

From: [REDACTED]
To: A303SparkfordtoIlchester@pins.gsi.gov.uk
Cc: [WARBURTON, David](#); [Michael Lewis](#)
Subject: A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling - Project TR010036
Date: 08 March 2019 21:00:16
Attachments: [Written Representation for Deadline 4 8th March 2019.pdf](#)

Dear PINS

A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling – Project TR010036

Phil Gamble – registration identification number 20015057

A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling – Deadline 4 submission.

Please find attached my written representation which comments on additional information/submission at deadline 3 and the ISHs and CAH at the Haynes Museum on the 26th, 27th 28th February and the 1st March.

I would be grateful if you would please confirm receipt.

<<...>>

Phil Gamble

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

Written Representation for Deadline 4

This project is very important to the local communities of West Camel, Sparkford, Queen Camel and Podimore having been disappointed in the past by cancelled proposals.

As can be seen to date they feel their cares and concerns have not been fully appreciated or had any real impact on the design submitted by HE on the 23 August 2018 for DCO approval. The devil is very much in the detail and they have not been reassured by HE about their fears for the future. The consequences of not “getting it right” will be with the local communities for ever.

The creation of a Parallel Link Road (PLR) between the A359 at Sparkford and the B3151 at Wayne’s Bistro is fundamental in the opinion of the locals.

The benefits of a Parallel Link Road (PLR), between the A359 at Sparkford Roundabout and the B3151 at Wayne’s Bistro, has been identified and promoted by local communities since the early days of this project and HE, at ISH1, stated that such a PLR had benefits.

Considering the possible significant benefits in terms of improved safety, streamlining construction, minimising disruption on diversionary routes and providing further resilience in the longer term, HE are not able to demonstrate the efforts they allocated to exploring this option. Due diligence and the best use of public funds suggest that there are considerable benefits available here which have not been fully evaluated.

It is accepted that the major design challenge of providing this PLR is the pinch point at Camel Hill where the MOD Signalling Station site is adjacent to the existing A303 carriageway. In an earlier design (1993 by Veryard Consulting Engineers) there was adequate space to provide a new dual carriageway and still retain a PLR at this point. Whilst the standards of road design may have changed over time Fairhurst Consulting Engineers, retained by interested individuals (who have made their own written representation), suggest that such a design is still possible. At the ISH1 CS, of Mott MacDonald Sweco, summarily dismissed this work and suggested that this did not meet current road design specification.

HE have stated, that to provide this PLR, land would be required from the MOD (possibly 5m x 100m detailed in their response to Deadline 3 (REP3-003 volume 9.11 para 1.3.20) but “despite the relatively small size of this plot, the risk to the project of not being able to secure it by agreement within the required timescales was considered to be unacceptable, and so a continuous PLR between the B3151 and the A359 was again rejected”. In the meantime discussions have taken place with the MOD/Infrastructure Defence Organisation on the release of land to the south of the Signalling Station to provide a new footpath/right of way and an extension to the RLB.

Even if a single carriageway could not be provided through the pinch point then perhaps a short single track section with priority signage (similar to the bridge at Queen Camel) could have been considered. This may even be seen to be preferable as it would provide traffic calming opportunities.

In his submission for Deadline 2 (REP2-032 and 033) Mr Tingey describes in detail the process and the sequence timing whereby a PLR could be constructed, without significant impact on the existing A303 carriageway, prior to commencement of work on the main dual carriageway upgrade. This could then be used as the main diversionary route and the existing A303 carriageways used as a haulage route, reducing unnecessary land take whilst also having a very positive reduction on driver stress for the duration of the scheme. Details of Mr Tingey's proposals have been shared and developed in consultation with Mott MacDonald prior to the registering of the DCO.

With regard for the need for addition land take from the MOD Signalling Site to facilitate a PLR, there is no evidence to suggest that the MOD/Infrastructure Defence Organisation were ever formally approached (engagement with the MOD/Infrastructure Defence Organisation are recorded in SOCG APP-181 and REP3-007). When asked at the ISH1 what discussion had taken place with the MOD/Infrastructure Defence Organisation, AM, of Mott MacDonald Sweco, replied that only informally questions had been asked. HE was then asked by Ms Coffey and Mr Jackson to produce any evidence they had of any detailed engagement with the MOD, at the next deadline.

It was hoped, with MOD/Infrastructure Defence Organisation being invited to the CAH1 session on Friday 1st March 2019, that there would have been an opportunity to establish their engagement with HE on the release of land adjacent to the A303 carriageway which could have facilitated the provision of a full PLR. Needless to say the MOD/Infrastructure Defence Organisation were not represented at the session.

In my submission for Deadline 2 I attached a copy of a meeting with HE (REP2-046 Meeting notes A303 31st May 2018) when our local MP offered to facilitate such talks which was dismissed as inappropriate by HE.

With such local support for such a design and with the possibility of having a considerable impact both during the construction phase of the scheme and thereafter I believe such an omission was not just unfortunate but displays an unwillingness to engage with the locally affected communities.

If the design of a PLR is neither practically possible or a cost effective solution then HE ought to be able to provide supporting evidence which stands public scrutiny.

The benefits of a PLR (between the B3151 and the A359)

Safety and Economics and Resilience.

Without resorting to repeating arguments used in earlier written representations the following issues were raised at ISH1 and ISH4

- Discussions took place about the length of highway between the Sparkford roundabout and the Mattia Diner and the Shell Service Station with the unquantifiable risk that this length of highway could attract an antisocial use. This would be mitigated by a PLR.

- The traffic calming plans for West Camel especially during the construction period were also discussed and put on the back burner until the traffic management plan was produced. The indications are that Traits Lane and Gason Lane are to be closed prior to the scheme commencing. During the ISH sessions much was made of the (as yet) undeveloped and unavailable Traffic Management Plans. A PLR would mitigate the need for possible extensive and expensive traffic calming considerations and also the need for lengthy diversionary routes and their impact on the adjacent local road network and local communities.
- There seems to be a total lack of any economic assessment for local businesses currently adjacent to the A303. It was interesting to note, that at the recent ISH1 at the Haynes Museum, when the Examiner asked the question of HE about what actions were proposed for mitigation/compensation to local businesses, for loss of trade. HE replied that they only considered recompense for demolition or land take. They repeated this answer when the question was asked a second time. There was a claim by HE that the local economy would benefit to the tune of £33M as a result of the scheme. This amount must be challenged as it seems much more likely that this is the total benefit to the national economy resulting from the reduced travel times expected as a result of the scheme. The direct consequential impact on the local economy has not been provided. A possible impact for local businesses situated on the existing carriageway is suggested below.
 - **Who will use the Shell Petrol Station?**
 - Travelling west you have passed the cheap petrol at the Wincanton Junction (Morrison's) so you get off the A303 at Hazlegrove sliproad, reach the Sparkford roundabout and then drive past the Esso petrol station to drive uphill along a no-through road to access the Shell Service Station. You then have to drive back down the hill to the Sparkford roundabout to regain access to the west bound carriageway. The next available petrol station is 6/7km to the west at the Podimore Roundabout.
 - Travelling east you past the Petrol station at the Podimore Services and travel on towards the cheap petrol at Morrison's off the Wincanton junction. If you leave the A303 at the Hazlegrove junction you approach the Sparkford roundabout under the bridge pass the Esso petrol station, round the roundabout and travel up the hill to gain access to the Shell Services. To rejoin the east bound carriageway you have to reverse the journey back to the roundabout through the underpass and along the sliproad.
 - I would suggest that similar logic may well apply to the viability of the Mattia Diner.
 - **Who will use the Bakery at West Camel?**
 - The Bakery is run by a local family employing local labour. A significant proportion of the current custom is passing trade - the Bakery sits adjacent to the existing carriageway with lay-by parking close by, for both east and west bound traffic. Not a very satisfactory arrangement and sometimes a high risk opportunity to purchase your breakfast, dinner or tea. With a PLR then the opportunity for west bound traffic to pass the Bakery would still be there. Without a PLR it is likely that there will be a considerable loss of trade. There is also a 7.5t weight limit proposed of the highway between the roundabout south of the Downhead junction and Howell Hill. This will also limit trade and funnel vehicles, over the weight limit, through West Camel via Keep Street

and Fore Street. (see also REP2-019 Joint Councils Local Impact Report - BH8 MM273) - The bakery was established over 100 years ago to serve travellers on this strategic road and is a well-known facility on the A303 with its “outside” loaves of bread. The realignment of the A303 will remove the Bakery’s location alongside a main through-route, thus fundamentally alter its relationship with its setting and threaten its historic use. (Policy: Paragraph 5.125 of the NPS requires the Secretary of State to consider the impacts on non-designated heritage assets on the basis of clear evidence that the assets have a significance that merits consideration. Paragraph 5.126 of the NPS requires the applicant to assess the significant heritage impacts of the proposed project.)

**Safe use of the new Dual Carriageway and the removal of the eastbound junction at Downhead. (REP2-019 Joint Council Local Impact Report T9).
The dangers of lane weaving when using a busy dual carriageway to only travel 2km when a PLR could avoid mixing fast moving through traffic with slow moving local traffic. Mitigation provided by a PLR and the removal of the eastbound junction at Downhead.**

Understanding current local traffic movements and using nationally developed traffic modelling to predict future movements may not prove accurate. Current choices of route for local traffic is determined by the existing A303 constraints (difficulty turning right across a busy fast moving vehicles or perhaps stationary lanes of traffic) and the existing traffic calming arrangement in Queen Camel. With time of day, time of year, school timetables, MOD time tables at Yeovilton and weather condition all playing their part in the daily decision on which is the best route today. In the future as an illustration:

- Parents in and near West Camel taking their children to school at Hazlegrove School, North Cadbury Primary School or Ansford Secondary School at Castle Cary will have a choice of using the local roads to and through Queen Camel to access the Sparkford roundabout for their ongoing journey or joining the new A303 dual carriageway at the Downhead junction to travel the short distance to exit at the sliproad at the top of Camel Hill or travel on to leave the A303 at the (dangerous) at grade junction at the Haynes Museum.
- At the end of the day parents picking up the offspring have the similar choice in reverse, either via Queen Camel High Street or via the Hazlegrove junction and along the short stretch of new dual carriageway to the B3151 junction at Wayne’s and then back up the hill on the detrunked A303 to access the village.
- I believe that the majority may well use the new dual carriageway in order to avoid the traffic calming in Queen Camel which can provide unforeseen delays, with the major traffic flow towards Yeovil having preference through the traffic calming areas.
- Without a PLR these parents and grand parents will be encouraged onto the new high speed road only to exit at the next junction, which may well be the at grade junction at Haynes Museum. (not to be recommended)
- I would suggest the use of a suitable PLR would be a much safer (and short) journey especially when transporting young and sometimes distracting children, especially during the hours of the busy morning period.
- The newly revised and proposed access in and out for Blackwell Farm becomes unnecessary as access can be maintained from the PLR via Traits Lane.

- The provision of a PLR would provide ready access for emergency vehicles, ambulance, police and fire, both to the new dual carriageway and to local communities in Blackwell, Eyewell and West Camel especially when the river Cam floods. It is normal practice for emergency vehicle to be stationed in the vicinity of Sparkford Services.

There are many items in the Council's Joint Local Impact Report which would directly be mitigated by the provision of a PLR. (REP2-019 Joint Council Impact Report.)

Assessment of impacts – classified as red (strongly negative) or orange (negative)

- Transport – T4, T7, T9
- Suspension of the 7.5tonne weight limit on the A359 and the impact on other villages on the A359 diversionary route.
- Build Heritage - BH10
- Economy and Community Impacts – EC13, EC15
- Noise and Vibration – NV2
- Cultural Heritage – para 3.8

I understand the DCO process and that the design registered by HE on 23rd August 2018 is the only design that should be under scrutiny. Nevertheless if safety on the new dual carriageway could be improved and safety in the resulting local network could be improved then I submit that consideration should/could/must be given and the supporting arguments, that will stand full public scrutiny, made available before a final design decision is submitted to the Secretary of State.

There are many comments and observation which could be challenged in HE submission for Deadline3 (REP3-003) but I will only pick out one which is particularly relevant.

Traffic impact on local communities – West Camel para. 1.12.3.

I know that SCC has been asked to provide the latest traffic accident figures for the Parsonage Road/West Camel Road crossroads. At every consultation and meeting I have attended the accident record at this junction has been highlighted. Many of the accidents has resulted in ambulance and police attendance, probably the worse being that of a retired Admiral and his wife, returning with their grandson after a swimming lesson in Sherborne, resulting in the wife been hospitalise for over a week. HE submission acknowledging only “two slight accidents” which just illustrates the local view that HE are not listening.

Phil Gamble

■■■■■■■■■■
■■■■■■■■■■
■■■■■■■■■■
■■■■■■■■■■