

# A40 Llanddewi Velfrey to Penblewin

## PUBLIC LOCAL INQUIRY

[www.A40lvp-publicinquiry.co.uk](http://www.A40lvp-publicinquiry.co.uk)

### COUNTER OBJECTORS TO THE ALTERNATIVES

Comments received on the Objector's Suggested Alternative (PID.006)

LIVE DOCUMENT – UPDATED 17/03/20

Name	Comment received
J W P Lewis	<p><i>Date: 12/03/2020</i></p> <p>'I am responding to the 'Objectors Alternative Proposals' for the Trefangor Side Road in the A40 Llanddewi Velfrey to Penblewin Improvement Scheme.</p> <p>I wish to register my strong opposition to both of these alternative suggestions on the following grounds:-</p> <p>In both cases they will take significant additional amounts of Agricultural land and therefore additional expenditure.</p> <p>There would be very significant drainage problems caused by both options. The need to maintain drainage through the underpass would create a particular problem to the South. Considerable extra expenditure would be needed with land take, another attenuation pond and pipes/ditches required.</p> <p>For Option 1b the cost of construction of an 8 metre embankment would be a significant increase in terms of finance, air and noise pollution over the published scheme. The resulting embankment would have a much greater impact on the environment than the published scheme.</p> <p>Both alternative schemes exit onto the existing A40 opposite Caermaenau Fach which would cause increased disturbance particularly when there are extensive Agricultural operations in progress.</p> <p>I am in agreement with the conclusions that the environmental impact would be greater than the Published scheme and that during construction there would be greater air and noise pollution.'</p>
M Farrant & C Langmaid [R0063]	<p><i>Date: 12/03/2020</i></p> <p>'Having looked through the Objectors Alternative Proposals, hand delivered to us yesterday, we are writing to strongly object to both, in particular 1b.</p> <p>1b, an 8 metre, elevated, piece of carriageway, directly outside our property, leaving us no privacy, increasing noise level and pollution, totally unacceptable.</p> <p>We have noted, with relief, these suggestions are not being promoted by Welsh Government and sincerely hope they never will be.'</p> <p><i>Date: 16/03/2020</i></p> <p>'Having had more time to look at the Objectors proposed alternative plans we feel we must write again to express our many concerns regarding these, in particular Plan 1b.</p> <p>Aside those mentioned in our email last week relating to, not only, the impact on our privacy, increased noise and pollution levels. There is also concern for our livelihood, in trying to run a holiday cottage business.</p>

Name	Comment received
	<p>Months of road disruption and noise from construction traffic, right outside our doors, probably on our land too, would seriously affect said business. Aside from this, our visitors would hardly be in a position to enjoy a quiet holiday. Unable to appreciate the country air, owing to increased pollution levels and the volume of noise during it's construction and thereafter with a noisy elevated carriageway.</p> <p>There is also the problem with light pollution from farm vehicles/machinery, driving through an underpass directly in the direction of our driveway, merely feet away. At busy times in the farm year, this would be taking place into the early hours of the morning. We have lived in farming communities before and know only too well their lives continue through the night when needs be. These activities would be conducted during the prime weeks of the year, in the holiday business calender, and could seriously impact on our livelihood, with very negative reviews being written by unhappy holidaymakers.</p> <p>We purchased Caer'maenau Fach 4 and a half months ago in the knowledge we had a busy road outside our gates and that a bypass had been in discussions for the past 50 years or so. Our attitude was how great it would be if this did happen but, if not, we knew what we had let ourselves in for with the current road. Had we known about these proposals there is no way we would have considered purchasing this property. There was no mention of this ever considered when the searches were carried out by our conveyancing solicitor. How anyone could be so inconsiderate in proposing 1b in particular is beyond us!</p>
<p>Llanddewi Velfrey Community Council [R0083]</p>	<p><i>Date: 12/03/2020</i></p> <p>'Thank you for passing on the information regarding the objectors alternative proposals for the Llanddewi Velfrey to Penblewin road improvement scheme. These were considered by this Council in their meeting this week, and it was agreed that they were not in favour of them for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The cost would be considerable, and the benefit would only be perhaps for two households.</li> <li>• The proposal to have a raised embankment would have a major negative impact upon the visual amenity of a considerable number of households and residents.</li> <li>• The location suggested by the alternative proposal has already been considered earlier in the process.</li> <li>• There would be significant additional drainage and environmental impacts caused by the alternative proposals. In addition there would be increased negative climate impact in the form of increased greenhouse gases from the work, and a reduction on the biodiversity of the area.</li> <li>• Any requirement to restart the process of consultation would delay the scheme and risk losing the monies that have been specifically set aside for it - so could result in no road improvement scheme happening. The Council is firmly of the opinion that the road improvement scheme is long overdue and needs to go ahead.</li> </ul> <p>Therefore the Council supports the original scheme as published by the Welsh Government rather than the alternative proposal.'</p>

Name	Comment received
<p>A G P Lewis [R0037]</p>	<p><i>Date: 16/03/2020</i></p> <p>'I write further to the publication of the Objectors Suggested Alternative Proposals brochure March 2020 for the Trefangor Side Road Alternative which has been sent to me by Martin Gallimore. I confirm that we, Owen and Owen are responding on behalf of Mr Alexander Lewis who is the Landowner who will be subject to the land take for the proposals in 1A &amp; 1B.</p> <p>We write to confirm my client's strong opposition to the scheme as proposed. Notwithstanding the significant amount of land take proposed for the existing scheme, the new proposals take significantly more land. We are concerned that the proposed alternatives both present problems of drainage and also the proposed construction may have a greater detrimental visual impact than the published scheme. We are also concerned about the additional cost to an already very expensive scheme, if this was to go ahead. I would be grateful if our client's objections are noted and reported to the Inspector.</p> <p>Should you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact me on the details below.'</p>
<p>Rodney Powell of Edward H Perkins on behalf of Margaret Rhian Thomas [R0026]</p>	<p><i>Date: 17/03/2020</i></p> <p>I write in response to your letter dated 11 th March 2020, and the details contained in the Objector's Suggested Alternative Brochure.</p> <p>On behalf of our client, we strongly object to Option IA and Option 1B, as outlined within the aforementioned brochure. We consider the proposed published scheme to be preferable to both of these alternatives, for both our client and the general public, for the reasons outlined below.</p> <p>The alternatives IA and 1B offer no considerable benefits over the published scheme.</p> <p>The alternatives would have a significant adverse effect in terms of landscape and the environment, when compared with the published scheme.</p> <p>The additional costs (IA would cost approximately €830,000 and 1B would cost approximately €1,470,000) cannot be justified when we already have a satisfactory published scheme.</p> <p>IA and 1B have no considerable benefit for the general public.</p> <p>The proposed underpasses pose a security risk — dark, unsighted passage could attract criminal activity.</p> <p>Whilst we act for Rhian Thomas, the proposed under passes will have a significant adverse visual impact on Bounty Farm, Caermaenau Fach and Trefangor Farm, because they will alter the immediate landscape, particularly 1B,</p> <p>The underpasses will create a more complicated access route for Pencaerminau and Bounty Farm in terms of meandering roads and steep approaches, particularly IA.</p> <p>IA and 1B require additional land take, which is simply not necessary when we have an acceptable public scheme.</p>

Name	Comment received
	<p>There is potential for road traffic accidents on the approach to the underpass (IA) due to steep gradients and meandering routes.</p> <p>Journey quality is poorer for the affected parties with either of IA or 1B.</p> <p>The published scheme (as modified with passing places) meets the requirements of those parties that require alternative access (to include our client) and there is no reason to deviate from it.</p> <p>We have concerns that the underpass in Option IA could flood during high rainfall, and affect the safe passage along the access route.</p> <p>IA and 1B propose tight turning circles (particularly IA) which are not desirable and impact on journey quality.</p> <p>In summary, the published scheme will have far less impact on the landscape and environment than either IA or 1B, and satisfy the requirements of those affected parties who require alternative access. For these reasons, an underpass is simply not feasible at this location.</p> <p>I would be most grateful if these points could be considered at the Public Inquiry.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>