

Nigel Cooper

3 April at 22:33

I have written to Dr Fox and now in similar vein to North Somerset: I will review the council's reasons next.

Sent to: traffic.orders@n-somerset.gov.uk

Ref: ATF2/RL/310321

Sirs,

To be clear I object to the proposal in its current methodology and principles.

I am a Claverham resident who regularly uses the roads across Kenn Moor.

I am a local resident, not a leisure user of our local infrastructure.

I am not a recreational or sport cyclist or horse rider however I happily and safely co-exist with respectful people using any mode to travel the local lanes. Over almost 40 years I have had no problems except a few HGVs that were patently traversing the moor and a few peletons who rode many abreast on kenn moor road with no thought of other road users.

So in summary, I have not witnessed or occasioned any problems for any users of the moor roads.

I do not think you have considered the two possible outcomes of your proposals. One is that it fails and you will have acrimonious activism which is already fomented on social media. Another is that you deny access to locals and you will most certainly have civil disobedience and unfortunate encounters. Plus a further load will be placed on enforcement if that can ever happen, there is no enforcement of vehicle weight restriction.

The process you have set in motion is tragically ill judged.

If you wish to have support with such a scheme then it must be evidence based not the result of opinion or mere social convictions on behalf of part of society. You must try to carry people through properly published research and reasoning.

Please provide the following research, comparative benefits and cost analyses.

(1) individual Road and Lane use by mode over week and weekends during a non-lockdown year. With seasonal variation. You cannot justify action on asserted leisure use.

(2) records of incidents causing harm over a non-lockdown year that justify investment on each Road or Lane.

(3) comparison of fuel use for diverted traffic from recorded annual traffic flow to divert around the proposed restricted zone.

(4) impact of additional traffic on Yatton, Backwell and other villages on the bounding roads of the proposals plus junction flows.

(5) proposed measures in event of M5 issues and closures.

(6) comparison of this scheme with other possible areas of investment such as accelerating the extension of the Strawberry line and the coastal access Clevedon to WSM and improvement of pavements for pedestrians in villages.

(7) provide proper evidence of non-local car use of the proposed roads. Do not just state opinions.

If such evidence cannot be brought forth and shown to be properly weighed then the TRO really should not be proposed as it will be based upon opinion and without facts.

Naturally, in such a matter Legal process will be investigated as and when it proves necessary.

Why not consider improving access for all in the preexisting multi-mode use of the lanes? Lower speed limits. Constrained access to roads to stop HGV where alternative routes exist?

There is an opportunity to improve matters in a non controversial manner without disadvantaging local road users who can not rationally use horses or bicycles to travel between villages and sparse services.

Research, prove and publish. All we have at present are assertions