



Ken Pegden  
17 Huxley Vale  
Kingskerswell  
Devon TQ12 5ED  
Email: [kpegden@bat400.com](mailto:kpegden@bat400.com)

15/06/09

Paul Ewings  
Devon County Council  
County Hall  
Matford Lane Offices  
Topsham Road,  
Exeter, EX2 4QW

Dear Paul,

**RE: A380 SOUTH DEVON LINK ROAD PUBLIC INQUIRY**

Please find enclosed the following documents relating to the public inquiry.

Proofs of evidence from our 3 witnesses (1 copy of each)

In addition we have included the following background material (4 copies of each)

Updated version of Our Response to the Major Scheme Business Case (v12.1)  
(Recognises where questions have been answered, corrections and clarifications etc etc)

Village Plan Survey Results and Analysis  
Kingskerswell Alliance Journey Time Survey – updated June 2009  
Press release from ATOC regarding plans for a rail link to Brixham announced today!  
Information on Digital Road Marking

You have the other documents already e.g. brochure, SDG Report

Yours faithfully

Ken Pegden  
Chairman, Kingskerswell Alliance

Visit our website: [www.kingskerswellalliance.org.uk](http://www.kingskerswellalliance.org.uk)

The Kingskerswell Alliance is a member of the



Campaign to Protect  
Rural England



**Proof of Evidence**

**To**

**Public Inquiry**

**Regarding**

**A380 SOUTH DEVON LINK ROAD  
(KINGSKERSWELL BYPASS)  
COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDERS  
and SIDE ROAD ORDERS 2008**

Prepared by: Karen Frith

Date 8<sup>th</sup> June 2009

The Kingskerswell Alliance

## **1. Introduction.**

- 1.1. My name is Karen Frith. I have lived in Kingskerswell since 2001 having moved to Devon from Basingstoke. I am a graduate in Occupational Psychology with Chartered status and worked for British Airways as a manager for 12 years. I have no qualifications in transport planning.
- 1.2. I had no particular views about the SDLR proposal when I first moved to the area but became increasingly concerned about what I considered to be the monetary and environmental costs as the case for the road was promoted by Devon County Council.
- 1.3. I acknowledged that the A380 was sometimes busy (as I regularly use it in peak times to take my children to school) but did not recognise the picture painted of intolerable congestion, gridlock and long delays. I had regularly commuted by car from my previous home in Hampshire to London Heathrow and could not see that similar traffic congestion was apparent here.

## **2. How I became involved**

- 2.1. I began to attend meetings of the Kingskerswell Alliance. When the Major Scheme Business Case (MSBC) was published at the end of December 2007, a group undertook to read through the documents produced by DCC to understand the case set out.
- 2.2. It was during my perusal of this, I considered some of the issues and analyses did not appear to correspond with my knowledge and experiences as a local resident. Other members of the Alliance, some of whom had lived here for much longer, also felt some of the issues were misrepresented in the case document.
- 2.3. For these reasons, I wondered how the MSBC had been put together. I found out that the DCC proposal would be analysed by DfT via systematic appraisal process using 'WebTAG'.

## **3. What I did**

- 3.1. I studied the Guidance Notes given on the Internet by DfT for local authorities on producing MSBCs and those used for WebTAG.
- 3.2. Even on an initial reading I was able to identify several shortcomings in the MSBC. I saw that the options evaluated were all road options although the DfT guidance said there ought to be comparison with non road alternatives.
- 3.3. A Corridor study was included in the MSBC but this gave little detail that there had been extensive robust evaluation of non road alternatives. This Options report was undertaken in 2000 so little weight had been given to proven initiatives e.g. Sustainable Travel Towns projects, Smarter Choices, Individualised Travel Marketing, demand management and modal shift.

3.4. The corridor study also suggested a cut and cover tunnel which was required to mitigate the highly detrimental effect on the environment on the west side of the village, in view of the effect on the adjacent conservation Area and the biodiversity. The tunnel option is not in the current plan.. ( see Option Assessment and Strategic Development Report Halcrow Fox January 2001 pages 26-27)

3.5. I then systematically reviewed the Work sheets and Appraisal Summary Sheets completed for the preferred road scheme by DCC.

#### 4. What I found

4.1. I noticed that there were deviations from WebTAG guidance in a number of topics.

4.2. As a result, the Alliance, as a group, agreed that the most appropriate way to set out a reply to the MSBC was by producing our own comments on the Summary appraisal sheets for the preferred scheme.

4.3. As I am not an expert, I concentrated on those aspects where I considered it would be more straightforward to research the topics and find supporting evidence in the way that the report authors seemed to have done.

4.4. I found a large number of differences (which are set out in detail in the Alliance response to MSBC). The main differences were:

4.4.1. **Biodiversity** : Reviewing the 'impact' scores on the Biodiversity Worksheets (as there are a number of red listed species covered by European Habitat Directive now Conservation ( Habitats and c) Regulations 1994) I considered some scores had been reduced so that the overall impact on these species was underplayed. [ see MSBC Volume 2 Appendix 6(9) ]

4.4.2. **Townscape** : The Newton Abbot flyover will be visually intrusive and there will be major adverse effects on the historic part of Old Kingskerswell with many of the listed buildings found so close to the proposed route affecting their setting and ' sense of place'. I am not sure how this can be described as a 'slight beneficial' assessment. [ see MSBC Volume 2 Appendix 6(7) ]

4.4.3. **Landscape**: Although it was acknowledged that extensive earthworks would disrupt the existing pattern and scale of the landscape, mitigation would not prevent the scheme from scarring the landscape in the longer term as some features of interest will be destroyed or the setting reduced/ removed. The cut rock face would be seen from afar and form an ugly feature to this landscape. One of the characteristic features here, Kerswell Down, will suffer a really adverse impact. [ see MSBC Volume 2 Appendix 6(6) ]

4.4.4. **Severance**: The current A380 will be still be used so the main part of the village will still suffer severance. Additionally, the west side of the village will suffer severance by the addition of a 4 lane dual carriageway, and a flyover

will be built in front of existing homes. I am again unsure why this is rated as 'large positive'. [ see MSBC Volume 2 Appendix 6(19)

- 4.4.5. **Physical fitness:** I have found it difficult to understand how building a road ( which will encourage car driving ) can be ' slightly beneficial' to physical fitness. The MSBC states there will be an extra 30 seconds of walking on paths! [ see MSBC Volume 2 Appendix 6( 11)]
- 4.4.6. Worksheets on the categories of *Access to the Transport System* and *Transport Interchange* were not included in the MSBC, although assessments were derived.( as slight beneficial and moderate beneficial).
- 4.4.7. There didn't seem to be anything suggested in MSBC which would improve interchange between different forms of transport. Road building encourages dependency on the private car.
- 4.4.8. **Yannon Lane Landfill:** Last year, a lot of publicity was given to the illegal and unlicensed dumping of waste at Yannon Lane. This tip site is adjacent to the proposed route. I looked at the MSBC to see what safeguards there would be to protect the water supply if, for example, toxic substances leaked into the underground water systems which are a feature of the karst limestone around here. The Environmental Impact Study was undertaken in 2004. I could not find any documents or information to suggest that any further work had been undertaken to realise the nature of risk.
- 4.4.9. It is my understanding that any developer should undertake some assessment to ensure the safety of others. I am naturally concerned for the well being of my family until I can understand what action will be taken in line with Planning Guideline 23 Pollution Control.
- 4.4.10. **Options:** The issue of a bypass has been mooted for some 50 years and building a road has always been seen as the only option to reduce congestion and improve the economic standing of Torbay. DfT MSBC guidance ( Chapter 2) para 2.5.1 however states that: "the starting point for preparing a major scheme is to identify the problems to be addressed..... and then generate a *wide* range of options covering different types of interventions and measures..... and then undertake a high level of assessment of these options."
- 4.4.11. It would appear that building a road has been the option chosen and promoted every time the scheme has re-emerged.

## 5. Conclusion

- 5.1. Having read as much as I can about this topic, and acknowledging I am not an expert, I still do not see that building 5 km of road at a cost of £130 million can transform the problems of a seaside town in decline.
- 5.2. It appears to me that the impacts this scheme would have on the environment have been underestimated.
- 5.3. Alternative solutions seem to have been forgotten long ago and are not compared at all with the 3 road building options in the MSBC, How can it be said that they wouldn't work?
- 5.4. I also wonder why more emphasis has not been given to using the railway (the irony being that it is parallel to the existing A380) or investing more in public transport. The introduction of free bus passes has been a marked success in getting people to use buses. There are a large number of elderly people in our village who rely on public transport and to whom the road would offer no help in allowing them to access more facilities in this rural community.
- 5.5. The Government have set clear targets for green house gas reduction with a challenging target to reduce emissions by 80% of 1990 levels by 2050. ( DfT Delivering a Sustainable Transport System November 2008). This scheme is envisaged to increase overall CO<sub>2</sub> output here by 18%. This is clearly incompatible with present Government thinking. ( see A380 Kingskerswell Bypass Environmental Statement Volume1 November 2004, Section 13 Air Quality 13.6.11 table 13.6)
- 5.6. It seems to me that the scheme proposed by the Council represents limited and old style thinking which is out of line with the wishes and transport needs of the local community and with the real problems that we all face with climate change. This County currently has the opportunity to be in the forefront of delivering a novel, imaginative response to the issues of congestion and economic regeneration. That is the future I want to see.



**Proof of Evidence**

**To**

**Public Inquiry**

**Regarding**

**A380 SOUTH DEVON LINK ROAD**

**(KINGSKERSWELL BYPASS)**

**COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDERS**

**and SIDE ROAD ORDERS 2008**

Prepared by: Mr K. Pegden

On behalf of

The Kingskerswell Alliance

June 8<sup>th</sup> 2009

## **1. Introduction.**

1.1 My name is Ken Pegden. I have lived in Kingskerswell since 2002 and have been chairman of the Kingskerswell Alliance since 2006. I have no qualifications relating to road engineering.

## **2. The Kingskerswell Alliance**

2.1 The Kingskerswell Alliance was formed in 2002 by a group of local people, because of their deep concern about the proximity of the Kingskerswell Bypass scheme which was being proposed by Devon County Council and Torbay Council to the village itself.

2.2 The Alliance has approaching 500 supporters on its mailing list who live around the village or in and around Newton Abbot and Torbay. They are well aware of local traffic issues.

2.3 Committee meetings are held once a month and are attended by around 6-8 members.

2.4 Campaign direction is decided by the Alliance committee after discussion and general agreement.

2.5 As a group we are members of the Campaign to Protect Rural England, the Open Space Society and we work closely with the Campaign for Better Transport. We are not a registered charity.

## **3. The Aims of the Kingskerswell Alliance**

3.1 We accept that congestion on the A380 is a problem, but do not consider that the building of a new road is necessary or desirable. From the beginning, the Alliance has campaigned for sustainable, achievable, cost effective and environmentally friendly alternatives to the Kingskerswell Bypass.

3.3 We feel that we have a mandate to continue to put forward our alternative solutions to the Bypass for the following reasons.

3.3.1 At the last two Parish Council Elections, two Kingskerswell Alliance candidates stood for election and have both been returned each time.

3.3.2 In June 2007, a petition calling for alternatives was presented to Parliament with 2,082 signatures collected outside local supermarkets from people not only in Kingskerswell but also in the Newton Abbot and Torbay area. The only limitation was time available to our canvassers

3.3.3 We estimate that around 400 letters of objection to the Scheme were submitted to Devon County Council following the exhibition in 2002. We have received numerous letters of support