

Number: WG39604



Llywodraeth Cymru
Welsh Government

Welsh Government

Consultation – Summary of Responses

A40 Penblewin to Redstone Cross Improvements

November 2019

Mae'r ddogfen yma hefyd ar gael yn Gymraeg.
This document is also available in Welsh.

Contents

1. The Project.....3

2. Consultation Publicity.....6

3. Public Engagement and Consultation Events7

4. Consultation Feedback10

5. Stakeholder Feedback24

6. Summary of Key Points.....25

7. Next Steps27

Appendix A: Consultation document28

Appendix B: Display panels29

1. The Project

Context

In December 2004, the Minister announced the publication of his Addendum to the 2002 Trunk Road Forward Programme (TRFP) and this included two major single carriageway improvement schemes for the A40 west of St Clears. The improvements would use the 2+1 configuration allowing overtaking on the two-lane direction, with overtaking prohibited in the one-lane direction and would be delivered in the following phases:

1. A40 Penblewin - Slebech Park.
2. A40 Llanddewi Velfrey - Penblewin.

The first of these projects, Penblewin - Slebech Park, was completed in March 2011.

In July 2013, Edwina Hart AM CStJ MBE, Minister for Economy, Science and Transport, published a written statement outlining her priorities for Transport. The statement included the following:

“Improving the A40 has been identified as a priority by the Haven Waterway Enterprise Zone Board and I intend to undertake further development of previously proposed improvements.”

On 12 November 2014, in providing an update on the closure of the Murco Refinery in Milford Haven, the Minister made an oral Statement in Plenary:

“In terms of transport links, I have instructed my officials to accelerate to the fullest extent possible the programme for delivering improvements at Llanddewi Velfrey.”

In June 2015, in a written statement on the A40 Improvement Study, the Minister noted *“It is my intention to progress delivery of the A40 Llanddewi Velfrey to Penblewin scheme as soon as possible...”*

In 2017, attendees at the Public Information Exhibition for the A40 Llanddewi Velfrey to Penblewin Improvements expressed their support for improvements to Redstone Cross.

In August 2018, the Cabinet Secretary for Economy and Transport, Ken Skates AM, confirmed in writing to the Senior Coroner in response to the inquest into the death of a driver joining the A40 at Redstone Cross¹, that investigations would be commenced to look at improving junction safety and providing safer overtaking opportunities along the length of the A40, which includes improvements at Redstone Cross.

¹ <https://www.judiciary.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/2018-0242-Response-by-Welsh-Government.pdf>

In January 2019, Arup (supported by RML), began investigating the problems and developed potential effective solutions to address the transport-related problems along the A40 between Penblewin Roundabout and Redstone Cross for the Welsh Government.

The draft Orders and the Environmental Statement were published on 31 July 2019 for the A40 Llanddewi Velfrey to Penblewin Improvements (adjacent scheme).

WelTAG

A Welsh Transport Appraisal Guidance (WelTAG) combined Stage 1 and 2 study has been undertaken and a Stage 3 study is currently being undertaken. The Scheme problems and objectives have been determined and solutions have been identified, reviewed and appraised. The problems and objectives are compatible with those from the A40 Llanddewi Velfrey to Penblewin Improvements, which have been agreed with the Review Group. The Review Group comprises the Welsh Government's Project Director, in addition to the Employer's Agent, the Designer (Arup supported by RML), and Pembrokeshire County Council as the relevant local authority. WelTAG embeds the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 and considers economic, environmental, social and cultural impacts.

The problems

The WelTAG Study currently being undertaken identified the problems listed below. The evidence and data collected and analysed included: geophysical surveys, ground investigation surveys, biodiversity surveys, traffic counts, legislation and policy, journey time reliability, public transport provision, seasonality traffic data, accident severity data, socioeconomic data and environmental constraints.

The identified problems are:

1. The A40 mainline and Redstone Cross Junction is substandard.
2. Limited overtaking opportunities lead to poor journey time reliability and driver frustration.
3. Occasional convoys of heavy goods vehicles from the ferry ports and slow-moving agricultural vehicles contribute to periods of platooning and journey time unreliability, which is exacerbated with limited overtaking opportunities.
4. Seasonal spikes in traffic volumes along the A40 - especially during the summer months - leads to slow-moving traffic causing journey time unreliability, which is exacerbated with limited overtaking opportunities.
5. There are many side road junctions and direct accesses to properties and agricultural fields off the A40, which contribute to operational problems along the road.
6. A mix of traffic types using the road, contributing to journey time unreliability and driver frustration, risky manoeuvres and collision incidents.
7. A lack of strategic public transport connectivity in Pembrokeshire generally means there is a dependence on the private car for inter-urban connections.

Scheme objectives

A number of Scheme objectives have been developed and informed by stakeholder engagement. The objectives consider both the strategic and local transport issues, as follows:

- O1** To enhance network resilience and improve accessibility along the east-west transport corridor to key employment, community and tourism destinations
- O2** To improve prosperity and provide better access to the county town of Haverfordwest, the Haven Enterprise Zone and the West Wales ports at Fishguard, Milford Haven and Pembroke Dock
- O3** To reduce community severance and provide health and amenity benefits
- O4** To improve the Redstone Cross Junction safety (including perceived safety) and reduce the number and severity of collisions
- O5** To promote active travel by cycling, horse riding and walking to provide opportunities for healthy lifestyles
- O6** To deliver a Scheme that promotes social inclusion and integrates with the local transport network to better connect local communities to key transport hubs
- O7** Deliver a project that is sustainable in a globally responsible Wales, taking steps to reduce or offset waste and carbon
- O8** Give due consideration to the impact of transport on the environment and provide enhancement when practicable.

Scheme options

Given the project context described above, design and development work has focused on a highway led solution. This has resulted in a range of options being considered, appraised and consulted on.

A public transport option has been considered as an alternative to road building, with a proposal to increase bus frequencies. However, this was discounted as the appraisal indicated that this would not address the problems or achieve the objectives. Wider public transport investment and initiatives are ongoing to help address local and regional connectivity, led by the relevant local authorities and with support from the Welsh Government.

As part of design development, walking, cycling and horse-riding options are being considered in line with the Active Travel (Wales) Act 2013 and will form part of the highway options under consideration, forming complementary measures to the road-building solutions, also seeking to improve connectivity to all modes of transport.

Purpose of the consultation

The purpose of this report is to describe the stakeholder engagement and public consultation exercise held between 26 July 2019 and 20 September 2019, which sought views on the proposed improvements between Penblewin Roundabout and Redstone Cross on the A40. This provided the opportunity for views to be shared on:

1. The initial identified preferred solution;
2. Enhancements that could be made to the preferred solution; and
3. Active travel measures that could be potentially incorporated.

This report summarises the feedback received and highlights key actions arising to assist the development of the Scheme.

2. Consultation Publicity

This section outlines the measures that were undertaken to publicise the consultation activities and events, seeking to maximise involvement with all groups of people.

All reasonable steps were made to make appropriate publicity arrangements, including:

- a) A press release was issued by the Welsh Government to inform members of the public about the Consultation on 13 August.
- b) An announcement of the consultation was made on Twitter by the Welsh Government's Economy and Transport account on 13 August and a post was made from The Queens Hall (venue in Narberth) Facebook account on 30 August.
- c) Bilingual consultation documents and covering letters were hand-delivered in the local area on 23 August. A copy of the consultation document is included in Appendix A.
- d) Emails were sent to a targeted distribution list in advance of the exhibition to respond to those who had shared their personal information with the Welsh Government during previous events (for the purposes of being kept informed about any further events and project decisions accordingly). A follow-up reminder was also sent ahead of the consultation including to key stakeholders.
- e) The consultation was also advertised within the Western Telegraph on 19 August and the Tenby Observer on 23 August.

3. Public Engagement and Consultation Events

This section provides detailed information about previous Public Information Exhibitions (PIEs) held in April 2019 and May 2019 and the feedback received from members of the public. It also provides detail on the Public Consultation Event held in September 2019.

April 2019 Public Information Exhibition

95 people attended the first Public Information Exhibition (PIE) held in April 2019. The three options presented were:

1. Option 1A - Northern Route with staggered T-junction;
2. Option 1B - Northern Route with no Redstone Cross Junction; and
3. Option 2A - Southern Route with staggered T-junction.

Key feedback received from the attendees included:

- a) 75% of respondents strongly supported the need for improvements between Penblewin Roundabout and through Redstone Cross.
- b) The majority of respondents (68%) agreed with the problems and objectives.
- c) Safety was a key concern at Redstone Cross.
- d) There was no clear preferred option by respondents. 17 respondents preferred Option 2, 15 respondents preferred Option 1B, 13 preferred Option 1A, 12 chose 'None of the options / other option' and 3 respondents left their response blank.
- e) Alternatives or enhancements included a roundabout, traffic calming measures, removal of the Redstone Cross junction and improvements to the existing junction layout.

May 2019 Public Information Exhibition

Following the feedback received at the first PIE, a further option was developed, and further public engagement was undertaken to test it.

170 people attended the second PIE in May 2019 where four options (the three consulted on in April plus the new *further option*) were presented:

1. Option 1A - Northern Route with staggered T-junction.
2. Option 1B - Northern Route with no Redstone Cross Junction;
3. Option 2A - Southern Route with staggered T-junction; and
4. *Option 2B – Southern Route with no Redstone Cross Junction.*

Key feedback received from the attendees included:

- a) 89% of respondents strongly supported the need for improvements between Penblewin Roundabout and through Redstone Cross).
- b) The majority (79%) of respondents agreed with the problems and objectives.
- c) Safety was a key concern at Redstone Cross.
- d) 72 respondents preferred Option 2B, 25 respondents preferred Option 1B, 15 respondents preferred Option 1A, 13 respondents preferred Option 2A, 3 respondents chose both Option 1A or 2A, 5 respondents chose both Option 1B or 2B, and 7 respondents chose No option or left the response blank.
- e) Alternatives or enhancements included alternative junction forms including a roundabout or slip road; speed limit and traffic calming measures; improvements to the current junction and existing A40; and consideration of public transport.

Further information, including drawings of the above options, is provided within the Consultation Document; a copy of which is contained within **Appendix A**.

September 2019 Public Consultation Event

The latest consultation involved a Consultation Event that was held at Queens Hall, High Street, Narberth, SA67 7AS on 2 September 2019 between 12pm and 8pm.

This venue was selected given its appropriate location and public access, including suitable connectivity by walking, cycling, public transport and car. The timing of the events included out-of-working hours to help access all groups of people.

A series of nine bilingual display panels measuring 2m by 1m were prepared for the PIEs as listed below:

- 1. Welcome Board.
- 2. The Problem.
- 3. Scheme Objectives.
- 4. Constraints Plan.
- 5. Route Option and Appraisal Option 1.
- 6. Route Option and Appraisal Option 2.
- 7. Appraisal of Options.
- 8. What Happens Next?
- 9. Thank you - Contact Details.

Copies of the display panels are included within **Appendix B**.

Project team staffing at the consultation event included the following:

1. Welsh Government - Project Engineer.
2. Arup - representatives from the highways team, highways design team and planning team.
3. RML Consulting - the environmental design team lead.
4. MJ Gallimore Consulting- Public Liaison Officer.
5. Arcadis – a representative from the Employer’s Agent team and project management team.

Seven project team members representing the Welsh Government were present at the consultation event and were available to explain the proposals, answer questions and consider any concerns that were raised by the attendees.

Two of the project team members at the consultation event were Welsh speakers. Some preference for communication to be conducted in Welsh was made during the events. All consultation and publicity materials were bilingual.

A register was used at the consultation venue to record total numbers attending the consultation and obtain future contact details to help people stay involved if they wished. The attendance details are shown in the table below.

| Date | Location | Opening Times | Attendance | Attendance / Hour |
|------------------|--|---------------|------------|-------------------|
| 2 September 2019 | The Queens Hall, High Street, Narberth | 12pm - 8pm | 108 | 13.5 |

4. Consultation Feedback

This section provides a summary of the feedback received during the Public Consultation.

Individuals and organisations were encouraged to respond to questions set out on a response form, which could be submitted by freepost to the Welsh Government, by emailing the given project email address, or by submitting an online response using the Welsh Government website (with details provided).

Questions were designed to seek feedback on the options and to help inform design and development work, with a view to supporting meaningful engagement that could help raise any issues, concerns or suggestions for improvements. An open question was also presented to facilitate any other comments, allowing flexibility to all.

Attendees at the consultation event were encouraged by the project team members to submit their responses so that feedback could be captured to assist with analysis and reporting of the consultation.

Consultation responses were not submitted to staff at the consultation event but staff did complete verbal record sheets to record requests for information and capture and issues or points raised. This sought to help facilitate individuals or organisations participating in the consultation, and to help inform ongoing design and development work.

A total of 81 responses were received during the consultation. This included 43 online completed surveys, 17 partially completed online surveys, 13 email responses and eight paper copy responses, received through the post.

No responses were received in the Welsh language, although the questionnaire was bilingual and allowed for Welsh language responses.

Due diligence has been undertaken to avoid the potential for duplication of responses and as such the risk of any duplication is very low and would not significantly affect the results. Consultation analysis has coded responses in order to attribute to comments key themes and topics for consideration, also providing a helpful indicator as to how frequently a particular point has been made. It is important to note that there is some potential for human error in coding, but through due diligence all reasonable steps have been taken to reduce the risk of double counting or inaccurate attribution with robust checking procedures.

Feedback received

The feedback was analysed on a question-by-question basis. Most of the questions were qualitative, therefore the analysis below is structured by the key themes / topics and points that were raised by respondents.

Question 1: Given the outcome of our initial appraisals and feedback provided by the public at the Public Information Exhibitions, Option 2B is considered the likely preferred solution. Do you have any comments on this solution?

The responses to Question 1 are summarised in the table below.

| Comment | Number |
|--|--------|
| Positive impacts/support | |
| Option 2B is the preferred option. Reasons relate to improvements to safety, support to remove Redstone Cross junction, the best compromise in terms of balancing a range of competing needs and demands, improvements to traffic flows, best all-round solution, improves north-south connectivity. One respondent stated that they agreed pending confirmation that the work would not damage any sensitive archaeological or natural sites with many other respondents stating that although Option 2B is their preferred option, some alterations to the existing design are put forward. | 32 |
| Hope that there will be less visual impact with this option / should be less visible than the northern options. | 2 |
| Option 2B avoids the dangers at Redstone Cross. | 1 |
| Currently health is affected by fumes and noise of the existing road and hope that the road improvements will have a beneficial impact. | 1 |
| Alternative Options | |
| A connection is required between Redstone Road and the A40 towards Haverfordwest. Comments included that if Option 2B does go ahead that slip roads should be incorporated as without this connection, there will be traffic problems in Narberth. | 6 |
| Prefer 1B but 2B is good / prefer 1B but 2B is preferred over 2A. | 2 |
| Immediate action is required at Redstone Cross to respond to safety issue such as reintroducing a speed limit as any road improvements will take time. | 2 |
| A junction turning in the region between Sodston House Lodge and Redstone Farm would prevent the issue of double-back movements. | 2 |
| Mitigate potential traffic issues in Narberth by restricting parking in the high street during peak hours. | 1 |
| Traffic should be slowing down and not speeding up – there is no good reason for overtaking opportunities at this location. | 1 |
| The scheme needs to be developed with consideration for what is best for Narberth and not for visitors heading west; improving safer access and egress with Options 1A or 2A. | 1 |
| 2A is better. | 1 |
| Need a clear scheme of signage to prevent lorries from travelling through Narberth. | 1 |
| Strongly object to Option 2B and find the other options also unacceptable. | 1 |
| A dual carriageway between Haverfordwest and St Clears. | 1 |
| Thought needs to be given to the design of Penblewin roundabout, there is a concern that the access off the roundabout would create a series of small fields. | 1 |
| A comprehensive study of drainage is required and plans in place to ensure that a local property is not adversely affected by changes to natural drainage from existing water. | 1 |

| Comment | Number |
|--|--------|
| An ongoing and comprehensive noise survey must be undertaken at a local property. Noise modelling has been undertaken but noise monitoring surveying has not been undertaken at the property. | 1 |
| If this option is adopted, the distance between the road and the care home should be increased and there should be noise and visual impact mitigation measures in place. | 1 |
| Question why a northern route is not being chosen; whilst agreeing that historical sites to the north are important, they are considered small and are of the view that the road could be moved with little expense. The land to the north is also only considered used in the summer months. | 1 |
| Potential Adverse Impacts | |
| Concern for an increase in traffic through Narberth, where problems are already experienced at times, and along the A478 where it is already considered dangerous and busy. Comments included a concern for large vehicles travelling through the town, and for within a town that is not designed for heavy traffic. | 15 |
| Longer journeys would be required for some journeys, incurring extra costs and travel time. | 5 |
| Concern about noise impacts. | 5 |
| Concern for the impact on the environment of local residents and care home residents. | 5 |
| Removing the Redstone Cross junction would restrict movements e.g. to the west. | 4 |
| Impact on businesses - local B&B business as the road would affect the nature of the setting and the tranquillity/impact on accessibility and will function as a deterrence/impact on passing trade. | 4 |
| Concern about the impact on property values and the potential issues with future sales. | 3 |
| The scheme would cause distress and discomfort. | 3 |
| Only concern is that / views are not lost and the proximity to the road. | 3 |
| Negative impact on the care home. | 2 |
| Concern about the impact the scheme would have on enjoyment in the garden. | 2 |
| Concern for the impact on dirt pollution. | 2 |
| Home would become an island with two main roads on either side. | 2 |
| Does not direct traffic away from householders. | 2 |
| Options to the north would have less impact. | 2 |
| Long term adverse impacts on Narberth's ability to grow should there be a need for housing and building expansion. | 2 |
| Concern about the impact on light pollution. | 2 |
| Concern for health and safety risks for construction workers and the public/impact of particulates. | 2 |
| Might be awkward for those living nearby. | 1 |
| Concern about the impact on air quality. | 1 |

| Comment | Number |
|---|--------|
| Concern about impact on dust and mud. | 1 |
| Narberth is expanding northwards, therefore, this option is likely to have a worse impact than the northern options. | 1 |
| Other | |
| Narberth is not mentioned in the objectives. | 2 |
| Options 1B and 2B have the same scores. | 2 |
| Too much weight is being given to improving accessibility along the A40, not the relevant issues surrounding Redstone Cross. | 1 |
| All three meetings attended have been informative and lively at times. | 1 |
| The LDP has focused economic growth in this area to keep the heavy vehicles from having to travel through Narberth – has there been consultation with PCC? | 1 |
| It seems obvious that the purpose of this project is to increase the traffic flow on the A40 to the detriment of the local community. | 1 |
| Surprised options have been discarded and put out for consultation prior to adequate traffic surveys. | 1 |
| Narberth receives more visitors compared to Haverfordwest which has deteriorated in recent years. | 1 |
| Would be useful to have the information published on how many people responded to the question of retaining the junction or not and how many of those people resided in the town or surrounding villages. | 1 |
| Agree that all options would improve safety but do not agree that Option 2B will provide greater benefit owing to increased overtaking opportunities. | 1 |
| A survey should possibly be undertaken to see how many cars have exceeded the speed limit between Canaston Bridge and Clarkenhill farm. | 1 |
| How many traffic violations have occurred in recent years since the construction of the A40 Penblewin – Slebech Park Road improvement scheme? | 1 |
| Concerned as to why Option 2B is preferred when it was not in the original consultations. | 1 |
| Option 2B directly impact on properties however online improvements have been ruled out due to the impact on property. | 1 |
| Welsh Assembly stopped the M4 due to environmental impacts, feeling that it is for profit over people. | 1 |

In summary, the key points raised in response to Question 1 are:

1. A large number of respondents explicitly state their support for Option 2B as the preferred option with many comments relating to the improvements to safety.
2. Many respondents are concerned for the impact that Option 2B would have on traffic through Narberth, with a number of comments noting that the existing situation is problematic and will be exacerbated with no junction at Redstone Cross. A number of respondents also raise their concern for the increase in journey length for some journeys with no junction at Redstone Cross.
3. A few respondents stated that some form of connection needs to be maintained between Redstone Road and the A40 towards Haverfordwest.
4. A concern for the impact on property within proximity of Option 2B is clear, with a concern for the impact on property value, environment and amenity cited. There is also concern for the impacts on Blaenmarlais Care Home.
5. The impact on the environment is cited as a concern by a few respondents including the impact of noise and air pollution.
6. A concern is also raised for the impact on businesses within the vicinity due to adverse impacts on journeys and also the adverse impact on amenity for a local B&B.
7. It is also explicitly noted by two respondents that the focus on the scheme should be more on Narberth than the strategic objectives.

Question 2: Some concerns have been raised with Option 2B (see preferred solution section of the consultation document). In your opinion, are there any enhancements that could be made to Option 2B to address these concerns?

The responses to Question 2 are summarised in the table below.

| Comment | Number |
|--|--------|
| Enhancements / alternatives | |
| To provide access onto the A40 to the north of Narberth within the vicinity of Redstone Cross / via slip road or roundabout / towards Haverfordwest / both east and west. Comments included that the existing proposal would cause traffic problems in Narberth and reduce connectivity for locals and businesses; and a question why another roundabout is not considered when there are ones nearby and this could serve to eliminate accidents and maintain access to the industrial estate. | 23 |
| Adequate signage for routes for larger vehicles and towards local businesses. | 5 |
| Traffic should be accommodated by junction turning between Sodston House Lodge and Redstone Farm to avoid double-back movements and unnecessary traffic. | 3 |
| A northern route. | 2 |
| Creating sharp junctions with the new alignment is likely to give rise to hazardous situations. It is likely that the advantages of facilitating Haverfordwest / Narberth flows is likely to be outweighed by road safety concerns. | 1 |
| Staggered junction or roundabout. | 1 |
| Laybys. | 1 |
| Option 2A is preferred. | 1 |
| Design the junction and overbridge to be wide enough for articulated lorries, removing the need for travel through Narberth. | 1 |
| Any enhancement would be costly and might not be achievable. Could widen the B4314 or improve parking in Narberth however it would be best to retain the junction. | 1 |
| Construct road at the lowest practical level with bunds and/or acoustic screens where required to reduce noise and visual impacts. | 1 |
| Realign Redstone Road so that it sweeps around to existing A40 but do share concerns that this could increase speeds. | 1 |
| Restrict parking in the town centre. | 1 |
| Balustrades on the bridge to be a minimum of 1.8m to safely accommodate horses. | 1 |
| Dual carriageway. | 1 |
| Surprised that the scheme ends at Jacobs Park as this leaves a relatively short section of unimproved road. | 1 |
| Measures would be needed to improve traffic flow if implemented. | 1 |
| Other concerns | |
| Concern for the impact of large vehicles travelling through Narberth which already experiences problems, including due to the narrow streets and roadside parking. | 3 |

| Comment | Number |
|--|--------|
| The increased distances travelled / would increase emissions and it does not appear possible to mitigate this. This is one of the reasons for the objection. | 2 |
| Concern for visual and noise impact – welcome ideas such as tree planting. | 1 |
| Although there would be no diversion of bus services, the scheme would deliver no benefit and would put services at an increased disadvantage to private car travel, potentially resulting in losses of patronage. This is one of the reasons for the objection. | 1 |
| Catastrophic impact on Narberth by cutting off access and limiting the ability of the town to expand. | 1 |
| No concerns/willing to accept diversions | |
| Willing to have diversions for the provision of a safer junction. | 3 |
| Do not believe the option would negatively impact traffic in Narberth as large vehicles can still use the A40 junction, even if it requires slightly longer journeys. | 2 |
| Do not believe it will impact bus services. | 2 |
| Do not see how this option would negatively impact on Narberth as feared by some. Removing the junction would not make me drive all around Narberth, I avoid the high street if possible, already due to traffic problems / Do not consider possible concerns serious or credible. | 2 |
| Not sure how to best reconcile issues regarding access to some local properties and businesses however I would not envisage a major impact on traffic flows through Narberth as better routes are already available. | 1 |
| Closing one of the three routes into Narberth is not a big issue. | 1 |
| No revisions required. | 1 |
| Other | |
| No. | 4 |
| The plan is top-heavy in its plans to remove Redstone Cross junction. | 1 |
| Business owners are in favour yet residents' views have been ignored. | 1 |

In summary, the key responses to Question 2 are:

1. A large number of respondents would like Option 2B to incorporate a connection between Redstone Road and the new A40 e.g. via a western slip road or a junction proving access east and west.
2. Good signage has been suggested by many respondents, to improve the likelihood of large vehicles travelling via the A40 as opposed to along the A478 via Narberth. Good signage would also enhance the visibility of local businesses.
3. Other junction suggestions include providing a junction between Sodston House Lodge and Redstone Farm, and providing a staggered junction or roundabout in the place of Redstone Cross junction.

Question 3: What Active Travel provision (walking, cycling, horse riding) would you like to see incorporated within Option 2B?

The responses to Question 3 are summarised in the table below.

| Comment | Number |
|--|--------|
| Enhancements | |
| Explicitly stated support for improvements to cycling. Comments include incorporating cycle routes on the existing A40 / A478 and resurfacing Redstone Road to remove potholes of which make it highly unsafe for cyclists. | 30 |
| Explicitly stated support for improvements for walking. Comments include the provision of a footpath/cycle route between Narberth and north of the Landsker border; a circular route between Narberth and Penblewin; provision along the old A40 and the A478; footpaths with good lighting; and turning surplus land into walking routes or park areas where possible. | 25 |
| Explicitly stated support of improvements for horse riding. Comments include connecting north and south of the A40 via bridleways and having a segregated bridleway running parallel to the A40. | 10 |
| The proposed bridge should be wide e.g. to provide ample provision for pedestrians, dog walkers, buggies, bicycles and disability scooters. Horse riding also would require a minimum of 1.8m Balustrade across the bridge. | 3 |
| Reduce speed limits e.g. on the old A40 / to an enforced 30mph zone with 20mph in Narberth / reduce speed of traffic at Redstone Cross. | 3 |
| Provision for the less mobile and for motorised wheelchairs including improving surfaces, providing appropriate gradients and good lighting. | 1 |
| Maintenance/creation of active travel provision along the bypassed section of the A40. | 1 |
| Ensure that priority is given to making Redstone Cross as safe as possible for all road users. | 1 |
| A park area with a lake, nature reserve and tea rooms. | 1 |
| A bus route along the B4313 from Narberth to Fishguard through Maenclochog. | 1 |
| Money could be better spent from this project on improving public transport, cycle tracks etc. | 1 |
| Existing situation | |
| It is currently not safe for active travel users in the region of the A40. | 1 |
| There are no safe cycle tracks in a five-mile radius. | 1 |
| Footpaths to the north of Narberth are very narrow and not suitable. | 1 |
| It is currently extremely dangerous to cross the A40 – you are literally taking your life in your hands. | 1 |
| Comments on Option 2B | |
| Removing the crossing will allow safer active travel movements. | 4 |
| Assume that active travel would be catered on the old road. | 1 |
| The new bridge is the strongest argument in favour of Options 1B and 2B. The benefits would appear small due to the lack of demand for active travel on the B4313 north of Redstone Cross. | 1 |

| Comment | Number |
|--|--------|
| Limited provision for active travel facilities are already provided as part of Option 2B's proposals. None of the options would make significant improvements. | 1 |
| Concerns / against active travel improvements | |
| Do not see how active travel improvements can be incorporated into the scheme. | 3 |
| Not in favour of the creation of new cycle paths as most cyclists continue to use the roads anyway so it would be a waste of resources. | 1 |
| Active travel provision would be a waste of space and there are not enough people around for such provision. | 1 |
| No as there is enough countryside for this. | 1 |
| Do not see horse riding as an option due to the speed of traffic and huge lorries on Redstone Road. | 1 |
| Other | |
| None / nil / no. | 4 |
| Should integrate with other planned active travel improvements. | 2 |
| Public transport does not seem to feature in the options. | 1 |

In summary, the key points raised in response to Question 3 are:

1. There is evidently overall support for cycling, walking and horse-riding improvements including the following suggestions:
2. Incorporating active travel provision along the existing A40.
3. Resurfacing potholes.
4. Provision of more walking routes.
5. Provision of a segregated bridleway.
6. Ensuring that the proposed bridge is sufficiently wide for active travel.
7. Reduce speed limits on the existing A40 and through Narberth.
8. Improvements aimed at those with mobility impairments.
9. Option 2B will provide enhancements for active travel users e.g. by removing the Redstone Cross junction.
10. Do not see how improvements to active travel could be incorporated.
11. Improvements should integrate with other planned active travel improvements in the area.

Question 4: Do you have any further comments on Option 2B?

The responses to Question 4 are summarised in the table below.

| Comment | Number |
|--|--------|
| Positive impacts/support | |
| Option 2B is the best / preferred / reasonable option. | 9 |
| Support for no junction at Redstone Cross. | 5 |
| Would like works to commence as soon as possible. | 5 |
| The proposals would provide a safer environment e.g. for residents of the local care home who can currently more easily wonder onto the A40; for cyclists. | 2 |
| The proposals could improve traffic in Narberth as people travelling north of the A40 from Narberth direction would be more likely to use the overbridge, as there would no longer be a fear of queuing. | 1 |
| We would get used to whatever proposals are put in place. | 1 |
| Adverse impacts | |
| Concern for the impact of proposals on the traffic in Narberth / please consider the impact / Narberth currently already experiences problems with traffic. | 5 |
| Option 2B would have adverse environmental impacts including landscape and visual impacts due to loss of woodland and embankments and cuttings/biodiversity impacts due to the damage on broadleaved woodland / facilitating faster traffic flows would not reduce carbon emissions. | 3 |
| Some journeys would be negatively affected e.g. longer journeys of which would not save on carbon emissions / reduced local connectivity would impact on me as a resident and business owner / more fuel and travel time. | 3 |
| The scheme focuses too heavily on motorists e.g. as opposed to public transport. | 2 |
| Overtaking provision will make the road more dangerous and increase the number of accidents. | 1 |
| The new road would be expensive and reduce the availability of funds. | 1 |
| Object on the basis of environmental and health concerns. | 1 |
| Alternative options | |
| Support the idea of a slip road / or roundabout from Redstone Cross heading west / heading west and east / would save on fuel and travel time. | 3 |
| Slow traffic down at the junction approach. | 2 |
| Limiting objectives to improving safety at Redstone Cross, acting in a globally responsible manner by minimising the impact on the global environment, and minimising the impact on the local environment. This would allow option of a roundabout or staggered junction to be revived which would avoid most of the biodiversity and greenhouse gas impacts. A roundabout would have the greatest improvements to safety and journey time reliability however this does not appear practical at the location. A staggered junction would, therefore, be preferable with minimal disruption during construction, with a short new route for the B4313 to join the A40 slightly west of its current position. | 2 |
| Dual carriageway required / would favour a roundabout so a dual carriageway could still be built. | 2 |

| Comment | Number |
|--|--------|
| Better public transport would promote health, more equal society, promote cohesive communities and be globally responsible / however public transport alone would not solve safety issues. | 2 |
| 2A is better. | 1 |
| Redstone Cross junction should be redesigned in conjunction with a lower speed limit. | 1 |
| Ensure good cycle provision through the inclusion of segregated lanes at Penblewin roundabout. | 1 |
| Do not do it. | 1 |
| Need clear signage and lane markings at the new Penblewin roundabout. | 1 |
| Existing situation | |
| The current layout of Redstone Cross is dangerous especially for those unaware of the potential hazards. | 2 |
| Find it worrying that our son cycles on this stretch. | 1 |
| Other | |
| Cannot see how proposals could safely incorporate active travel e.g. horse riding along the main trunk road. | 1 |
| Before a preferred option is chosen, details of traffic surveys relating to Narberth need to be published with a further opportunity for public consultation provided. | 1 |
| It seems that there has been more thought put into accessibility to Haverfordwest, the ferry ports and Milford Haven than to Narberth residents. | 1 |

In summary, the key points raised in response to Question 4 are as follows:

1. Many respondents expressed their support for Option 2B and the removal of the Redstone Cross junction with a handful of respondents expressing that they would like to see the works commence as soon as possible.
2. There is a clear concern for the impact of proposals on the traffic flow within Narberth. One respondent did, however, comment on the potential improvements to traffic flow given the improved north-south connectivity at the location of Redstone Cross.
3. The removal of Redstone Cross junction would require longer journeys to be travelled for some journeys and this was raised by a number of respondents as a negative impact.
4. A number of respondents commented on the potential adverse environmental impact of the scheme including on the landscape and carbon emissions.
5. Alternative options or suggested improvements included: slowing traffic down around Redstone Cross junction; a slip road providing access onto the A40 to the west, or to both the west and east; changing the objectives to focus on local issues and the environment; and constructing a dual carriageway. Another comment also referred to ensuring that cycle provision is integrated at Penblewin roundabout.

6. Safety is of key concern for many respondents and comments included that the proposals offer potential safety improvements for care home residents and cyclists, whilst other comments are concerned about the potential for more accidents with increased overtaking opportunities.
7. One respondent expressed that they would like to see the results of traffic surveys relating to the impact of proposals in Narberth, and further consultation after this has been published, before a preferred route is chosen.
8. One respondent also commented that it is their view that the scheme has focused more heavily on strategic connections than on issues relating to Narberth, whilst another stated that the scheme has focused on motorists too heavily as opposed to public transport.

Welsh Language questions

Question A: We would like to know your views on the effects that the A40 Penblewin to Redstone Cross Improvements would have on the Welsh language, specifically on opportunities for people to use Welsh and on treating the Welsh language no less favourably than English. What effects do you think there would be? How could positive effects be increased, or negative effects be mitigated?

The following key points were made:

1. Most respondents (20) that responded to this question stated that there would be no or limited impact on the Welsh language through the scheme. Comments included:
 - a) Scheme signage is presumed to be bilingual.
 - b) There would be no impact on the learners travelling to the Welsh classes in Bloomfield House.
 - c) The scheme would maintain the ability to travel to other locations to speak Welsh and.
 - d) Narberth is not particularly a Welsh-speaking area therefore no impact is envisaged.
2. Five respondents explicitly noted that they did not see the link between the scheme and the Welsh language; two respondents stated that it was a non-issue whilst one respondent stated that they would not know.
3. Three respondents stated that the scheme would improve north-south connectivity between the A40, connecting Welsh-speaking and English-speaking communities.
4. A couple of concerns were raised regarding the Welsh language with one respondent stating that bilingual signage is confusing whilst another respondent commented that it can be cumbersome if not carefully considered.
5. One respondent noted that new signage should have Welsh language and English language in different colours, with the majority use language first. This is because there is often not enough time to read the message when travelling past.

6. One respondent expressed that access to Welsh language lessons at Bloomfield Community Centre would become more difficult with Option 2B. As noted above, another respondent stated that it was their view that there would be no impact.
7. One respondent supported all signage to be in Welsh and stated that they did not expect signage to be in English in Wales.
8. One respondent stated that visitors do not take notice of the Welsh language as they believe it is old fashioned.

Question B: Please also explain how you believe the proposed policy the A40 Penblewin to Redstone Cross Improvements could be formulated or changed so as to have positive effects or increased positive effects on opportunities for people to use the Welsh language and on treating the Welsh language no less favourably than the English language, and no adverse effects on opportunities for people to use the Welsh language and on treating the Welsh language no less favourably than the English language.

The following key points were made:

1. Nine respondents stated 'not at all' or 'none' in response to Question B. With a further six respondents stating that they did not have any ideas and one additional respondent stating that this was not an issue.
2. Three respondents expressed that they did not see the relevance of the question including a comment that everything has been done bilingually.
3. Three respondents also noted that the improved north-south connectivity would encourage Welsh speakers from the north of the A40 and English speakers from the south to mix more and would encourage the use of the Welsh language.
4. Two respondents stated that all signs should be bilingual. Another respondent stated that the signage should be clearly visible and ensure that English speakers have enough time to follow the signage in English, whilst another respondent stated that signage should have Welsh language in one colour and English in another, with the majority use language first.
5. Suggestions for improvements included better public transport links between north and south Pembrokeshire (one respondent) and new signage to indicate Narberth's link with the tales of the Mabinogion (one other respondent).
6. One respondent stated that producing consultation material in both Welsh and English was a waste of money and that Welsh speakers should instead request a copy if required.

Question C: We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them.

The following key points were made:

1. Five respondents stated no in response.
2. One respondent stated that environmental impact surely outweighs cultural heritage and that the well-being of existing and future populations should be considered first.
3. Ensure the legibility and visibility at Penblewin roundabout as there is a concern that the two entry/exit points could increase slow speed collisions (one respondent).
4. Ensure that there is direct access from Redstone Road to Carmarthen and Haverfordwest (one respondent).
5. Concern for the impact on traffic through Narberth and suggest improvements within the town (one respondent).
6. One respondent noted the traffic problems caused by cars having to park on the road near their homes.
7. There are traffic problems in Narberth where people have to park their cars on the road outside their homes (One respondent).
8. Include balustrades on Redstone Bridge (One respondent).
9. For the consultation to have included details on the impact of each option on traffic flows in Narberth including the responses of the Highway Authority to them (One respondent).
10. Remove the junction and lives will be saved (One respondent).
11. Prefer Option 1A (One respondent).
12. The improvement of a majority of roads in Pembrokeshire (One respondent).
13. Consider how to address the issue of ash dieback disease on the landscape with replanting trees (One respondent).
14. Improve the signage for business traffic (One respondent).

Other responses

Some responses received via email did not provide a structured response in a question-answer format. Therefore, those responses are summarised in this separate section.

1. Similar to responses noted previously, four of the six responses noted that Option 2B would require longer travel routes including HGVs. Three respondents also noted their concern for traffic problems within Narberth because of the scheme.
2. A concern for the removal of Redstone Cross junction and having no connection onto the A40 from Haverfordwest was also raised.
3. Recommendations for a link to the A40 were noted including a suggestion for a roundabout, a reformed staggered junction and a junction between Sodston House Lodge and Redstone Farm.
4. Another comment related to the desire for more bus stops for example outside Maes Yr Odyn. This respondent also stated that it is particularly difficult to wait for buses standing up with a disability.

5. Stakeholder Feedback

In addition to the public consultation feedback summarised above, there has been ongoing engagement with a number of stakeholders as part of the option development, including Pembrokeshire County Council (PCC), Narberth Town Council, Sustrans, Design Commission for Wales, South Wales Trunk Road Agent (SWTRA), Cadw, Dyfed Archaeological Trust (DAT), Natural Resources Wales (NRW) and politicians (MPs and AMs).

The project's Environmental Liaison Group met on a regular basis comprising the project team, PCC, SWTRA, Cadw, DAT and NRW throughout the development of the Scheme.

Additional engagement has been undertaken with PCC with a meeting held in May 2019 to present the shortlisted options and provide an opportunity to seek feedback. PCC considered Option 2B to have a number of advantages over the other options including in terms of strategic connectivity, journey time reliability, overtaking opportunities and safety. Concerns for the impact of the removal of Redstone Cross junction were expressed, with PCC recommending that the potential impact on traffic around Narberth should be reviewed. PCC considered how the proposals could tie in with PCC's active travel plans. A further meeting with PCC was held in October 2019 in relation to the preferred option.

Narberth Town Council and the local community organised a meeting to discuss route options with the project team in June 2019. The meeting was held in Bloomfield House Community Centre and approximately 35 people from the local community were in attendance. The project team were invited to answer questions on the scheme and proposed options. Concerns expressed by the local community included potential impacts on traffic through Narberth, on the environment and noise, and on Blaenmarlais care home. Attendees put forward suggestions including a northern route with a roundabout; a grade separated style junction with 4 slip roads and Option 1B with a westbound on-slip from Redstone Road.

Cllr Sue Rees provided a written letter in May 2019 detailing her concerns regarding the proposals in relation to Narberth following attendance at the exhibition held in May 2019 at Bloomfield House.

In May 2019, Cllr Vic Dennis wrote an article in the Narberth and Whitland Observer welcoming further consultation as part of the May 2019 Public Information Exhibition after a fourth option was revealed.

Sustrans were also consulted with and provided feedback in relation to the options at the May Public Information Exhibition. Their concerns related to the impacts of the scheme and the objectives. Sustrans also noted how the proposals did not include proposals for active travel improvements. It was then communicated that the development of active travel improvements were in progress and detailed proposals would be formed at a later stage.

The project team have presented to and engaged with the Design Commission for Wales throughout the scheme development. The next meeting is planned to be held in December 2019 to discuss the preferred option proposals.

A letter from Simon Hart MP was received in September 2019. Simon Hart MP offered his support in principle for the scheme as a welcome addition to the A40 Llanddewi Velfrey improvements. Issues of concern for proposals included the potential impact on local residents including the elderly at Blaenmarlais Care Home, and the potential impact on traffic in Narberth.

6. Summary of Key Points

The key points expressed in the August – September 2019 Consultation are summarised below:

1. Many respondents offered their support for Option 2B (as also expressed during the two Public Information Exhibitions previously held). Many respondents generally supported the option however would like to see alterations, enhancements and/or additions to the existing proposal design. A number of respondents also expressed their opposition to the scheme.
2. A key concern expressed was the impact that Option 2B would have on traffic in Narberth with a number of respondents stating that there are currently traffic problems at certain times through the town and this would be exacerbated through the removal of the connection to the A40 to the north of Redstone Road. There was particular concern relating to the problems that large vehicles would cause to traffic flows through Narberth. A couple of respondents noted that good signage could mitigate this issue by directing HGV drivers via the existing A40.
3. Many respondents wanted the connection to the A40 (to the north of Redstone Road) to be maintained in some form. Options suggested to achieve this included a western slip road, roundabout or staggered junction. This would enable connectivity to the trunk road to be maintained and would avoid causing traffic problems through Narberth and avoid creating longer routes for some journeys. Removing the junction was also viewed by some to potentially cause adverse impacts on local businesses.

4. Conversely, many respondents expressed their support for the removal of the Redstone Cross junction.
5. Concerns for the impact on residential property and the care home were expressed. These concerns were for the impact on property value, amenity, noise, pollution and views. The impact on the environment was also cited as a general concern by a few respondents including concerns for increased carbon emissions due to longer journeys.
6. A few respondents stated that there should be more focus on responding to Narberth's traffic problems and improving the transport network.
7. There was overall support for active travel improvements for cycling, walking and horse riding. Suggestions included: incorporating active travel provision along the existing A40, providing more cycle, walking and horse-riding routes, ensuring that the proposed bridge is wide enough to sufficiently accommodate all active travel users; reduce speed limits on the existing A40 and through Narberth, provide improvements aimed at those with mobility impairments. Other planned active travel improvements in the area were mentioned and would serve as an opportunity to join up proposals.
8. One respondent expressed that the results of traffic surveys should be published and that the public should be engaged following this and prior to the selection of a preferred option.
9. Most respondents felt that there would be no or limited impact on the Welsh language through the scheme or felt that they did not see a link between the scheme and the Welsh language. Some respondents noted that the scheme would improve north-south connectivity between the A40, connecting Welsh and English-speaking communities.
10. A variety of comments were received in relation to signage and the Welsh language including suggestions that signage should have Welsh language in one colour and English in another as currently, there is sometimes not enough time to read the signage.

It is considered that the exhibitions achieved the following objectives set out as part of the exhibition:

11. To attract as many people as possible to the consultation, from a range of backgrounds and interests.
12. To share our key messages about the project, openly and honestly, and provide a fair and balanced representation of the project.
13. To reduce potential opposition to the project by explaining the need for the proposals, addressing any concerns, queries or misconceptions, and putting people at ease.
14. To give the opportunity and encourage any feedback to be submitted to the Welsh Government.
15. To educate people about the process required to progress the project.

7. Next Steps

Following the Public Consultation and the analysis of the responses that this report contains, the Welsh Government will consider further the findings and make amendments to the proposals accordingly.

The Welsh Government then intend to decide upon a preferred route, which will be published. With this, a statutory notice will be served known as a TR 111, under Article 19 of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Wales) Order 2012 (as amended). This will safeguard the line of the proposed road, protecting it from development.

An anticipated timeline for the development of the proposals is provided below:

| Activity | Key Dates | Description |
|---|-------------|--|
| Publish Preferred Route | Autumn 2019 | Following this consultation, we will consider all feedback and undertake further option appraisals to help identify a preferred option. A preferred route would be announced. |
| Publication of draft Orders and an Environmental Statement | Early 2020 | If required, these will set out the land that would be required to build the Scheme and the environmental mitigation work that would be involved. It would detail local accesses and provision of Private Means of Access. The public will then have the opportunity to formally object or support the Scheme or suggest an alternative. |
| Potential Public Inquiry | Summer 2020 | If a Public Inquiry is required, an independent Inspector would hear evidence, in front of the public, from interested parties and stakeholders. The Inspector would make a recommendation to the Welsh Ministers on how to proceed. |
| Welsh Ministers' Decision to make the Orders | Early 2021 | The Welsh Ministers would decide whether to make Statutory Orders to go ahead with the construction of the Scheme. |
| Appoint Design & Build (D&B) Contractor | Early 2021 | A contractor would undertake detailed design and construction of the Scheme. |
| Commence Construction on Site | Summer 2021 | Construction works would start. |
| A40 Improvements Open | Late 2022 | The preferred solution would be implemented and opened to the public. |

Appendix A: [A40 Penblewin to Redstone Cross improvements consultation](#)

Appendix B: Display panels – [A40 Penblewin to Redstone Cross improvements](#)
[public information exhibition: September 2019](#)