

Somerset County Council responses to representations received on the Yeovil Transport Assessment 'Review of Yeovil Urban Extension' February 2011

Subject	Issue	Response
Highways Agency	§ Highways Agency - We have reviewed the documents and find the modelling undertaken to be satisfactory. As expected the modelling shows that development to the south of Yeovil is preferable and we are reassured that negative impacts of the proposed Urban Extension on the A303 are likely to be limited to the Cartgate Roundabout.	No response required
Highways Agency	§ Highways Agency - We support the recommendations as set out in the Non - Technical Forecasting Report - FINALv2a. Additionally we support the need for further analysis of the impacts on the Cartgate Roundabout as detailed in 5.2.2. Before this work takes place I would recommend that you contact me for details of any programmed improvements to this roundabout so that they can be taken account of.	No response required /recommendation noted
Highways Agency	§ The Highways Agency specifically stated that the development of southern options could generate harmful impacts on the SRN. These comments have been ignored in the Traffic Survey.	The purpose of this strategic report is to model impacts of major development on the highway network within Yeovil; other issues will be considered at a later stage. Furthermore, this comment applied to all options and subsequent correspondence from Highways Agency has indicated acceptance of the southern option subject to a further modelling exercise considering the final option and its impacts on Cartgate.
Assumed Highway Improvements	§ The parish council would like to point out a number of elements in the assumed highway improvement list that are, from our understanding, incorrect and are likely to have a significant impact on the traffic modelling particularly in the Western corridor and potentially at the Cartgate/A303 roundabout. These anomalies are:	
Assumed Highway Improvements	§ 1. Copse Road/Western Avenue roundabout - There is some uncertainty as to when/if this will actually be delivered.	It is likely that the scheme will be in place by 2026
Assumed Highway Improvements	2. Westland's (Cartgate/Bunford) - 'Enlarged roundabout' The planning approval and the recently signed Section 106 Agreement for the nearby Bunford Park employment land development indicates the 'Phase 2 Highway works' at this roundabout to be the creation of a traffic signal controlled 'through-about'. Enlargement of the roundabout to increase capacity was apparently not achievable due to land ownership issues.	The improvements to the junction specified in the Section 106 agreement are an alternative way of increasing the capacity of the junction. The enlarged roundabout in the model is therefore a robust representation of the traffic conditions. Detailed implementation issues will be addressed as the study develops.
Assumed Highway Improvements	3. signed Section 106 Agreement for the nearby Bunford Park development land indicates the 'Phase 2 Highway works' at this roundabout to be some fairly modest realignments of entry roads, etc rather than an enlargement.	These improvements increase the capacity of the junction in the same way as enlargement. The model is therefore a robust representation of the traffic conditions.
Assumed Highway Improvements Junction	4. A new signal controlled junction is proposed at the entrance to the Bunford employment land mid-way between the above two roundabouts.	The development at Bunford Park and the access junction are included in the model.
Assumed Highway Improvements	§ Option 1 - Junctions with the A3088 and Thorne Lane make sense, but why introduce a roundabout (£674k) onto Ball Hill? This is a narrow lane, unsuitable for any but occasional light traffic, and only leading to Tintinhull and Montacute. Why not have the A3088 access where the proposed development site adjoins the road in its south-west corner.	An access junction on the A3088 has been proposed but will not be able to cope with all the traffic that is likely to be generated by this site. A total of 3 new 3-arm roundabouts will probably be required, taking into account the capacity of the local highway network, but exact locations of junctions cannot be identified at this stage.
Junction Improvements	§ Option 2 - The words (Table 2.1 of the Non-Technical Report) are inconsistent with the maps. The words describe a new 4-arm roundabout with Mudford and Lyde Roads, but this isn't on the maps. The maps show access with Marsh Lane, but this isn't mentioned or costed in Table 2.1, and not costed in Appendix 7. And why build a new roundabout just a few metres north of the existing one on the A37? Why not just add a further 'arm'?	It appears that the location of the junction is wrongly indicated on the map. The proposed new 4-arm roundabout should be at the junction of Mudford Rd and Lyde Rd as in Table 2.1. This will be corrected in the addendum report. The exact location of the new roundabout has not yet been identified. The existing roundabout does not have sufficient capacity to accommodate the increased traffic flows accessing the development.
Junction Improvements	§ Option 3 - The Lyde Road access point is 1km outside the edge of the defined area, and on the other side of the railway line! Nevertheless, the cost (£674k) is exactly the same as the small roundabout in option 1. The Babylon Hill access is a new 4-arm roundabout on the steepest part of the hill, but only 600m from the existing roundabout.	An indicative cost for a 3-arm roundabout has been given independent of its location. The cost of additional infrastructure between the new roundabout and the development is included in Appendix 7. The exact locations of accesses cannot be identified at this stage.

Junction Improvements	<p>§ Turning to the West Coker road system, the Report (in appendix 7) talks about up-grading of Gooseacre Lane and putting roundabouts at the bottom, where it joins the A30 and at the top, where it joins Camp Road. The junction at the top has very poor visibility, due to the curve of Camp Road and a roundabout would do little to improve that danger. At the bottom of the lane, the present T junction is probably the most dangerous in West Coker, due to lack of visibility in both directions. It is impossible to see up Pack Hollow to the left and, to the right, cars appear rapidly around the bend from the traffic lights. A roundabout will not improve this dangerous spot. Clearly, additional houses will dramatically increase the use of this narrow lane which would, as stated, need up-grading, but I believe the up-grading has been massively under-stated. And to talk about demolishing properties to achieve this - this is totally unacceptable.</p>	Locations of accesses are indicative. Proposals for junction improvements will be subject to feasibility testing and further analysis at a later stage in the planning process.
Junction Improvements	<p>§ Para 4.7.21 "Cost not given (for Para 4.7.20) as scheme is considered undeliverable." In previous paragraph 2.1.2 it considers requirement to convert existing Placket Lane/Yeovil Road into a 4 arm roundabout as a necessity to meet ECO requirements. The report therefore appears to have contradicting statements.</p>	Table 2-1 shows how traffic has been loaded on to the network in the traffic model. 4.7.21 makes it clear that this junction as modelled would not be deliverable in 'real-life' after having surveyed the area. So alternatives options have been proposed as a way to give access to the A30.
Junction Improvements	<p>§ Much more detailed information about exactly what works are being counted in the consideration of all options, and what is already planned and scheduled for the options, should be provided.</p>	The most detailed information available is given in the Technical Report in Appendix 1. The timetable for SSDC's Core Strategy process can be found at www.southsomerset.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/core-strategy/
Junction Improvements	<p>§ It is noted that no improvements have been identified for the A30 / Watercombe Lane roundabout and the A30 / A37 Dorchester Road roundabout. This is surprising given that the areas to the south of Yeovil have been identified for a substantial urban expansion by 2026.</p>	The A30/A37 Quicksilver Mail roundabout and the A30/Watercombe Lane roundabouts have both been modelled but results has been omitted from the written report. This data will now be published as an addendum to the existing report
Junction Improvements	<p>§ Thinking of the roundabouts proposed for option 4, and given that there is no intension to upgrade the roads in between, what is the purpose of a roundabout at the junction of Two Tower Lane and Newton Road? Two Tower Lane is barely double carriageway, and why would anyone choose to go down Newton Copse, itself a very steep, often dangerous road, when it leads to the bottom of Yeovil into a road system which still causes problems, and which is away from parking places and the major shops and facilities?</p>	A roundabout is proposed to increase the capacity of the junction to accommodate traffic flows generated by the development. Newton Road provides access to the road network south of Yeovil and to Yeovil Junction station.
Junction Improvements	<p>§ One must also ask the point of making a roundabout at the junction of Placket Lane and the Yeovil Road, as it is stated elsewhere that the Yeovil Road is not suitable for upgrading, the road towards North Coker cannot take heavy traffic and there is no costing for new roads.</p> <p>Likewise. I question the objective of a roundabout at Two Tower Lane /Little Tarrat Lane.</p>	Table 2-1 shows how traffic has been loaded on to the network in the traffic model. 4.7.21 makes it clear that this junction as modelled would not be deliverable in 'real-life' after having surveyed the area. So alternatives options have been proposed as a way to give access to the A30. A roundabout will provide an extra arm for access to the development and increase the capacity of the junction to accommodate traffic flows generated by the development.
Junction Improvements	<p>§ Option 5 - It proposes a new '3-arm roundabout on Camp Road', (although the map shows it on Hardington Road). But this location already has two minor roads meeting the A30 - Camp Road and Hardington Road. So the roundabout will require 4 arms, and will presumably cost more.</p>	Locations of access junctions are purely indicative at this stage. The proposal is to create a new 3-arm junction on Camp Road rather than extend the existing one.
Eco-success	<p>§ Options 1, 2 and 3 should have been modelled for eco success in order to have a valid comparison with options 4, 5 and 6.</p>	Additional modelling has been commissioned to consider these options and will be published as an addendum to the existing report.
Eco-success	<p>§ The Option 1 site within the parish of Brympton would appear to fail from the point of view of being 'non-eco' and unattractive financially. There are a number of other issues relating to the Option 1 site, some of which are highway related, that would make it a poor choice for development. The proposed development is an 'Eco-Urban Extension' and 'eco-success' is obviously an important factor in this respect.</p>	The report does not recommend option one. Option one's inability to meet 'eco-success' criteria and cost levels are cited amongst the factors in this decision. SCC commissioned an addendum to this report (from Parsons Brinkerhoff) that provides further comparison of potential highway impacts between all options.
Eco-success	<p>§ Appendix 1 sub paragraphs 3.4.2 - 3.4.6 gives significant detail regarding homeworking, employment and education in relation to Non-Eco, Partial Eco and Full Eco success. It is clear that any of the options would fit these scenarios as for example Home Working is not necessarily location specific as it is about a seed change that could be applied to most locations. It is an example of the FAILURE of this study.</p>	Whilst measures proposed to encourage home working tend not to be affected by location, the propensity to home work is very much dependant on location. Locations' transport characteristics will dictate the type of residents they attract and, therefore, the number who will homework (with easy access by car attracting those who wish to drive to work, for example).
Eco-success	<p>§ Option 3 has a problem in that some of it is in Dorset. However eco success could be helped by provision of cycle/ pedestrian walkways over the railway line and a link with bus services which will be provided for the Lyde Road key site.</p>	The infrastructure requirements set out in the report for Option 3 includes a bridge over the railway line to facilitate movements of this type.

Eco-success	§ SSDC funded a UWE report on the Low Carbon Transport Vision for Yeovil this report clearly shows the opportunities for Eco success for the Northern Areas of Yeovil.	The UWE report had a very different focus to this study. The potential to increase the sustainability of existing areas in northern Yeovil does not suggest that such sites would be the most suitable for additional purpose built eco-friendly development.
Eco-success	§ The measures required to achieve the eco solutions will have minimal effect. It is likely that fuel prices will have a bigger impact on the reduction of our use of cars.	The measures proposed are supported by a robust evidence base that quantifies their impact. Whilst fuel price does have an impact on demand the relationship is fairly elastic and significant price rises over recent years did not prevented the considerable growth in demand we have experienced. This suggests fuel prices would not be a suitable primary mechanism for achieving travel behaviour change. Furthermore, as fuel prices affect the entire market and are beyond our control, they do not allow us to achieve step changes in travel behaviour at specific locations.
Eco-success	§ Discussions with officials in the traffic departments at Peterborough, Worcester and Darlington has revealed some very interesting and relevant information. Each has been designated as a 'Sustainable Traffic Demonstration Town' and was given a grant of over £3 million for use over a five year period of public re-education in travel habits from 2004 and 2008. In each case they have achieved some increase in walking and cycling but none have even come close to the target of only 50% of total journeys by car. Peterborough and Worcester have both, at the end of the period, after a very slow start, reduced the figure to the same extent, from 66% to 62%. In other words it has required massive funding and 5 years of sustained effort to achieve a mere 4% reduction in journeys made by car.	The figures quoted in relation to the demonstration town projects are understood to be network wide statistics (i.e. the change across the entire town, only portions of which would have been involved in the projects). The 50 per cent target for proposed Eco-Urban Extension relates only to trips originating in the development. This means all relevant trip makers will be affected by the behaviour change measures (which will include urban form and other improvements not undertaken in the demonstration towns), therefore, a greater magnitude of change can be expected.
Eco-success	§ It is noted that only sites to the south of Yeovil have been identified as being able to achieve the required eco standard (50% or less car based mode share) despite the same development mix be assessed for each site. This mix includes residential units, employment land and primary/secondary education therefore the trip internalisation factors used should clearly be the same for all site options. This is not the case with greater internalisation being applied to the sites south of the town than the sites to the north. This creates an inappropriate bias within the modelling results and associated conclusions.	Internalisation rates are not solely a product of landuse, access to external destinations also has an impact. Therefore, it is appropriate for different locations (with different connectivity) to have different internalisation rates.
Eco-success	§ Assuming high quality cycle routes and frequent public transport services are implemented at both sites as per Table 3-1 of the Non-Technical Forecasting Report, similar levels of modal split are likely to ensue. To avoid undue bias, all sites should be assessed based on the same trip rate scenarios.	Comparable facilities in different locations can produce very different results. For instance a 5km cycle on high quality infrastructure in a dispersed development will be less attractive than a 1km cycle on a similar path in a more sustainable urban form. Therefore, it is appropriate that different locations, with different characteristics, have different trip rates.
Eco-success	§ Option 5 does not have the best prospects for Eco Success. Furthermore, it has not been shown to have either the lowest overall costs or the lowest adverse impact on traffic flows and delays.	Our assessments (as set out in the report) explain the reasons for the selection of this option. The preferred option was selected for its performance across a range of parameters. Without understanding the reasons behind this disagreement with the report's conclusions it is hard to comment further.
Eco-success	§ The assumptions used in terms of modal split have been based on a number of factors some of which appear arbitrary.	The modal split figures employed were generated from the trip generation model described in section three of appendix one to the report.
Terrain & Distance from services	§ The fields at Nash and Keyford in the parish of East Coker may be 'relatively flat terrain' within each site (Review, Table 3-2), but each has a steep hill between it and Yeovil - Watercombe Lane and Hendford Hill - and this is what matters in terms of any site being an 'Eco-success'.	The ability to walk and cycle to key external destinations will influence the degree of "eco-success" that can be achieved but internal movements are of prime importance.
Terrain & Distance from services	§ Lufton is the one which is the most level within itself and also in relation to Yeovil town centre. and therefore amenable to cyclists and walkers. The fact that there is no current, bus service- for this or any of the sites- is immaterial, when there is a demand bus services will be provided, if economical. Option 2, Combe Street Lane, although adjacent to an escarpment which is actually less steep than the one to the south, is actually within itself fairly level, particularly at the eastern end where it would meld into the Lyde Road key site. As above, it is also closer to key amenities than options 4, 5 and 6.	The comment is valid but the provision of a bus service is not considered to be a significant factor at this stage.
Terrain & Distance from services	§ The distance quoted in option 6 is inaccurate, going from around Naish to Yeovil town centre is 3.8km. not 2km. as suggested.	Distances to key destinations are approximate and have been calculated from the centres of the sites to the town centre "as the crow flies". On average, the main (western) plot in option 4 and option 6 are closer to the town centre than options 1 and 2. Distances to key destinations are approximate and have been calculated roughly from the centres (centroids) of the sites to the town centre "as the crow flies". Naish is situated on the farthest edge of the Option 6 development. Its distance from the town centre "as the crow flies" is approximately 2.7km. The centroid of the development is about 2.2km from the town centre.

Terrain & Distance from services	<p>§ Under the heading "Strategic development site locations and best achievable scenario" we see that that options 5 and 6 will help to encourage cycling and walking because of the "relatively flat terrain within the site. Surely it is not the walking and cycling within the site that matters, but rather the ability to walk or cycle into the town centre that will have the most impact ecologically on the surroundings.</p>	<p>The ability to walk and cycle to key external destinations will influence the degree of "eco-success" that can be achieved but internal movements are of prime importance.</p>
Terrain & Distance from services	<p>§ Options 5 and 6 are given good prospects they are both said to have 'relatively flat terrain'. This is just not true. Option 2 was marked down for gradient. The summit of Mudford Rd is 110m. However, the summit of Nine Springs (adjacent to Newton Rd) is 107m and the highest point of West Coker Rd is 90m, so there is minimal difference; they all have steep hills and few people will ever be prepared to cycle to and from the town centre from any of them. The only exception is the low area near Broadleaze Farm. The SSDC 'Finding the Best Location' website correctly says that Option 5 is 'badly related to the town centre'. The 2006 Traffic Strategy Review says that Yeovil is classed as 'very hilly' and assesses the likely demand for a cycle route to East Coker as 'low' and to West Coker as 'very low'.</p>	<p>The profile of land depends on gradient (i.e. differences in height) rather than the highest points. Inevitably depending on route and direction there may be variations in gradient. Further work on the likely demand for cycling will be undertaken at a later stage.</p>
Terrain & Distance from services	<p>§ Option 4- the main plot mentioned ie. Keyford is actually 2.4 km. from the Red House Roundabout to the clock tower in Yeovil. This takes no account of the fact that the bulk of the site is further away or that access to other parts of Yeovil such as the hospital could easily add a half mile.</p>	<p>Distances to key destinations are approximate and have been calculated from the centres of the sites to the town centre "as the crow flies". On this basis, the distance from the centre of the Keyford site to the town centre is less than 2km. On average, the main (Keyford) plot in option 4 and option 6 are closer to the town centre than options 1 and 2. It is true that some key destinations (such as the hospital) are further away but others (such as Westlands) are nearer.</p>
Smarter Options	<p>§ Disagree with the reports conclusion "smarter" options, i.e. cycling or walking will result in a drop in transport use. Cycling in the present traffic would be quite a daunting proposition and walking would take up a lot of valuable time which people don't seem to have to spare these days.</p>	<p>The measures proposed are supported by a robust evidence base that quantifies their impact. Measures are included to improve the cycling environment and walking offers very reliable journey times which are very attractive to many travellers (as it is largely unaffected by congestion).</p>
Smarter Options	<p>§ Note the argument that buses will be provided, how will this happen when South Somerset has just announced that thirty other routes have now had their buses taken away.</p>	<p>Whilst support for certain bus services has been removed, bus travel remains an important part of our transport network and significant potential exists for the operation of commercial services, particularly to serve significant new developments (such as the new 68 service operated by South West Coaches).</p>
Smarter Options	<p>§ In the SCC report referred to in 3.1.3, the impact of all measures is estimated to reduce car journeys - by the year 2026 - by 13.5% in the morning peak hour, 11.4% in the evening peak hour, and 9% in the interpeak hours. It is not clear how they have arrived at these figures and they admit that 'there is potential for even the most successful measures' to be interfered with by unforeseen circumstances. In other words prediction is notoriously difficult.</p>	<p>The derivation of these figures is explained by the SCC report referenced, which can be made available on request. The report notes that reductions may be "offset by induced traffic". This suggests that the reduction in traffic may be counteracted by increased trips made by other travellers, it is not a comment on the certainty of the forecasts.</p>
Route Congestion	<p>§ The routes are shown on the map, Appendix 5 Figure A5.1. The A30 to the west of Yeovil is not included in this study, despite the fact that the Transport Strategy Review (table 3.3) shows that it has the second highest AM and third highest PM peak hour flows across the 'outer cordon'.</p>	<p>The A30/A37 Quicksilver Mail and the A30/Watercombe Lane roundabouts have both been modelled but results has been omitted from the written report. This data will be published as an addendum to the existing report.</p>
Route Congestion	<p>§ The report fails to address both junction capacity and traffic flows on the A30 west of Yeovil, which is the second or third busiest commuting route into and out of Yeovil, and which is part of the important link from Dorchester to the A303 and M5.</p>	<p>The A30/A37 Quicksilver Mail and the A30/Watercombe Lane roundabouts have both been modelled but results has been omitted from the written report. This data will be published as an addendum to the existing report.</p>
Route Congestion	<p>§ West Coker road, Hendiford Hill and Lysander road are already heavily congested. Trying to get on to the west coker road from a side road at peak times is almost impossible.</p>	<p>Congestion on road links is usually the result of lack of capacity at junctions. The report seeks to provide an overview of potential capacity issues at junctions in Yeovil in 2026 resulting from the development options. Existing local issues will be taken into consideration when more detailed analysis is carried out.</p>
Route Congestion	<p>Heavy goods vehicles are using West Coker road and Bunford Lane as a way of avoiding hold ups on Lysander Road caused by all the traffic lights.</p>	<p>The report seeks to provide an overview of potential capacity issues at junctions in Yeovil in 2026 resulting from the development options. Existing local issues will be taken into consideration when more detailed analysis is carried out.</p>
Route Congestion	<p>§ Appendix 5 does present analysis of five specific routes and compares the impacts of the various options. Route B is 'Sherborne to Hospital roundabout'. Unfortunately, Appendix 1, the Technical Note states that 'Currently the journey times calculated do not include delay accumulated at the final junction of the journey (i.e. overall journey times are measured from the start of the journey to where the vehicle stops on the final link, so any queuing on the final link is excluded). As several routes end at the Hospital Roundabout but none crosses it east to west, the report fails to show delays there.</p>	<p>The analysis of journey times excludes delays at Hospital roundabout. However the roundabout is included in the change in congestion analysis and is identified as a key junction requiring attention due to high levels of congestion.</p>

Route Congestion	§ Another related omission is the absence of any analysis of the major north/south route (e.g. Dorchester to the M5) which uses the A37, West Coker Road, Bunford Lane, the Western Relief Road and the A3088.	Journey time analysis using Routes D and E covers most of this route. The only section that is absent is the section comprising West Coker Road and Watercombe Lane. The A30/A37 Quicksilver Mail roundabout and the A30/Watercombe Lane roundabouts have both been modelled but results has been omitted from the written report. This data will now be included.
Route Congestion	§ It does not seem that the routes which people are actually likely to choose have been identified, and 'alternatives' have been mentioned without a clear indication of what they are achieving.	The routes have been chosen to help us understand the effects of the strategic development sites on existing roads and junctions.
Route Congestion	§ The suggestion that people may use an alternative route or time of travel is dependant on there being another route or if the time of travel can be varied. I would suggest that most journeys' timing is dictated by factors such as schooling, work, shop opening hours etc. and as such difficult to work around. Similarly, there is mostly only one useful route to take, particularly in the southern options where most trips out must negotiate the Horsey roundabout if not the A30/A37 junction as well.	The model reflects the fact that it may be possible for some journeys to use alternative routes if they are available. Alternative routes become more attractive as congestion on the first-choice route increases. Some journeys must be undertaken at fixed times whilst others can be re-timed and the model reflects this.
Route Congestion	§ The documents appear all to be focused on a comparative analysis of the internal network of the town under the various development scenarios. While some broader information on delays and journey times on various incoming routes is given there seems to be no clear overview information that tells us the increase/decrease of traffic flows on the networks in and out of town at main route points.	The purpose of this strategic report is to model impacts of major development on the highway network within Yeovil; other issues will be considered within application stage as developers are required to undertake Transport Assessments that specifically look at the impacts of development-generated traffic.
Route Congestion	§ Your congestion statistics are not clear at what time of the year they were recorded but will certainly not take into account road works.	The traffic model attempts to represent "typical" highway conditions. Traffic data for building base case models is collected at "neutral" times of the year i.e. to avoid school holidays, Christmas traffic etc. It is good practice to avoid carrying out surveys on days on which typical traffic patterns may be disrupted by events such as road works.
Route Congestion	§ There is no definition of what constitutes a journey in the study. Is going for a walk for pleasure or walking the dog treated as a journey?	Yes
Route Congestion	§ The correction detailed in sub paragraph 5.7.3 is believed to be incorrect. Local knowledge of the traffic flow indicates the significant traffic flow from that area is west along Park Street/ Brunswick Street Road to the Horsey Roundabout which is a significant bottleneck with Hendford Hill and the three way roundabout into the Town Centre at Hendford.	The correction described in 5.7.3 has been made in order to reduce unrealistic levels of local congestion shown in the model caused by an increase in demand for access to the Quedam Shopping Centre and employment in the new Urban Village development. By dispersing the extra trips over several car parks the trips are better able to enter and leave the network (as they would in reality). The distribution of the trips on the wider network is not greatly affected by this change i.e. they still come from and go to the same origins and destinations. Traffic counts from 2007 at the Horsey Roundabout showed 7277 vehicles heading eastwards into Brunswick Street between 7:00 am and 7:00pm and 7844 and vehicles arriving from the west.
Roundabout / Junction Congestion	§ We live two thirds of the way up Hendford Hill which even before the advent of an eco-development is horrendously congested at peak times, we sometimes have to go up the hill to the Quicksilver roundabout in order to go down the hill which can then take five minutes due to the horrendous congestion at Horsey roundabout.	The report identifies Horsey roundabout as a key junction requiring attention due to high levels of congestion.
Roundabout / Junction Congestion	§ The current report does not include an assessment of the impact on Hospital Roundabout traffic delays.	The report identifies Hospital roundabout as a key junction requiring attention due to high levels of congestion.
Roundabout / Junction Congestion	§ The statement in appendix 1 at 6.2.4- that any queuing on the final link in a journey is excluded, so reducing travel times, I find very odd as the final link will very likely be in Yeovil itself and the place where most delay will occur.	There is no reason to think that most delay occurs on the final link (or junction). Delays at locations that form the end of a journey on one route are analysed by including them in other routes that pass through the particular junction.
Roundabout / Junction Congestion	§ It gives no indication of the impact on Junctions at Sandhurst Road/A30, A37/A30 Quicksilver Mail roundabout, the junctions at both ends of Bunford Hollow, Hendford Hill/Horsey roundabout, the Yeovil end of Newton Road & Camp Road/A30.	Hendford Hill/Horsey and the Bunford Hollow (A3088/Watercombe Lane roundabouts have both been identified as key junctions where high levels of congestion are likely. The A30/A37 Quicksilver Mail roundabout and the A30/Watercombe Lane roundabouts have both been modelled but results has been omitted from the written report. This data will be published as an addendum to the existing report. Junctions at Sandhurst Road/A30, Camp Road/A30 and the Yeovil end of Newton Road are included in the model but have not been identified as key locations.

Route Widening	§ To make Two Tower Lane an alternative route into Yeovil, the road would have to be widened considerably and what about the tree roots which are causing a switchback effect to the road now?	As noted in sections 2.1.3 - 2.1.4 of the report, access arrangements were chosen to allow an assessment of the options to be made and have only been developed to the level required to do this. Detailed design issues such as this will be considered as options are developed further. Any accesses implemented will be designed in a manner that promotes appropriate driving behaviour for the road type.
Route Widening	§ Requirements for options 1, 2 and 3 have included items such as road widening which have not been fully costed in options 4.5 and 6.	Section 4.7 of the report explains the costs attributed to each option. It includes road widening costs for all options where this was felt relevant, including options 4 and 5. Option 6 includes a costs for an alternative route to a link that would otherwise require widening (hence the omission of any widening costs).
Route Widening	§ No costing is provided for constructing a 7.3m carriageway along the line of Placket Lane between the end of Payotts Lane on Yeovil Road and Balidon on the A30, but it would not be inconsiderable. This would, of course, also require the widening of Payotts Lane to a similar carriageway standard and, maybe, an appropriate roundabout at the junction of the four roads.	Whilst it was not felt appropriate to develop a specific cost, an allowance is made for the cost of works on Placket Lane in section 4.7.22 of the report (as part of a £1.1 million allowance).
Directions for growth (options)	§ Option 4: East Coker / Barwick, I find it hard to believe that people will be encouraged to walk or cycle into the town. The traffic along the Dorchester Road and Hendford Hill is already horrendous, particularly during the early morning and early evening, when people are travelling to and from work. This development will only make the situation worse for car drivers, even if more roundabouts are built.	It is widely recognised that delay and congestion cannot be addressed simply by increasing provision for car drivers and that any solution must include reductions in car travel. The measures proposed and their predicted effects are supported by a robust evidence base that quantifies their impact. This evidence suggests the changes predicted are realistic and whilst the situation in Yeovil may be challenging it is not unique.
Directions for growth (options)	§ It is noted that proposed access to Option site 5 is from Camp Road and the A30. Whilst this may be acceptable, subject to the above comments, the possibility of creating an alternative access either directly from the Cartgate link road or via the Bunford park employment land would bring with it serious complications and is not considered to be an option.	As the comment states access to option 5 is proposed from Camp Road and the A30 rather than by any other links.
Directions for growth (options)	§ The options considered in the traffic report include a further option (Option 6) that was not included in the main consultation process undertaken in the autumn of 2011. This option should be removed as it has not been widely consulted on, in effect being introduced following the open consultation.	The location of the options was not a consideration of this report, they were defined in 'SSDC's Core Strategy Preferred Option' report. This concern should be addressed to SSDC. However, it is understood that Option 6 is a variation of Options 4 & 5 and as such was considered in the consultation. Should Option 6 be progressed further it would be consulted on formally as part of the Publication Plan.
Directions for growth (options)	§ Figure 1.1 of the 'Non-Technical Report' section of the February traffic Modelling Report shows different, but more precisely defined locations than previously consultant upon in the Draft Core Strategy. Examples: Option 2 - the area now extends to Coombe Street Lane at its western end, and into Lyde Rd at its eastern end. Option 4 - the area now includes the Showground and a much larger area south of, but 'coalesced with' Barwick. Option 5 - the area now extends less to the north, but has been extended to the south-west to the A30 and Gooseacre Lane. In the east, it now extends to Sandhurst Rd. Option 6 - this also coalesces with existing settlements (Nash and the southern edge of Yeovil). My comment (Objection to the Report) is that the areas studied to the west and south of Yeovil have been significantly changed relative to the October 2010 study. They are mostly extended, such that they now adjoin and coalesce with existing settlements, notably Barwick, North and East Coker and West Coker. These contravene the Core Strategy policy of avoiding 'settlement coalescence'.	The areas highlighted in the report were defined by South Somerset District Council and formed an input into this report and have not, therefore, been considered therein. This concern should be addressed to SSDC. It is also important to note the map that forms 1.1 of the report is indicative and intended simply to aid interpretation of the report. The more 'precisely defined locations' were required purely for the construction of the traffic model developed to assess the options. This was made clear in the report.
Directions for growth (options)	§ The distances quoted are given no end points and so are suspect, however the distance between the current minor road junction in Lufton and the clock tower at the top of Yeovil High Street is 5.1km. not 6km as stated.	The distances quoted are based upon specific points employed in the traffic model using a consistent approach across all options. Within this context, and given the high level nature of this study, the small difference between the results of the consultee's calculations and those in the report is not seen as significant.
Directions for growth (options)	§ None of the options appears to have a very large impact on traffic, but the overall effect of Option 1 is much less than the other options, and is concentrated on just a few junctions on the west edge of Yeovil which have spare capacity and would anyway be easier to improve than those in the town.	Whilst the increase in traffic may not be 'very large' this increase must be considered in the context of an already congested network. The network statistics presented in the report and Appendix 4 do not show the impact of option one as being lower than other options in any significant or systematic way.

Directions for growth (options)	<p>§ Option 3 is also assessed as a poor prospect, but for very strange reasons - 'The southern part of the site is within reasonable distance of the town centre, but also has good access for car travel.'. Given the traffic delays at the Lyde Rd/A30 and Reckleford Gytratory junctions, the general absence of hills and the existing level cycle route through the Country Park one might have expected a higher score.</p>	<p>Whilst (as the report notes) the southern section of Option 3 is relatively close to the town, the northern portion is fairly distant and severed by the railway line. This fact combines with good car access to make the achievement of eco-success unlikely at this location.</p>
Directions for growth (options)	<p>§ Option 4 is given a better chance, despite one of the sites being a 'remote location' (it is as distant from the town as option 1, but with more hills).</p>	<p>Whilst the most distant parts of Option 4 are comparable in their distance from the town centre with (the closest) parts of Option 1, the majority of the site is significantly closer.</p>
Directions for growth (options)	<p>§ The analysis concludes option 1 and 5c have the lowest journey times, yet option 1 of developing an urban extension is so readily discounted.</p>	<p>The preferred option was selected for its performance across a range of parameters (summarised in section 6 of the report), not simply journey times. This range of factors was designed to cover the wide range of objectives set out in The Department for Communities and Local Government's guidance on eco-town developments ('Planning Policy Statement: eco-towns: A supplement to Planning Policy Statement 1').</p>
Directions for growth (options)	<p>§ I would favour Option 2 over those mentioned so far if access onto the A37 and A359 were to form. However, in my view, if agreement were to be forthcoming from West Dorset District Council and the Parish Councils involved, by far and away the best Option is Option 3 east of Yeovil towards Over Compton. This area could be easily accessed from Wyndham Park via a new bridge over the railway line. The southern end of Option3 site is partly alongside the A30 dual carriageway to Sherborne for easy access via the existing roundabout at Compton Road and the new indicative access junction would add to quick and easy vehicular access. There is already existing employment sites and housing at the Yeovil end of Compton Road. Option 3 is probably the nearest site to Yeovil town centre at its southern end, plus it has some shopping facilities already present at the retail park adjoining Yeovil Golf Club. Ideally a link to the A359 south of Mudford around the perimeter of Wyndham Park should be incorporated. No existing villages would be encroached upon, if the area was narrowed where it adjoins Over Compton and if necessary it were to be enlarged to the west of it</p>	<p>The Department for Communities and Local Government's guidance on eco-town developments ('Planning Policy Statement: eco-towns: A supplement to Planning Policy Statement 1') states that they "<i>should be designed so that access to it and through it gives priority to options such as walking, cycling, public transport another sustainable options, thereby reducing residents' reliance on private cars</i>". The provision of numerous links to strategic roads and a reliance on out of town retail park style shops is not deemed a suitable way of achieving this .</p>
Directions for growth (options)	<p>§ I understand that Average Speed Assessments showed Option 1 (Lufton) provides the least impact on average speeds on the 5 routes into & out of Yeovil. Can you please explain why this has not been considered important?</p>	<p>The preferred option was selected for its performance across a range of parameters (summarised in section 6 of the report), not simply journey speeds. This range of factors is designed to cover the wide range of objectives set out in The Department for Communities and Local Government's guidance on eco-town developments ('Planning Policy Statement: eco-towns: A supplement to Planning Policy Statement 1').</p>
Directions for growth (options)	<p>§ The above table illustrates that the highest average traffic speed on the network post development (i.e. least congestion and least overall driver delay) is associated with Option 1 - Lufton West. This would seem to suggest that a conventional development to the north west of Yeovil would be more appropriate than a full eco standard development to the south of the town as journey times, congestion and delays would all be less.</p>	<p>The preferred option was selected for its performance across a range of parameters (summarised in section 6 of the report), not simply traffic speeds. This range of factors was designed to cover the wide range of objectives set out in The Department for Communities and Local Government's guidance on eco-town developments ('Planning Policy Statement: eco-towns: A supplement to Planning Policy Statement 1').</p>
Directions for growth (options)	<p>§ Option 1 Lufton West is located in closer proximity to the Houndstone Road Business Park employment area than any of the development sites to the south of the A30 are to the Lysander Road employment sites.</p>	<p>The preferred option was selected for its performance across a range of parameters (summarised in section 6 of the report), not simply proximity to any particular landuse or site. This range of factors was designed to cover the wide range of objectives set out in The Department for Communities and Local Government's guidance on eco-town developments ('Planning Policy Statement: eco-towns: A supplement to Planning Policy Statement 1'). The traffic impacts of the various options were considered in the modelling undertaken.</p>
Directions for growth (options)	<p>§ The southern options would suffer from the 6,000 employee Bunford Business park and 23 hectare of additional employment land. There would be a significant cross Yeovil commute from the northern residential areas to employment land in options 4 and 6 as well as inward commuting from Yeovil's hinterland. It appears that this has not been modelled. It would have severe impact on Bunford Hollow and Hendford Hill/horsey roundabout.</p>	<p>Appendix One to the report details other developments which are included in the traffic modelling undertaken, including development at Bunford Park. The demand for travel associated with these sites is considered by the model. Obviously it would be neither practical nor instructive to include all model outputs in the report. Therefore, only the most significant were included in the report, the absence of an impact from the report does not suggest that no analysis was undertaken.</p>

Direction for Growth (access)	<p>§ The discussion on access highlights again that the policy of avoiding coalescence has been disregarded. Gooseacre Lane and Uplands Terrace (on the A30) are part of West Coker village. Most of the problems identified above would be mitigated if the access to the western area were not at or via Gooseacre Lane or Camp Rd, but at the White Post junction onto the A30, and also via 'Bunford Park' onto the Western Relief Road (and hence the A3088) at the northern edge.</p>	<p>The location of the options was not a consideration of this report, they were defined in by SSDC, to whom this concern should be addressed. As noted in sections 2.1.3 - 2.1.4 of the report, access arrangements were chosen to allow an assessment of the options to be made and further refinement may be made as the study process (and associated consultation) progresses. This assessment was made in the context of the road network expected to exist. There are no plans for relevant new roads and major new roads would be a major cost to the development.</p>
Direction for Growth (access)	<p>§ Most of the development options suggest that they have only 2 access points to the overall road network. At peak times, with nearly 4000 new homes it is estimated that there could be up to 1500 cars could be trying to leave the development at about the same time. If we assume that it takes 5 seconds for each car to negotiate one of the access points it would take 62 minutes for all the 1500 cars to leave the site. This does not seem to have been considered in the study.</p>	<p>The traffic modelling undertaken considered the ability of vehicles to access the various sites, with adverse consequences included alongside other factors in the report.</p>
Ring Road	<p>§ Yeovil is in desperate need of a ring road, Babylon Hill area is the only area that has access to a dual carriageway and would be better equipped to handle the extra traffic.</p>	<p>The ability of the existing road network to cope with traffic generated by any development is a noted as a key consideration in the Department for Communities and Local Government's guidance on eco-town developments ('Planning Policy Statement: eco-towns: A supplement to Planning Policy Statement 1'). It has been carefully considered through the modelling exercise reported, with adverse impacts assessed and mitigation requirements described. These factors were all considered in the conclusions drawn in order to minimise the impact on the existing road network.</p>
Costs (Table 2.1 & Appendix 7)	<p>§ Table 2.1 is therefore misleading because its cost summaries are incomplete - Appendix 7 makes this very clear. For example, Table 2.1 suggests that Option 1 will cost £2m whereas Appendix 7 ADDS £4.8m PLUS some uncosted items:</p>	<p>Table 2.1 details only construction costs for the assumed access arrangements (as stated in its title), whereas Appendix 7 includes a wider range of infrastructure costs associated with each of the options, hence the different figures included in each.</p>
Costs (Table 2.1 & Appendix 7)	<p>§ The additional infrastructure costs in Appendix 7 include upgrading of more than 2km of Thorne Lane, as far as the A37. This road is already better than the access roads proposed (without upgrade) for some other options, e.g. Two Towers Lane and Newton Road.</p>	<p>Infrastructure requirements have been included where deemed necessary following the assessments appropriate to a study of this type. This has been undertaken in a consistent manner for all options. As noted in sections 2.1.3 - 2.1.4 of the report, access arrangements are indicative and further refinement may be made as the study process (and associated consultation) progresses. For the sake of clarity it should be noted that Appendix 7 discusses upgrades for both Two Towers Lane and Newton Road under Option 4.</p>
Costs (Table 2.1 & Appendix 7)	<p>§ Option 4 - The roundabout at the Two Towers Lane/Newton Rd junction implies greatly increased traffic along Two Towers Lane. This is narrow, mostly single track, and unsuitable for general access, but no proposals or costs are shown for widening and improving it.</p>	<p>Appendix 7 of the report includes a cost for the improvement of Two Towers Lane.</p>
Costs (Table 2.1 & Appendix 7)	<p>§ A new 4-arm roundabout with Gooseacre Lane and Camp Rd is also proposed, Para 4.7.16 describes Camp Rd as 'a narrow single lane country road and would require upgrading to deliver the development'. Appendix 7 supports this view - and estimates a further £1.2m to upgrade the 700m length to the A30. The other 'arm' of this roundabout, Gooseacre Lane is single lane only, with blind bends - much worse than Camp Rd. It is 600m long. The study does not address the access which would be required from outside Yeovil - from (and through) Odcombe, and from Crewkerne etc. The latter would want to use Gooseacre Lane as the direct line to the western access point. Appendix 7 speculates on an alternative access using Gooseacre Lane, but acknowledges that the junction with the A30 is difficult and 'any junction improvement is likely to mean the demolition of a residential property'. This is also 'not costed'.</p>	<p>The traffic modelling undertaken to support the study incorporates a variety of links within the study area. Therefore, the demand for movements of the type noted was considered in the analyses undertaken by the report and the recommendations made therein. Where the impacts of this demand was deemed significant they were included in the report. Improvements were proposed where this assessment suggested they would be proportionate to the demand. However, as noted in sections 2.1.3 - 2.1.4 of the report, access arrangements included in the report are indicative and further refinements may be made as any proposals progress and options are considered in more detail.</p>
Costs (Table 2.1 & Appendix 7)	<p>§ Option 6 - This option assumes that access to the A30 will be via Sandhurst Rd and 'if widened access to properties could not be achieved as there is a significant level difference between the east and west frontages'. Further, the 'existing T-Junction with A37 will need analysis to ascertain new layout. Assume 4 arm roundabout incorporating Forest Road, although there is limited space.' Not surprisingly, neither of these is costed. An alternative new road to the A37 is estimated at £1.1m in Appendix 7 and para 4.17.21</p>	<p>No cost is provided for improvements to Sandhurst Lane as no practicable method for making the improvements could be identified. A cost for an alternative access to the A37 is included as this is deemed as necessary to provide suitable access.</p>

Costs (Table 2.1 & Appendix 7)	<p>§ Table 1, showing 'Access Costs' is very misleading because it shows less than half the overall cost of each option. Other costs (which are themselves incomplete) are hidden in Appendix 7.</p>	Table 2.1 details only construction costs for the assumed access arrangements (as stated in its title), whereas appendix 7 includes a wider range of infrastructure costs associated with each of the options, hence the different figures included in each.
Costs (Table 2.1 & Appendix 7)	<p>§ It is suggested that option 5 is cheapest but it does not consider the high cost for changes to Gooseacre Lane and Holywell/Primrose Lane both of which are at present very narrow lanes requiring big development to make them useful for the development.</p>	No costs are attributed to improvements to Gooseacre Lane, Hollywell or Primrose Lane as the report did not identify a need for such works, with the alternative links listed expected to form the primary accesses.
Costs (Table 2.1 & Appendix 7)	<p>§ In analysing the cost for various options it appears that for options 1, 2 and 3 significant work would already have been completed to support the key site developments that should reduce the costs detailed for these options. Particularly regarding Western Avenue, Larkhill, development of the Lufton residential key site, Lufton 2000 phase 3 employment area, Thorne Lane/Brimsmore/Larkhill, Coombe Street Lane/Mudford Road, Lyde Road/Mudforcl Road & A30/Lyde Road Junction.</p>	Table 3.1 of Appendix One to the report sets out highway improvements included in the traffic model for 2026. The improvements included in the model are those for which (at the time of the model's construction) there was a reasonable certainty of delivery by 2026. It is important that only relatively certain improvements are included in order to avoid underestimating the impact of any development. The assumed improvements were consistent across all options and provided a good basis against which to test their impacts. As more detailed considerations are made the potential for other schemes to contribute will, of course, be considered at the appropriate juncture.
Modelling Calculations	<p>§ Note: See full response by East Coker Preservation Society</p>	
Modelling Calculations	<p>§ The modelling studies seem to have been conducted using SATURN and SATSAT. It happens that the SSDC website also has available the 'Yeovil Transport Strategy Review 2006 - 2011'. It is undated, but I assume it was produced in 2005 or 2006. It includes SATURN model traffic predictions made in 2005/6 for 2011. Various journeys are assessed, notably the main commuting routes AM and PM. Tables compare journey and delay times for 2002 (presumably actual) with predictions for 2011. Among these is an estimate of the delay at the AM peak to traffic approaching the Hospital roundabout from the east along Reckleford. Table 3.4 suggests that the delay should have risen from 34 seconds in 2002 to 473 seconds now - almost 8 minutes! An informal survey of frequent users (one has commuted from Sherborne to AugustaWestland for 30+ years) shows that this is not the case. He thought that the study numbers were 'bizarre' and estimates 10 to 100 seconds. He adds that his worst delays arise from traffic waiting to turn right into St Michaels Ave - a problem not even mentioned in these studies. So what reliance can we place on modelling predictions</p>	The forecasts shown in Table 3.4 of the Yeovil Transport Strategy Review (YTSR) 2006-2011 are for a reference case representing the local transport system in 2011 assuming certain increases in travel demand and population growth. The reference case predicted what might happen in Yeovil if no mitigating action was taken. YTSR proposed a transport strategy to avert this scenario. Implementation of this strategy is therefore likely to have successfully reduced the forecast delays at Hospital roundabout (and other junctions). It is also possible that there was less growth in demand than predicted, as has been witnessed across Somerset in the last few years due, in part, to the economic recession. It is accepted that traffic modelling is a best estimate as opposed to future 'guarantee'.
Modelling Calculations	<p>§ Simplified peak hour spreading through the means of reducing overall traffic is not ideal and a more detailed methodology should be used. The average speed assessment demonstrates that option 1 provides the least impact on average speeds of the five routes in and out of Yeovil. This would be further improved if full or partial Eco success were applied to the trip generation.</p>	This is a strategic model and the methodology is considered suitable for the purpose of this report. More detailed assessments will be considered at a later stage. The model will be re-run in order to test options 1,2 and 3 with partial and full eco-success and provide valid comparisons with options 4, 5 and 6.
Modelling Calculations	<p>§ The modelling zones clearly and fully extend outside the study area (Technical Report Figures 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4) which suggests that the modelling work would have provided sufficient information to be able to give AADT, am peak and pm peak flows on the study area boundary (Technical Report 2.1) at the boundary intersection with the A.37, A.352 and East of Sherborne together with a flows on the A30 between Yeovil and Sherborne.</p>	The model has been validation across the Yeovil urban area, and on key routes into and out of Yeovil. Flows on the study area boundary may be extracted from the model if they are required at a later stage although results at some locations on the limits of the study area may be more reliable than others. Note: AADTs can only be estimated from the three modelled hours.
Modelling Calculations	<p>§ TRICS based trip generation seems appropriate;</p>	No response required
Modelling Calculations	<p>§ It is suggested that a four stage 'Multi-Modal' model should have been constructed within the SATURN and EMM software. This type of model would have provided a clearer understanding of the impacts of modal shift based on public transport provision, which would seem to be an essential element in fully assessing the overall traffic and transport implications of any potential Eco-urban extension of Yeovil.</p>	This is a strategic model and the methodology is considered suitable for the purpose of the report. More detailed assessments will be considered at a later stage.
Modelling Calculations	<p>§ Development on the edge of settlements could lead to a change in the speed limits in the vicinity and it is unclear how or if this has been included within the 'with development' models. SATURN works by assigning vehicles to the quickest route therefore a higher speed road will 'encourage' drivers to use it within the model. If this is not modelled correctly then the results may not be accurate.</p>	Speed limits have been considered as appropriate in a strategic model. More detailed assessments will be considered at a later stage.
Modelling Calculations	<p>§ The potential growth in background traffic flows (cars) within the model area has been calculated by applying local TEMPRO growth factors up to 2026 from the 2007 base data. For the growth in lorry movements the National Transport Model has been used. This methodology is considered appropriate.</p>	No response required

Modelling Calculations	<p>§ A Gravity Model has been applied to create a new demand matrix that distributes future development trips to the network on the basis of generalised cost (accounting for both time and distance). Again this is a relatively standard approach but without access to the detailed spreadsheets it is not possible to identify the accuracy of the eventual results. For the purpose of this review however they are considered to be accurate.</p>	No response required
Modelling Calculations	<p>§ Given the reduction factors applied to elastic assignment, particularly in the PM peak (5.9%) the impacts on the overall conclusions of the modelling report could be considerable.</p>	Demand reduction due to congestion (elasticity) has been estimated as described in Section 4.6 of the Technical Report (Appendix 1) and the methodology is considered to be appropriate for the purposes of a strategic report. In practice it is unlikely that a small variation in this figure would affect the comparison of options, as the same figure is used in all the models. The report recommends that more detailed analysis is undertaken on the demand elasticity at a later stage.
Modelling Calculations	<p>§ The data presented on junction capacity in Appendix 6 shows that none of the options studied has a dramatic effect - either positive or negative. Similarly, the journey times shown in Appendix 5 are generally affected by less than 15 seconds. Of 360 data points, only 4 are greater than 1 minute; the highest is 94 seconds. Taking the sum of the ten AM journeys, to try to get an overall picture, Option 1 adds a total delay of 0.3%; the other options add 1.5% to 4.1% in total. For the Inter and PM peaks, Option 1 apparently reduces the overall time. This result is also clear on the sample journey times shown in Tables 4-1 and 4-2 of the Non Technical Report. Furthermore, the effects of Option 1 are only seen at the three roundabouts on the west side of Yeovil (Preston Road, Westland's and Bunford Hollow), all of which have spare capacity, unlike the town centre junctions - see Tables 4-4 to 4-6 of the Non-Technical Report and Appendix 6, RFC Change tables. Improvements to these junctions would be easier to implement than those to built-up town centre intersections.</p>	The report states that overall the impacts of the options on the key junctions are "generally small", bearing in mind that small increases in traffic can be significant where the network is already congested. The costs and benefits of implementing improvements to individual junctions will be assessed at a later stage.
Modelling Calculations	<p>§ The Technical Note, Appendix 2, para 2.4.2. states that the minimum gap at junctions is 2.5 seconds. This seems unduly pessimistic. Where visibility is good, especially on roundabouts, vehicles follow each other with no delay. With a 2 pcu gap at 20 mph, the interval would be under 1.6 seconds, and on many roundabouts, there are 2 or 3 entry lanes, and vehicles frequently enter simultaneously.</p>	The GAP parameter refers to the minimum gap in the opposing flow of traffic that is acceptable to the entry flow (not the gap between entry vehicles). It is correct that it influences the modelled capacity of the junction and its value is usually set to correctly simulate saturation flows.
Modelling Calculations	<p>§ It appears that the current key site developments have not had correct demand reductions applied in the modelling exercise. The survey also fails to assess any opportunity to link developments across options 1, 2 and 3. This would improve the already strong potential to disperse traffic flow into and out of developments to both Yeovil Town Centre and the Strategic Road Network (SRN).</p>	Reductions in car trips attributable to "Non-Modellable Interventions" (e.g. Smarter Choices) have been estimated using the most up-to-date research available. Ultimately it is not possible to know what the "correct" NMI reductions are. Demand reduction due to congestion (elasticity) has been estimated as described in Section 4.6 of the Technical Report (Appendix 1). The methodology is considered to be appropriate for the purposes of a strategic report. In practice it is unlikely that a small variation in this figure would affect the comparison of options, as the same figure is used in all the models. The report recommends that more detailed analysis is undertaken on the demand elasticity at a later stage.
Modelling Calculations	<p>§ There has been no disclosure of the reasoning behind the arbitrary attribution of trips within the traffic model to the 3 zones 500, 501 and 502 that have large impact on how each development site is assessed.</p>	Each of the developments options is comprised of three zones (numbered 500, 501 and 502 for all the options). Each zone is linked to one of the proposed access junctions for the site. (Where there are only two accesses for the development two zones are assigned to the major access.) The trips assigned to the zone represent the trips that are predicted to use the associated access. This is estimated using information about existing trip distributions to destinations in Yeovil.
Modelling Calculations	<p>§ All the public transport assumptions used within the traffic model should be revisited based on a realistic and robust assessment of likely service provision and frequency.</p>	The assumptions about public transport used within the traffic model are appropriate for the strategic level of this report. We agree that it will be necessary to consider the role of public transport in more detail at a later stage in the process.
Modelling Calculations	<p>§ A 23 hectare employment site south of Yeovil with employment for several thousand will require significant cross town commuting from the major northern residential areas; this appears not to have been factored.</p>	The trips generated by all land uses including employment have been estimated using the TRICS database and distributed across the network in line with existing and forecast traffic movements. Cross town commuting trips from the north to employment in the south are therefore included in the model.
Ultra Light Rail	<p>§ Note: see full response by Sustraco</p>	See comment below and separate correspondence.

Ultra Light Rail	<p>§ Sustraco has considered and sought to raise awareness at several eco towns, but it is considered that Yeovil probably offers the best available eco town opportunity, due to the existence of historic underused and abandoned railway infrastructure. Yeovil is also the ideal size of town for a ULR system, because it is too small for conventional trams to be viable but large enough to generate sufficient passenger demand to justify ULR trams.</p>	<p>Whilst technologies such as Ultra Light Rail (ULR) have considerable potential to contribute to developing sustainable transport systems, it is important that transport policies are developed in a 'modally agnostic' way. By considering the problems we face first, and then assessing the potential for different options to contribute to solving them, we can make sure the best possible solutions are selected. As no approach will be appropriate in all situations, beginning with any particular solution (such as ULR) could lead to the selection of a sub-optimum approach. ULR was not identified by the report, as a demand for that type of solution did not emerge from the challenges identified. Further consideration of how to achieve trip reductions will be considered at the masterplanning stage.</p>
Rural Villages	<p>§ Transport model does not consider how the existing road infrastructure outside Yeovil within the village communities will be affected.</p>	<p>The transport model developed includes a number of the villages and hamlets around Yeovil, as described in sections 2.2.8 - 2.2.12 of Appendix One to the report. Obviously there is a limit to the amount of data from that model than can be meaningfully presented in the report, as such only the most significant issues are presented. Nevertheless, the impact on a wider area was considered by the model.</p>
Rural Villages	<p>§ 7.4 The study fails to show the cost associated in mitigating impact on Barwick and Aldon Parks. It also fails to identify the traffic impact on the populations of East Coker (including North Coker), West Coker and Barwick/Stoford.</p>	<p>This study has sought to consider the impacts of the development options on transport in the study area and the options' abilities to fulfil certain transport criteria associated with eco-town developments. Whilst transport may have some impact on these parks, any requirement for mitigation within them would have to be considered as part of the wider planning processes undertaken by South Somerset District Council.</p>
Rural Villages	<p>§ Furthermore the traffic impact on those sensitive, narrow and historic lanes has not been considered at all, with respect to health and safety, well-being or impact on heritage and natural environment including damage to listed buildings and hedgerow environments.</p>	<p>The traffic modelling undertaken to support the study incorporates a variety of road types, in order to account for the different characteristics of the roads in the study area. Whilst this may not include some of the costs noted, it allows an assessment of the relative merits of different links to be made at an appropriate level for a high level study of this type.</p>
Rural Villages	<p>§ Nor does it correctly reflect costs to the minor road system south of Yeovil and costly mitigation to protect the historic Country Parks.</p>	<p>See the two previous responses.</p>
Rural Villages	<p>§ The route beyond Halstock in particular could be characterised as largely 'single track with passing places' - while the current volume of traffic is just about tolerable in terms of hold ups etc, any increase would I suspect lead to congestions and a higher accident rate. There is an associated risk of the 'bottle-necks' at the railway bridge by Sutton Bingham reservoir and the designated single track section between Halstock and Corscombe becoming 'black spots'.</p>	<p>The traffic modelling undertaken to support the study incorporates a variety of road types, in order to account for the different characteristics of the roads in the study area. Therefore, the impact of this link's characteristics is included in the analyses undertaken by the report and the recommendations made therein.</p>
Rural Villages	<p>§ The access proposed for Options 1, 4, 5, and 6 would encourage increased traffic along small lanes and through neighbouring villages.</p>	<p>The traffic modelling undertaken to support the study incorporated a variety of links within the study area. Therefore, the demand for movements of the type noted was considered in the analyses undertaken by the report and the recommendations made therein. Where the impacts of this demand was deemed significant they were included in the report.</p>
Rural Villages	<p>§ The Gooseacre Lane/Camp Road access for Option 5 brings the development right into the existing village of West Coker.</p>	<p>The access arrangements discussed would allow some of the traffic generated by this option to pass through the edge of West Coker. As noted in sections 2.1.3 - 2.1.4 of the report, access arrangements were chosen to allow an assessment of the options to be made and further refinement may be made as the study process (and associated consultation) progresses.</p>
Pollution	<p>§ The transport model could consider noise and pollution due to increased volumes, and impact on the quality of the local environment beyond the qualitative and course 'eco-success' parameter.</p>	<p>Whilst calculations of impacts on noise and air pollution are not explicitly made in the study, these factors are strongly linked to levels of traffic and congestion which are considered in detail. It is felt that this provides an appropriate appraisal of the relative merits of the options, in terms of a variety of traffic related impacts, for a high level study of this type.</p>
Car Parking	<p>§ All options for this Urban Development require improved parking provision. With a potential population increase of 20% extra parking is required and no costing or provision is made within the study. Extra parking is required particularly for the hospital, which will have increased patients due to the development.</p>	<p>Provision for parking at destinations outside of a development is not usually considered in the assessment of that development. Provision for destination parking is considered as part of the development where this parking occurs and through wider reviews of provision by the district authority. Therefore, such provision has not been considered in this study.</p>

Freight Routes	§ The study does not include any increase in HGV trips within the transport network. Any increase in population to an area will require extra deliveries to support their provision requirements.	The traffic modelling undertaken to support the study incorporates all traffic generated by the various options, including Heavy Goods Vehicles. Whilst HGVs are not quantified separately in the results presented, they are included in overall figures using an appropriate number of passenger car units to represent each one, as separating out every vehicle type (car, bus, van, HGV etc) would be impractical.
Freight Routes	§ Options 4, 5 and 6 access the Regional Freight Route Network and traffic flow into and out of the residential and employment developments of the urban extension would impact directly with this network (A30/A37 and A3088). This appears not to have been modelled and has the potential for serious further congestion.	The traffic model employed includes a variety of different vehicle types, including both the HGVs that would be on the network regardless of any development and those generated by it. Therefore, consideration of the impact on freight movements (which our transport policies recognise as vital to Somerset's economy) is included in the wider considerations of the impact on the existing network. Equally, it is important that developments of this scale have good access to freight routes, to minimise the impact of the HGV traffic they may generate.
Freight Routes	§ Costs for options 4-6 fail to adequately take into account changes necessary to the Regional Primary Freight Network A37, A30 and A3088 junctions when associated with high volumes of development traffic.	Options 4-6 all include costs for works at junctions with the A37, A30 and A3088. As any further design work is undertaken the requirements will be tailored to the demand experienced at the junctions. The infrastructure and costs proposed are believed to be appropriate for the respective roads, based on the assessments undertaken at this early stage.
A303 access & dispersal (Cartgate roundabout)	§ There is no accounting for the fact that the northern development options all have scope for access to the A303 through 4 access points, being the A3088 at Cartgate, the minor road via Tintinhull, the A37, and the A359. This scope means there is in fact more opportunity for dispersal onto the A303 for the options to the north of Yeovil than there are for the options to the south.	The transport model developed includes the links to the A303 noted (see sections 2.2.8 - 2.2.12 of Appendix One to the report). Therefore, demand for movements of the type noted will be included in the analyses undertaken in the report and the recommendations made therein.
A303 access & dispersal (Cartgate roundabout)	§ The feasibility of encouraging extra dispersal onto non-A3088 routes to the A303, for instance by allowing traffic only to exit the A3088 directly into the north of Yeovil development site options and not to access onto the A3088 directly from them.	
A303 access & dispersal (Cartgate roundabout)	§ By taking an OFF slip road from the A3088 east carriageway (Yeovil bound) at Lufton it would alleviate pressure on inbound traffic flow at the Westland roundabout. If there was no ON access for west bound (A303) traffic at Lufton the A303/Cartgate junction would benefit. Dispersal outbound from the north of Yeovil has four potential routes which most have spare capacity. From the three south options there is only one effect route that is the A3088/A303 junction. I do not believe the consultant modelled alternative dispersal to the A303 from the north of Yeovil but they should have.	As noted in sections 2.1.3 - 2.1.4 of the report, access arrangements were chosen to allow an assessment of the options to be made and have only been developed to the level required to do this. Detailed design issues such as this will be considered as options are developed further. Section 5.2 notes that the Cartgate Roundabout in particular will need further consideration. Amendments will be developed as appropriate to the challenges identified through this process. Further modelling of the impact of option 1 on the north west both with and without access onto the A3088 will be undertaken. This modelling exercise will inform any final decision.
A303 access & dispersal (Cartgate roundabout)	§ It is suggested that the above factors will all have an adverse impact on the already congested Western corridor and the associated issues at the Cartgate/A303 roundabout. The effect of this on the traffic model would undoubtedly make the Option 6 and/or 4 sites more attractive as these are slightly more remote from the Western corridor.	