

**From:** [A303 Sparkford to Ilchester](#)  
**To:** [Anderson-Rowe, Asha](#)  
**Subject:** FW: On behalf of Mr B G Norman - Further information relating to my earlier submission  
**Date:** 11 February 2019 12:39:33  
**Attachments:** [Further Information relating to submission by B G Norman - V3 - 08.02.19.pdf](#)  
[Tuersley letter 7\\_2\\_19 \(1\).pdf](#)

---

---

**From:** Les Stevens [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 08 February 2019 15:52  
**To:** A303 Sparkford to Ilchester  
**Cc:** Les Stevens; Brian Norman  
**Subject:** On behalf of Mr B G Norman - Further information relating to my earlier submission

Dear Sir / Madam,

Please find attached Further information relating to Mr B G Norman's earlier submission and a copy on an email referred to within the letter.

Les Stevens  
On behalf of Mr B G Norman

---

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.  
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

---

**Bryan G Norman, B.Sc. (Est Man.) F.R.I.C.S**

**Further information relating to the my submission**

**Ref A303, Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling**

---

### **1. Project Management Credentials.**

In his letter Mr Pieser endorsed my credentials as a Project Manager. I confirm that I introduced these skills from the USA and subsequently developed 'Project Management' into a recognised Surveying skill. I spent that last 20 years of my career, until retirement and subsequently as a Consultant, project managing large developments on behalf of companies such as GEC /Marconi, Sun Alliance, Air Products and Slater Walker.

The most important lesson I learnt was that if an outline development scheme did not look right, or did not feel right, it very probably was not right and would need detailed investigation.

I note from the SSDC Impact Report (23.01.19) 2.2 that H.E.'s design is only at a preliminary stage and whilst advanced, is not finalised; further design work is not programmed until appointment of a further contractor (presumably because it is the intention to appoint a design and build contractor).

There is therefore time to incorporate the relatively minor amendments, as set out in my earlier detailed submission, which will considerably improve the performance of the whole development. Namely by the redesign of the Hazlegrove Junction and the inclusion of a parallel road.

### **Hazlegrove Junction**

The design of this junction never looked right, being very 'contrived' and so it has proved, using more of the Registered Park Grounds (RPG) than necessary, creating 1 million kilometres of additional travel and, by not understanding the impact and magnitude of the A359 traffic conflicting with Hazlegrove School's, creating peak-period back-ups to Sparkford roundabout and hence sending unwelcome extra traffic through Sparkford High Street.

The alternative design set out in my original submission, backed by factual evidence and recommended by 'Fairhurst' -

*Fairhurst were appointed by the collective Parish Councils to provide general technical advice and prepare indicative drawings for their alternative scheme. The advice was focused on providing high level reviews of the alternative scheme to ensure compliance with the standards set out in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges.*

*Fairhurst are satisfied that the alternative scheme is a significant improvement over HE's. The retention of the existing A303 as a parallel link road during construction will avoid unnecessary increases in journey times for local trips, the overall alternative provides a safer and more direct route to Hazlegrove Prep School. The provision of the link road will also avoid the potential 12 mile detour via Yeovil for those travelling from Sparkford to Ilchester.*

Would achieve the following objectives and cost savings –

1) Creates a simplified more flexible design, using substantially less land within the RPG, enabling better landscaping by using lower land to the South East, replacing bunds with more natural looking and higher mounds which would better screen the petrol station and dual carriageway and help to utilise more effectively the surplus fill.

2) Avoids 1 million kilometres of extra travel and congestion problems at peak periods, which could be further aggravated in future should the school increase the number of day pupils.

In relation to (2) above I found that the Safety Audit did not consider the serious problems posed by the School movements; in fact nowhere could I locate facts, rather than estimates, relating to these or the likely conflict with A359 traffic numbers established from surveys.

NB. A further survey in Queen Camel will be carried out in May 2019 as residents living in the High Street believe there has been a substantial increase in traffic volumes since the last survey in 2017.

3) There would be approximately £9m saving in construction costs and an estimated £750,000 per annum saving in social and indirect costs as calculated in my original submission.

In addition I have sought advice from a leading climate policy adviser (letter attached). This shows the additional mileage creates 217 tonnes per annum of CO<sub>2</sub>, costed at a further £70,000 per annum.

### **Parallel Road**

Again H.E.'s proposals never felt right with a very busy A road weaving in and out of major construction works. From previous A303 dialling proposals it seemed clear that this need not happen and I cannot understand why H.E. did not fully investigate how to include the parallel road (instead of making out it was all too difficult).

My subsequent investigation, checked and confirmed by 'Fairhurst', proved that there is not a problem in accommodating the dual carriageway and parallel road through the 'pinch point' at Traits Lane, enabling the missing 0.9k section to be built. This would keep the old A303 open and free from construction work, with all the advantages this will bring (as I have shown in my full submission), with important indirect savings as a result of enabling three businesses to remain trading and in particular a substantial amount would be saved from the £26.1 million allocated by H.E. for risk (letter 19.07.18 to WC clerk).

### **Additional Comments.**

I, the three Parish Councils and Hazlegrove School recognise the long term benefits that the dual carriageway will bring but are seriously concerned that the overall outcome will be badly affected by the defects in the current design of Hazlegrove Junctions and the omission of a parallel local road. Full details of which are set out in my original submission.

I would like to draw attention to various extracts from the documentation relating to standards H.E. set themselves, which should apply to all parts of the development, not just the dual carriageway.

2.1.2 – A duty to minimise impact.

2.3.1 – Key parameters:- safer, improved user satisfaction, improved traffic flows, better environmental outcome, real efficiency. A high quality dual carriageway leading to eventual future enhancement to 'Expressway Link Standard'.

2.3.4 – Safe and serviceable networks.

2.5.5 – again – to improve safety, operational efficiency of network.

2.6.10 – Ensure safe environment for those travelling the route and those delivering the construction

2.6.32 – Cause minimum disruption of the construction works.

6.3 Table A1 – Frustration, H.E. recognise that this is likely to increase throughout construction.

I submit that there is serious failure to have regard to these principles and to design to minimise risk.

These problems can largely be corrected by adopting the proposals in my earlier submission giving both short and long term benefits to the project as a whole and particularly for the users of these local roads and secure substantial savings for the Tax payer.

I urge Highways England to work to incorporate these changes while Mott McDonald have the ability and there is still time for a revised DCO.

Nigel Tuersley

to Bryan Norman

Thu 7 Feb 14:09

A303: short form

Hi Bryan

I think this is much punchier and easier to follow.

Kind regards

Nigel

Nigel Tuersley

#### THE TRUE COST OF WASTED MILEAGE

In addition to the productivity costs of unnecessary driving, the social, economic and health impacts from GHG emissions are considerable.

The average GHGs per km can be derived by dividing the total emissions from all road transport ie 114.2 mtCO<sub>2</sub>e (1) by the total number of miles travelled ie 327.2 billion (2). This produces a figure of 217 gms/km, equating to 217 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>e per annum for the additional 1m kms travelled

A recent study (3) estimated the global social cost of carbon (GSCC) at US\$417 per tCO<sub>2</sub> (66% confidence levels US\$177-805 per tCO<sub>2</sub>). This yields a cost of £70,147 (exchange rate £1.00: \$1.29).

Note that—assuming the additional travel distance remains at 1m km per annum--this figure is the annual cost, albeit attenuating relative to the declining time horizon and improvements in emissions performance.

FOOTNOTE 1: For ease of calculation it is assumed that the A303 traffic mix reflects the national average.

FOOTNOTE 2: The Global Social Cost of Carbon (GSCC) has been used here rather than the UK-specific CSCC which, being negative, gives a false impression of the global consequences. The GSCC captures the amount of marginal damage expected to occur globally as a consequence of additional CO<sub>2</sub> emission, in which a discounted time series of future damages is compressed into a single present value.

#### REFERENCES



(1) [UK greenhouse gas emissions: annual data](#)

- [data.gov.ukhttps://data.gov.uk/dataset/9a1e58e5.../uk-greenhouse-gas-emissions-annual-data](https://data.gov.uk/dataset/9a1e58e5.../uk-greenhouse-gas-emissions-annual-data) (see 2017 UK greenhouse gas emissions: final figures--data tables)

(2) [General facts and figures about roads and road use](#) -

[RAC Foundationhttps://www.racfoundation.org/motoring-facts/mobility](https://www.racfoundation.org/motoring-facts/mobility)

(3) Ricke, Katherine et al, Country-level social cost of carbon. Nature Climate Change Articles. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-0118-0282-y>