

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Metrowest1](#)  
**Subject:** Issue Specific Hearing 2 Day 1  
**Date:** 20 January 2021 13:07:15

---

**Application by North Somerset District Council for an Order granting  
Development Consent for the Portishead branch line – MetroWest Phase 1**

**Issue Specific Hearing 2, Day 1, Monday 11 January 2021**

**Response to Action Points**

**Agenda item 4 - Permanent Public Right of Way Diversions and Alternatives**

**Action No. 29, 30 for Applicant and NSDC**

I was expecting a joint action together with Mr Ovel (Pill & Easton-in-Gordano Parish Council) reference our comments regarding National Cycle Route (NCN) 26. I believe Mr Ovel has already responded; therefore, I am responding under separate cover.

1. Bridleway Crossing Royal Portbury Dock Road. Works 14, 14A, 14B.  
LA15/66/10, LA15/21/20, LA8/66/10

I spoke raising my concerns about the bridleway crossing at Portbury Dock Road.

I stated that the speed limit was 50 mph, it is actually 30 mph.

I regularly use this route (approx. 5 days a week in both directions) and often cross at Royal Portbury Road if I do not use the underbridge option. I note that vehicles frequently appear to travel in excess of the speed limit on what is a straight and very wide road; with sometimes continuous, fast moving streams of HGV's, lighter commercial traffic and cars, particularly in peak periods.

I have never seen any horses/ horse riders, and rarely other users on either part this bridleway as it crosses Royal Portbury Dock Road; they, like the majority of traffic using the cycle path, choose to take the safer underbridge route.

The cycle path/ bridleway is becoming increasingly busy with horse riders, walkers, runners and cyclists; the latter of which can be individuals, or groups of varying sizes often multiple family groups including children of all ages.

Therefore, I share the view that providing an uncontrolled crossing on this road could potentially result in a serious accident. Crossing on a horse would be extremely dangerous. Crossing on foot or cycle is already hazardous.

I understand that there is an objective to provide a route for horses that avoids the need to pass under the Portbury Dock Road overbridge close to the reinstated rail track. However, unless user controlled traffic lights are provided for the crossing, I believe that it would be extremely dangerous to encourage horse riders, pedestrians and cyclists to cross the road at this location. This applies both when the underbridge is closed off during the construction period and post construction when the underbridge is hopefully reopened.

## 2. Proposed Diversion Route for NCN 26.

Mr Ovel raised his concerns about the proposal to divert NCN26 southbound from its junction with Marsh Lane to the junction with Church Road in Easton-in-Gordano. I to share his concerns on grounds of user safety having experienced several near misses as a regular user of this route. The Applicant's representative (Mr Wilcock, NSDC) expressed an opinion that because Marsh Lane is a minor route, the proposed diversion would not significantly increase the hazard to users of the diverted section of NCN 26. With this statement I must disagree.

As Mr Ovel; I too, walk this road several times a week to access the cycle path/ NCN26. The majority the stretch of the diversion route is subject to a recently introduced 40 mph speed limit (previously 60mph), reducing to 30 mph just before reaching Church Road; why the whole road was not made subject to a 30 mph limit is another question. There is also a semi blind, narrow, hump-backed bridge on a bend over the railway. There is no footpath for a distance of 100+ metres either side of the bridge; although there are white lined "pedestrian refuge" areas recently added when the "Honda" traffic lights were installed near the cycle path crossing point on Marsh Lane. However; these white lined areas are on the opposite side of the road in each direction, so the user has to cross the road at the top of the hump back bridge.

This road is busy with local traffic accessing and exiting the dock area and J19 M5; and, non-local private and light commercial traffic both accessing and exiting the docks area, using Marsh Lane as a "rat run" to avoid delays at J19, particularly in peak periods; at times this road can best be described as a "speed track" with many vehicles ignoring the speed limit. As have previously mentioned, the cycle track/ NCN26 is becoming increasingly busy, with horse riders, walkers, runners and cyclists; the latter of which can be individuals, or groups of varying sizes often multiple family groups, including children of all ages.

I would also like to point that the entrance point to the cycle path/ NCN26 in Marsh Lane is almost directly opposite what will be Access Point AW 5.1, which provides access the proposed Haul Road to the construction compounds under the M5 Avonmouth Bridge and Lodway Farm; again, causing direct conflict between users of the cycle path/NCN26 and construction traffic.

As per Mr Ovel, I agree it would be unwise to re direct any users of the cycle path/ NCN26, on to Marsh Lane placing them in conflict with fast moving traffic for several hundred metres on a narrow road with a view restricted crest over the bridge. I share Mr Ovel's opinion a lot more work would have to be done to make this diversion route safe. A further reduction to a blanket 30 or 20 mph limit would be a good start, combined together with speed reduction measures such as speed humps and warning signage. Perhaps making Marsh Lane "one way" to motor traffic might be worthy of consideration; or, as it is deemed only a "minor" route, perhaps temporary closure of this stretch of Marsh Lane should be considered, with traffic affected being redirected to the main primary routes in an out of Pill/ Easton In Gordano and Royal Portbury Dock. This last option would also prevent any construction traffic the ability to use this stretch of Marsh Lane.

Martin Berry

Reference 20025020

18 January 2021

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Metrowest1](#)  
**Subject:** Issue Specific Hearing 2 Day 1  
**Date:** 20 January 2021 13:12:33

---

**Application by North Somerset District Council for an Order granting Development Consent for the Portishead branch line – MetroWest Phase 1**

**Issue Specific Hearing 2, Day 1, Monday 11 January 2021**

**Response to Action Points**

**Agenda item 4 - Permanent Public Right of Way Diversions and Alternatives**

**Action No. 15**

**Subject: Issue Specific Hearing 2, Day 1, Agenda item 3 (v) - Lack of Acoustic & Barrier - M5 overbridge**

Please see below, Mr Ovel's response to this action point.

**PLEASE SEE MY FURTHER COMMENTS FOLLOWING ON FROM THIS RESPONSE**

Bill Ovel, representing Pill & Easton-in-Gordano Parish Council

Ref: DCO, Section 2.37 National Cycle Route (NCN) Temporary and Permanent Works Plan

Currently, the disused railway and a permissive route run side-by-side through the M5 overbridge to the west of Pill. This permissive route is heavily utilised by pedestrians and cyclists on national cycle way NCN 26 and, occasionally, by horse riders. The bridge is effectively a short, narrow tunnel about 50 metres long. It is believed that, once MetroWest construction is complete, the intention is for the permissive way to be reopened. It is recognised that an alternative, longer route, bypassing the overbridge to the north, will be provided by the proposed re-routing of the bridleway. However, if the pedestrian/cycle route is to be retained in close proximity to the operational railway, then a significant health and safety issue would result for any people and animals who were on the path inside the M5 overbridge when a train transited under the bridge due to the deafening noise levels that would inevitably be generated. The length of the bridge is such that it might not be possible for many people to get out of the "tunnel" in time even if a train was heard to be approaching. Accordingly, if the permissive route is to be retained, then an acoustic barrier should be installed for the full length of the overbridge to shield pedestrians, cyclists and animals from the noise caused by the passage of the train. Of course, an alternative solution would be to close that section of the permissive route and oblige all users to use the diverted bridleway but that is not shown as being the case in the DCO. Of course, it would be necessary to ensure that the re-routed bridleway would be compatible with simultaneous use by pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders.

Regards

Bill Ovel

### **FURTHER COMMENT**

I have been in further contact with Mr Ovel. We share the opinion that as per the potential need for an acoustic barrier between the public footpath and the M5 underbridge, the same need applies the underbridge at **Royal Portbury Dock Road** (Works No. 14B); as the needs here are no different to those at the M5 underbridge, albeit I estimate the underbridge to be approx. 25 metres in length.

I request that the potential need for an acoustic barrier between the public footpath at the underbridge at **Royal Portbury Dock Road** is therefore taken in to scope and given likewise consideration.

Please see Mr Ovel's response to action point 15 for justification in support of this request as the need is fundamentally the same.

Martin Berry

Reference 20025020

18 January 2021