

Chair,  
Public Inquiry,  
A40 Road Scheme.

Dear Sir,

Further to our letters of September last year and after several meetings with the Welsh Assembly Government representatives, I write with some concerns still in place.

If the question was put to us today as to whether we wished to have a by-pass or keep the status quo, we would always opt for keeping the status quo. We speak from a unique perspective, in that we live right on the roadside and own land, that will be taken in this road scheme.

I have met with WAG' representatives together with our land agent, Mr Evans on two occasions and Mr Evans has had a further two meetings. WAG representatives have looked at many of the issues and have come up with several modifications, to be fair to them.

However, as in my last letter in September, on a regular basis, I discover new areas of concern. For example, in one of the meetings I discovered that there was a ditch going from the new road all the way down to the pond being constructed in our field. My obvious concern on learning this could be an earth ditch would be that the water may soak into the fields all around. I was told that this would not happen but ..... What was most worrying about this and other features I discover on a regular basis, is that one is not fully informed of all the changes and alterations that are happening to our land. It is only forthcoming after I ask questions. This only adds to the stress of all of this and it should not happen.

On Friday 6<sup>th</sup> March, I received a series of modification schedules and a fairly detailed list of matters that had been covered. Mr Evans phoned me on the following Monday saying that there was an urgency to sign that one accepted all the changes by the next day, from WAG. At this point, I had not scrutinised the paperwork and said that I would do so that evening. This involved looking carefully at a series of maps/drawings and other information. The main area of concern was access to our land through the cul-de-sac beyond the property of Awelfa at 3/6a. The modification was a PMA and what looked like enough room for vehicles to pass each other, which had been a major concern. This would have to have a bolted gate into this 'dead end'.

It appeared much improved but then I looked at Modification 11 and found in red 3/H and 3/L. These were cycle ways going through the PMA and over the entrance into our fields. I had been led to believe this was a dead end not a route for the public. If vehicles were using that PMA to enter the fields and someone was cycling down and they collided, who would be liable?

The next day I phoned Mr Gallimore to check whether there was indeed a cycleway and it was confirmed. I expressed concern about this latest revelation. This is a potential minefield. Yet again, I had to find this out, rather than being informed, from the start.

The Inquiry has looked at financial, environmental and other costs. Little if anything has been spoken of the human cost. The last few years and especially the last few months have been extremely stressful for us, as it must be for all those affected directly or indirectly by this new by-pass. I rarely ever tell my 92 year old father any longer about the outcomes of these meetings or new potential problems, as I do not wish to cause him further upset.

I would ask the inquiry to recommend for future road or other infrastructure projects that those who are the proposers of these schemes, fully reveal to the 'victims,' the full extent of their losses and/or changes to their property and lives, from the start. This would alleviate a large amount of stress and anguish.

Yours sincerely,

Sandra Rowlands (Miss)

On behalf of the Rowlands' family