Item 9 - Junction 16 of M4 Motorway Comments/observations received

CIIr Mollie Groom, Wiltshire Council

I am a little surprised to read the lengthy report on J16.

No mention is made of the full Council meeting which followed the Cabinet meeting on that day when a coach was hired to bring local residents to the meeting.

The full Council decided not to permit the proposed layout and it was after that the Cabinet decision to permit it had to be revoked.

I am pleased to observe that WC has not yet signed off the layout which has been described as unsafe by one leading consultant and as causing severe congestion by another.

I support CPRE questions.

Response

Agenda Item 37 of the 8th May County Council considered a notice of motion from Cllr Groom, asking full Council to acknowledge and agree a number of concerns relating to the proposed changes at Junction 16.

Following consideration of options allowed under the constitution, full Council resolved:

That the Leader of the Council be asked to refer the matter back to Cabinet at the appropriate time.

The appropriate time was Cabinet on 30th October 2007.

It is not therefore the case that either the decision to not accept the Junction 16 layout was made by Council, nor that Cabinet is being asked to overturn a Council decision.

Mr John Ingleson, Swindon

As a resident of Haylane (I live opposite the junction of Haylane and Wharf road) I must object to the badly thought out scheme proposed for junction 16, as this plan will change Haylane from a semi rural road to a main access route.

There has been no consideration given to the heath and safety of the residents of hay lane (all council tax payers),

The road has been widened, by stealth with each road resurfacing exercise, the result is increase in both the volume and speed of traffic.

This has increased the risk to residents exiting or returning home as no thought has been given to the access/visibility/line of locals individual properties, when reducing the width of grass verge to widen the road, the result = reduced line of vision.

(Surely councils have a responsibility in ensuring any alterations to roads do not increase the risks for locals)

Haylane was a one time, access only but now this route has been opened up, basically because of a lack of any coherent strategic transport plan, houses are built and no proper infrastructure put in place, cul-de-sac style development seems to be the norm.

Also please note; part of the wichelstowe agreed plan, was to introduce traffic calming into haylane, when the development reached 350 houses, this point has been passed and no traffic calming has been put in place.

Please reject this Junction 16 scheme as it will not improve access into Swindon or enhance local economies but will lead to more congestion and rat running through rural roads, the result being increased hardship for residents in the affected areas.

Response

The planning permission for Wichelstowe (S/02/2000) has 102 conditions attached; no such condition requires traffic calming on Hay Lane associated with 350 occupations.

CIIr Neville Smith - Lydiard Tregoz Parish Council

....this report which further supports my worry of congestion at this junction. It would also seem that there is insufficient land to carry out these improvements with the A3102 carrying the bulk of the traffic and subsequent congestion. At last nights LT Council mtg members seemed uncertain of who would assume overall responsibility for the project which is being driven by Swindon! Surely WiltshireCC should have this

mantle and accept the public liability for the project! I do not think this scheme should be allowed to continue in its present form.

Response

Some aspects of delivery have yet to be finalised – ultimately, the completed scheme will remain vested with Wiltshire Council and the Highways Agency.