

From: [REDACTED]
To: A303SparkfordtoIlchester@pins.gsi.gov.uk
Cc: [Michael Lewis](#); [WARBURTON, David](#)
Subject: TR010036 - Deadline 6 submission
Date: 30 April 2019 21:37:11
Attachments: [written representation deadline 6 1st May 2019.pdf](#)

Dear PINS

A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling – Project TR010036

Phil Gamble – registration identification number 20015057

A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling – Deadline 6 submission.

Please find attached my written representation for deadline 6.

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>

A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling – Project TR010036

Phil Gamble – registration identification number 20015057

Written Representation for Deadline 6

As we progress towards the end of the process and as a long term resident of the local community it seems appropriate to reflect on the procedure to date. Many of the comments below have been made before but the overview should not get buried in the detail.

The DCO procedure seems never-ending and we are continually reminded by the Applicant that only their design can be examined by the process. Throughout the pre-application period and during the formal consultations, local views and opinions have been sought and given. Most, if not all, of the concerns of the locals seem to have fallen on deaf ears and have been summarily dismissed without, in my opinion, receiving a detailed and professional evaluation which can stand the test of open public scrutiny.

In my opinion, for local communities with limited resources and minimal experience, the DCO process is overwhelming and intimidating and although the procedure appears to value and solicit local views the resulting effects are minimal, yet it is only these local communities with everyday local knowledge whose future will be affected significantly and it is for ever.

As an individual the task of keeping abreast of the 437 (to date) documents, which are integral to the process, is challenging but I am pleased to see that the Examining Authority is demonstrating its understanding of the local concerns and seeking to challenge the Applicant and seek satisfactory answers to important questions. I would only criticise the lack of an issue control register which would enable easier identification of the latest issue of a plan or document and the clear identification of any recent changes.

Overall the principles of the upgrade bring significant (and long overdue) benefits to both A303 travellers and to the local communities affected by the scheme. In my opinion, not to make the upgraded dual carriageway (expressway) as safe as possible seems inexcusable, and to neglect the damage it will cause to local businesses, which is irrevocable, is unacceptable.

In their “Scheme Objectives” (APP-149 para 4.1) HE highlight

- Making the network safer
- Helping cyclist, walkers and other vulnerable users of the network
- Reducing local severance and promote opportunities for improving their quality of life.
- To improve journey time reliability and resilience and provide extra capacity to make it easier to manage traffic when incidents occur.

The provision of a Parallel Link Road challenges the Applicant’s design and addresses these objectives, but it also seems, in this case, the provision of a PRL is an area of professional conflict.

Improved Safety.

With a PLR there is no need for either an eastbound or a westbound junction at Downhead. Minimising the number of junctions facilitates the separation of fast moving through traffic from slow moving local traffic and the consequential removal of junction hopping inherently reduces risk and improves safety. It could also significantly reduce overall cost.

Without access to the A303 at Downhead the temptation to use West Camel village as an access route is removed and the pressure on traffic calming provision by SCC is reduced. As far as I can ascertain no consideration, in any of the traffic modelling, has been given to the fact that with a junction at Downhead regular travellers from the Yeovil area wishing to join the A303 to travel east will (despite signage) turn left off the A359 before the B3148 junction and travel through West Camel to join the A303 at the Downhead junction. This unrestricted route will avoid the slow, narrow and bendy roads through Marston Magna and the busy and traffic calmed Queen Camel before negotiating the existing Sparkford roundabout to gain access to the A303 at the new convoluted Hazelgrove junction.

Local Business.

At the recent open floor hearing at the Haynes Museum it seems the Applicant does not recognise, or have a procedure or a responsibility for compensating businesses affected by their schemes – only for loss of land. The negative impact the scheme will have on local businesses adjacent to the existing A303 (and their employees) has been highlighted and it is doubtful of their ability to survive in the longer term.

Local Severance.

The existing A303 currently provides a significant barrier to non-motorised users who wish to cross the carriageway during busy periods; to such an extent that most locals are not prepared to take that risk and make alternative arrangements. It was hoped that NMU links would be improved by the scheme but, in my opinion, the proposed new links although being much safer are also much longer and will encourage the use of motor vehicles rather than the reverse. Another missed opportunity which does not benefit the locals or the environment.

Resilience.

The provision of a PLR provides the best possible resilience both during the construction phase and thereafter into the future.

I make no apologies for taking this opportunity to repeat the plea to

- **Plan for the future and**
- **Ensure the best value is achieved from the public purse.**

Phil Gamble

████████████████████
██████████
██████████