

I feel that the process of consultation with the village of Cowley has been less than satisfactory by NH. It is quite apparent from the Consultation Documents that NH favoured Option 30 from the start of the process. NH have been reluctant to do modelling and testing in the village as we were informed "Cowley was outside of the required testing area" when attending the National Star consultation. At the same consultation I asked "what likely effects the new road would have on Cowley". The reply was "where's Cowley? And how many houses are there? I replied "about 40" to which the reply was "that will be of no consequence". There has been a total lack of ongoing engagement and disregard with the local community throughout the process. The proposed route was later moved considerably closer to the village of Cowley without any consultation with residents of the village. There was little or no engagement concerning the choice of link roads/ junctions. There has been no interaction with the community regarding specific mitigation measures during the construction process.

Can the ExA be appraised as to whether this constitutes a consultation of the quality that members of the local community are entitled to. "Clearly from the Open floor hearing 1, the residents of Cowley are not the only interested parties who feel that there has been inadequate engagement/consultation throughout the process".

The whole process has been flawed even with the pros and cons of options 12 and 30. They were not presented in a balanced way and quite apparent by use of language which option was preferred. For example, one of the cons for option 12 was the cost of including a bridge at Cowley Roundabout that was discarded and is a saving in Option 30, although the junction in both options is very similar. This bridge has now been included in National Highways design upgrade option 30, thus distorting the original cost comparisons. I can also only conclude that the high return on investment for Option 30 is due to the repurposing of the redundant route as a "tourist destination", therefore sacrificing the AONB and environment.

Another con for option 12 was "There were also some concerns raised around Barrow Wake, particularly in relation to Option 12, and that the proposals would not allow it to be restored to a tranquil beauty spot. The area is a Site of Special Scientific Interest and a number of important archaeological discoveries have been made". At the 27th February hearing 11.8.7 a representative from Burgess Salmon said "Option 30 was chosen because it would direct the road away from the escarpment edge".

Could the ExA be appraised that the B4070 to Birdlip has now been moved closer to Barrow Wake SSSI. Okay for Option 30 but not for Option 12!

On Tuesday 25th February hearing article 13 reference lighting. I was surprised that lighting was proposed on the "Green Bridge", surely not environmentally friendly.

This bridge is now also going to be 50m wide instead of the 100m originally proposed, which is not adequate for all wildlife. The public have been hoodwinked into believing this is an environmentally-led scheme when it now appears to be eroding many of the environmental features that the public supported.

Lighting has also been proposed for Ullenwood roundabout in an area where there is currently no lighting.

Could the ExA be appraised to ask the applicant if any modelling has been done for light pollution? What effect would it have on the wildlife in the area?