



Campaign to Protect  
Rural England

Devon  
Teignbridge & Torbay Group

12 July 2009

Michael Smith  
Technical Director  
Parsons Brinckerhoff  
The Forum  
Barnfield Road  
Exeter  
EX1 1QR

Dear Mr Smith

Proposed South Devon Link Road (Kingskerswell Bypass)

Public Inquiry started 7 July 2009

Regarding your letter dated 3 July and received on 4 July 2009, in connection with Devon County Council's response in reply to the CPRE Proof of Evidence. Please find attached the CPRE reply, using the same numbering but starting with R for our reply. Please place in Section 15 of the CPRE presentation binders.

Please find attached a copy of a letter dated 30 November 2007 (CPRE 15.3) from Parsons Brinckerhoff concerning the proposed new road junction and layout at Kerswell Gardens. We are concerned about the practicability of this road layout and note we have received no updates.

In summary we are very concerned about the lack of information the public have been made aware of. It was only on 7 July 2009 at the first day of the Public Inquiry that a photographic montage was shown of the proposed road impact, and there is information in the Devon County Council and Parsons Brinckerhoff Proof of Evidence that we feel the public should be made aware of so they could comment accordingly.

We still reserve the right to add supplementary information. For example there is to be additional CPOs' and SROs', including affecting the Kerswell Down vicinity, and as they appear not to have been issued yet, are not able to comment. Also the Freedom of Information requests, although answered, do not give all the information wanted.

Yours sincerely

John Hartley (Also railway representative for Devon CPRE) (Email:  
jtlhartley@hotmail.com)

The campaign to Protect Rural England exists to promote the beauty, tranquility and diversity of rural England by encouraging the sustainable use of land and other natural resources in town and country.

Registered Charity No. 1089685

~~OBJ/CPRE/5~~  
053/REB/5

053/REB/5

Newton Abbot, TQ12 5LB  
Tel. 01803 873339

Brian Hall, Vice Chairman  
"Elford"  
10 Murley Crescent  
Bishopsteignton  
Teignmouth, TQ14 9SH  
Tel. 01626 777952  
email: BBrihall@aol.com

2 Issues relating to the Environmental Statement (ES)

R2.2 The cover would hide the road from the village for the section covered, and the noise from 70 mph traffic

R2.4 "Woodlands" is not relevant to the CPRE reply. The use of attenuation boarding or similar has not been mentioned

R2.5 Volume 3 of the ES. This shows maps with locations that are not in volume 1 and 2. Volume 3 of the ES states (Figures) and is not shown as an appendix.

R2.6 New information that has not had public consultation, so how are the public meant to be aware of this information. Volume 3 of ES has not had public consultation known for noise. Trees are not a shield for noise in winter.

R2.8 Improvement in air quality, but increase in carbon emission. This appears to not make sense. What has the regional scale to do with this

R2.9 Agree visual increase

R2.10 Refer to volume 1: summary. (6: Landscape, Townscape and Visual) See chart on page 6 (CPRE 15.1). When have the public been told about this and the adverse effects. Please state exhibitions with dates and locations.

R2.13 The pamphlet does not give anything like the 3 volumes of the ES

3 Issues relating to the Economic Impact Study, February 2002

R3.1 The public were not exposed to this, and consider that they should have been. Why were the potential development maps and development numbers (ie pages 70 and 71) used in the first place.

R3.2 No map was shown in the 2002 exhibition so disagree with comment. The Kingskerswell Bypass Economic Impact Study is about 200 sides of A4 paper and not shown to the public. The Kingskerswell Parish Council asked for a copy in 2007 following my remarks. Why were they not given a copy in 2002, especially as a statutory body.

R3.3 Used for the MSBC, still without consultation.

4 Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)

R4.1 to 4.4 Not shown to the public. For example, no stream widening from Daccabridge Road toward Newton Abbot. Daccabridge is a flood area, and how stream cope with extra water. Do the public not have a right to have the FRA explained to them.

## 5 Exhibition of alternative road routes

R5.1 Only one route offered, others shown as already rejected.

R5.2 The ES and FRA were not shown to the public, except route aspects of ES. For example, noise and visual effects not shown.

R5.3 At the RFA2 consultation meetings at Sandy Park in Exeter, sustainable transport was rated highly, not road building. Many different organisations attended these meetings. So why is this very expensive road put forward, and not public transport projects including railways. National polices support public and sustainable transport.

R5.4 Is it normal practice to have a first sentence that contained: "The purpose of this activity is to conduct a confidential review of the project for Edward Chorton, the Project Owner." Why should the gateway review be confidential and the public not told.

R5.5 Proof of Evidence. Please state dates and exhibitions / consultations where the public were advised.

## 6 Yannon Lane / Foredown Landfill site.

R6 As shown in CPRE 15.2, there is a Devon County Council (DCC) report showing many failings on the site.. Together with CPRE 11.8, please explain what DCC are going to do about the 100,000 tons of unknown waste. Is there a 100 percent guarantee there will be no problem in any way? Why water diversion? Exactly where will it go? When are the villagers going to be told?

## 7 Railway issues and public transport

R7.5 There is a submission with Network Rail. Time is a major factor with cost efficiency. Also with freight trains, the engine would have top run around the train at Newton Abbot.

R7.6 Kingskerswell station should be opened in the short term, not long term

R7.10 to 7.14 Where is all the research data on travel modes to review public transport? For example on June 15 (by Langford farm) and June 16 (Aller Lay By) there was a traffic survey for what appeared one direction. Where are the results and how used.

## 8 Kingskerswell Village Plan.

R8 For example question 83, 56.1% said they do not fully support the road scheme as published. Please comment. Question 80, 72.2% said they had not received a DCC bypass newsletter, please comment. Questions 78 to 101 covers the proposed SDLR.

## 9 Media and responses

R9 Yes. The reason to include was contained in the media reports, and that comment on would be appreciated.

## 11 Habitats directive

R11.3 The proposed route goes through many areas of nature importance, so why no consultation. This for example, is demonstrated in ES volume 3.

## 12 Other matters

R12.1 The cost to benefit ratio of 8.34 was stated at the SWRA transport meeting in November 2007. Now you say 7.46, less than that stated at the meeting to get extra finance. Please give the exact details for 8.34, or it may be concluded the decision for extra finance was invalid. Also "Excellent" Value for Money, please give evidence.

R12.8 to 12.9 You agree extra carbon emissions

## 13 Letter dated 12 June 2009

R13.1.to 13.3 Alternative Eastern Route. Four bullet points only given, but where is the full report with costings, on why route was rejected as shown in volume 3 of ES, so had been taken as serious option. Can the file be made available. The flyover at Kerswell gardens appears not to be as complicated as the proposed junction of dual carriageways.

R13.4 to 13.12 DCC and PB, went over the Steer Davies Proposals submitted by the Kingskerswell Alliance. It is questioned that an independent analysis should have been done, not by the promoters of the scheme? Public money is being used for the proposed SDLR plans (appears about £4 million so far), so why not use public money to pay for SDG to develop their Technical Note they did for the Kingskerswell Alliance, which was on a restricted cost.

R13.14 This good reason to open up between Bushmead Avenue and Priory Avenue, to reduce the traffic using the Jury's Corner junction where there is traffic lights, where the traffic hold up is caused.

R 13.15 The 2002 exhibition was over 7 years ago, before the ES and RFA were produced, and the Kingskerswell Bypass Economic Impact Study had not been shown to the public. For example noise and visual impact was not known, so not part of consultation. Also there is now updated data in the Proofs of Evidence, that the public have not been told about.

R13.17 What is DCC /REB/5, Annex C? No public consultation held on Jury's Corner. There is a short tunnel under the road by Jury's Close used for the stream and people have walked through. Has this been evaluated?

R13.18 There has been no public consultation over Jury's Corner, where the traffic hold up is caused by the traffic lights. An idea has been a slip road coming down Coffinswell Lane to turn left towards Torquay, not having to change the lights and feed into the traffic flow.

- 8.3 Impacts on the 3 LCAs in the Kingskerswell valley were assessed as Moderate adverse during construction and in Year 1, diminishing to Slight adverse in Year 15. No impacts were predicted on the more rural LCAs to the west and east.
- 8.4 Effects on two Newton Abbot TCAs (Forde/Wolborough and Keyberry Park) and Torquay Fringe are assessed as Neutral throughout.
- 8.5 The effects on two TCAs in Newton Abbot were assessed as Slight adverse at all stages and on the two Character areas in Kingskerswell, Slight beneficial after the Scheme is opened.
- 8.6 I give details of Visual effects on properties, Public Rights of Way, Recreation Areas and historic sites and buildings in Appendices.
- 8.7 I assessed the numbers of visually affected properties as follows:

Numbers affected in:

Effects	Construction Phase	Year 1	Year 15
<b>Substantial adverse</b>	248	186	45
<b>Moderate adverse</b>	174	168	48
<b>Slight adverse</b>	533	562	266
<b>No change</b>	All properties with no views of scheme	14	571
<b>Beneficial</b>	0	70	70

DEVON COUNTY COUNCIL  
COUNTY ENGINEERING AND PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
WASTE REGULATION - SITE INSPECTION REPORT

COPY

SITE NAME: YANWOD LAKE

SITE FILE REF: WR/L/S 108

SITE INSPECTOR: K MULLEN

TIME: (24 hr clock) 1615

DATE OF INSPECTION: 7.9.94

WEATHER: DRY

	Good	Sat	Unsat	N.A	N.I	Observations
Compliance with working plan			✓			
Site supervision			✓			
Roads - internal		✓				
external		✓				
Site security		✓				
Equipment and fuel		✓				
Litter controls		✓				
Control of face operations			✓			
Waste compaction at face		✓				
Waste types			✓			
Cover - temporary		✓				
permanent		✓				
Pest control		✓				
Site tidiness		✓				
Surface water controls		✓				
Leachate controls		✓				
Gas Controls		✓				
CA/Recycling facilities				✓		

	Water	Gas	Other (specify)
Sample			
Monitoring			
Full Metal Analysis			
Photographs taken	Yes	No	Showing

ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS/ACTIONS REQUIRED:

Key: N.A = not applicable N.I = not inspected

Site had waste on face excluded by site licence as a result of conversation with J CRAXFORD all still WASTE NOW HAZARDOUS INTO THIS SITE. SEEKING OTHER PLACES TO DISPOSE OF WASTE OR CHEAP, SUCH AS RUBY FARM who have rejected all callers. Letter to CRAXFORD made out.

FURTHER MEETING WITH MR CRAXFORD 8.20am 8/9/94. AT HOME AT HIS REQUEST. POSITIONAL SPREAD OUT TO 4km.

*K Mullen*



**Parsons  
Brinckerhoff**

The Forum  
Barnfield Road  
Exeter EX1 1QR  
United Kingdom  
44-(0)1392-229700  
Fax: 44-(0)1392-229701  
www.pbworld.com

Mr John Hartley  
Teignbridge and Torbay Group of CPRE  
Woodlands  
Old Newton Road  
Kingskerswell  
TQ12 5LB

30 November 2007

Our Ref: HEX43444A -1 - 86

Dear Mr Hartley

**A380 SOUTH DEVON LINK ROAD - KINGSKERSWELL BYPASS**

As requested, please find enclosed one copy of drawing HPE43444A/SKC/419, which shows preliminary details of the road markings and traffic signals at Kerswell Gardens and the Torbay Ring Road Junctions.

We trust that this is satisfactory.

Yours sincerely  
**Parsons Brinckerhoff**

**ROGER HULL**

Enc: Drawing Number HEX43444A/SKC/419

cc Paul Ewings EDG

