

A14 PUBLIC INQUIRY SUBMISSION Huntingdon racecourse 15 to 17 September 2015
{HWE refers to High Ways England}

Issues I wish to have brought to attention are: (A) LOCAL (B) GENERAL

I think it important to state I had very helpful, and much appreciated, responses from staff I talked to.

I have kept this short as you have the data from other inputs to support my points. The concepts involved below need stressing and addressing, rather than getting lost in material you already have.

LOCAL:

- 1) Noise increase Brampton, Buckden Marina and Hinton. Evidence from local groups that noise will be significantly higher than HWE predict during post construction normal road use.
Further mitigation was raised as post build option: No GHG factoring or cost on this was available.
- 2) Visual degradation: There would still be intrusive degradation at Buckden Marina.
- 3) Wildlife effects: There were no answers forthcoming on this at the inquiry. Given overwhelming evidence about bio diversity decline, the lack of adequate response to hand indicates a low priority on this .Not satisfactory.
- 4) Inquiry evidence : The inquiries I attended were well chaired, allowing views to be expressed.
HWE noise pollution and air quality degradation figures were presented as “worst case”. However, these were regularly shown to be highly circumspect, with basic data against the HWE case left out, undermining the claim of HWE to be neutral and also public confidence. All members of the public present I talked to, said the whole affair was pre-decided at a much higher level, a forgone conclusion from the start with HWE being told to “prove a case”. This needs consideration.
- 4) Forthcoming Parish consultations: There is a major issue of resolving direct local objections within the structure and time frame of these meetings. No adequate measures that meet public confidence on this point are in place. The replies received indicated local concerns would be ignored in the case of a head on clash.

(B) GENERAL

Sustainability: Environmental Targets: THE BIGGER CONTEXT

None of the data I have been able to look at gives adequate answers to fundamental questions on this when set within national and international targets on GHG reduction.

- a) GHG targets are not being met. The project will increase GHG levels. All scientific advice asks for a reduction. An “elephant in the room “ ignored and glossed over.
- b) Sustainability: When set against wider resource availability and demand, little consideration seems to be given to this.
Given that national figures on population growth and inextricably linked GHG emissions have consistently been higher than government estimates, this becomes even more of a serious concern.
The assumption from step one with the whole project is that growth can continue in its existing form, with expanding population numbers. Pressure on resources has not featured as a prime consideration. This is not adequate sustainable planning. Another “elephant in the room.”
- c) The Term “sustainability” was used in a very precise way in the planning discussion but confuses local and financial management with a long term and effective definition of sustainability. This is highly misleading, often confused with “mitigation”. Two definitions are needed:
 - (i) Change the current misleading use of the term “ sustainability” to what it is being used for by HWE, ie local and immediate resource management.
 - (ii) Use “sustainability” correctly being defined in terms of renewable resources only. This has not been done and is a serious environmental failure.

The real challenge this project shows up is a very difficult one for the UK.

How to maintain, and develop living standards, using a more realistic definition of sustainability?