1. The effect of all this growth on the safety and environment of small historic towns has been ignored and should be a specific policy. The various planning regimes that governments and local authorities have used in recent years have allowed local authorities and developers to ignore the effects of developments on the wider communities.

2. As a resident of Olney I did go to the MKSM Panel but was not allowed to say anything at the examination. The point I had made in writing was that all the development of urban areas north, south, east and west of Olney was having a hugely detrimental effect on Olney with traffic getting ever worse. I was ignored, and the panel in fact allowed no transport schemes, other than those in the then government’s short term plans. This was a pathetic response from so called professionals to a long term planning exercise.

3. **IN MY VIEW THERE CAN BE NO STRONGER CASE FOR A BYPASS IN THE COUNTRY THAN OLNEY’S.**

4. Although there may be difficulties in funding at present MK Council should be active in promoting and developing the details of an Olney Bypass through to preferred route stage or even through inquiry and CPO. The Council would then be seen to mean business. I understand the Council did make a frivolous bid to SE Region some time ago but obviously such a bid would be treated with contempt as the MK Council had done nothing to build on Bucks CC consultation in 1994. The Government has funded “shovel ready” projects but this is the last thing the Olney Bypass is. MK Council should get on with developing the scheme. It is a Catch 22 as there will be no funding without a prepared scheme and the Council seems to want funding before they even start the earliest stages of preparation. Shovel ready seems to be what is required for funding.

5. The old MK Development Corporation was going to make a substantial financial contribution towards the Olney Bypass but this fell by the wayside as the Local Authorities made no progress with the scheme and the Development Corporation was wound up. However this illustrates that the initial developers of just Milton Keynes recognised the very detrimental effect their new town would have on Olney; let alone the others in Northamptonshire and Bedfordshire and Buckinghamshire surrounding Olney with their own expansion plans.

6. Following the Bucks CC consultation in 1994 there was argument for and against Western and Eastern routes with strong opinions for and against both. Rather than tackle the issue head on Bucks and MK Councils have decided to do nothing. There are vague suggestions of lorry bans but the A509 is a Primary Routes and large sums have been spent in bypassing all the other communities on the route so traffic diversion is very unlikely. Also the M1 runs SE to NW in this area so is not an attractive alternative.

7. Bucks CC’s initial preference was for an Eastern Riverside route between Olney and Clifton Reynes. I suggest that MK Council have a look at the Baldock Bypass on the A505 Primary Route where Herts CC have built a 250 yards dual carriageway tunnel just to avoid a cutting through the skyline. It seems to me a short length of tunnel and thoughtful use of the excavated material could totally protect Clifton Reynes and the Olney riverside from serious impact of a bypass on this route as well as keeping the road above flood level. It does seem to be accepted nationally that in special cases the construction of tunnels for environmental reasons is worthwhile.

8. I would like to see a firm commitment from the MK Council to do something for Olney in view of the impact of their and adjacent authorities development plans. As far as I am aware there is no sense of urgency in MK Council to do anything for Olney. As far as I am aware they have never built a bypass. They should not just let things drift because Olney is outside the New Town.