

I am speaking as a representative of the Heart of Lansdown Conservation Group.

We do not debate the Gay Street and Catherine Place ETRO decisions. **But** the Winifred's Lane ETRO decision is irrational using flawed interpretations of data from the reports, data which is at odds with the Statement of Reasons for the trial.

Let me cover a number of important points.

The views and concerns of local residents have been ignored. The council's own report shows 72% opposition from respondents within the trial area. In the case of the Sydney Road/Sydney Place ETRO decision, Cllr Elliott stated that *"Crucially, the panel heard that 72% of those living inside the Liveable Neighbourhood support it."* Why is the same logic not being applied in this case where 72% are in opposition?

The decision document states that an objective is to disperse traffic over a wider area. Traffic has **not** been 'dispersed,' it has simply been displaced within the trial area past more houses and has put more than half a million extra vehicles past schools. On Sion Road past the Gardens significantly more traffic is going past the extremely dangerous blind bends past Sion Hill Place.

The decision document blames this increased traffic on Sion Road on school traffic. This is blatantly false. The baseline data was taken during term time, whilst trial data was taken **both** during term time and out of term time. All the measurements showed a substantial increase in traffic. The increase of up to 880% northbound on Sion Road past the Gardens can only be blamed on the closure of Winifred's Lane.

The proposed mitigations will make not reduce the dangers created on Sion Road as the topography cannot be changed. Indeed, removing parked cars will likely lead to more speeding and more danger to pedestrians. We note the 2nd sentence in the decision document stating that the trial will be permanent **irrespective** of mitigations. **Predetermination?**

Data on the net change in CO2 emissions in the reports is lacking. Given the Council's commitment, quite rightly, to address the Climate Emergency **this is astonishing**.

The council's own numbers show an additional 1,649 km per day being driven around the Winifred's Lane area due to displaced traffic, equating to over **30 additional tons of carbon emitted per year**. So, money intended to address the Climate Emergency has funded a trial that increased CO2 emissions rather than reducing them. **This alone is a reason for the scheme to fail.**

The claim that Active Travel in the Winifred's Lane trial area has increased has **no supporting data**. Only a narrow set of roads were considered and the net change in Active Travel over whole trial area was not evaluated.

You are a scrutiny panel, please scrutinise the data that has been misused in making this irrational decision.