

Written representation by Richard (“Dick”) Jeffcoate – my comments on responses made by the Applicant to Relevant Representations submitted by me to the Planning Inspectorate on 23.11.25

My name is Richard Jeffcoate.

I live in Grittleton and have done so for about 35 years.

I submitted Relevant Representations to the Planning Inspectorate on 23 November 2025. I also made an oral submission (speaker number 29) Open Floor Hearing 1 (“OFH1”) on 21 April 2026.

An issue raised in my Relevant Representations and focused upon in my oral submission is designation of The Street, Grittleton as an access to the proposed contractor’s compound on the east side of Grittleton village and as part of the construction route to the “Cable Route Corridor” access point, also on the east side of Grittleton village. In particular, use of The Street for use by Abnormal Indivisible Loads.

In my opinion, The Street, Grittleton is unsuitable for use by traffic of the type that would be generated by the proposed Lime Down development and I respectfully refer you to my comments on this issue, as set out in my Relevant Representations and my oral submission.

By the way, I have seen The Street, Grittleton referred to as “Main Street” but that is not its correct name. The Street is the correct name of the road running east from Grittleton crossroads.

I wish to make comments on the Applicant’s responses to my Relevant Representations. My comments are listed below, in no particular order, numbered for convenience.

1) At reference T-53 in the Applicant’s Response to Relevant Representations (Part 2) April 2026 and in response to the concerns expressed as regards “impact of traffic on Grittleton, including Main Street [sic]”, the Applicant has commented as follows:

“The main Street in Grittleton is not proposed as part of any construction routes.”

That statement does not appear to me to be correct. I refer to paragraphs 1.2.41 and 1.2.42 of the Applicant’s Environmental Statement Volume 3 APP-233 in which The Street, Grittleton is listed as one of the roads that are to form part of the construction routes to the Cable Route Corridor access points.

2) With further reference to paragraph 1.2.42 of the Applicant’s Environmental Statement Volume 3 APP-233, The Street, Grittleton is described as “a two-way single carriageway road”. Whilst that is technically correct, the Applicant has made no reference to the presence of vehicles lawfully parked on The Street. As mentioned in my Relevant Representations and my oral submission, residents of numerous houses adjacent to or fronting The Street, including mine, have no off-street parking available to them. We all park on The Street. Take into account home delivery grocers’ vans; visitors’ cars; parcel delivery vans; deliveries to the pub; pub visitors; people attending the church; oil tankers delivering heating oil; bin lorries; garden contractors with equipment trailers etc, street parking is integral to village life.

Vehicles parked lawfully on The Street reduce the available width of the roadway for use by other vehicles. In effect, this makes lengthy sections of The Street single track. Assumptions made by the Applicant as regards highway width and suitability of The Street for traffic associated with the proposed project should, I believe, be rigorously questioned. As I understand it, an “abnormal load” such as a cable delivery would have a width of at least three metres and a rigid length of at least 18.65 metres.

3) As acknowledged by the Applicant within paragraph 1.2.42 of the Environmental Statement Volume 3 APP-233, there is pedestrian infrastructure within Grittleton. Indeed, there are footpaths on both sides of The Street all of the way from The Neeld Arms public house to Malmesbury Lodge on the eastern edge of the village. Along the remainder of The Street within Grittleton there are footpaths on one or other sides of The Street. All such footpaths are actively used by the village community.

Vehicles mounting the kerbs at the side of The Street in their endeavour to overcome restrictions caused by vehicles parked lawfully on The Street (please see my comments on this issue in my oral submission at OFH1) are at conflict with safe use by pedestrians of footpaths along The Street.

4) With reference to my previous representations and submission, the situation with The Street and the traffic problem we have is bad enough, as it is, without being exacerbated by additional and abnormal traffic generated by the proposed Lime Down project.

At paragraph 5.5.1 of the Applicant’s Outline Construction Management Plan, it is stated that all abnormal load movements will be co-ordinated by a haulage specialist and traffic management will be in place to support the movement. It is further stated that the exact nature of traffic management, to be agreed with the local highway authority, is likely to include measures such as “rolling road closures”.

The Applicant refers to management of vehicle movements through a Construction Traffic Management Plan an outline of which talks about coordination of deliveries, delivery scheduling, liaison with the local highway authority, community liaison, provision of a contact for feedback and such like. The Applicant has commented that suitable mitigation measures will be put in place so as to avoid significant impacts on the local highway network. In my opinion, adverse impacts on the community of Grittleton from use of The Street as an access to the proposed contractor’s compound on the east side of Grittleton village and as part of the construction route to the “Cable Route Corridor” access point also on the east side of Grittleton village would be exceptional, beyond mitigation and a considerable challenge to the community. The ebb and flow of vehicular movement within the community will be adversely affected by the proposals.

I am mindful of car borne attendees of pre-booked events such as weddings or funerals at the church on The Street, pre-booked events and gatherings at Grittleton House, also at The Neeld Arms pub and the Village Hall on The Street. Also, I am concerned for emergency vehicles – police, ambulances and fire engines – needing to make their way through or attend a situation within the village, unhindered by congestion on The Street. Abnormal Indivisible Loads passing through Grittleton would do so at a slow pace, thereby obstructing use of The Street by other vehicles for some while. I mentioned in my oral submission having witnessed chaotic scenes on The Street, particularly bad when traffic using sat nav is unofficially diverted from the M4 - vehicles coming from opposing directions, attempting to pass through Grittleton are obstructed by parked vehicles. Vehicles mount the kerbs at the side of The Street, drive along the pavements and dash for a gap in an effort to get through. Typically, unofficial diversions from the M4, such as described, occur several times each year. On one such occasion within the last twelve months, traffic approaching Grittleton crossroads from The Gibb queued from Lime Kiln corner on The Gibb to Grittleton. Combined with traffic loads generated by the proposed

project, problems caused by situations such as this would be exacerbated.

I urge the Examining Authority to form the view that designation of The Street, Grittleton as an access to the proposed contractor's compound on the east side of Grittleton village and as part of the construction route to the "Cable Route Corridor" access point, also on the east side of Grittleton village, in particular, use of The Street by Abnormal Indivisible Loads, is not appropriate, even with mitigation measures mentioned by the Applicant in place.