

Having read document 8.11, I wish to make the following comments:

1 - The failure to consult with those most affected by the proposal - the residents of Cowley. (i) National Highways are not recognising that they declined to meet with the village as requested during the process. The village has a large hotel, the County guide camp and a pub with a function room - all capable of holding the meeting. (ii) National Highways have a statutory responsibility to ensure adequate consultation. This can't be delegated to another body (the Parish Council) which was inevitably going to support the option favouring Birdlip due to the makeup of the Council. (iii) During the process, the proposals changed and the final proposal was settled late in the process.

2 - National Highways are pursuing an option which has maximal effect on the environment, affecting cultural heritage, habitat migration, biodiversity, and ancient woodland. This is avoidable and unnecessary and completely at odds with stated policies of the Government and the wishes of local people.

3 - The decision to re-route traffic through Cowley is disastrous. The single-track road is completely unfit for the volume of traffic. This highlights ignorance of the locality and the local effects.

4 - The notion of a high speed link is threatened by the local microclimate. Option 30 will be affected adversely by fog, snow and ice.

5 - NH are pursuing an inappropriate option which is costly in finance as well as environment. There is adequate space to widen the existing road which will complete the dual carriageway between the M4 and M5 at far less cost and would be far more proportionate to the perceived current problems.