



**A380 South Devon Link Road (Kingskerswell Bypass)**

**Public Inquiry**

**Devon County Council's Response to  
Proof of Evidence on behalf of the Campaign to Protect Rural  
England**

**(Obj 53): OBJ/CPRE(53)/P/1 and OBJ/CPRE/P/2**

**Response by Mr Paul Ewings**

**with contributions by Ian Harrison, Michael Smith, David Black,  
Richard Perkins, Bethan Tuckett-Jones, Rosalyn Guard and  
Andrew McCarthy**

## 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This rebuttal (**DCC/REB/8**) to the Proof of Evidence of John Hartley representing the Campaign to Protect Rural England (**OBJ/CPRE(53)/P/1**) and to the letter dated 12 June 2009 (**OBJ/CPRE(53)/P/2**) has been prepared by Paul Ewings with contributions from Ian Harrison, Michael Smith, David Black, Richard Perkins, Bethan Tuckett-Jones, Rosalyn Guard and Andrew McCarthy,
- 1.2 Mr Hartley, in his letters dated 6th November and 8th November 2008, raised only one specific concern which related to the closeness of the Scheme to the Yannon Lane landfill site.
- 1.3 This issue is addressed in **paragraphs 11.1.72 to 11.1.75** of Michael Smith's Proof of Evidence (**DCC/P/3**).
- 1.4 In his Proof of Evidence on behalf of the Campaign to Protect Rural England, Mr Hartley has raised several themes as follows:
- Issues relating to the Environmental Statement
  - Issues relating to the Economic Impact Statement, February 2002
  - Flood Risk Assessment
  - Exhibition of alternative road routes
  - Yannon Lane/Foredown Landfill Site
  - Railway issues and public transport
  - Village Plan
  - Media and responses
  - Specific route issues
  - Habitats Directive
  - Other matters
- 1.5 This rebuttal provides a response to each of the themes above.

## 2.0 Issues Relating to the Environmental Statement

### Mitigation (Contributed by Rosalyn Guard)

- 2.1 Mr Hartley asserts that the Scheme has minimal mitigation compared to that suggested in the Halcrow Fox report of 2000 (A380 Newton Abbot to Torquay Corridor Study **CD5.23**).
- 2.2 The Halcrow Fox report indicated the location of a possible tunnel on a 1:25000 OS map, at a time when Halcrow Fox considered that a cutting in that location would have to be up to 45m deep. Rosalyn Guard's Proof of Evidence (**DCC/P/6**) **Section 11.2** describes Parsons Brinckerhoff's development of the highways earthworks design to reduce the depth of the potential cutting and the consideration of the tunnel option that was undertaken when embarking on the present Scheme mitigation design.
- 2.3 The only other landscape mitigation arrangements proposed by Halcrow Fox were two 'bullet points' in a list on page 9 of their 2001 report (**CD5.24**): 'Additional landscape works to screen and shield the Bypass, particularly in the vicinity of Maddacombe Road' and 'Extensive planting and transplanting'. As noted in Rosalyn

Guard's Proof of Evidence, paragraph 5.2.19, the mitigation proposals for the Scheme include those landscape mitigation measures.

- 2.4 The author of the CPRE Evidence, John Hartley, states in his personal Proof of Evidence (**OBJ/HART(51)/P/1**) relating to his own property, 'Woodlands', that there will be 'no screen mounding' to the west of his house. The Scheme plans do show screen mounds there and they are illustrated further on a section on Parsons Brinckerhoff drawing HEX43444A/SKC/485A (**DCC/REB/7, Appendix 1**).

Environmental Statement Volume 3

- 2.5 Mr Hartley points out that the Grant of Conditional Planning Permission for the Scheme does not list Volume 3 of the Environmental Statement (ES). However, the contents of Volume 3 are referenced in detail in the preface to Volume 1 and each of the figures is referenced in the relevant sections in Volume 1. Volume 3 formed part of the supporting information to the planning application and was therefore considered by the planning authority as part of the planning process.

Noise Impact (Contributed by Richard Perkins)

- 2.6 In Mr Hartley's proof of evidence, he states that the Environmental Statement contained inadequate information on the noise impacts of the Scheme. Noise has been dealt with in Richard Perkins's Proof of Evidence (**DCC/P/9**) where he has updated the information provided in the Environmental Statement using the latest traffic flow forecasts, and the latest methodology guidance. Detailed noise level calculations for the area within 600m of the Scheme and the existing road through Kingskerswell have been made using the methodology set out in Chapter 4 of his proof. Figures to illustrate the noise levels and noise changes are included in Richard Perkins's Appendices (**DCC/A/9**) with Figure NV5a-c showing the noise changes as a result of the Scheme.

Air Quality (Contributed by Bethan Tuckett-Jones)

- 2.7 Mr Hartley considers that pollution impacts on the countryside are adverse, and need to be either avoided or minimised, and that potential airborne pollution impacts of the Scheme are dealt with at an unacceptable level.
- 2.8 The air quality assessment undertaken for the ES was robust and the methodologies used were in accordance with the appropriate guidance at the time e.g. DMRB and WebTAG. The Air Quality Proof of Evidence (**DCC/P/10**) provides the most up to date air quality impact assessment for the Scheme, undertaken using current guidance, updated traffic assessments and detailed dispersion modelling. The robustness of the ES assessment is demonstrated by a comparison of the overall conclusion of the ES and the Proof of Evidence: overall there will be an improvement in local air quality and there will be a slight increase in total emission of pollutants including carbon dioxide. No standards or objectives for local air quality will be exceeded as a result of there scheme, and the increase in carbon emissions is negligible on the regional scale. Therefore, no mitigation of the operational effects of the Scheme is warranted.

Visual Impact (Contributed by Rosalyn Guard)

- 2.9 Mr Hartley states that 'the CPRE regards visual impact as extremely detrimental to the amenities of Kingskerswell and its affected surrounding area, as well as to the community itself.'
- 2.10 It is acknowledged that a bypass solution will result in visual impacts and that from some properties and public viewpoints these will result in substantial adverse effects, particularly in the first years after opening.

- 2.11 Rosalyn Guard's Proof of Evidence, (**DCC/P/6**), explains the role of route selection and mitigation design in minimising the visual impacts of the Scheme on Kingskerswell and the surrounding rural area. The photomontages that accompany the Proof of Evidence show that the proposed mitigation planting will significantly reduce the visual impacts as it matures.

Environmental Statement used for Major Scheme Business Case

- 2.12 Mr Hartley states that the ES was used for the Major Scheme Business Case (MSBC) (**CD 5.32 and 5.33**).
- 2.13 The ES was not used as an accompanying report to the MSBC; however, a copy of the Non-technical Summary of the Environmental Statement only was included. The MSBC process involves a different methodology (WebTag), as explained in the separate sections dealing with WebTag in the DCC proofs of evidence.

### **3.0 Issues relating to the Economic Impact Study, February 2002**

Map of Potential Development Areas

- 3.1 Mr Hartley refers to four versions of the above plan. However, it is clear that the plans shown in his CPRE 5.1 and CPRE 5.2 are the same, one being a clearer version of the other, and this is the plan contained in the Economic Impact Study (**CD 5.26**). The confidential plan shown in his CPRE 5.3 simply shows in more detail where the study consultant considered potential sites might be located. As explained in the letter contained in Mr Hartley's CPRE 5.9; *'the opinions expressed by the consultants, particularly those relating to potential development, have no statutory significance and any future development would need to be taken on board by Teignbridge District Council in their emerging Local Development Framework before enjoying any planning status. If any of them are, it will only be after extensive community consultation and careful consideration of the options by the Council.'* Given this status, public consultation would not have been appropriate.

Study not sent to Parish Council

- 3.2 The results of the study were included in the public consultation undertaken in 2002. However, it was not until 2007 that the Parish Council requested a copy of the study report at which point it was provided

Study used for Major Scheme Business Case

- 3.3 The study report was an accompanying report to the MSBC.

### **4.0 Flood Risk Assessment (Contributed by Michael Smith)**

- 4.1 Michael Smith states in paragraph 6.4.1 of his Proof of Evidence (**DCC/P/3**) that:  
*'Government guidance on flood risk and development is found in Planning and Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk. (PPS25) (CD 4.25). A site-specific flood risk assessment was prepared and submitted to the Environment Agency in support of the Planning Application. The flood risk assessment took account of the advice on climate change contained in PPS25 (CD 4.25) and included for an increase of 20% on the rainfall intensity.'*

- 4.2 The Environmental Statement (**CD 2.3**), which was prepared in support of the Planning Application, contained the provisions of the flood risk assessment. The Environmental Statement was published in November 2004.
- 4.3 A copy of the Environment Agency's response dated 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2005 to the flood risk assessment is contained in Appendix 1. In the 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph of their letter they state:
- 'Given all of the above, the drainage set out in the FRA offers benefits to those living along the valley route of the road and who are currently exposed to the risk of flooding. Providing the proposed drainage improvements set out in the FRA are carried out before, or in conjunction with, the construction of the road we are not only able to remove our earlier formal objection to this proposal, but can go further and advise that the scheme offers significant benefits in terms of alleviating most of the long standing flooding risks for those living along the valley route of the road.'*
- 4.4 The Environment Agency's response also refers to the need to obtain consent under the Land Drainage Act 1991. These consents have been obtained. Copies are given in Appendix 7 of **DCC/A/1**.

## 5.0 Exhibition of Alternative Road Routes

### Only One Public Exhibition

- 5.1 Paul Ewings' Proof of Evidence (DCC/P/1) describes in Chapter 7 the series of exhibitions undertaken since 2002 and the content of each event. The exhibition of 2002 included a summary of the finding of the corridor study and the four page exhibition leaflet listed the solutions considered.

### ES and FRA produced After the Exhibition

- 5.2 The ES and FRA were produced in support of the planning application submitted in November 2004. These documents were the result of more detailed work undertaken once the results of the consultation had been considered by Devon County Council and Torbay Council and the authorities had decided how to progress. See Paul Ewings' Proof of Evidence (DCC/P/1), Appendix 6.

### Changes in Government Policies (Contributed by Ian Harrison)

- 5.3 Mr Hartley's Proof of Evidence states that new Government policies have been introduced in the past 7 years which place more emphasis on carbon and public transport.

Dr. Ian Harrison's evidence (**DCC/P/2**) demonstrates that the Scheme complies with current national (**DCC/P/2, section 3**), regional and local (**DCC/P/2, section 4**) transport policy.

Dr. Ian Harrison's evidence (**DCC/P/2**) also demonstrates that the Scheme fits with emerging transportation policy, and in particular with the Eddington Study (**DCC/P/2, Section 5.1**) and Delivering a Sustainable Transport System (DaSTS) (**DCC/P/2, Section 5.2**).

The Scheme has therefore been shown to be in agreement with current and emerging transportation policy.

### Gateway Review

- 5.4 Mr Hartley expresses concern about the gateway review process; however such a review is normal practice during the development of local authority and central government major schemes.

#### Lack of Transparency

- 5.5 Mr Hartley expresses concern about a lack of transparency by the promoters of the Scheme. Paul Ewings' Proof of Evidence (**DCC/P/1**) describes in Chapter 7 the series of exhibitions undertaken since 2002 and the content of each event.

### **6.0 Yannon Lane/Foredown Landfill Site**

- 6.1 As stated above, this issue is addressed in **paragraphs 11.1.72 to 11.1.75** of Michael Smith's Proof of Evidence (**DCC/P/3**).

### **7.0 Railway Issues and Public Transport (Contributed by David Black)**

#### Aller Triangle proposed in RFA2

- 7.1 Mr Hartley's Proof of Evidence discusses plans to construct an additional railway section between the mainline and branch lines at Aller (the Aller Triangle).
- 7.2 This section of railway is unlikely to be required for the following reasons:
- 7.3 There is currently little traffic travelling between Plymouth and Torbay. Traffic survey data recently collected in Totnes shows that during the AM and PM peak hours, approximately 150 vehicles per hour travel from Plymouth to Torbay (and vice-versa). During the off-peak periods, the flow is less than 100 vehicles per hour.
- 7.4 It is currently possible to travel from Torbay to Plymouth by rail, which would involve a change at Newton Abbot.
- 7.5 The journey from Torquay to Plymouth could be provided without changing at Newton Abbot. This would involve the train changing direction at Newton Abbot, which does currently occur at some other stations.

#### Kingskerswell Station

- 7.6 Mr Hartley's Proof of Evidence states that Kingskerswell Station should be re-opened.
- 7.7 Re-opening of the rail station at Kingskerswell is addressed in David Black's evidence (**DCC/P/4, section 12.5**).
- 7.8 The reopening of Kingskerswell railway station forms part of the long-term transportation strategy for the region, as detailed in the Devon Structure Plan. Re-opening the station does not remove the need for the Scheme.
- 7.9 Reopening the station would serve to remove a proportion of A380 trips with an origin or destination within Kingskerswell. Over 95% of traffic on the A380 is through traffic, and as a result reopening of the station is unlikely to make a difference to the congestion experienced on the A380. This is further explained in section 14.3 of the Traffic and Economics Proof of Evidence (**DCC/P/4**):

*'The opening of the Kingskerswell rail station and provision of rail interchange facilities would only attract approximately 380 trips per day. This, although desirable, would not make a noticeable difference in the operation of the corridor and would not remove the need for the Scheme.'*

#### No known proposals for reduced car use through public transport improvements

- 7.10 Mr Hartley's Proof of Evidence states that 'we do not know of any proposals to improve public transport, and to reduce the road traffic through Kingskerswell or area in general. No known proposals are known to reduce the use of the car'.
- 7.11 Personalised Travel Planning and travel plans are already actively taking place throughout Devon, Torbay and the Newton Abbot areas. Further work on this element of the transport strategy will continue, subject to funding being available. However, these measures will take a considerable time to achieve and even a 10% reduction in demand is not sufficient to remove the current levels of congestion or demand for the Scheme.
- 7.12 The issue of demand management and travel planning is addressed in David Black's Proof of Evidence (**DCC/P/4, section 14.2**).
- 7.13 David Black's evidence demonstrates the importance of the Scheme as a measure to improve public transport reliability and encourage increased use of public transport. **DCC/P/4, paragraph 12.7.5** states:
- 'The most pressing need for improvement to bus services in the Torbay to Newton Abbot area is with regard to bus journey time reliability, which at the moment is very poor. The proposed Scheme is probably the most important single measure that can help realise this aspiration, while any alternative scheme that puts more traffic on the existing A380 will exacerbate congestion and bus unreliability.'*
- 7.14 The public transport issue is addressed in David Black's evidence (DCC/P/4, section 12).

## **8.0 Village Plan**

- 8.1 Whilst Mr Hartley includes a copy of the Village Plan and refers to items within it, this section does not appear to require a response.

## **9.0 Media and Responses**

- 9.1 Mr Hartley includes copies of media articles and correspondence, as above this does not appear to require a response.

## **10.0 Specific Route Issues**

- 10.1 Mr Hartley refers to proposed supplementary orders and reserves the right to comment in due course.

## 11.0 Habitats Directive (contributed by Andrew McCarthy)

11.1 Mr Hartley's proof of Evidence makes the following comment:

*'It is understood there are requirements of an European Directive affecting this Scheme, and what has been done about this is unknown. I understand insufficient meetings have taken place, and that the CPRE would wish to be involved if they take place. We will comment further then. The CPRE think this is very important due to the adverse effects of the road.'*

- 11.2 It is unclear from Mr Hartley's statement which elements of the Habitats Directive he is referring to. The Directive is transposed into UK law via the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations 1994. There are a number of protected species present along the Scheme route that are relevant in respect to the Conservation Regulations; for example bats, Otter, Great crested newt and some fish species. As the Environmental Statement (**CD 2.3**) makes clear, any adverse impacts upon such species will be subject, where necessary, to mitigation under the appropriate European Protected Species licence, in line with national best practice. Thus the mitigation measures will enable full compliance with current legislative requirements.
- 11.3 There is no requirement within the Conservation Regulations to hold public meetings in respect to impact on such species.
- 11.4 There are no sites nearby designated under European legislation that warrant an appropriate assessment under the Conservation Regulations.

## 12.0 Other Matters (Contributed by David Black)

### BCR 8.34 (November 07)

- 12.1 Mr Hartley's Proof of Evidence states that *'in November 2007, the Devon County Council stated a cost to benefit ratio [sic] of 8.34 for this Scheme but have not yet substantiated this.'*
- 12.2 The economic assessment of the Scheme is summarised in David Black's evidence (**DCC/P/4**) **section 11.6 and Table 37**. The table shows that the Scheme has a benefit to cost ratio (BCR) of 7.46 demonstrating that the scheme is "very good" value for money.

### Questions on costs, £164M

- 12.3 Mr Hartley's Proof of Evidence states that part of the Economic Assessment Report (**CD 5.31A**) shows that the Scheme will cost £164 million.
- 12.4 The Quantified Cost Estimate for the Scheme is £120.859M (**DCC/P/4, Table 32**).
- 12.5 The DfT recognise cost overrun within their projects. To account for the 'systemic appraisers to be overly optimistic about key parameters' (**CD 4.45 DfT, WebTAG unit 3.7.8**), the DfT advise the use of Optimism Bias in scheme appraisal. At Order Publication / Works Commitment stage, WebTAG guidance suggests an optimism bias of 15% should be used. However, the DfT have advised Devon County Council, for the purposes of the appraisal of the Scheme, an optimism bias of 44% should be used. The Scheme costs used purely for the economic appraisal process are therefore the £164m as stated in the Economic Assessment Report (**CD 5.31A**).

- 12.6 With Optimism Bias added to the cost of the scheme, the scheme still represents excellent value for money with over £7 earned for every £1 spent (see **DCC/P/4, Table 37**).

Carbon Increases (contributed by Bethan Tuckett-Jones)

- 12.8 Mr Hartley's Proof of Evidence states that the proposed Scheme will have a '*material increase in carbon emissions*'.
- 12.9 The Air Quality Proof of Evidence (**DCC/P/10**) provides an assessment of the change in carbon emissions anticipated with the Published Scheme. A slight numerical increase in road traffic emissions will occur but the impact of the increase will be neutral since, taking into account all trips of relevance to the Scheme, the carbon dioxide emissions will increase by less than 1% of the total emissions anticipated if the Scheme does not proceed (as shown in **DCC/A/10, Table AQ 10**).

**13.0 Letter Dated 12<sup>th</sup> June 2009 (OBJ/CPRE(53)/P/2/1)**

Alternative Route Proposals

- 13.1 Mr Hartley suggests that the Eastern Route options shown in the ES should be reconsidered '*as the environmental damage is far less than the proposed route*'.
- 13.2 Rosalyn Guard's Proof of Evidence (**DCC/P/6**) Section 5.3 describes the previous work undertaken on route the Eastern Route and that it is shown in the ES on Figure 3.0 together with a long section of the route on Figure 3.4 before concluding that '*I considered that this route would substantially cut across the grain of the deep side valleys, the high valley crossings could not be adequately mitigated, the adverse impacts on the Kingskerswell valley and village would be greater, and the route would adversely impact on a significant area of the relatively rural and tranquil AGLV (Breccia Hills LCA).*'
- 13.3 Paul Ewings' Proof of Evidence (**DCC/P/1**) Paragraph 5.2.21(iv) states that a bypass to the East of Kingskerswell was considered during the A380 Newton Abbot to Torquay Corridor Study (**CD 5.24**) but '*rejected as no viable eastern bypass options could be identified, all routes having over-riding environmental problems.*'

The Corridor Study Option Assessment and Strategy Development Report (**CD 5.24, paragraph 2.3**) states;

*'The Previous work undertaken for the Highways Agency showed that the landscape to the east of Kingskerswell is more sensitive than that to the west, and that a new road would have a more significant impact. We have attempted to identify alternative alignments and carriageway standards, which might reduce these impacts but have concluded that there are no viable eastern bypass options. Key points to emerge from our investigation of eastern bypass routes are as follows:*

- *All reasonable eastern bypass routes, which run from Aller quarry to Kerswell Gardens, are very damaging in landscape terms as they affect a sensitive part of an area of Great Landscape Value.*
- *Longer eastern bypass routes which might avoid the particularly sensitive landscape areas would need to diverge from the existing A380 near the Teign Estuary and would have significant adverse environmental impact on the Estuary itself.*

- *There are significant difficulties in landscape, engineering and operational terms in connecting any eastern Bypass back to the A380/A3022 near Kerswell Gardens due to the natural gradient of the land.*
- *The use of tunnelled sections to mitigate environmental impacts with an eastern bypass appears infeasible due to the length of tunnels that would be required.*

*Whilst we recognise that there would be some benefits associated with an Eastern Bypass, the over-riding environmental problems have brought us to the view that such options should be rejected.'*

Kingskerswell Alliance Proposal (Contribution by David Black)

- 13.4 David Black's Proof of Evidence (**DCC/P/4, Section 14**) provides a full assessment of the Alliance package of measures. Richard Perkins' Proof of Evidence (**DCC/P/9, paragraphs 8.1.1 to 8.1.17**) provides a noise assessment of the package and Bethan Tuckett-Jones' Proof of Evidence (**DCC/P/10, 8.3.1 to 8.3.7**) provides an air quality assessment.
- 13.5 David Black's response to the three proofs of evidence on behalf of the Kingskerswell Alliance (**DCC/REB/5**) also provides further responses regarding the Alliance proposals at Sections 4, 5 and 6.
- 13.6 This package of measures includes:
- Demand Management Measures;
  - Improved Public Transport;
  - Traffic Engineering and Congestion Management.
- 13.5 In the Kingskerswell Alliance package, when considering demand management measures, the Kingskerswell Alliance have failed to account for the demand management measures already in place and the considerable work by Devon County Council in this area. Therefore the claimed benefits are optimistic.
- 13.6 Particular mention is made of travel plans to be introduced across Teignbridge and Torbay. Reference is made to workplace travel plans cutting single car occupancy by between 10 and 25%. It is claimed that an estimated 1 in 5 vehicles during rush hour are 'school run' traffic. With reference to **DCC/P/4, paragraph 14.2.9** it can be seen that only 4% of AM peak hour trips on the A380 are school related. **DCC/P/4, Section 4.2** gives more details of the considerable travel planning that has taken place in Devon.
- 13.7 The Kingskerswell Alliance proposals for improving public transport will yield limited benefits. Reopening the Kingskerswell railway station, as discussed in **DCC/P/4, Section 12.5.1**, is likely to result in the removal of only 0.3% of car trips from the A380. Increased mode share for buses will not be possible as the Kingskerswell Alliance Proposals will not improve journey time reliability and will not encourage increased bus operator investment, currently two of the largest barriers on the route to increasing patronage.
- 13.8 There are considerable difficulties associated with implementing a tidal flow system on the A380. The Kingskerswell Alliance has proposed a system using only LED lighting in the carriageway and oppose the use of gantries. Such an arrangement has not been implemented before in the UK on this type of route and Devon County Council would have concerns over the safety of such a scheme. Furthermore the scheme would only provide additional capacity for a limited period of the day and encourage commuter traffic away from the Torbay area.

- 13.9 The Kingskerswell Alliance proposals fail on a number of objectives set by the Corridor Study. An analysis of these objectives is given in **DCC/P/4, Table 55 – 58**. These failures are summarised below:
- Environment – increased severance in Kingskerswell and increased rat-running on unsuitable parallel routes, does not address Air Quality Management issues in Kingskerswell;
  - Safety – Increased accidents due to increased traffic on unsuitable parallel routes. Poorer safety for vulnerable road users under a tidal flow system and on parallel routes;
  - Economic – limited additional capacity on the A380. Limited improvements to journey time reliability and no improved access to the Torbay employment and retail areas;
  - Accessibility – Does not allow for improvements to bus priority measures so proposed travel plans will be difficult to establish;
  - Integration – No integration with other transport services; it will not be possible to provide attractive pedestrian or cycle facilities, it will not be possible to improve to bus facilities due to congestion on A380.
- 13.10 Furthermore the scheme is not sustainable. It will not be possible to improve journey times or reliability for buses and therefore patronage will not be increased.
- 13.11 The scheme will also result in significant amounts of congestion; the lower speeds and increased queuing will inevitably lead to poorer air quality through Kingskerswell. Higher traffic flows on the corridor and the addition of an extra lane will increase severance and therefore make crossing the A380 safely very difficult.
- 13.12 Under the economic appraisal of the Kingskerswell Alliance proposals (see **DCC/P/4, Table 54**) a BCR of less than 4 was calculated. It is concluded that the Kingskerswell Alliance proposals cannot be considered as one of the ‘very best’ schemes and therefore would be unlikely to be obtain funding through the Regional Funding Allocation. Furthermore, given the issues highlighted above it is not a Scheme that Devon County Council would be prepared to promote.

#### Public Suggestions and Village Plan Results

- 13.13 Mr Hartley refers again to Volume 3 of the ES. This issue is dealt with in paragraph 2.5 above.
- 13.14 Mr Hartley suggests that ‘*half the people want Prior Avenue and Bushmead Avenue joined*’. However, he fails to give the full response to the Village Plan survey on this item, i.e. ‘*Of the people responding 50% were in favour and 50% were opposed to this idea.*’
- 13.15 Mr Hartley suggests that in view of the Village Plan results ‘*the whole traffic issue should go to a proper public consultation, and include the issues in the Village Plan, for instance alternatives*’. Paul Ewings’ Proof of Evidence (**DCC/P/1**) describes in Chapter 7 how this was undertaken in 2002.
- 13.16 Mr Hartley raises here the point about reopening Kingskerswell Railway Station again. This issue is dealt with in paragraphs 7.6 to 7.9 above.

#### Jurys Corner (Contribution by David Black)

- 13.17 A more detailed appraisal of alternative proposals around Jurys Corner has been completed by Devon County Council; **DCC/REB/5, Annex C**.

13.18 Devon County Council has endeavoured to work up an alternative which is realistic as possible given the constraints at the junction. Nevertheless, the scheme still has the following issues:

- Visual Intrusion - the scheme is not in keeping with the village environment;
- Severance Issue - there will be a large detour for pedestrians / cyclists; which may encourage them to cross at the junction;
- Safety issue if pedestrians / cyclists do decide to cross;
- Security of the pedestrian underpass, may be considered dangerous by users;
- Land take is required for footways and bus bays;
- Discontinuous guard rails (driveways cannot be blocked) may further encourage crossings at Jurys Corner;
- A continuous segregated footway / cycleway cannot be provided without additional land take;
- Gantries may possibly have to be placed in gardens. If a light weight version can be designed then could be placed in the already cramped footway / cycleway.