

I object to Route 30 because:

â€¢ It was chosen without input from key stakeholders, including the residents of the village of Cowley. Despite requests from residents, there was never a briefing meeting including them (a briefing was refused in 2019) and so our opinions were never heard.

â€¢ It fails to take into consideration the interests of our village and its residents.

â€¢ It is the most expensive option. It also seems disproportionately expensive given that this option would confer little gain for road users and at the same time would inflict the greatest possible disruption to this AONB, this landscape, these villages and all inhabitants.

â€¢ It will result in construction traffic that will cause irreparable damage and disruption to local villages/villagers, roads, wildlife and businesses. The roads will be irreversibly damaged and in particular widened, pot-holed, with damaged vegetation/hedgerows/curbs, due to heavy construction traffic.

â€¢ It will cause huge and everlasting damage to our AONB and could jeopardise the Cotswolds elevation to National Park status! To quote the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), â€œplanning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances.â€• (Paras 176 & 177).

My preferred route is option 12 because:

â€¢ It follows the existing A417 route, doing much less damage to the surrounding landscape and our community. By just widening the route half the damage has already occurred.

â€¢ It is better for the environment/atmosphere with reduced speed limits of 50 mph producing less carbon dioxide, and are already clearly used in multiple examples of motorways around the country and overseas. N.B. Heads of the Valleys Road construction reduced speed limit to 50mph from 70mph was advantageous for the environment

â€¢ It offers minimal disruption to lorries which, whatever option is chosen, would be unable to go above 50mph anyway on this â€˜stretch' due to either the significant uphill or downhill gradients.

â€¢ It would improve road safety, to some extent would improve journey times, would reduce cut-through driving through villages and improves pollution, whilst, unlike option 30, preserving more of our wildlife, our farms, our landscape and our treasured public footpaths.

â€¢ There are new environmental/social factors which should be taken into consideration but have not been. In light of new COVID working practises, Brexit and proposed changes to the speed limit on the existing A417, the research currently underpinning the proposal is now outdated and should be re-visited to be relevant to our current times. This is because certain changes to the way we live, drive and work will likely reduce the number of vehicles on the road and the potential usage of this road. For instance, the general move to increased working from home. Also, the ever-increasing pressure to address environmental issues as a matter of public policy means that people will be encouraged to use public transport more and use cars/the road less.