

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [A303SparkfordtoIlchester@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:A303SparkfordtoIlchester@pins.gsi.gov.uk); [WARBURTON, David](mailto:WARBURTON.David); [Michael.Lewis@southsomerset.gov.uk](mailto:Michael.Lewis@southsomerset.gov.uk)  
**Subject:** A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling  
**Date:** 28 April 2019 17:44:45  
**Attachments:** [Deadline 6.docx](#)

---

Dear PINS,

Registration Identity Number 20015173

I attach hereto my submission in respect of Deadline 6 the contents of which I trust are worthy of pursuing.

I would appreciate confirmation of receipt of this email.

Regards

A Keith Tingey

[REDACTED]

---

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

---

## Deadline 6

### A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling Project TR010036

#### Allan Keith Tingey

Registration Identity Number 20015173

Resident of West Camel for 33 years.

My submissions have all been based on achieving minimum disruption to the flow of traffic along the A303 during and after the construction phase of the Project.

I respectfully draw your attention to the Highways England DCO submission for the **A30 Chiverton to Carland Cross Scheme** and particularly to Ref 6.4 E. S Appendix 2.1 together with Appendix A1, A2, A3, A4, and A5. This is a comprehensively produced Traffic Management proposal that has been so detailed that the various stages of handling traffic at prime locations has been shown on a series of maps for each. This has been aided, of course, by the retention of some of the existing A30, and the express intention to create links, to ensure that there is a parallel link road (PLR) along the whole length.

On the A303 Sparkford to Ilchester DCO submission by Highways England, the Traffic Management narrative is bland, lacking in any sort of detail and is reliant on a detailed submission at a much later stage by the appointed Contractor. There is a reliance on minimal closure of the route, which frankly I, nor a great many others, do not accept.

The programmes for both Projects are running concurrently, but how can it be that one, the A30 be produced in so much greater detail; it must be said, in virtually every aspect of the design than that of this section of the A303?

#### Parallel Link Road. (PLR)

Highways England have committed to identifying the alleged **extra** cost for the introduction of the proposed PLR to the new dualled A303. See AKT 1. (submitted previously). There has been no analysis of the **savings** that will be accrued by the omission of designed items in Option 1 that would no longer be required to construct the Project. Are we not entitled to a thorough appraisal of the comparisons?

## Consultation conclusions

Again, referring to the A30.

DCO 6.2 ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT CHAPTER 3 CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES.

There is no such Environmental Statement for the A303 Sparkford to Ilchester included in this DCO. As there have been no apparent acceptable views expressed at the numerous consultations with Highways England and their Consultants it is not surprising that they were not able to include a 6.2 Environmental Statement (ES) listing and considering the various submissions made and the reasoned arguments for their rejection. It would have been of enormous interest to have had the ES, to all those who have given time to attend the consultations and those who have continued to present considered views to help to ensure that the Project when carried out is the best that it can be for the travelling public, local inhabitants and importantly that it provides value for money for all those who have contributed monetarily to its completion (i.e. the tax payer).

## Drawings.

As a Chartered Quantity Surveyor, I always found it totally frustrating to receive drawings from Architects and others, where modifications had been made but were so loosely described that it proved almost impossible to identify all the alterations made. Mott Macdonald have now issued drawings with numerous separate dates when changes have been made, and have for example noted on Works Plan Drawings that there are four changes so far. The last over the heading of Amendment Details states - Deadline 5.

I would call for each of the changes made to be within a balloon that could be followed by ALL of those receiving and having need to understand the changes made. It saves everyone having to ferret through the Deadline 5 notes, for example, to identify the changes.