

**West of England Partnership  
Joint Transport Executive Committee, 4 February 2010  
Agenda Item 7, South Bristol Link**

**Summary of Issues Raised in Public Statements**

*Officer notes added in italics*

**1. Increased traffic** (25 references)

Increase in traffic leading to more, not less, congestion, more air pollution, more noise and an increase in greenhouse gas emissions.

*Objectors' state new road inevitably equates to more traffic and congestion. Yet changes in overall congestion as reflected in the economic performance of the scheme show BCR of more than 4.0 (para 30). On air quality, work at option appraisal stage on the option closest to that now being proposed, predicted, "there could be a very slight overall improvement in air quality" (although the improvement is extremely small for both nitrogen dioxide and particulates).*

**2. Loss of Green Belt** (21 references)

Infringes on Green Belt and destroys countryside, biodiversity, natural habitats, which are valuable for recreation or food production, and provide pleasant outlook on the urban fringe.

*The scheme does cross Green Belt on a route that is safeguarded in the local plans of North Somerset Council. The value of the land is partially compromised by being partly landfill and on a flood plain. Public Rights of Way would be maintained, rerouted where necessary. Value of landscape, townscape and biodiversity is acknowledged in para 28.*

**3. Poor Use of Public Funds** (18 references)

Money spent on the scheme would be better spent elsewhere (e.g. rapid transit, rail such as Portishead line, or buses) or not spent at all.

*Indicative funding for the scheme cannot be transferred to alternative projects.*

**4. Enables unwanted development** (9 references)

By building the link, we encourage development on the urban fringe.

*The South Bristol Link aims to encourage development in South Bristol, not on land to the southwest of Bristol (para 7). If development is discouraged from South Bristol it seems more likely to put pressure on adjacent areas to the southwest. Each UAs is addressing future development through their respective Core Strategies and they oppose the South West Urban Extension and encourage the regeneration of South Bristol.*

**5. Severance** (8 references)

South Bristol Link will cut communities, increase social division and impede local movements.

*Modelling to date and reported in para 38 shows limited changes in traffic on most roads. King George's Road would experience an increase, but to a level lower than currently on Kings Head Lane. Barrow Gurney and Kings Head Lane would experience a reduction. The design has been developed to enable safe and convenient crossing, and complementary measures are proposed (para 26)*

## **6. Loss of green space (in addition to Green Belt)** (6 references)

Highridge Common, farmland and other green spaces are invaluable and irreplaceable.

*The route is described in the report and land lost at Highridge Common will be replaced (para 19)*

## **7. Hinders Regeneration** (5 references)

The scheme would hamper, rather than promote, regeneration; or no evidence is provided to show it would happen. People would travel to the area from elsewhere and take local jobs, or pass through the area rather than supply passing trade on existing routes. Regeneration is proceeding without the scheme.

*The link is intended to stimulate investment and bring employment opportunities to local residents. Work has shown that a combined rapid transit and highway scheme potentially generates more jobs than other options. The private sector has not invested in a significant way in South Bristol for several reasons; one of these is reported by many businesses to be poor access.*

## **8. Better Access** (5 references)

By providing a direct new link, scheme provides potential relief on unsuitable routes

*Analysis to date shows some traffic reduction on local residential roads. More complete analysis will form part of the Bid presented to DfT.*

## **9. Peak Oil** (3 references)

Assumption that new roads equate to greater fuel consumption, and in an age where fossil fuels are projected to decline, it is therefore wrong to build them.

*Work to date does not indicate net change in vehicle kilometres. For the future, there is no certain correlation between distance travelled and oil consumption since energy can come from other sources. Scheme promotes cycling and walking, access to more sustainable travel modes.*

## **10. Discourages Mode Shift** (3 references)

New roads tend to provide an 'easy' car driving option that discourages people from using public transport, walking or cycling.

*The link provides improved access for all modes. Giving people the options of public transport and cycling/walking potentially reduces the demand for unnecessary car travel.*

## **11. Brings Confidence to South Bristol** (3 references)

The scheme would demonstrate commitment to the area and help signal confidence.

Other issues referred to in one or more statements include: flawed rationale for the scheme, worse parking and access on King George's Road, safety, improved access for BIA, misleading consultation.