

DAY 1 17/6/08 [notes by Lynne]

Great opening statement by the way.

Parvis Khansari (K)

Had old copy of document.

C This is a departure application – K yes

C minutes of meeting agreed eastern 1997/8 – K yes. 2005 application withdrawn just before 2007 app. Went in. C – any significant changes? K – No

TST and PPS 1 both introduced since scheme drawn up. C quoted PPS1 supplement. C do you think current LTP should reflect these new guidelines? (K did not understand the Q) C – this scheme is infrastructure project – K Yes

C sustainable transport, overall reduces need to travel – K agreed

C decision making process- limited CO2 – K agreed

C new development – K yes C –PPS may supercede development plan. This (scheme or PPS- sorry missed that) is material and therefore if this scheme fails to satisfy – no reply

C this scheme falls within the scope of this planning guidance? K- Yes the package of WCC does comply with this guidance. K this scheme is part of WCC strategy and includes modal shift to bus and rail, increases road safety, reduces noise and air pollution . C – what package?

(WW strategy for Regeneration ?)K + Semington/Melksham already delivered + Chippenham railway improvements already delivered as part of this package.

C – we are now in the interim period? K I do not understand the Q

K I do not know where they are with the development plan. K Yes it does apply But Mr Simpkins will know.

C This scheme has not been amended yet still complies with guidance? K yes

C Is this scheme carbon neutral? K ask Mr Helps

TAG. ?witness has copy – no find green file. Randle copied tables only. Inspector – please note this is now included as an Inquiry document WHA 107. Randle – there is now a JUNE 2008 update – WHA 108 (Oh what a surprise! Here are some figures we have just made up)

App summary table 1

C greenhouse gases- scheme increases distance travelled and increases g gases K- some gases will decrease

C carbon emissions – unable to answer. Ask Mr Helps/Mr Smyth

C how long on have you been on this scheme- K 3 1/2yrs but one of many schemes WCC has ongoing.

CD13.1 published 2007, after planning app and after call in- K Yes

C goal of transport to tackle climate change? K Yes

C Is Westbury town centre congested? K scheme addresses road safety, pollution, accessibility.. “CONGESTION IS NOT A HIGH PRIORITY IN THE SCHEME” but will be made better by the scheme. C Is that a happy coincidence? K – it is a benefit of the scheme. Journey time also an objective. C providing relief = relieving congestion? K yes. CD13.1 C Are you familiar with this? K I have read the briefing. (something like we get a number of briefings and I will have read this at some stage)

P28. C does WCC think Westbury is congested? K It suffers from journey unreliability.

C bypass will increase road capacity? K Yes it is an addition. C It is not significant?

Are the traffic flows? K this is the busiest non-trunk road... Westbury...

C is it WCC (position?) that all modes is sustained.... Bus, rail

C do you understand the word mode? Is there a sustained peak period of congestion? K I do not have data. I understand there are peak times. Ask Mr Helps.

C GVT policy. All modes are congested – you can build a new road. K what we are missing is accessibility and reducing emissions. THIS IS NOT THE BIG PICTURE IN WESTBURY. C -air quality K- air quality not only due to congestion. C – traffic safety – traffic levels= accidents K I do not agree

C – rebuttal J Whitlegg. 22. If congestion is more localised...”which I suggest it is here in Westbury” K Yes

C – some modes congestion and others spare capacity. Do you have data? K that is available. I do not know if it’s provided to the Inquiry but it is available to WCC.

C what modal shift? K This scheme is part of proposals to achieve modal shift. It is available at WCC or in the LTP.

C - LTP 2. potentially added? Not added? July 2006 letter from Minister is when it was included.(sorry lost it there) C That letter. C LTP settlement letter –does not present a high priority at this stage. Given GVT change of priorities (what chance does it have?

Again lost it) K – I find this difficult to understand in proofs. None of statutory consultees nor GOSW are objecting but objectors seem to look at GVT policy differently. Gov agencies, environment agency, GOSW do not object (Jenny’s note- they are civil servants). I struggle with objectors points that GVT policy has changed. (something like roads are still being built)

C section on climate change. Quote from WCC K – yes.

C para 4. UK emissions..restrain.. Will this result in restraint?- K Yes

Can you take me to the evidence? K Yes I will try to find it. Up economy, up jobs, there is evidence, road side interviews, increased economy= up job creation to reduce need for people of Westbury to travel which leads to better access to invite inward investment, local jobs and local people to go to those jobs. C how many local jobs? Economic statement?(? K’s answer or C’s further Q). K- in MSBC. Economic assessment at back of proof – that justifies this scheme and will lead to investment to North of county- trend is quite clear(?businesses moving North?) We want to reverse this trend.

C there are no figures. Nor does this reduce traffic? K we are talking about something else. We have to plan for local people to get to work. Reliability of journey time. Local people to work locally.

C chapter 5 of LTP page 73 table. LTP core transport strategy. Landuse to reduce out commuting...prime contribution to reduce congestion? K – yes.

C No mention of new road building? K – it is not excluded either....

C Safer roads. Existing manage...WCC policy = use existing? K – the majority of our efforts are going in that direction. Reduce pinch points but this is last resort. In this case road building is unavoidable. Construction is unavoidable.

C Investment priorities? Low priority congestion. K – as I said earlier, **Westbury is not in need of congestion solving.**

C p147 tackling congestion. Is there a market in Westbury? K – there is a market place. (No idea of when market day is)

C reduce the use of the car? K scheme **doesn’t increase or decrease use of car.**

C 9.2 traffic counts. Low vehicle growth. Agree. K –yes

C lower than national traffic growth? K – absolutely

C journey time surveys. Table 9.2 Actual recorded time has improved. Agree? K Yes

C problem = Chippenham and Yarnbrook? K yes – that’s a specific issue.

C consultation top priority BOA, Devizes, Trowbridge – no mention of Westbury? K Unable to answer.

Document only Charlie had.

Wiltshire LTP 2206/7-2010/11 Westbury Community Area Consultation Summary Report. Meetings Sept – Oct 2004. **Return to this another day.**

C Westbury was part of consultations and was included? K I do not know as I do not have that document.

C Chapter 15 targets and indicators p231. Congestion, air quality, climate change.

Actual is on target. Graph below. However subsequent traffic growth has been below?

K WCC has been very successful.

C Wiltshire is lowest traffic growth. K – agree that this is the situation at the moment. Also large housing growth in RSS.

C p236 Air quality. Traffic levels in Westbury. AADT 2004-5 Westbury below targets.

AQ better than target? K I need to read more. (lost it here I have TG no more than give target?) K just looking at other graphs...p242 total killed or seriously injured

K -county wide it is yes.

C 244 slight casualties- on target? K – againaccident rates (sin jen??) great effort goes into, fluctuations occur, especially killed or seriously injured. The WCC comments and information here are correct.

C growth rates below targets? K Yes. WCC graph shows that but I haven't read the graphs yet. Changes in employment patterns = predicted growth. I am sure this is true and the strategy is working.

C 2.5.2 Inter-urban traffic = target? K yes. Yes in line with target. All you are showing me is in line with our evidence.

C Cycling. Declining but target .. to increase? K yes

C 259 Walking – slight decrease but then target aspirational? K Yes

C Pedestrians up by 30%. A high target indeed? K Yes. All pages you refer to are not Westbury specific. Ensures. These are corridor statistics. C Westbury must be part of this? K yes.

C Journey reliability on target? K again all of corridor and A350 And Semington Melksham completed.

C all of these targets are being met without an Eastern bypass? K No. It shows a trend. There is no guarantee. I do not have time to read. C assumed bypass on line or not? K – I do not know.

C Progress to date? K up to 2011

C Journey time reliability actual and targets? K – yes.

C What they show = actual and in line with targets? Targets in LTP are being met without the scheme being in place? K – I am not expert in that.....

C public consultation- appendix B. Meeting 6/5/98. Summary of public consultation.

Total no of returns 1453. population 17,000 K No population 10,000 in 1998....

C 30% of that %(whatever it is) = 1/3 of those who expressed a preference wanted East? K yes. C No indication of non-road option is there? K No We will come to that later on.

C Oct 1999 Parkman Westbury Town Poll. Turnout 22.3% A clear preference expressed for West? K yes I would like to explain....**What is the role of elected members?**

C WCC promotes East? K CC prides itself on consultation. We do not ignore public opinion.

C no non road option? K Westbury Town Council decision not WCC.

C since this have there been further votes for W residents. K no consultation I am aware of.

C Parkman commissioned by WCC P 2 review of route options. Reports to WCC may not in themselves.. in economic regeneration etc increases need for bypass. Justification is only increased by economic regen? K Yes. 2 further reports also C Do you agree with report at that time? K Yes.

C Is it WCC case still that unless economic case/without reg. objectives it cannot be justified on a stand alone basis? K to achieve objectives this is the only scheme. 1999 this was written in a different time. Now need LTP. Policy framework has moved on. High priorities now are different. Fully support Eastern Bypass.

C Samw doc. Parish councils. West Ashton? K Yes, Bratton? K Yes. Westb k yes.

N Bradley, Southwick, Frome? (no reply or just I did not record it – sorry). Mendip DC? K I do sir. C- WWDC in 1999 had not formed a view. Have they expressed a view now? K – we do have a letter included in doc. **Inspector – there is such a letter.** K - ? Mr Simpkin ? rebuttal. Recent.

C – SSC – not convinced K – Yes

No 22 Chamber of COMMERCE = West more logical K Yes

C – In the face of this level of opposition it nevertheless went for E. K – I made this point. Consultation. **Elected members taken into account.** This Inquiry is a chance for all to have their say.

C – Justification 10.3 (1999) Traffic OK. At odds with WCC is it not? K _silence. That must have been the situation at that time. I do not know guidance for traffic flows.

C 10.4 West on its own consultants say. K I repeat housing growth not taken into account. Capacity to deal with growth. K I haven't read this.

C congestion (sorry missed a point there) one of the objectives is that

C need for reg. still as strong now as in 1999? K I have no idea.

C who can I ask? K I will get back to you. If title proof ask Mr Helps.. WHA I do not understand... **I may have to introduce a new witness**(can he do that – if so I want one!!!) C Who can I ask Q of? Next issue is regeneration.

C Back to proof 4.3. Slow economic development etc. What evidence do you have? K trend in employment are reflected in information. In appendices to my proof. App L. provided by economic regeneration unit. Talk about history of employment – number of jobs, accessibility. P5 para 3 our e.r. team works very closely with transport team. RPG 10 does say there is an economic link between the town in WW. It says A350 has to be improved. Which.... Structure plan influences LTP. **If we are to question every step of the process it would take a long time.** These things have been (? discussed/planned).

C p 2 Ec. Dev of county. Warminster TTW area. Westbury is in this? K yes

C WWTTWA= in a strong position- out performs Bristol etc? K again I do not know which model this is based on. I agree to what has been said there. There is evidence. I do not have it. Travel to work has got worse. Plans of WCC will lead to achieving these targets.

C Employment prospects.. Cambridge. WW is well located... Westbury to motorway? Yes? WHA 106?????? Lost doc?

THE END!!! But only of Day 1