

Notes on Applicant's Submission

Early on Ramblers understood that there would be an Environment Heritage and Landscape Technical Working Group that our relevant Officer would be able to attend. Apparently the EHL TWG only met once and its output missed the Air Balloon Inn - a place regarded as an Historic Landmark on both the Cotswold and Gloucestershire Ways.

Ramblers aims include defending Footpaths and protecting the Countryside. We're keen to ensure we're included in Countryside discussions e.g. Environment, Heritage and Landscape.

It is important that our position within this scheme is fairly portrayed and represented.

- to remove through traffic from local roads so they become walkable and crossable again, preferably with a tunnel so the landscape remains much the same.

- The Air Balloon Inn is an historic and well known landmark on both the Cotswold and Gloucestershire Ways and a popular base for walking.

TR010056-000589-6.4 Environmental Statement - Appendix 12.2 - Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding Review at Preliminary Design-1.pdf
page 65 of 89

2.10.27 a paragraph about the Air Balloon crossing being potentially the most dangerous on the Cotswold Way

Comment:

The paragraph could usefully have ended with

This crossing could be improved by moving through (vehicular) traffic away from the popular Trails and the Air Balloon (rather than diverting the former and demolishing the latter).

TR010056-000589-6.4 Environmental Statement - Appendix 12.2 - Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding Review at Preliminary Design-1.pdf
Page 83 of 89

2.1.4. Predominantly the affected public right of way network is for general leisure activities, with the following key destinations identified:

- Crickley Hill Country Park
- Barrow Wake Viewpoint
- Birdlip Village
- Golden Heart Public House
- Emma's Grove (Scheduled Monument)

Comment: Surely the Air Balloon Inn should have been included in this list? Many members and walkers believe that if the scheme is landscape-led, the Air Balloon will stay in landscape.

Procedurally our Walking Environment Officer was waiting to be called to an Environment, Heritage and Landscape Technical Working Group but the EHL TWG did not become active. Is it acceptable that there was no EHL TWG throughout the consultation?

TR010056-000604-7.11 Cotswold Way National Trail Diversion Report.pdf
page 27 of 27, 4 February 2021 end of para
Relevant matters discussed

All parties agreed with the proposed diversion of the National Trail across the Cotswold Way crossing.

Comment: Obviously this would not be Ramblers position as it means not only diversion of the Trails but also demolition of the historic landmark Inn on the trails.

The notes are different, for the same meeting, in the Statement of Commonality Document *TR010056-000607-7.3 Statement of Commonality.pdf*

Page 323 of 368 shows that the meeting of 4th February was one where Highways England ran through its latest proposals - submissions could be made afterwards.

TR010056-000607-7.3 Statement of Commonality.pdf

Comment: This document is related to the Statement of Common Ground SoCG.

Unlike a previous consultation on the A417, instigated by the local authority, to try to establish a common ground between all parties, (the tail end of which arrived at a green bridge for wildlife retaining the Air Balloon above the new road) this consultation only establishes which organisations are in line with the Applicant's proposals.

For example if it was proposed to divert the Cotswold Way and Ramblers as the relevant body on walking matters objected, but no-one else had an opinion either way, is it reasonable to exclude the objection, and suggest everything is ok?

Procedurally shouldn't a statement of commonality indicate common ground between parties rather than which parties have common ground with the Applicant's proposal?

A further example is Table 5.1

Table 5-1 Table of Commonality at DCO submission

SoCG Ref	Party	Broad topics considered in SoCG and current position																									
		Principle of Development	Project Description	Consultation	Consideration of Alternatives	EIA Methodology	Air Quality	Cultural Heritage	Landscape & Visual	Biodiversity	Geology, and Soils	Material Assets and Waste	Noise and Vibration	Population and Human Health	Public Rights of Way	Drainage/Water Environment	Climate	Cumulative effects	De-Trunking	Traffic and Transport	Crossings of the A417	Engineering Design	Draft DCO	Land	Environmental Management Plan	Construction Traffic Management Plan	
7.3.1	Joint Councils																										
7.3.2	Environment Agency																										
7.3.3	Natural England																										
7.3.4	Historic England																										
7.3.5	Cotswolds Conservation Board																										
7.3.6	Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust																										
7.3.7	National Trust																										
7.3.8	WCH TWG																										

The table highlights in red where one of the Parties is not in agreement with proposals.

Since the Statement of Common Ground includes where Ramblers or other Parties do not agree with proposals, shouldn't that mean that the lower line WCH TWG in Table 5.1 should have red squares to indicate 'Not agreed' overall.

TR010056-000782-2.7a Traffic Regulation Measures APFP Regulations 5(2)(o) Speed Limits.pdf

To avoid too much signage in the countryside, or creating a limit that's non-compliant or less safe, if a speed limit is necessary it should comply with DfT Speed Limit Guidance.

It's appreciated that not every minor road has a lower speed limit. Is there a document showing that the proposed speed limits are necessary? Will many repeater signs be required?
