

Another Kings Dyke Story – No problem.

After my post of the Kings Dyke News-Letter - last Friday, I received 2 separate e-mails – both highlighting similar issue(s), the writers are not known to me – but I have checked and they are both Whittlesey residents.

They are not complaining about me..... just that they were very surprised that I made no comment on the contents of the 'News-letter' – I did actually....

Both writers (I do not know if they collaborated) point several inconsistencies in the News-letter – (Their comment)

My reply will be underneath their observations.

Dear Roy,

Being a long term reader of your web-blog and the information contained, I was somewhat surprised that you made no comments on the contents, therefore I would be grateful if you could publish the following.

Whilst I welcome the very belated and somewhat out of date contents of the News-letter – I found it 75% politically motivated and somewhat rhetoric.

1) For the uninitiated who may not be following your very extensive coverage, the writers appear to have completely forgotten the past 6+ years and the previous 50+ campaign.

2) They have failed to even touch on the 'real' cost – for example all the costs that they have paid the previous developer 'Kier', the cost of the land purchase which rose substantially when the landowner found what was planned, the cost of consultants and the cost to Cambs County Council Officers and the time involved. I believe I read that it was over £6 million. (actually £8.2 million) So with the latest 'estimate' of £32 million, plus the Covid-19 mitigation, plus the £6 million mentioned I make that to be £40+ million.

3) How can 5 months early be 40 to 50 years late be on time.

4) FDC leader stated the 'we' have been campaigning for this for over 20 years – this Councillor did not live in Whittlesey until relatively recently.

I could made other minor comments about the 'risks' still involved and whether all the so called benefits will be realised.

A Bypass would have been a much better option.....

I look forward to your comments...Bill...B...

Roy G's reply.....

All points very well noted 'Bill' – I think you will find that over the past 6+ years since I started reporting on the Kings Dyke Crossing – that most if not all contained in your e-mail have been addressed and published on my web-log.

Firstly why me..... why not write your concerns and issues directly to those in the publicity photograph, or The Cambs Times/Peterborough Telegraph™

I have on numerous occasions published the 'official' costing when they came into the public domain, who knows with 'all' the success of this present contract we may find that they will find further savings along the line.....I am not holding my breath.

When I publish articles, I do not edit them for my own arguments, I would leave it to my loyal readers to make up their own minds as to whether anything contained was 'Spin or Rhetoric'

At some point – A line has to be drawn – we are now as far advanced as ever for this project to come to life – Builders and Contractors onsite.

As I have said on numerous occasions (2013) I will jump (if I could) for joy, the day the KD Bridge opens – I and many others hope to see that day.

The 'risks, environmental and mitigation' will I hope all have long since been addressed (not to every ones satisfaction) –

I believe that all concerned should be accountable and the past history leaves that to question.

That is decided at the ballot box at elections in our democratic system.

Most if not all the critics will have long disappeared by the time the Bridge opens.

I am and will be keeping a sharp lookout on the project, and to an extent I agree with some of the contents of the News-letter – as I said I am not here to stifle or censor good debate and you and the other correspondent are more than welcome to contact me and comment on any subject to my disclaimer rules below...

Roy G....

Community Activist

Whittlesey Town Councillor

St Mary's Ward South

See below CCC own account...(probably out of date)

2.38 A breakdown of the total spend to date is shown in table 2.

Table 2 - Total expenditure to date

Description	Spend to date	Further details
Stage 1 contract detailed design costs	£1.4m	Detailed design costs. Plus vegetation clearance (carried out before bird nesting season) and ecological works (Greater Crested Newt monitoring, trapping etc; Badger monitoring and sett removal).
Land and all legal fees	£4.1m	Land acquisition fees and all associated legal fees. Side Roads Order fees.
Statutory undertaker costs	£900k	75% of all utility diversions quotations have to be paid in advance. However, CCC will only be charged for completed work and currently only the 33KV and 11KV UKPN cables have been diverted and so the final cost here may be lower.
Network Rail	£60k	Costs from Network Rail Asset Protection and Optimisation team, associated with legal and technical approvals to work in proximity of the railway.
Management & Supervision fees	£1.5m	CCC staff costs, Skanska and WYG consultant costs to date
Asbestos removal	£60k	Removal of asbestos from site. This work is ongoing.
TOTAL	£8.02m	

Disclaimer.

The maximum length of a Letter to RG's Web-Blog is 500 words.

Letters to RG's Web-Blog may be edited for length and clarity.

RG's Web-Blog will print no more than one letter per writer per month.

RG's Web-Blog will only print letters that address a specific issue theme or article.

I will not print material that is:

Potentially libellous.

Libel is any unsubstantiated or untrue statement that damages someone else's reputation. You can disagree with someone, but you can't claim they did something damaging unless you can prove it.

Discriminatory on any grounds

This includes discrimination based on age, ability, gender, sexual orientation, religion or culture.

Obscene.

This includes any statement that is vulgar, profane or offensive.

Threatening.

This includes personal attacks, intimidation, bullying or threat of harm against a person or organisation.