

I feel the Highways group has been evasive and abstract when confronted with hard questions about the details of the planned road. Many answers appear to be standardised responses or tissue thin vagaries. We have yet to see any clear answers regarding the impact that this proposed road will have upon the surrounding area. The only clarity we have received is a complete denial of any impact this proposition will have upon Cowley village. This view is interesting as when questioned Highways are have either not visited or unaware of the location of the village. Words fail to express the lack of professionalism of making statements about how the village will not be affected by the proposed road while never having been there. It is unacceptable at the very least as surely implies a contempt for the lives of others. Based on the above I feel Option 30 has not been thought through to any extent and been sold to the public via emotive rather than factual evidence.

I contest the claims that this road will be environmentally beneficial. The proposed green bridge is smaller than proposed which in its original form was only a token gesture. Acres of established grassland will be ploughed up, forests cut down and habitat to nature destroyed. As seen by the replanting on the previous section of the A417 bypass this has by no means been replicated, maintained or replaced with like for like. To claim that an environmental impact survey showed that these actions were acceptable calls into question the validity maintained of such a report. This is before carbon emissions from cars and lorries are included in the equation. The amount of damage that will be done in the construction period alone will be devastating for the natural wildlife at a time when many species are threatened. When the government has promised a green initiative. As the Highways are unaware of the location of Cowley this could be true for the any Environmental studies. It appears they are unaware of amount of wildlife which perishes on the road at present. If they were they would also be aware how woefully inadequate their provisions for the wildlife are.

We could talk of the risks that uncaring construction will have to the local archeology and historical sites but as the body in charge has shown to not care about the living one can hardly expect them to care about the past. Rather than being able to show local children places where Romans and Celts once walked we can instead show them the site where the port-a-loos were kept.

Likewise we could talk about the dangers that repurposing the A417 will have. Narrow country roads are not conducive to heavy traffic and rat run drivers. We could talk about the expected rise in accidents and fatalities within these lanes which at present has few. We could talk about how the verges and hedgerows will be destroyed as vehicles try to squeeze down single track roads. How the already potholed roads will become little more than gravel with mud pits running along the side. Cars dumped at any free space. We could talk about how pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders will be put in lethal risk by this increase in traffic. That what had once been a safe walk through the countryside now will turn into an ordeal of exhaust fumes and heavy traffic. We could talk about all these things. Of the irreparable damage that it will cause to the village. To people. As the inspectors have not actually been along any of these roads the discussion would be pointless. I am sure that when they looked at google maps it looked fine.