

**From:** [Jo Wilkins](#)  
**To:** [A303 Sparkford to Ilchester](#)  
**Subject:** A303 Sparkford to Ilchester, TR010036 - Deadline 8  
**Date:** 10 June 2019 16:08:18  
**Attachments:** [image002.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)  
[image008.png](#)  
[The South Somerset District \(Sparkford No.1 \) Tree Preservation Order 2019..pdf](#)  
[SSDC Deadline 8 submission.pdf](#)

---

Dear Ms Coffey

**PLANNING ACT 2008**

**APPLICATION BY HIGHWAYS ENGLAND FOR AN ORDER GRANTING DEVELOPMENT CONSENT FOR THE A303 SPARKFORD TO ILCHESTER DUALLING**

**SUBMISSION MADE PURSUANT TO DEADLINE 8**

Please find attached relevant documents from South Somerset District Council in respect of Examination Deadline 8.

The submission includes the following: -

- South Somerset District Council's responses to Highways England's response to Action Points arising from Issue Specific Hearings 5 and 6 submitted at Deadline 7 and the draft Development Consent Order revision 0.5 (May 2019)
- A copy of The South Somerset District (Sparkford No.1 ) Tree Preservation Order 2019, dated 7<sup>th</sup> June 2019

Yours sincerely

**Jo Wilkins**

**Specialist – Strategic Planning**

Strategy and Commissioning

South Somerset District Council

☎ +441935462588

🌐 [southsomerset.gov.uk](http://southsomerset.gov.uk) 🐦 [@southsomersetDC](https://twitter.com/southsomersetDC) 📘 [@SouthSomersetDistrictCouncil](https://www.facebook.com/SouthSomersetDistrictCouncil)

This communication is intended solely for the person (s) or organisation to whom it is addressed. It may contain privileged and confidential information and if you are not the intended recipient (s), you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it. If you have received this e-mail in error please notify the sender. Individuals are advised that by replying to, or sending an e-mail message to South Somerset District Council, you accept that you have no explicit or implicit expectation of privacy and that emails may be disclosed under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. In line with Council Policy, any e-mail messages (and attachments) transmitted over the Council's network may be subject to scrutiny, monitoring and recording. You must carry out your own anti-virus checks before opening any attachments/documents as the Council will not accept any liability for any viruses they may contain.

## Application by Highways England (Ref – TR010036) for an Order Granting Development Consent for the A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling project

### Deadline 8: South Somerset District Council's Responses

Please find below South Somerset District Council's responses to:

- Highways England document 9.36 Responses to Action Points for Deadline 7 (REP7-027)
- The revised draft Development Consent Order revision 0.5 (May 2019)

### 9.36 Responses to Action Points for Deadline 7 (REP7-027)

Action Points	Action Point requests	Applicant's response at Deadline 7	Response from SSDC for Deadline 8
<b>Action points from Hearings held on Tuesday 14 May 2019 &amp; Wednesday 15 May 2019 (EV-033)</b>			
1	Viewpoint 27 and 28 – a summary note on issues surrounding the environmental barrier, possibility of alternative to fence as mitigation and how this might be secured within the ES.	<p>The selection of a timber fence is considered to be the most balanced solution at this location given that a bund would have required the acquisition of additional land that is associated with residential property. The use of a fence rather than a bund minimises residential land-take.</p> <p>From a visual impact perspective, it is considered that the presence of a two metre high timber acoustic fence (environmental barrier) has been adequately mitigated for, through the introduction of an intervening native hedgerow as well as further screening provided by a linear belt of trees and shrubs which will screen views to the fence over time, all of which will require less land-take than a bund. Existing vegetation between the proposed fence and residential property, which will be retained, will also screen views to the proposed fence. Additional hedgerow trees could also be included in the proposed hedgerow to provide an additional vertical element within the mitigation proposals.</p> <p>However, the concerns of the Local Planning Authority are noted. The Applicant has therefore committed to reviewing opportunities</p>	SSDC's observations have been presented in earlier submissions and the Council welcomes the commitment in row L5 of Table 3.1 REAC of the OEMP.

Action Points	Action Point requests	Applicant's response at Deadline 7	Response from SSDC for Deadline 8
		to reduce adverse visual effects from the vicinity of Camel Hill Farm and the perception of the area with travellers on the A303 within row L5 of Table 3.1 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) of the Outline Environmental Management Plan (document 6.7, Volume 6, revision B) submitted as part of the Applicant's Deadline 7 submission.	
23	Listed milestone – <i>Submit possible solutions to missing stone and how these could be secured in DCO.</i>	The Applicant has included the following additional mitigation which now makes up the second paragraph of row CH4 in Table 3.1 of the revised version of the Outline Environmental Management Plan document 6.7, Volume 6, revision B) that has been submitted as part of Deadline 7: <i>If the milestone is not recovered during works, consultation will be undertaken with South Somerset District Council and Historic England regarding potential mitigation. This will focus on the significance of the milestone through its function and context as a marker of the former turnpike route. Mitigation could include a record of the milestone from existing material and site survey, a replica milestone or a modern interpretation of the milestone. It should be noted that the provision of a replica or modern interpretation of the milestone will be subject to a safety assessment associated with its proposed position in the highway verge.</i>	Please note, the wording for the last sentence in the Applicant's Responses to Action Points and in the revised OEMP for Deadline 7 do not match.  The commitment to securing a replica milestone feature, should the original not materialise, is non-committal. The Council requests that the wording of the commitment is changed to:  <i>If the milestone is not recovered during works, consultation will be undertaken with South Somerset District Council and Historic England regarding potential mitigation. This will focus on the significance of the milestone through its function and context as a marker of the former turnpike route. Mitigation <del>could</del> would include a record of the milestone from existing material and site survey and a replica</i>

Action Points	Action Point requests	Applicant's response at Deadline 7	Response from SSDC for Deadline 8
			<i>milestone or a modern interpretation of the milestone. . .</i>
29	Bund 4 – Confirm position of bund and landscape effect.	<p>Bund 4 will be located from Howell Hill running east, and in effect will create a false cutting to aid screening of the scheme from West Camel in the south and south west. To the west of Howell Hill, the realigned A303 will fall into cutting north of the existing A303 alignment, with the exception of the realigned northern section of Howell Hill, which will run adjacent to the newly aligned A303. A proposed native hedgerow will continue the existing field / highway boundary along Howell Hill to aid integration with the local landscape and screen views of Howell Hill. In addition to the A303 being in cutting or false cutting, all earthworks will be planted with trees and shrubs to further integrate the scheme and provide additional screening value. This is indicated on the Environmental Masterplan (Environmental Statement Addendum Appendix B Figure A2.4 Environmental Masterplan, Sheets 1 to 4 version C03, Sheets 5 to 6 C04, Sheet 7 C03) which has been submitted as part of this Deadline 7 submission.</p> <p>In terms of noise, . . .</p>	<p>The reconstruction of the Howell Hill stone wall is also relevant to this area of the scheme. Bund 4 will cover the top half of the local stone wall on Howell Hill. SSDC has pressed for the demolished section of the wall to be reinstated along the alignment of the realigned carriageway. This has been picked up in part in commitment CH2 of Table 3.1 REAC of the OEMP, but not to the extent requested by the Council.</p> <p>The reinstatement of the wall along the realigned carriageway way will retain a local feature and have the same benefit as the hedgerow works identified in the Action Point Response; i.e. aiding integration with the local landscape.</p>
40	Produce report setting out changes from OEMP submitted at D5 [REP5-013].	<p>The changes that have been made to the Outline Environmental Management Plan are detailed in Table 2.2below.</p> <p>Table2.2: Schedule of changes to Table 3.1 REAC of the OEMP since Deadline 5(REP5-013) (See page 29).</p>	<p>Inclusion of GH7 supported.</p> <p>Request for the wording of CH4 to be amended in line with the Council's comments raised against Action Point 23.</p>

Action Points	Action Point requests	Applicant's response at Deadline 7	Response from SSDC for Deadline 8
			<p>Inclusion of L4 supported.</p> <p>Inclusion of L5 supported.</p> <p>Inclusion of L6 supported.</p>
<b>Additional responses for Deadline 7</b>			
Table 3.1	<p>Details of the physical dimensions of the noise bund or any other barriers that are required to mitigate the noise impact at the two noise sensitive properties – The Spinney and Annis Hill Farm should be provided. It is important that SSDC understands this mitigation so that we can ensure the design implementation is completed.</p>	<p>Details of the physical dimensions of the noise mitigation for The Spinney and Annis Hill are detailed within paragraphs 2.5.159 to 2.5.167 and Figure 2.20 of Chapter 2 The Scheme of the Environmental Statement (APP-039).</p>	<p>Chapter 2 The Scheme of the Environmental Statement identifies the following acoustic barriers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Barrier 1 (2m high) opposite The Spinney.</li> <li>• Barrier 2 (3m high) at Steart Hill.</li> <li>• Barrier 3 (2m high) at Camel Hill, opposite Traits Lane.</li> <li>• Barrier 4 (2m high) at Camel Hill, opposite Gason Lane.</li> </ul> <p>There is also the environmental barrier at the east end of Bund 7 for the RPG.</p> <p>SSDC has to date made representations on Barrier 3 and the RPG barrier in light of their proximity to either Key Views or heritage assets and the potential for alternative screening measures, on the grounds that</p>

Action Points	Action Point requests	Applicant's response at Deadline 7	Response from SSDC for Deadline 8
			<p>the timber barriers are not in-keeping with the local and district rural character or historic parkland.</p> <p>The debate on the merits of these two barriers has resulted in modifications being proposed: a commitment to investigate other means of screening more in keeping with the rural character as part of the detailed design (row L5 of Table 3.1 REAC of the OEMP), and the addition of semi-mature hedge planting to the front of the barrier (non-material change request).</p> <p>Whilst recognising that it would not be appropriate to introduce new matters to the Examination at this late stage, the Council would like to suggest that consideration is given to the design of the remaining barriers in order to diminish the visual impact of the barriers on the rural setting through their design or hedge planting where feasible.</p> <p>This would be facilitated under the preparation of a landscaping</p>

Action Points	Action Point requests	Applicant's response at Deadline 7	Response from SSDC for Deadline 8
			scheme under Requirement 6 Landscaping.

**South Somerset District Council comments on the revised draft Development Consent Order (May 2019)**

In terms of the comments on the revised dDCO revision 0.5 (May 2019) there are no new issues to raise. However, the Council has raised issues in previous submissions which have not, as yet, been addressed in the dDCO. The Council would ask that the ExA consider in particular those comments submitted at deadline 6 (Examination Library reference REP6-021).

Of particular note is:

- Item number 2 in REP6-021- the definition of “relevant planning authority” and SSDCs wish to be referred to by name in the newly numbered requirements 12 (traffic management) and 16 (highways lighting); for the reasons set out in its submissions SSDC does have an interest in these matters but there is a risk that it may not be considered the relevant planning authority on the face of it.
- The other items in that document numbered as follows, 4. 6. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 14. An explanation of the Council's view on each of these issues is set out in REP6-021