

Cherry Bartlett

Response to the answers given by SPH in document SPH\_GREX\_WED5\_01 following my written submission

Using the numbering in the SPH answers I would make the following further points:

1. Consideration of alternative routes - SPH say that there is no alternative to using Fford Cefyn Du, but the representatives of both Gwynneth Council and AECOM at the so-called "consultative meeting" all confirmed that they had not been asked to look at alternative routes and were only required to consider what would be needed to bring Fford Cefyn Du up to the standard that SPH want. I have referred to the so-called consultative meeting as it was clear that there wasn't much consulting being done by the AECOM staff who had never previously visited the site, could only say they had done what they were asked in drawing up plans, and could answer few questions outside the immediate (poor) limited knowledge they had. However they had even more bad news for residents, as it is clear that in order to create a 4m road all the way from the A4085 to Q1 will involve the green verges being buried under tarmac, residents' driveways being raised, roadside walls to be reinforced thereby possibly losing their current appearance of a pleasant country lane, and the possibility that future flooding will affect properties more seriously even than now because of the lack of suitable drainage on the carriageway. Mike Vicovitch has carried out a great deal of work on an alternative between Q6 and Q1 and shown how a viable alternative could be created. The standard and professionalism of his work on many aspects of the project is clearly well above that of the SPH representatives who appear to have carried out very cursory investigations. An alternative route has been identified and described in detail by Mike showing that it can be done and may even be quicker and more cost effective than that proposed by SPH

2. Businesses - SPH's only response to the issue that businesses along the route would be destroyed by their action was to reiterate that the times HGVs would use it was 08.30am to 4.30pm. Just how this might help those such as holiday home owners is hard to fathom, but as that is their only response it is clear that they have no regard or concern about the effect they will have on the livelihood of people and the local economy which is largely based around tourism

3. Safety and the fears of local residents - Again the time limits for traffic are cited as mitigation, are SPH claiming that residents, cyclists, horse riders etc should only use the route before 08.30 and after 4.30 if they want to be safe? Banksmen are mentioned, but the staff at the "consultation" were unable to clarify how they would operate to ensure people's safety. SPH responses repeatedly indicate that the construction traffic will not use the road passing the local primary school. SPH are being very disingenuous, as they are perfectly well aware that one of the major concerns is for the secondary school children who catch buses to and from schools in the area at the Groeslon crossroads. Even if they get on busses before 08.30 they will certainly be returning before 4.30pm and walking home along the routes used by HGVs for five years, and during the predicted six months that the road works will take. This is a great concern for everyone along the route. SPH claim that the HGVs will stick to reduced speed limits, give way to other road users and that there will be room for HGVs to safely pass these road users. The speed limit is for the HGVs only and the road is otherwise unrestricted, this means that other road users have the potential to drive faster on a resurfaced and widened road, increasing the likelihood of the boy-racers increasingly using it. HGV drivers are not known for being the gentlemen (or women) of the road, who will police their behaviour? Does a child need to be injured before residents are taken seriously? The question of what will happen to the cars of residents who currently park on Fford Cefyn Du was raised at the "consultation" event, and it became clear that the representatives present had no idea what if any proposals were being made to ensure that t

they could park safely, pedestrians and others could pass around their cars safely and HGVs could pass them. There had been talk of an alternative parking area being offered but there was no knowledge of this at the meeting. This is a very clumsy answer to the problem and still makes life difficult for many people. I have raised the issue of "fear and intimidation" being considered as part of the Environmental Statement. SPH made no direct response to this except to reiterate all the usual stuff about the primary school, the "consultation Meeting" etc. However it was suggested that mobile phones be supplied to residents so that they could contact the developers to find out if it was safe for them to leave or return to their homes. If this doesn't indicate that residents have plenty to be afraid of what does? How could anyone live not knowing if they could safely leave or return to their house for five and a half years? What sort of development is this that places citizens in such a position?

The SPH response about the route continually refers to their plans for the route as "Highway Improvements". This road is not a "highway" it is a quiet country lane. An "improvement" is usually thought to be a process that makes something better than it was before, for the residents and other users of the route it will most definitely not be better than it was before. The people living along it and in Waunfawr don't want "highway improvements", they are satisfied with the "Green Lane" as it is and want it to remain that way.

A viable alternative has been proposed and deserves very serious consideration and, if rejected, then very clear reasons provided.