



Planning Inspectorate
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

Hearing Transcript

Project:	Lime Down Solar Project
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 3 (ISH3) – Part 2
Date:	2 July 2026

Please note: This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above hearing. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the hearing.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:06:22 - 00:00:07:10

Okay.

00:00:07:18 - 00:00:18:06

So it is 1150 and I will resume this issue specific hearing in relation to transport. Um, so I want to come on to highway user safety.

00:00:21:09 - 00:00:25:21

Do we need to wait, Miss Broderick, for Mr. Darryl? Uh, Claire.

00:00:25:23 - 00:00:30:18

Broderick for the applicant. Um, yes. If you could just wait for a moment. I believe he's just on his way back. Thank you.

00:00:33:03 - 00:00:37:20

The toilets seem like a million miles away from here with ten minutes.

00:00:41:05 - 00:00:42:00

No worries.

00:00:43:22 - 00:01:14:17

Okay. So I think the main parties are here. So Wiltshire Council stop lying down. And many others have raised safety and operational concerns about the ability of two HGVs or even a car and an HGV to pass along some of the narrow rural roads proposed for access to the solar PV sites in particular. Now these include Alderton Road, Foss Way, the road east of Lavington, and Bradfield Cottages, the road between Foss Way and Churston, and several others along the cable route corridor.

00:01:14:19 - 00:01:54:05

Now, having travelled the road several times on our site inspections, I to share some of these concerns. I do have some observations on certain parts of the construction routes, and if we get to the

Highway Improvement Areas section of this agenda, then I will come across. I will cover some of those then, but from a safety perspective, the applicant seems to suggest that on some roads the visibility, distances and space between passing points meets standards and notes that in locations where highway improvements are not necessary, construction drivers will be briefed and reminded of the relevant sections of the Highway Code relating to passing distances.

00:01:54:11 - 00:02:16:18

Now we will be coming on to the Highway Code aspect shortly, but in the first instance, can I ask the council's highways, um officers what visibility distances are usually required on single lane rural roads, or even slightly nary a two way rural roads before a passing bay needs to be installed? I mean, is there such a standard?

00:02:21:07 - 00:02:53:06

David Lee, Wiltshire Council um, I think it obviously depends on the nature of the road. And obviously if you've got lots of bends in the road, you would expect obviously if you can't see around that bend, you, you want to possibly reduce spacing. So as long as you can, you necessarily see clearly as you get to the position where you make the decision to move forward, whether you can, whether you can actually see along the narrow section to the next to the next passing bay. So we would say

00:02:54:27 - 00:03:32:06

100 to 150, 150m. You know, it's comfortable. Um, but it put in situations where, where the, the road, the road is very sinuous. You may want them closer. So it depends on the alignment. Um, speed is probably less of an it speeds less of an issue. Um, obviously with the road, the road's very, very poorly aligned. Um, the alignment itself, um, will dictate the speed of traffic. Anyway, you wouldn't expect people to be driving 60 mile an hour on some of those, on some of those, some of those narrow, very narrow roads.

00:03:34:24 - 00:03:36:16

You wouldn't expect it, but you might.

00:03:36:18 - 00:03:37:14

You might.

00:03:37:16 - 00:04:18:03

But you might get it. So there's no particular standard then there's there's no safety code, no DMR rules that sort of apply. Um, and the reason I ask is because in one of the applicant's, um, plans? I mean, certainly an annex J and K of their transport assessment. Um, they plot swept paths and intervals into visibility distances. Um, and in particular in paragraph 2.1.44 of their rep 3133, it's their response to stop lying down.

00:04:18:05 - 00:04:36:15

They say that for the stretch of road between Dyson Roundabout and Bradfield Cottages, for instance, because all into visibility displays between passing places are under 168m, it's considered to be a good level of visibility. And I'm just wondering why 168m.

00:04:38:20 - 00:04:44:26

Was referenced in that, and I've come to the applicant to ask that. But from your perspective, um,

00:04:46:11 - 00:04:49:03

what do you know why that figure may have been used?

00:04:50:12 - 00:05:22:12

I can't comment on whether they've come up with that particular number. So if you would, you would want, um, to be clear that it does affect the alignment vegetation, um, and vertical alignment as well as horizontal alignment. Um, except you don't want to be basically widening the road any more than you need to at intervals. But it must be. It must. Two HGV drivers must have adequate opportunity to see each other in time before that, before they go into effectively a position where they suddenly face to face, where they're then reversing along the highway.

00:05:22:18 - 00:05:52:08

Yeah. Now, if you come to areas of roads you talked about where there are more bends in the road, you don't necessarily have that lengthy visibility distance. Um, you may have no visibility when you hit some of those bends. And I think if you go along Alderton Road in particular, there are some areas where you wouldn't be able to see around the bend. Um, in those situations, is there generally a need then, for a passing be in close proximity to the bend for an evasive manoeuvre to be made quickly.

00:05:53:05 - 00:06:30:21

Um, that'd be normally what you'd use. Obviously, you'd come to the bend. Yeah. Effectively. Um, any vehicle getting into the bends. It's obviously in a position to see to the. Obviously, between two bends, you would not try to pass to put your passing places close to the corners so that you were in a position to actually see through the next section of road. Um, so in a sense, Alderson Road is the most, probably the most, um, the one that's actually most sinuous in terms of horizontal alignment. Um, I mean, the third, the first, um, the first transport assessment that, um, that came out, although it was in a highway improvement area, there was nothing proposed.

00:06:30:23 - 00:07:06:24

And we did query this so. Well, there's also what are you doing? And obviously now we've got the we've got the second iteration of the transport. So I will actually say, say now is that obviously the the third, the third revision of the transport assessment was which was submitted at deadline three is still something we are working through. So that would include obviously the conversations just gone with obviously the responses to lying down deep on the generation issues. That is still information that we are obviously processing and will obviously come back with comments at, at deadline for.

00:07:06:26 - 00:07:40:15

So there may be some things in the latest revision of the transport assessment, um, which um, we're still reviewing. So some, some obviously some comments on, on changes. I mean we may we may comments on Oldham Road is that although Alderson Road has now got passing play details and I use the word detail, um, it isn't detailed. It's very sketchy. So they show some indicative areas of widening. We don't know what carriageway widths those are supposed to be um, or the lengths or anything else.

00:07:40:17 - 00:07:48:28

All we know is that, um, we have some proposals. Um, we would want to look at those and obviously approve those in much more detail.

00:07:49:00 - 00:08:10:04

Yeah, I don't think that detail is coming till deadline for. Um, I don't think it the detail, because we are the examining authority asked a specific written question around more detail on his, and we're sort of straying into the next item of the agenda. Um, but that information is due to come at deadline for. So if you haven't seen it in the latest iteration of the transport system, it's probably because it's not there.

00:08:10:06 - 00:08:41:17

But, um, I mean, the other point it would make in terms of the spacing visibility were they're a long way apart, say on the Fosse Way, there are some distance like 400m over 300m. Um, our concern is that drivers that far apart aren't necessarily going to appreciate they have to when they see a driver in the distance, think, well, can I move forward or not? Yeah. Um, and our concern there is that those drivers and it happens now will just ride the verges. Um, and we will end up with damage to the verges. Those many of those roads have no edge restraint.

00:08:41:19 - 00:09:15:22

So you will have lorries trying to pass and effectively the the axle loadings will be on the carriageway edge. Where then those. Those those edges were start to break away. And I think we've been told. We've been. We've seen and obviously been notified some of the, the residents in the area that the road edges are crumbling now. So and that's under, you know, relatively low volumes of HGVs using those routes. So I think our fear is that we will end up with a situation with an awful lot of highway damage, which basically said, well, we'll roll and let it happen.

00:09:15:24 - 00:09:22:13

Let's put some reason, let's put some extra passing provision in. But I know that's another one of the other questions to come.

00:09:22:15 - 00:09:38:21

But yeah. And in turn that if it if it isn't done, it still leads to a safety perspective. Because irrespective of the breakup of the road, if the road breaks up, there's more damage potentially or more evasive maneuvers by drivers trying to avoid, you know, damaged carriageway, which has a safety implication in itself.

00:09:38:23 - 00:10:18:15

Well, I think our fear is two lorries meet on a section of road where they both passed a passing place some distance behind them, and they think, well. So they then left. They are trying to try and make an evasive move, effectively causing damage to. Could be roadside ditches, could be the verge, the edge, the carriageway could break up, or worse still, they decide that one of those lorries has to try and reverse along the highway to the last passing point that they they felt they could, they could pull into. Um, we don't, we don't really want um, we don't, we don't want it at all with the highway lorry drivers having to reverse and the likelihood that they won't, they would that they would, they would just override the road edge.

00:10:19:07 - 00:10:20:11

Yeah. Okay.

00:10:20:27 - 00:10:21:13

Um.

00:10:27:24 - 00:10:30:07

Can I come then to stop lying down.

00:10:30:09 - 00:10:42:11

To see if they've got any thing to add to Wiltshire Council's position on that and not specifically coming to non-motorized users yet.

00:10:42:13 - 00:11:21:20

Okay. Bruce Bamber, stop lying down. Um, I would say that, um, on a straight road. Um, if there's a need for passing bays, then a distance of 200m. Um, I've, um, used in the past. Um, but that is. I don't think that's put in any standards. Um, I think the basis for coming up with a figure around that, um, is that it allows a driver to see both an oncoming vehicle and see where the next passing opportunity is.

00:11:22:04 - 00:11:58:26

Um, obviously where the road bends, where forward visibility is obstructed, then 200m is just won't work. Um, so in order to, um, deal with a road, um, such as Bradfield Cottages or Alderton Road, um, there really needs to be a detailed assessment made of where it's possible to pass, what the forward visibility is from there, and then what needs to be provided in which locations in order to provide something that is going to work in practice at the moment.

00:11:58:28 - 00:12:31:24

I think what the applicant has done is identified some opportunities to widen the carriageway, but what I haven't seen is any assessment that demonstrates that that is sufficient to allow that into visibility to make so that drivers, as Mr. Lee said, can make that decision at the right time and then act accordingly. Um, I welcome the additional information from the applicant that I believe is coming in at the deadline for, um, the plans that have been provided thus far are not clear.

00:12:31:27 - 00:12:55:12

Um, I can't actually zoom into them on my computer because the program just crashes. Um, and I've been on site and some of the information is incorrect in any case, but I won't comment on that because I suspect that that will be corrected in the in the next round of submissions. Um, I think that's that's all I need to say on that particular issue. Thank you.

00:12:55:14 - 00:12:55:29

Okay.

00:12:56:01 - 00:12:57:05

Thank you. Um.

00:12:59:10 - 00:13:14:12

I'll come then to the applicant as to what they think. Suitable passing distances are what we need. Passing Bays on straight roads, good visibility and more bendy roads.

00:13:16:07 - 00:13:48:20

James, now for the applicant. So, um, following the line of questions and answers. So, um, I think when we said 168m, that was because that was the maximum, uh, into visibility along that route. It wasn't, uh, we weren't saying that is the visibility requirement for to passing bait. Okay. And then, um, in general, there is no standard, into visibility between party plates. So what you need to do is make sure that you can. So there's no standard for spacing between passing points.

00:13:48:22 - 00:14:20:00

But what you need to do is make sure that your forward visibility, either your view, you can see the next passing point. Um, we have got a passing point, which is, um, just under 400m on Fosse Way. Um, the rest of them are a lot smaller than that, but that's the largest one. Um, and we've done a vertical alignment to see how visible the next passing bay really is from your, from from the starting point essentially. And that uses topographical survey I think that was submitted at deadline three.

00:14:20:09 - 00:14:56:23

Um for deadline for we're providing which they would want to go into road widths at the moment, but we're providing much more detailed plans showing which sections of road are 5.5m or wider, showing where we're proposing passing points, showing whether those passing places include verge, hedge, what the works are required and also showing the wits in direct response to your questions, ma'am. So, um, I have got a copy of some of those now which I can share on the screen if you want to start looking at it, but.

00:14:57:15 - 00:15:06:17

Sorry, can I just clarify? You said and maybe I didn't write it down, right? Um, at default you'll be providing plan sharing roads of 5.5m and wider, which.

00:15:06:20 - 00:15:18:01

Yeah. So wherever. Um, so it should, we should easily be able to agree that 5.5m is wide enough for two HGVs to pass. And I think Wiltshire have said that in their responses. And stop lying down.

00:15:18:12 - 00:15:20:07

I'm going to come on to that very shortly.

00:15:20:09 - 00:15:49:08

Yeah, it's quite important because, um, in consideration of this, this topic, you need to know one, the numbers of vehicles in the likelihood of them passing, uh, to where which areas of links you can actually pass. And three the inter visibility between links. And that's what we've tried to provide. Sorry, tried to provide. But at deadline four we're providing further information, which is the detail that that we've been asked to provide. And hopefully that should clear things up and we can move forward on it.

00:15:49:10 - 00:15:49:28

Okay.

00:15:52:18 - 00:15:53:19

Good. Can I please.

00:15:55:16 - 00:16:22:18

Think on the point of which five point. So 5.5m is the absolute minimum capacity to H2 two large vehicles. And that's going to manage the streets. Um, I think from our point of view that leads to particularly on roads such as this, with no age restraint, we can have that even accepting that it's a made possibly a low frequency occurrence. But obviously it's still still a risk that, um, we would perhaps for a little bit more comfort than that, maybe six metres.

00:16:22:20 - 00:16:27:07

Mr.. Leah. You're stealing my thunder. Yeah, that's where I'm going.

00:16:27:09 - 00:16:27:24

So

00:16:29:16 - 00:16:37:24

it's not always possible. But obviously, you know, you you want a little bit of comfort factor because obviously. So the chances are even on 5.5 you'll probably still run the edges. Yeah.

00:16:37:26 - 00:16:58:20

Um, can I just stop you there? Because I want to come on to why these dimensions matter. Okay. Um, so. And this and some of this relates to non-motorized users, and I just think this, this is not necessarily just about two HGTV's passing. It's about the distance that you need to provide to pass non-motorized users. Um.

00:17:01:10 - 00:17:26:21

And I'm, I guess I'm I've been somewhat perplexed by some of the information in the applicants assessments, where it seems to be implying that because non-motorized user flows are low, um, or because most of the rural roads lack footpaths and in their words, therefore undesirable for pedestrians to use, that the safety implications for those users would be insignificant. Um.

00:17:29:05 - 00:18:07:12

I also note that the applicant has dismissed the validity of stop lying down survey of non-motorized users, which they had submitted in one of their representations. But we haven't received any comprehensive survey data of from the applicant, um, that they've done similar non-motorized user surveys. Now, I do note that there was some information provided in response to the XK one HT 1.18. Um, but it isn't the level of detail of stop lying down, and I don't want to debate how their survey was conducted, um, and what questions were asked and how many users said the same, you know, said multiple answered multiple times.

00:18:07:14 - 00:18:37:29

Um, but the point being is their survey came in and we hadn't had anything, um, to the contrary already in the submissions. But each time that my colleagues and I have been to site, we have undoubtedly encountered cyclists, horse riders, walkers and runners. And I. Whilst I can agree that

these have not been a steady stream and they certainly haven't been on every route that we've passed along. Um, we have encountered those users.

00:18:38:01 - 00:18:59:12

Um, and they therefore need to be seriously entertained. Number four, I want to come on to the applicant. Um, I would like to hear from stop line down on this matter. And I'm particularly interested to know if there are particular locations along the routes where they feel non-motorized users would be particularly vulnerable.

00:19:02:20 - 00:19:24:20

To stop lying down. Um, yes. Thank you. Um, particular concerns along the Fosse Way. Um, I have also observed cyclists every time I've been on site along Foss Way. And it is part of the Wiltshire Cycleway. Um, and there's plenty of representations from cycle clubs, local residents, um,

00:19:26:13 - 00:20:00:10

um, identifying how often they use it. Um, it's certainly a big concern. Um, the road up to Churston. So the Lyme down a, um, that is very popular with cyclists. Um, I understand that um, Churston is a popular destination for cyclists. Out for a ride. Uh, a nice, um, cafe there. Um, and then Bradfield. Uh, sorry. I've also seen many, um, I've had pictures sent of, uh, equestrians on the Fosse Way.

00:20:01:00 - 00:20:35:03

Um, there is a stables on the road to Churston. Um, so Fosse Way and road. Churston for equestrians. Um, I've seen people out walking, um, the roads to Bradfield or the Bradfield Cottages section. Um, you probably have seen those plans of the walks from her Lavington. Um, so they are promoted as routes and they are the popular routes to the countryside around the village.

00:20:35:16 - 00:21:10:29

And some of those do include sections of the lane. Um, and it is a particularly, um, difficult lane to negotiate at the best of times. Um, I've walked along there measuring widths, and it feels sometimes I'm taking my life in my hands. Um, certainly large vehicles along there do. Um. It is they are very threatening. Um, and obviously I've got my yellow, um, jacket on and I'm being careful, but, um, uh, I have concerns about pedestrian safety along that section.

00:21:11:17 - 00:21:23:26

Um, it is also used by a lot of cyclists. Um, the the cafe there. Um, just to the north of the railway line. That's well used by cyclists.

00:21:23:28 - 00:21:24:21

Flying monk.

00:21:24:23 - 00:22:04:24

The flying monk? Yes, yes. Um, So we have I think I've seen pictures of equestrians. I've seen equestrian there myself, but I've seen pictures of equestrians using that section as well. Um, so all of those narrow sections. So the Fosse Way, um, Alderton Road obviously is on the same section of road used by cyclists. Um, the road to Churston and the section um path between Lyme down de uh, the lane east of Lavington and Bradfield Cottages.

00:22:04:26 - 00:22:17:17

That section. Um it is used by cyclists, I would say not as heavily as Fosse Way and the road to Churston and Alderton Road. Um, but cyclists do go along there.

00:22:20:07 - 00:22:24:01

I think that's yes, they are my main areas of concern.

00:22:24:03 - 00:22:26:18

Okay. Thank you. Um, miss Shelby.

00:22:29:14 - 00:22:36:18

Wiltshire Council have any particular areas of concern for non-motorized users?

00:22:37:19 - 00:23:10:15

I think the main area is Mr. Bamber just alluded to his, um, his obviously walkers that come from the flooding and walk up the hill to either the, um, the Flying Monk or, um, across to the prows on their um, the one concern on that section is that, um, so from the junction with the street to the first, effectively that bend on the corner there, um, you have a carriageway where the effectively the there are no verges, it's just steep banks, both sides. So you do feel in a bit of a canyon there and the road is, um, apparently unsuitable.

00:23:10:17 - 00:23:33:06

You can't pass to um, certainly come past two HGVs on that section and I can't recall if it was even possible to pass the car in HGV, or I'd have to check back on that one. Um, I mean, there is visibility from that corner to the junction just. But if you were a pedestrian there, you would feel that, well, I can't really step out of the way because it's it's a bank. Um,

00:23:34:21 - 00:23:51:14

I can't comment so much on the on the Fosse Way, although it's obviously a more open environment where there are verges where people, but certainly pedestrians can pass. Obviously cyclists can't clear the carriageway and obviously, um, not so sure about horse riders either. But obviously, you know, there's a little bit more room for manoeuvre there. But um.

00:23:51:20 - 00:23:52:09

Okay.

00:23:52:12 - 00:23:54:08

Thank you. Okay. Um.

00:23:54:16 - 00:24:09:08

Sorry, madam. Um, I just. Mr.. Mr.. Um, Danny. Because I could stop lying down, obviously I picked up that was from section seven of Mr. Bamboos. Rep one rep 1-172, but was one over in there, but he just wanted to add as well, if that's okay. Apologies.

00:24:09:10 - 00:24:43:26

Yes. Thank you. Uh, Bruce Bamber, stop lying down. Um, yeah. Sorry. We're been concentrating on that part of the site. Um, the area around Rod Borne. Um, there, there's, uh, you will have seen them. The narrow lanes, public rights away around there, which are going to be heavily impacted by construction vehicles. I'm conscious that there's there's been a, um, a proposal to to move one of the access routes off the lane, I think, and put it parallel to avoid the ancient woodland there.

00:24:44:00 - 00:25:19:00

Um, but beyond that and then going south, crossing over the railway. Um, there are obviously local residents use that route, um, recreationally take dogs out. Um, so that that I think is also a highly sensitive area at the moment. There's hardly any vehicles there at all. Um, so the construction will be a very significant change in the environment. Um, and again, the lanes of a narrow, um, vehicles won't be going fast, but they will certainly be, you know, large vehicles on narrow lanes.

00:25:19:12 - 00:25:21:28

Um, all around that area.

00:25:22:00 - 00:25:23:06

Okay. Thank you.

00:25:26:27 - 00:25:27:16

So.

00:25:30:18 - 00:25:52:11

In terms of the non-motorized users, we obviously had representations about the relevance and applicability in certain parts of the, of the scheme about the Highway Code. And I just wonder if we can share on the screen the applicant's response to stop lying down in rep 3133, specifically page 22.

00:26:04:13 - 00:26:06:09

Yeah. Thank you. So

00:26:08:04 - 00:26:29:23

the applicant states that the Highway Code rule in this document that we can see. And then what it means for the road space required for HGVs to pass these non-motorized users. Can I just clarify? Doesn't matter from which party, um, that all or most TVs are 2.5m wide generally.

00:26:29:25 - 00:26:31:25

James Dower for the applicant. Yes. Correct.

00:26:31:27 - 00:26:32:29

Okay, perfect.

00:26:33:01 - 00:26:33:18

So

00:26:35:15 - 00:26:52:21

if an HDTV is 2.5m wide and a pedestrian takes a half a meter of the highway, and then two meter separation is required from that pedestrian, the minimum road width required would be five meters. I mean, have I got that right? Mr. Darrell?

00:26:56:05 - 00:26:56:24

Yes.

00:26:57:07 - 00:27:10:24

Okay. But that doesn't include any verge buffer for the HGV. That's just literally from side to side. Five meters is what this document is suggesting is required for safe space for a pedestrian.

00:27:11:09 - 00:27:12:25

James Alford applicant. Yes.

00:27:12:27 - 00:27:26:15

Okay, so if we're in a road of five meters or less in width, then an HGV is either got to overrun the verge to pass that pedestrian, or it's got to pass too close to the pedestrian. Is that correct?

00:27:26:22 - 00:27:37:01

Uh, H-e-b would probably just stop and let the pedestrian pass, because all of our HGV drivers have to go through an induction, which there. And as explained in RTMP.

00:27:37:03 - 00:28:13:15

Well, I think that's probably a bit unrealistic that all HGV drivers will stop um, for pedestrians. HGV drivers all over the country don't stop for pedestrians and they're probably briefed as well. Um, but so what I would suggest is there's they will overrun the verge or pinch the space. And we see this with cyclists all the time. Cars do it as well. It's not just HGV HGV drivers. They pinch the space that they're required to give. So five metres or less we'd have the HGV possibly not providing enough space or overrunning the verge.

00:28:13:17 - 00:28:43:18

That's just an assertion I'm just putting out there. Um. Then we look at cyclists and equestrian users and then clearly more road width is required and the dimensions given in that response similarly don't account for any verge buffer. And I think this is where Mr. Leia was going before when I said, please don't steal my thunder because I was coming on to on to this. Um, but I think that's the point.

00:28:43:20 - 00:28:55:06

So it's for pedestrians. We need a minimum of five meters for cyclists, a minimum of five and a half. And question six. But none of that accounts for a large buffer. Um.

00:28:57:28 - 00:29:01:22

You say in this is to the applicant. Um,

00:29:03:15 - 00:29:36:28

you say that in response to our first written question, which is TT 1.18 in rep 3128, that these road widths are available at various points along the construction route, but I guess what I was more

interested in is where these road widths are not met, as opposed to they might be met at various points, but that implies that they're not met at various points. Um, now, you said a D4, we'd be receiving more information and you would be showing where these 5.5m road widths are met.

00:29:37:00 - 00:29:47:13

And then for equestrians at six. But actually I'm interested in where they're not met. Um, so I'm wondering if that's an action we should be, um, issuing for the applicant.

00:29:48:21 - 00:30:02:07

Um, James Darren for the applicant. Yeah. The plans will show both. So I'll have a red box around the areas that are 5.5m or wider, including our passing points. And then the areas outside of the red box are. Will be narrower than the 5.5m.

00:30:02:09 - 00:30:41:09

Okay. Thanks. Now, I appreciate that those sections of road I mean, this is this is a big scheme and there are many roads. Not all of those roads will be swamped with pedestrians, cyclists and and equestrians users. But however we. It's really important that we can understand where those widths are not met, so that we can consider whether they may need highway improvements. And that's the purpose. Um, from my perspective now, I want to ask the applicant if they want to come back on anything they've heard from stop lying down.

00:30:41:11 - 00:30:54:09

Um, particularly around the pinch points, the areas where they're concerned about non-motorized users. Um, and whether you agree that they are areas of concern and possibly measures to deal with them.

00:30:54:21 - 00:30:55:06

Uh,

00:30:56:23 - 00:31:12:25

I think if we perhaps deal with the point about the survey data first, because I know that was the original, uh, comment that was made in terms of, um, survey data that's been provided by the applicant. So I'll just let Mr. Darrell answer that point first, and then we can go on to the points about pinch points. Thank you.

00:31:13:22 - 00:31:47:20

James. Now for the applicant. Um, so original, uh, submission included some survey data. Um, and it wasn't enough, but it included, uh, January surveys and cycle surveys along the routes. Um, obviously there will be construction in January, but it's not a peak month. Um, like a summer month would be. Um, so we undertook further surveys, and this was done recently in, um, uh, at the May Bank holiday to the 23rd to the 29th of May. Um, we had cameras up on Alderton Road, Fosse Way, two cameras on Fosse Way.

00:31:47:28 - 00:32:18:23

Um, a count camera at um Lavington, Bradfield Cottages. Um. And a camera at Rob Bourne as well. Um, we managed to get some survey data, but the camera on Fosse was broken and stolen. Um, and

so was the Bradfield Cottages one. Um, and they both have trackers, so we're trying to work out where they are. Um, in terms of, um, the data, we did get some data from there, and the quite one thing we picked up actually is currently there's some Network Rail works which are happening on Fosse Way.

00:32:18:25 - 00:32:48:23

So they've got a compound that is about 200m by 200m and they're doing embankment works. And our survey picked up, they're doing this for six months. I think it finishes in October. So you can still go out and see it. Um, they travel along Alderton Road and Fosse Way to access their site. In fact, where the compound is, is actually in London. See? Um, so the survey picked up on Ollerton Road. This is without widening. 19 HGVs, tipper lorries in one hour.

00:32:49:14 - 00:32:55:03

Um, Mr. Darrell, I was more interested in the surveys for non-motorized users, not surveys of HGVs.

00:32:55:05 - 00:33:10:24

Yeah. I'm sorry. These are the non-motorized user surveys. I don't with videos. I'm just saying it. Also it's quite interesting to pick that up. Um, so in terms of the survey results, um, for the areas that have been, um, highlighted by the respondents, Um,

00:33:12:16 - 00:33:48:00

the results for the Fosse Way camera that remained um, showed ten pedestrians, um, and 26 cyclists during the proposed delivery hours on the bank holiday Monday. Um, I think I'll see. Timothy confirms we're not, uh, there's no deliveries on the bank holiday, but we thought we'd take that day as a sign because it's going to be the maximum sort of flows, really, or higher flows. Um, and there were no equestrians recorded at all during these hours. Um, and it was quite hot weather, but it was good weather and it cooled down later on in the week.

00:33:48:27 - 00:34:26:17

Um, and so, you know, the non-motorized users could be expected to be higher than a typical day. Um, by comparison, from Tuesday to Friday, the survey showed an average of three pedestrians and eight cyclists per day on Fosse Way during the delivery hours. So I'm just focusing on the actual delivery hours because I noticed Justin Velo came in yesterday, and we're talking to you. And, um. When you go on to their website, a lot of their rides are outside of the delivery hours. Um, but I acknowledge there's deliveries on Saturday, which would also, um, count towards that.

00:34:27:01 - 00:34:36:10

Um, from a review of the survey data across the whole week. Um, it's noted a number of the moons were taken concurrently. Yeah.

00:34:36:11 - 00:34:40:29

I don't see that in your answer to my question. I'm just looking at that now.

00:34:41:01 - 00:35:14:09

Okay. Um, so. And the service location at Hamilton, opposite the street. So this is the camera that remains at 14 pedestrians, four cyclists and no questions. And then at Robert, I mentioned this because

these are the areas that have been brought up by, um, the respondents. Rob Bourne um, south of the bridge, there were 41 pedestrians, two cyclists and eight questions during the delivery hours. But that was over the whole week. Um, and Tuesday to Friday, The total over the days was 13 pedestrians, one cyclists and eight questions, and six of them were on Wednesday.

00:35:14:11 - 00:35:27:26

So, um, I think that's just highlighting that. It sort of matches our initial observations. Okay. And the flows are not as high as, as as has been stated. Okay.

00:35:27:28 - 00:35:38:20

I've got questions then. Um, so these surveys were done in May this year, 2026. Yes. Yeah. And you suggested that you had done one a one day survey in January.

00:35:38:22 - 00:35:41:14

It's a week long. It's it's our attics. It picked up okay.

00:35:41:18 - 00:35:44:09

There was a week long in January when 2026.

00:35:44:11 - 00:35:45:28

2024, 2025.

00:35:46:18 - 00:35:56:02

So in the planning of this scheme since 2024 to May 2026, they're the only surveys that you've done for non-motorized users.

00:35:56:04 - 00:35:58:06

Yes. James Darren, for the applicant.

00:35:58:08 - 00:36:26:21

Um, I'm just questioning whether they're representative. No, I'm not going any parallel with the survey that stop lying down. I've done. It's not. It's. It's not for them to provide the evidence that I feel should have been provided in things. And I'm just wondering why we've got one survey done while we're in examination to counter evidence that another party has put in. And we've only got one other survey since 2024 for non-motorized users.

00:36:32:06 - 00:36:57:29

Um, there's two parts of that. Firstly, you know, it would normally just be typical to do one survey. So we thought it was sufficient as um, as the Wiltshire Cycleway. Um, and the second part is we did in our scoping with Wiltshire talk about survey for the pros. And it was agreed that they're not required. So the pro so surveys the pros didn't happen. But there was there were NMU surveys on the road network.

00:36:58:01 - 00:37:06:07

But on the road network we've got one one week survey in January 24th in the winter and nothing until May 2026.

00:37:06:12 - 00:37:07:13

James. Overlap. Yes.

00:37:07:15 - 00:37:08:00

That's correct.

00:37:08:02 - 00:37:14:21

Thank you. All right. I'll come back to you to deal with the other matters that were raised by the parties

00:37:16:15 - 00:37:21:07

in terms of the locations they suggested, where NMS would be particularly vulnerable.

00:37:22:09 - 00:37:22:29

Yeah. James, now.

00:37:23:01 - 00:37:50:10

For the applicant. Yeah. I think what we're submitting it deadline for is quite important for this because it provides road widths, which is what what we're talking about here on there. It's in our plans. Um, so I think it's important for those to be viewed, um, by, um, Wiltshire and there I mean Stockland Downs consultants. It'd be good for everybody to review them at the same time. Um, because essentially we're talking about road widths.

00:37:51:10 - 00:38:03:07

Okay. So you don't have you don't have anything. You don't contest the areas where stop lying down in the council have said where enemies would be particularly vulnerable. You don't dispute the locations that

00:38:04:29 - 00:38:05:26

they mentioned.

00:38:50:03 - 00:38:56:07

Of the applicant. I think in the absence of having the confirmed data.

00:38:58:09 - 00:39:44:10

It's difficult for the applicant to specify exactly whether or not in the particular locations that have been mentioned, whether there are greater areas of narrow road width than in others because we haven't got that technical detail in front of us. I think the applicant does recognise that there are sections of road that are narrower than others, and obviously you've observed that yourselves, but we don't have the specific widths in front of us, so we don't want to talk to something that then is okay, different. But I think in terms of the other points, um, the applicant would just say that, I mean, we we do appreciate, um, the level of comments that have been made through the examination process and therefore the applicant has done further work.

00:39:44:18 - 00:40:19:08

Um, as a result of the comments that are being made, it considered that the information it had, um, at the beginning of the process to undertake the transport assessment and the EIA was sufficient to undertake that process. But it has listened to what people are saying about their experiences of using this, and it has then sought to do further work in order to demonstrate the robustness of its, um, assessment and to give comfort that the mitigation measures that it's proposing are suitable and appropriate, and that there isn't necessarily a need for further roadworks to be undertaken.

00:40:19:10 - 00:40:36:23

So I just wanted to make it clear the applicant doesn't concede that there was a, um, an inadequacy in the level of information that it had used to produce its transport assessment, but it is listening to the concerns and is trying to provide further information to address those.

00:40:36:25 - 00:41:11:28

Yeah. And that's appreciated. Um, I, I guess what I would say, however, is in producing those, there were some unhelpful comments about how the data from another party can't be trusted. And yet we are also being asked to trust data from this side. So if those sorts of comments could not be made in responses and that was in the written response. It would be helpful. Um, but I do appreciate the applicant has obviously listened to the fact that people are concerned and you have done more surveys, so thank you for that.

00:41:12:00 - 00:41:13:24

Um, I

00:41:15:18 - 00:41:19:03

would like to come back just very briefly before we move on.

00:41:19:05 - 00:41:52:10

Yes. Of course. Danny, stop lying down. It's something we're going to pick up in comments on the documents anyway. Um, it may be something the applicant is aware of anyway. Um, luckily, I was in Scotland, so it wasn't as hot there, but when they did, they survey there was a heat wave and there was a yellow, um, health warning for heat across the country. Um, you may remember it was really hot in there. So, um, we would say it's just not a representative. Time again, um, when UK HSA are indicating it was a health risk walk walking. I know you don't want to hear back and forth on this, but just we don't accept.

00:41:52:12 - 00:42:02:09

I mean, even if the applicant doesn't accept the figures we're producing, we don't. It must be somewhere in the middle. Um, you know, these are not empty roads, as you have seen. Um, anyway.

00:42:02:11 - 00:42:07:05

Thank you. Thank you very much. What's your counsel? Anything to add? Will we close this item out?

00:42:07:08 - 00:42:09:29

Um, I actually had a no. Nothing to add at this stage.

00:42:10:01 - 00:42:14:09

Okay. Thanks. So. Coming on to. Oh, Mr.. Mr.. Bamba.

00:42:14:11 - 00:42:50:12

Thank you. Uh, Bruce Bamba, stop lying down. Um, could I request that, um, if we are going to get road widths, um, that they could be measured on site rather than from, um, survey bases or topo survey bases? Um, because there are sections of the highway where Mr. Lear pointed out where the edge has just fallen away. Um, to, to measure, um, the available width to the edge of the far side of a ditch where, um, uh, vehicle wheels have sort of fallen off the edge of the carriageway is not sufficient.

00:42:50:14 - 00:43:07:04

So they should be actually measured on site so that somebody can. I mean, I have done it myself. I am staggered that we don't have this information in front of us now. Um, but, uh, measured off a survey. Survey base is not good enough, I think.

00:43:07:06 - 00:43:28:19

What I mean, I'll ask the applicant how they've done it and if they have done it from a survey base as opposed to actual measuring on site, then I think that we will need some sort of caveat in that information as to how they've been measured. Um, and what, um, whether it was on site or not. But if they were done on site, you will similarly make that disclaimer.

00:43:28:22 - 00:43:35:02

Yeah. James Taylor for the applicant, these were topographical surveys which were undertaken on site, not from aerial photography or anything like that.

00:43:35:04 - 00:43:41:22

But accepting the point that Mr. Bamber is making a topographical survey would still show a width of a road. And if it's.

00:43:41:24 - 00:43:57:06

No, it would pick up everything on that road. So it's, it, it'll, it will actually tell you if it's just gravel by the side, it will actually be on there. It's very detailed. It's got hedgerow um walls, verge ditches, grips which are little channels that go into ditches. Everything's in there.

00:43:57:08 - 00:44:06:09

So everywhere where the verge is falling away and the road is broken up and there's no more road, it will still be on there. So are those topographical surveys provided there?

00:44:06:11 - 00:44:11:01

Yeah, we did our swept path analysis on those, but, um, we can provide them again.

00:44:11:25 - 00:44:14:02

They're already in the evidence base or not.

00:44:14:04 - 00:44:20:09

Not not the raw data. But obviously our swept path analysis was on top of topographical survey.

00:44:20:11 - 00:44:34:18

Okay. I'm going to come to Mr. Bamber to see if there's anything that he would need submitted into evidence from, from how you've surveyed, because I think we we're going to get queries on this, and we might as well all be happy with the evidence that's coming in.

00:44:34:20 - 00:44:57:02

Yes. Thank you. Bruce Bamber, stop lying down. Um, I welcome that. That's very helpful. Um, so what we need to be able to see is sufficient detail. So if it's picked up all those features, then the plans at the moment are no good for that. I agree. So they should be of a of office scale and all those features marked. So it's quite clear what what we're looking at.

00:44:58:05 - 00:45:29:08

Clare project, the applicant I think maybe it's a conversation we can have um outside of the hearing, just in terms of the sharing of information, because obviously there is the raw data that has been used to undertake the assessment, but we haven't sought to replicate all of those elements on the on the plans being provided. But there has been access to the raw data, and maybe there's an element of us being able to share that raw data with Mr. Bamber. So he's got, um, access to the same information and sits behind the plans because we can't obviously show everything on the plan itself.

00:45:29:14 - 00:46:01:22

No, and I do appreciate that. But I think for the day, we need to to feel confident in the information that's shown on the plan. So even the evidence is coming into us. Um, I mean, if what we're going to receive a plan similar to what's in annex J and annex K, um, of the, of the transport assessment, they're just not adequate. They don't show enough information even for the day. So I'm hoping that what you do submit at D4 is far superior to the the information in those plans, because at the moment they're just they're just vague.

00:46:05:27 - 00:46:14:29

Yes. We'll provide basically the raw data, the mapping that's underneath it. And it provides that level of information. So drainage ditches, um verges edge of carriageway gravel.

00:46:15:01 - 00:46:47:16

I just go one step further. I mean, maybe this is just impossible given the stage we are at the examination. Um, but stop lying down had produced, um, a layered map in one of in their written, um, submission. I think it was an x, y and XXY and x y. Um, and we as an expert, have found it extremely useful to be able to switch on and off layers. I don't know if the applicant has done something similar, or whether that type of process would be helpful for us, so that we have something where we're able to switch on and off that information.

00:46:47:24 - 00:47:05:12

Um, I'm going to leave it with you to. I mean, it would be happy to have an answer now, whether you have that or whether it's feasible. Um, as opposed to us just receiving lots and lots of more plans where we've got to open up multiple screens to see the information we need.

00:47:05:20 - 00:47:35:24

Uh, of the applicant. Um, we are able to produce layered plans. Um, we will, um, take the point away and and determine whether layer plans can be provided for that. We are aware of there being issues on other projects where layered plans were too big in size and then became unusable for people to open on their computers. And so there's a balance to be had in terms of providing full functionality with somebody actually being able to open the people.

00:47:35:27 - 00:47:37:25

And also for the planning inspector to receive them.

00:47:37:27 - 00:47:46:03

Exactly. So sometimes it's the size. Um, but we will, um, we've taken the point and we'll have a look and see what, um, what can be done.

00:47:46:05 - 00:48:01:07

Okay. Well, we'll issue an action for that consideration. Not so much an action that you have to do it, but it would be helpful that it was looked at and if it could be provided in some way, that may be better than submitting endless plans and, say, topographical data.

00:48:03:20 - 00:48:11:18

So that brings me on to highway improvement areas I can. Oh, sorry. Sorry. Miss Lee, Wiltshire Council.

00:48:11:27 - 00:48:44:16

David Lee, Wiltshire Council. Um, yeah, I think because because all these narrow lanes are so important, I would I basically, you know, basically agree that, um, what would have been helpful obviously the moment we got the swept path plans in the, in the in the transport penalties, it's very difficult to see all the colours on top and obviously all the swept path lines where the features are. And I think I think it's a case now that most you probably have produced topographical surveys before, but I'm still not entirely sure if there's any OS based information on any of those those parts.

00:48:44:18 - 00:49:20:22

But what would be useful is to have like, you know, the raw survey in PDF for the rule survey. And then what we would normally obviously you normally then put a change marker on the site. So you know, this is point zero, point 1.20 and that those, those positions indicate with dimensions what the actual carriageway widths are along those. So we've got a plan which shows his old tram road. Here's the whole length. Here's the here's the width here. Here's the width here. So we've got it all on the plan because at the moment it's, it's although the swept paths are shown on the transport assessment diagram, it's very difficult to actually know what's underneath that.

00:49:20:24 - 00:49:38:27

But as you say where it's 5.5 where it's five. Mm. Um, where there are roadside ditches, whether indeed the Ollerton Road improvements which are shown are actually possible and what widths have been assumed in and obviously what improvement widths are being proposed.

00:49:39:02 - 00:49:59:23

So you would prefer to receive plans? I would prefer to receive layers. Mr. Bamber seems content with what the applicant is suggesting. So we need to come to a common ground here. Um, and I don't mind if the applicant shares particular bits of information to the council outside of the examination. That helps them. But ultimately, we all need to see the same.

00:50:00:17 - 00:50:33:11

Yes. Thank you. Bruce Bamber. Stop lying down. Um, I think change, um, diagrams would be helpful because that does give an indication of how the width is changing along the link. Yeah. Um, I'm happy with layers or plans. As long as I can find the information. I'm conscious that layers might be more convenient for some people, but if plans show it more clearly for me, I'm happy to, you know, trawl through lots of plans to get to the information I need.

00:50:33:16 - 00:50:39:21

I think, Miss Broderick, we we have our position. We we I think we need the plans. Um.

00:50:40:00 - 00:51:16:14

Claire. Yes. That's noted. Um, we've listened. And just in terms of providing, you know, a proportionate set of documentation, what we're looking at here is, um, the areas that are much that are the narrower sections. So where sections of the roads are much wider, we're not. And it's clear that the area of, um, the paved surface of the road exceeds the distances we're talking about. We're not, we're not and we don't want to provide this level of detail for every road. No, no, no. Um, so it was just the roads that, that are, um, where width is, is a concern that we are going to provide this extra level of detail.

00:51:16:16 - 00:51:41:27

Absolutely. From my perspective that we're two HGVs can pass and there's no dispute of those sections of road where two HGV can pass. That means an HGV can pass a horse, a cyclist and a pedestrian without without a doubt. Um, it's those areas where, um, those wits aren't available for the for those enemies with a verge allowance as well for the HGV. So we are looking at the narrower parts of the routes.

00:51:44:19 - 00:52:17:08

Um, now, we're almost certainly not going to get through this whole agenda, so I'm already making an extra decision that we won't come on to the construction traffic management plan. And I don't I want everyone to be aware that possibly what I'm considering for a September hearings is a hearing specifically on the control documents, not I mean, it may be if we're back for transport, we will look at construction traffic management plan with that transport hearing. But if we are not, we will likely hold a hearing just on controlled documents.

00:52:17:10 - 00:52:53:06

Because obviously there's the we were talking yesterday about the environmental management plan. So there will be, you know, drainage strategies and so forth. So we may very well have a hearing specifically on control documents. So I'm not overly bothered that we're not going to get to that part of this agenda today. And I'm also very conscious. We haven't looked at um, like vehicle and shuttle bus forecasting. Um, I haven't forgotten it. It's still on my radar and it's still something which needs to

be covered. But I think we really just should look at coming on to the highway improvement areas element of this agenda.

00:52:53:10 - 00:52:57:05

It's a little bit difficult, I suppose, because we haven't got Mr. Bamba.

00:52:57:20 - 00:53:21:06

Bruce Bamba. Stop lying down. Just before we move on. I was informed at the meeting that we had that there would be, um, more surveys undertaken of NMU over the summer. Um, so I'm expecting, um, those May surveys to be repeated at a time that that is representative. Um, I just wanted to see if that is going to happen.

00:53:21:16 - 00:53:22:01

Okay.

00:53:22:03 - 00:53:25:22

Well, very quickly then, um. Applicant, please.

00:53:35:24 - 00:53:44:01

James, now for the applicant, because two of our survey cameras were stolen. We are redoing some of the surveys, but I can't say exactly when that is.

00:53:44:16 - 00:53:50:11

Okay. Can I ask even for the areas where they were stolen? Could you revisit the ones that weren't stolen?

00:53:50:13 - 00:53:51:07

We can do it all again.

00:53:51:09 - 00:54:23:18

Yep. Surveys again on that. Thank you. Um, so. Yes. Onto the highway improvement areas. Um, I suppose it's a little bit difficult without having the documents that are coming at deadline for. And I always wonder if it's a bit difficult to to cover this particular agenda item. Uh, because we don't know about widths of, of lots of the roads. Uh, what we do have before us, um, are several areas that are already identified for highway improvement works.

00:54:23:22 - 00:54:24:13

Um.

00:54:26:23 - 00:54:27:15

So I.

00:54:30:00 - 00:54:41:29

I just wonder if the applicant, in doing the work that they've been doing for deadline for. Have they identified any further areas where highway improvement areas may be needed from their perspective.

00:54:43:06 - 00:55:06:02

James Darren, for the applicant, um, we've shown passing points along Fosse Way within the red line, within the order limits in these plans submitted for deadline for. So we are so there. So the deadline for includes details of these passing points. So includes widths and curb alignment and how much verge is being used.

00:55:06:05 - 00:55:09:17

So improvements intended for the Fosse Way.

00:55:09:19 - 00:55:10:23

Yes that's right. Yeah.

00:55:11:03 - 00:55:11:21

Okay.

00:55:14:25 - 00:55:38:14

So I'll come then to Wiltshire Council before stop line down. Um, no, we don't know where on the Fosse Way yet. Um, but are there any other areas where you felt highway? And this is not so much necessarily about the same points where we talked about NMS, but we're also talking about HGVs passing one of them, where you felt highway improvement areas needed to be added into the application.

00:55:40:01 - 00:56:10:14

What's cancelled? Um, well, it's it's, um, encouraging that, um, um, that phosphate is being looked at because that was a concern that, um, particularly the southern part, Fosse Way between the oldest and road junction up to, um, actually the bottom of the line down. See, there were there were some very long sections there where, you know, some 400m between existing opportunities. We felt something was needed there. Um, I can't comment on obviously what's going to come forward.

00:56:10:20 - 00:56:41:18

Um, I will confess to not having fully seen revision three of the transport assessment, but one point we did make it, um, revision two is that the appendix A. Appendix K HGV Passing Survey didn't really cover the northern part of Fosse Way. Um, and I think the only concern there would be over what the available width would be coming up to the junction where the road turns through 90 degrees to go into the road towards Churston.

00:56:41:20 - 00:57:15:08

So from the Fosse Way turning towards um, I think from my point of view, um, the, the, the only other area which I, I do have concerns about are is the length of road, um, between the street junction at Lavington up to Bradfield Cottages, um, excepting that the first part, first section through to the the bend is actually quite difficult to do anything about. But beyond that, I think the survey, the last survey showed, well, there was an opportunity and then maybe another small one and another small one.

00:57:15:10 - 00:57:56:23

It was suggested to me the road, which was very variable, um, and whether we should be looking at some improvements there. Um, I think when you come onto the railway bridge, it's very difficult when you get to the Brookside Junction, um, which is just beyond the railway bridge up to the monks, the cafe at the top. Um, there's a I think the plan. The last plan I saw there was about 130, 140 metre visibility. So there was no opportunity from an HGV, um, approaching from Brookside, from the south, and obviously at the top of the hill by the, by the, um, the flying tap monk tap, whatever it's called.

00:57:56:27 - 00:58:27:06

Um, and there was, there was no, no opportunities between there. And I think my concern there was a road curve slightly and it was very overhanging vegetation. It was very, very difficult to judge. And I did think there was an opportunity at the bottom there where there's an existing wide access. Um, I think it's like a large x, um, concrete apron junction, um, to the back of the effect. It goes to a farm at the back of the, at the flying tap. And for possibly doing some improvement there to make sure you could pass the two large vehicles.

00:58:27:08 - 00:59:07:25

But at the moment there's nothing between those two. And then then once you get to the top of the you get to the top of the up to the where the cafe is all the way to the line down the access points. Um, the opportunities there are quite limited um, the opportunity there's a potential for Laurie over On the Verge quite easily. Um, but I also accepted in that situation that, um, because the because that's very close to the actual line down the access points, it would be possible if the lorry was at close to for them to control anything leaving it would obviously they would, they would know it was that close.

00:59:08:09 - 00:59:43:15

Um, I think the, the other concern we do have and it's more difficult to pinpoint is obviously the, the applicant makes the point that this will all be managed and will work wonderfully because there will be an a management system in place and no lorries, two lorries associated with construction will ever meet because they'll time it so well every day for two years, every hour of the day. That it will never happen. That. So they'll always manage. They'll never be 2 billion calls across. Um, I think our view is that you can reduce the risk, but you can never totally mitigate it.

00:59:43:17 - 01:00:16:26

And therefore these measures, you know, these passing, these passing bars need to go in because because it will happen. And obviously it ignores any existing traffic, um, as well. But the point I make about the, the delivery system is that so the way it's set up is that the arriving driver pulls in somewhere and phones ahead to say, I'm here, can I come through? Um, and there may be another vehicle that's just left aside. So we may be told, yes, you can come on through, but he's had to stop somewhere.

01:00:17:03 - 01:00:48:05

Um, and or it may be a case. Well, yes. There's a there's a lorry just left. You need to hold your position. And so what's unclear at the moment or what's unclear from the last time I saw is where these holding areas would actually be. They can't be miles and miles away, so a lorry has to be a lorry driver has to be able to pull in, say, say on the way to lime down. Dee's just left the A49. He's got to

stop somewhere to communicate ahead to the site. He's got to stop. When he does that. He can't stop just in the the highway.

01:00:48:16 - 01:01:19:29

Um and he may be required to wait um and not not proceed. So whether those whether those holding areas need an improvement, we're not entirely clear at the moment because we don't actually know what the applicant proposes these will be. And that would be the same on say, the lime down at sea access. So if a, if a glory turns into um off the B road into Alderton Road, um, and he's told to wait somewhere because there's already coming down.

01:01:20:01 - 01:01:31:09

Not quite sure where those holding areas are proposed to be and whether and whether and whether those holding areas don't exist, like a lay by. Or suitable lay by? Yeah. Um, whether whether they would need to be provided.

01:01:31:11 - 01:02:07:25

Yeah. I mean, I don't want to stray into the construction traffic management plan because that's the item that we're not going to get to, but it will certainly be given some considerable thought. And when I say we aren't very much likely to be back talking about that in terms of how they're going to manage that sort of communication. But I do think your point is quite valid if you are having to hold HGV somewhere. You know how that is. I don't don't believe that data is in there. Don't want to come to the applicant on it because I think you can respond to what we've just heard in writing at deadline four. Um, and if it is somewhere in the information in the construction traffic management plan, you can point us to it at that time.

01:02:08:19 - 01:02:41:14

Um, I would come now then to, to stop lying down if, if there are highway improvement works, which they consider should, should occur. Um, bearing in mind that I think that there isn't. Sometimes it's not desirable to have highway improvement areas because, you know, there is an impact upon character, rural character and so forth. So I don't want to give the impression that I want highway improvement areas all over the place because they they just might not be necessary. Um, for the communities that they may be installed in.

01:02:41:16 - 01:02:44:17

But if there are specific parts,

01:02:46:07 - 01:02:53:24

um, Mr. Bamber, that you've identified where you feel it's absolutely necessary, and I say, putting aside the NMU thing more about these.

01:02:53:26 - 01:03:29:27

Yeah. Uh, Bruce Bamber, stop lying down. Um, yes. Uh, obviously Alton Road is already, um, a, uh, highway improvement area. Um, and I think there needs to be more work done on that to, to make it work. Um, so the improvements I don't think are sufficient at the moment to avoid the risk of, uh, HGVs meeting in places where they may be forced to reverse. Um, I think, uh, well, I agree that Foss way should also be highway improvement area and I think that's now accepted.

01:03:30:06 - 01:03:52:27

Um, the section of um the roads to lime down a again there's once you've turned left out of Fosse Way, there's one passing opportunity. There's a big layby that you could probably fit a articulated vehicle in. After that, there's nothing. Um, and I think there is a good chance that there will be problems there with that.

01:03:52:29 - 01:03:54:19

There's only a ladies wood stud.

01:03:54:21 - 01:03:55:13

Yes, yes.

01:03:55:15 - 01:04:30:06

Yes, exactly. Um, and the other place, um, and I, I hear what you say about not wanting to impact for other reasons, but, um, the constraints of the highway, uh, along the lane east of Lavington and Bradfield Cottages is such um, combined with the volumes of construction traffic, which, um, it's not just because what we were discussing earlier about, um, you know, potential underestimates.

01:04:30:15 - 01:05:00:22

Um, but also you have the major the largest components are in lime down D and they haven't been taken into account. So, um, insufficient detail including um, staff movements as well, like vehicle movements. Um, they aren't proportionately, um, distributed to reflect that concentration in that location. Um, but yes, it's leaving it. Even leaving aside the NMU questions. Uh, just the narrowness of the lane.

01:05:00:24 - 01:05:31:15

And Mr. Lee has, you know, gone into detail about some of the locations. Um, it is going to be extremely difficult to manage, uh, the existing highway there with the level of traffic, even given that it's temporary for two years. Um, and even with the proposed management, if that could be made to work because there's already larger vehicles using that which the applicant has no control over.

01:05:34:10 - 01:05:37:13

That's they are the key areas of things.

01:05:37:16 - 01:06:15:28

Yeah. Um, I think I'll issue an action for the council. Um, in terms of just marking up a plan of those areas, just so that I am absolutely clear of the areas that you just spoke about. Um, if you don't recall, there will be a transcript of this hearing published in a few days time, and you can come back to listen to to the areas that you said. But it would be really helpful. Um, and I think Mr. Ballmer's, you know, reiterating some of those areas. Um, and I do had we had time to come on to light vehicle and shuttle bus forecasting, I almost certainly would have raised the point about lime down.

01:06:16:00 - 01:06:51:17

D um, in the sense that it's got the 400 kV substation and it's got the best. And without a doubt, um, we will have more traffic in that area. Um, but we're not going to cover that. I don't want necessarily

to come to the applicant back on here, because we will need to wait and see what we've got. Coming in at deadline four. But what I want to do, I want to do just before we really do have to close this hearing, is I've got some observations of my own from my unaccompanied site inspection.

01:06:51:19 - 01:07:21:06

Um, and my route plan is published, um, from a couple of weeks ago. It happened occurred after the company site inspection and I think possibly some of the areas which I'm about to mention, where I had concerns of some of the ones which were mentioned by um, Wiltshire Council and stop line down. So in terms of Alderton Road, now I know that this is a highway improvement area, but as I understand it, it's temporary highway improvement, not permanent. Mr. Daniel nodding. So.

01:07:22:09 - 01:07:25:24

Um. James down for the applicant? Yes, it's temporary for the construction.

01:07:26:04 - 01:07:46:12

Can I ask them what happens during the operation and maintenance phase, when you've got to replace components to and panels to line down A and see what happens then? So the improvement works temporary for the period of the life of the development. Or are they temporary just for the two year construction period? Because I'm uncertain.

01:07:56:21 - 01:08:38:03

The applicant um, so the, the, the applicant's proposal is that they would be temporary during construction, then they would be reinstated. Um, and should the applicant do the, the full replacement activities to replace all of the panels, then they would be put back in again at that point in time, um, whilst the replacement activities were being undertaken again. Then reinstated. And then they would, to the extent that they were required for decommissioning. Then they would be put back in again at that point in time, so that the applicant's position are that is, that they are sort of temporary for the duration of those works, because it's only the complete replacement of the panels that would trigger the need for them, not day to day operational requirement.

01:08:38:05 - 01:09:08:26

I appreciate that because you have smaller, much smaller vehicles for just day to day operational. Um, on that basis, I guess I need to understand from those plans. Um, what then is being removed to create the highway improvement areas so those work through their work gets reinstated? I mean, are there hedgerows or there trees? Because if we're then looking in, whether it's 20, 30 years time of replacement or 40. All that stuff comes back out again.

01:09:08:28 - 01:09:27:27

And I'm sure my colleague Mr. Love, when he's dealing with ecology this afternoon, would be interested in that. And so would Mr. Northover From a landscape perspective, that information may very well be in the document somewhere, but if you could direct us to that information, that would be helpful. And if it isn't in there, then we will need something on that.

01:09:32:28 - 01:10:04:00

Clare project for the applicant. So the areas we're talking about here are just the verges. So it would be the verge the the vegetation. So it's the verge that would need to be. Her works would be carried out in

my understanding and then that that verge area would be replaced. I know that obviously there have been separate conversations about whether Wiltshire Council would wish to have those highway improvements, um, put in place on a permanent basis, but that's not what the applicant has um, sought consent for.

01:10:04:02 - 01:10:17:11

It's only sought consent for temporary. All right. Um, at those distinct but obviously the the council would be free under its own highways powers to retain them should they decide that they were useful for another highway purpose? Okay.

01:10:17:21 - 01:10:39:05

Um, my next observation then, uh, was on the Fosse Way. It would be helpful if we could have, um, app 010 shown on the screen. And that's the access plan. And another reason is because it's easier for me to say what what I observed and where I observed it in relation to those accesses.

01:10:52:11 - 01:10:55:18

I can just confirm the sheet that you were wanting us to go to.

01:10:55:20 - 01:11:00:12

I think it's just one sheet, isn't it? Oh, it's it's the headline sheet. Sorry. It's, um, it's.

01:11:00:14 - 01:11:01:24

The index plan of that.

01:11:01:26 - 01:11:03:11

The index plan? Yeah.

01:11:06:01 - 01:11:09:21

Sorry. I've just printed off the one sheet. So for me, it's only one sheet.

01:11:16:07 - 01:11:49:09

Yeah. If we could just zoom in on that, that would be helpful. And then we can sort of see the access numbers. And I'm only looking at this point of the, the northern half of that. Um, so if we could just zoom in. Keep going, keep going. Yeah. That that I don't know if it's bigger behind me, but in essence, um, my next observation relates to the stretch of the Fosse Way. Um, in proximity to access is three and 204. Now, while I was at this location, I did observe several tipper lorries on this bit of road.

01:11:49:11 - 01:12:20:16

Um, they were driving in the centre of the road. Um, moving at some speed, I would say. But the passing bays in this area were full of holes. Um, the verges seem to be pitted or sunken and, um, and maybe these are the areas that. Mr. Dowd, you said you are looking at some highway improvement areas coming in at deadline for. I'm not sure if this is the section, but certainly to me those passing bays and verges, um,

01:12:22:08 - 01:12:24:17

needed some examination.

01:12:25:02 - 01:12:40:14

Uh, Mr. Darren, for the applicant. Um, yes. That that area is within the order limits, actually. Um, because obviously there's access points along there, and we've looked at providing some widening places along there as well. So that's within that'll be in our deadline for submission.

01:12:40:16 - 01:12:41:05

Okay.

01:12:41:12 - 01:13:14:20

And then the next stretch is exactly the point, Mr. Bamber said. And it was the stretch of road from Ladies Wood Stud to access five. Um, now, I felt that it did have good visibility, but I questioned whether it was suitable in width for two HGVs to pass without overselling or damaging the verges. Now, given I think access five is a is a, um, permanent highway improvement area. Um, I think it's on a route to access five. I just think that needed some consideration, and I think Mr.

01:13:14:22 - 01:13:21:26

Bamber was raising the same stretch of road where there's possibly a need for an extra passing place through there.

01:13:23:10 - 01:13:43:10

Uh, where we've got the access at access five. Um, it's an existing gated access, as you would have observed. Um, it needs obviously a lot of widening to get the vehicle in the way we've, uh, driven the vehicle in is we've done it at an angle, so it reduces. So it doesn't have to be as wide, but it is still quite wide. The width there is actually wide enough for two HGVs.

01:13:43:15 - 01:13:45:22

So without overselling the verges.

01:13:45:24 - 01:13:46:11

Yeah.

01:13:47:04 - 01:14:05:02

I'd say it was an observation I didn't measure. I just felt as I was in that area, that was something I thought needed to be looked at and again at the top of the Fosse Way. And again, this is the same point Mr. Bamber raised on by access 202, where it is that that tight bend. Um,

01:14:06:18 - 01:14:40:00

while I was there it was That was a pretty busy section of road. I parked on the non-tropical bit, really, of the Fosse Way, just out of the way. Um, and that was pretty busy with cars in both directions. Lots of cyclists I saw there. Um, but also several camper vans, um, coming around that bend. And then as I traveled to Norton, um, there was a sort of sharp, albeit short hill, um, with zero visibility from my side of the road as I was travelling towards Norton.

01:14:40:02 - 01:15:14:17

And as I got to the top of the rise of, as I say, Hill, it's people who are local will probably know exactly the location I'm talking about. Um, certainly not a mountain, but a hill in the car. But there was zero visibility for me of the other side, and there were two camper vans coming towards me, and now they certainly could see me because I rerouted myself back. I got to north and turned around, and I went back the same way, just to see get a sense of what I would see coming the other way. And certainly the campervans could see me, and they were able to make enough manoeuvre for me to come over the brow.

01:15:14:29 - 01:15:23:01

Um, but it did feel to me that there would be there was some opportunity there to do something. Um.

01:15:25:03 - 01:15:30:25

Uh, yeah. James. Daniel. For the applicant. Um, access to to is operational. Only access for habitat.

01:15:30:27 - 01:16:04:05

So it's not an access I was talking about. It's the stretch of road. So I the only reason I reference access to it, too, is because that's where I stopped my vehicle, and that's where I observe cyclists. But I drove that whole length in both directions. Um, and it was a fast stretch of road. Um, and there are some passing bays, but they're also pitted with potholes. Um, and I would just question whether if, if a cyclist or another car has to concede to an HGV, it's not going to be the HGV that stops, it's the car or the or the cyclist and therefore they'd have to cautiously drive into those.

01:16:04:07 - 01:16:18:01

But when I was, it was more the bit of the hill when I approached that. Say, I keep saying the word hill. It sounds massive, but it isn't. But certainly there was no visibility for me coming to the other side. And so I just raised it as an observation for the applicant to look at.

01:16:19:21 - 01:16:29:02

Um, James. Yes, we'll look at that, but I'm not sure it's on our construction route unless I've misunderstood which road you're talking about. Is it the Norton route?

01:16:29:22 - 01:16:59:27

Uh, yeah. And you're actually right. It possibly isn't, but there may very well be lots of diversion of traffic coming off your construction route. I think the implication, and one of the questions I asked at first written questions is what consideration have you given for diversion for local traffic diverting off your construction routes? And that seems to be getting dismissed. Um, because the movements aren't so significant in your view. But local people will look for alternative ways and therefore there will be busier traffic through there. So I'm just saying it was an observation.

01:16:59:29 - 01:17:30:28

It was just to put it on your radar. Um, the other section was, um, the stretch of road from Norton to Harlington along Bradfield Cottages. That again was a fast, busy stretch of road, possibly some widening improvements there. And these are some of the areas where Mr. Lehrer and Mr. Bamber have also referenced. But I similarly felt that they needed looking at. And then lastly, I want to come to Roger Bourne. Um, and we'll wrap this hearing up shortly.

01:17:31:00 - 01:17:48:22

But the highway improvement area, Rob Bourne for access to parcels, E1 to E7 and then certainly to the south side. If we're looking at the plan on the screen, we're sort of looking 1717 B17 eight. And I'm just using those as as reference points. Um.

01:17:51:11 - 01:18:30:04

I've been to that area a couple of times now and walked it on the ACI, walked it with my colleagues. I walked it on my own. In fact, the last time I went, I fell over and I was muddy. Um, so I know that stretch of area really well now. And I'm we still and I really, really hope a deadline for we are going to be receiving a whole lot more information about what is happening in that area, down that access track between the two sides of E1 to E7, and then what's happening down over the railway line down to the southern half of that site, because it seems to me that's one of the most sensitive parts of your route.

01:18:32:22 - 01:18:50:03

And at the moment there is I just can't comprehend the extent of highway improvement works. Um, and as I understand it, these are permanent highway improvement works to a really sensitive rural part of this site.

01:18:51:13 - 01:19:08:15

Um, James, now for the applicant. So, um, what's proposed is a compound around access near access 12 and then And so trips will be delivered to that compound. And then a tractor and trailer will be used to cross the bridge to go south.

01:19:08:24 - 01:19:39:18

Yeah, I understand that. And I know that you did update that in deadline. One of the Oct MP the construction traffic management plan. I understood that so therefore I begged the question whether you need a permanent A there. If you are using tractor and a trailer to take components down to the southern half of the site. So that's a question I just want some response to. Not now, because we are really tight on time, but I do query whether that is absolutely necessary, but it is also the track running between you've got parcels.

01:19:39:20 - 01:20:14:10

It's a shame where I haven't got the the final parcels plan here. Um, but you've got a substation. I think it might be E6. Um, and then you've got five fields of panels on uh, on mostly on one side of, of that track north of the railway line. I'm talking where again, it's proposed as a permanent hire and that is extremely sensitive. And I just wonder why. Um, yeah. That's helpful. So e4 e3, e2 e one on one side, e7, e6 on the southern side of that highway.

01:20:15:07 - 01:20:39:15

Why the applicant needed to to have that permanent hire, and why it couldn't have an internal access track at the top of E4. Take your components from an internal access track down to E1 and work backwards. Why the whole of that section of of track needs to be upgraded to a permanent highway improvement area.

01:20:41:00 - 01:20:50:21

Um, James, now for the applicant. Um, obviously the vehicles coming from um, access 818 um, along that blue bit then.

01:20:50:25 - 01:20:52:13

I can't see where we're.

01:20:52:26 - 01:21:05:05

So access 18. Yeah. Which is there. So that's that's the that's the origin of the of the delivery vehicles. Um, then they're running if we go back to the parcels.

01:21:07:27 - 01:21:18:29

Yeah. Uh, then running along um, into E1 and E2 and then they're crossing the road there to get to, um, I think that's the E6.

01:21:19:27 - 01:21:20:29

Substation would be.

01:21:21:01 - 01:21:37:02

Yeah. So they're just crossing. So that's why we need a permanent thing that because obviously they're crossing from one field to another and it's an existing public right of way. So, um, we're, we're crossing that and we're going into the field there. There's an existing compound that we want to make use of as well in that area.

01:21:39:21 - 01:21:54:28

Yeah. Okay. We're really short on time, and I know I have lots more questions on that particular, um, area, but the clarification on the access route into that is helpful before I.

01:21:57:12 - 01:22:10:19

Look to wrap up, given we are at lunchtime. I just want to ask the council or stop lying down if they've got anything they wish to add on any of the observations that I had made.

01:22:13:11 - 01:22:14:11

Miss Shelby. First.

01:22:14:22 - 01:22:15:09

Shelby.

01:22:16:28 - 01:22:27:24

Uh, no. There's there's one point that I think we were going to raise this afternoon about access tracks in the vicinity of the ancient woodland, but I think it's probably better dealt with this afternoon instead.

01:22:30:13 - 01:23:02:20

Bruce Bamber, stop lying down. Um, you had the discussion about the the road to, uh, to Churston past the stud. Uh, and I think there was a misunderstanding. Um, uh, Mr. Darwell was talking about

the road being 5.5m wide. I believe he was talking about the road outside of the access into the site. Um, the fact of the matter is that after a couple of hundred metres south from there, there's hardly any sections of that road that are 5.5m or above.

01:23:04:06 - 01:23:06:00

Hopefully they'll be picking that up on there.

01:23:06:02 - 01:23:17:20

Yes. I didn't want it to be sort of overlooked and, um, no information come on that because, uh, because it's assumed that it's it's wide enough. Because it is. It isn't, it isn't.

01:23:18:19 - 01:23:23:17

Okay. Um, miss Broderick, is there anything you want to say as a wrap up?

01:23:24:14 - 01:23:24:29

Uh,

01:23:26:19 - 01:23:27:04

just on on.

01:23:27:06 - 01:23:59:16

That last point, in terms of the extent of the potential permanent highway improvement areas are obviously we've shown an a fairly large extent of where potential highway improvements may be required on the basis of needing to microsite, where an operational access may be. So I, I just wanted I suppose to check is that your observations in terms of the extent is that based on on the the extent of the works plans of that work number.

01:24:00:06 - 01:24:01:09

Is this for Rob born.

01:24:01:11 - 01:24:02:04

For Rob one. Yes.

01:24:02:06 - 01:24:19:12

Yeah, absolutely. It was based upon that because in light of your change that you made at deadline one to the construction traffic management plan, it seems to suggest you don't need improvement works through there. And that's where my confusion is like. But I am totally basing it off of the works plan.

01:24:20:08 - 01:24:59:21

I think that's helpful because I think, and maybe we can provide some further clarity in writing in terms of the the reasons for showing a big extent that that being because we don't necessarily know exactly where a small amount of works may be required, rather than suggesting we're going to do highway improvement works necessarily along the full or permanent highway works along the full extent of those roads. So we'll provide as a post-it note, a bit more clarity in terms of what's actually proposed in that area. It may be that we still need to show the full extent on the works plans, because

we're not quite sure exactly where it's going to go, but we can give some more context as to what's actually being proposed in that area.

01:24:59:23 - 01:25:02:18

Yeah, I just wondered whether it needed to be a permanent hire.

01:25:04:11 - 01:25:05:22

Well, in terms of.

01:25:06:24 - 01:25:08:08

The railway line.

01:25:08:10 - 01:25:13:23

The work number includes a lot of different works. It could just be. Um.

01:25:14:21 - 01:25:32:16

No, no, no, but you have provided a plan at the last deadline showing the temporary and the permanent hires in light of a queue which we put out. And that section is still shown as permanent. And that's what I was querying. Given the fact that you're looking to trailer and tractor your.

01:25:34:20 - 01:25:38:14

Components into the southern half of of that site.

01:25:38:26 - 01:25:59:05

That was affected. We'll provide greater clarity on that because the that work number includes very minor works as well as great, substantial, more substantive works. And so it can just include the slight permanent widening of a small access existing access. I see. And that would still count as that work number. Um, so what I just found a double check.

01:25:59:11 - 01:25:59:26

No, no, we're.

01:25:59:28 - 01:26:10:17

Not assuming we're doing a greater extent of highway improvement works on a permanent basis than we are actually proposing. It's just spatially we've had to show it over a large area because I don't know exactly where it's going to go.

01:26:10:19 - 01:26:35:23

Okay. All right. Well, I need to draw issue specific hearing on transport to a close. Obviously the whole hearing is not closed. We will just adjourn for lunch. We will return after lunch to deal with ecology. And Mr. Love will be in the hot seat. You'll be pleased to know. Um, so it is now 116, and we will return, please, at 2:00. Thank you.