

Day Twenty-Three

Mr Bullock, Mr Helps, Dr Ireland

Evidence in Chief

WCC112. Set out six matters. Responsible for receiving responses?

-Yes

Mr Langton: Table 2, Part 3, deals with noise matters. The noise levels in the 50-60 DB section and 60-70 DB columns for the July 2008 HGV flows are identical. Wonder whether that is a coincidence?

-Has been a transposition of the data. Data in the 50-60 band is correct, the data in the 60-70 band is incorrect. Told that data is lower, will have revised table by lunchtime. Totals will also be corrected.

MSBC. Bundle of changes. CB9.8 D. A change to that table has been produced. Instruction column replaced with reason column. Reason column:

-Helps: Change to front cover and spine; minor change to DfT application form; in executive summary a revised PVB economy figure; on pg12 the labelling improved; pg119-120, induced traffic section revised; pg125 revised noise and air quality figures to reflect revised HGV information; pg130-132 revisions to COBA figures; pg137 BCR figures, appraisal summary table has updated noise, AQ and economy; Appendix B – NATA worksheets; Annexes 7 and 8 revised following recent reports to DfT and updated COBA figures.

Ring-binder information. Within that folder, CPO and SRO information; the bundle in original file, following additional comments, we should treat as superseded and replaced by new version?

-Correct

Within ring-binder, County's 2001 report on the bridge. Tables and diagrams dealing with traffic information also superseded.

-Mr Langton: With regards spreadsheet, there appears to be no change between original and revision.

Letter from Mr Day, Mar 2007; Natural England, April 2007.

-Mr Langton: Letters also exist from Wiltshire Constabulary and Wiltshire Wildlife Trust. Don't appear to be in section.

-Latter two letters in the wrong place.

Text of document put together by Mr Bullock. Dated 8 September, Number 129 A; original is Number 129. Explain differences.

-Information in relation to noise, AQ and emissions arrived late, not possible in 129. Document 129 A contains this information, and letter from Natural England.

Mr Langton: Accompanying letter from Dr Jones to Woodland Trust in Appendix B, marked 'draft'. Has this been sent?

-Ireland: Letter has been sent as drafted. Not aware of Woodland Trust's position.

Deal with matters relating to weight restriction. In terms of consultation exercise, what would comment be in relation to consultations?

-Responses dealt with in document. Statutory consultees have confirmed that their position has not changed. In terms of public consultation, did speak to local businesses. Struggled to receive written responses. Generally, the level of responses were quite low. On the whole was 'positive'.

Separate bundle of documents, Westbury Town Centre Measures Weight Restrictions. Mouchel document. 27 August 2008. Contains recommendation in Section Three. Explain the purpose.

-Relatively recently issued. Mouchel sets out what they were intending to do, as commissioned by WCC. These are recommendations – have not been adopted, and would be until there are further consultations. Intention was to provide clarity.

Cross Examination.

27 August document referred to - subject to further discussion. Any of the proposed improvements require planning permission?

-Depends on nature of improvements - as far as aware improvements fall within boundary of existing highway, probably would not require permission.

These improvements are wholly separate from scheme?

-Yes

For example, the costs of implementing the proposals formed no part of the COBA of the present scheme?

-These are not essential to the delivery of the proposal.

Position of WCC is that the ban itself is essential, but in order to offset possible adverse impacts of the ban these proposals are required.

-Not necessarily. Further consultation and analysis required.

Every possibility that these proposals will not be implemented.

-Possible that precise details altered.

-Possibility that will not be implemented.

De-coupling this from scheme?

-Purpose of document to provide additional clarity to heighten awareness that WCC is aware of problems raised in consultation.

Consultation process. Were the District Council consulted?

-Not directly.

Not formally consulted?

-WWDC not on list of consultees.

Any reason?

-No particular reason

Planning departments of the planning department from WCC itself?

-Not listed as formal consultee.

Bus operators?

-No

Any particular reason?

-Internal consultation with WCC passenger transport team. Reason why not consulted is that public service vehicles would be exempted from weight ban, so would be no impact from weight ban.

Assume bus operators aware of proposed ban?

-Not certain

Freight Quality Partnership?

-Consulted, not no written response.

WCC129. State at 3.7, pg5, that 72 businesses took part. How many businesses were approached to take part?

-Wouldn't know if it was more than the 72. Believe that as time was limited, understanding is that those 72 were the 72 that were approached.

On what basis were these businesses selected?

-Selected from list of companies that we have.

-Intended to survey businesses that were in the vicinity of weight restriction.

Unaware of criteria that were applied in respect of selection?

-Other than being a local vicinity that might be potentially affected. Tendency to target businesses served regularly by HGVs.

How many businesses operate from the WWTE?

-Not aware.

Hazard a guess?

-Seen list of 280 businesses in 'Westbury region'.

Looking at questionnaire itself in supplementary document. Williams Self Drive Services. Q4. The proposed route of bypass shown on attached plan. Attached plan not exhibited?

-Basic route plan that is within planning application.

'Thinking about when bypass is in place, do you anticipate any problems?'

Impression created that question is predicated on an eastern bypass?

-Agreed

Understand that the ban will come into the place prior to bypass construction, whether or not bypass is constructed.

-Based on what we were consulting on, this was the question that needed to be asked.

Position is that ban will be put in place irrespective of whether there is any bypass.

-Not quite strictly true. Strategy is that ban will be put in place in the short term due to structural issue. Strategy to solve access across that bridge is to provide eastern bypass.

Would it not have been more helpful to all concerned to have asked the question, 'what effect would a 3 tonne weight limit have on your business?'

-Not really.

-If bypass was not built, we would seek an alternative strategy.

Possibility that ban will not be in place?

-If bypass did not come forward, then another strategy involving alternative routing would be in place.

What about the overriding safety concern?

-Have said that in the short term a weight limit will be imposed until bypass comes forward or an alternative is provided.

When anticipate that ban will be in place?

-As soon as possible. In a matter of months. Approximately 6 months.

If businesses were notified that 3 tonne ban would be put in place within 6 months, would their response have differed?

-Potentially, but that would have been a different consultation process.

-Weight limit will happen for structural reasons. No consultation necessary.

Time frame for implementation of town centre measures around Slab lane?

-Alterations may be needed if bypass not constructed.

Have a DM scenario of a 3 tonne weight limit. For how long will that situation persist?

-Out of my hands. Strategy is that bypass will come forward, which provides a viable alternative route. That would be the DS scenario. Time frame is in the hands of the government, and their approval of this scheme.

Proposed that shuttle working traffic lights be placed on bridge, which is effectively reduced to one lane. System of number plate recognition. That won't have the effect of stopping vehicles. A retrospective measure?

-Yes, same principle as with speed cameras.

In terms of effect of ban on traffic that is less than 3 tonnes, we see that there are relatively high traffic flows on Station Rd? Figure of 10,143 with Eastern Bypass. DM 12,243. Comparatively high figure?

-Mr Helps: For a road of that type would not use the word 'high'.

10-12,000 vehicles a day flow over bridge. Once have traffic lights, flow will be interrupted. What will effect of that be?

-Capacity reduction, some vehicles will have to wait.

Any indication of time delay?

-Not been modelled, but there would be a delay.

Not been taken into account in respect of COBA figures?

-Ban is in relation to a structural issue, not related to scheme.

Ban is an integral part of scheme?

-Mr Bullock: Shuttle working is a sustainable transport measure.

Shuttle working part of scheme?

-Is part of town centre improvements.

-Impact of delay may displace traffic and enhance benefits of bypass.

Would delay traffic, but no evidence as to what that delay would be?

-Would not be a particularly long delay.

Benefit of bypass is a two minute saving - that is not particularly long. Delays at Station Rd not been assessed in relation to cost and NPV?

-Costs included within scheme costs.

Delays that would be caused have been included in the NPVs or not?

-Mr Helps: Journey time saving due to reduction of traffic in town centre. Some of that benefit taken away by delays. Equalises result so that total journey time similar, but with less traffic.

How do you know they equalise if not modelled? Simply guess work?

-Model has .. um ... journey times for town centre traffic similar to journey times as they are now ... er ... journey time the same.

Link 13 on table. DM 12,243. With EB 10,500. Only reduction of 2,000 vehicles a day, but that will more than compensate for delays on bridge. No basis for that?

-Difference between total delays between DM and DS, we put forward that these delays are equalised.

No evidence for that?

-Mr Helps seemed to lose the power of speech at this point.

Your evidence on Day 11 of this inquiry was that the model was not able to disaggregate HGVs over 7.5 tonnes and between 3 and 7.5 tonnes?

-Correct

-Now disaggregated, through analysis of original count data.

Have a 3 tonne ban modelled. West Wilts Constabulary seeking 3.5 tonne ban. Now a 3 tonne or 3.5 tonne ban?

-Mr Bullock: In the short term will be a 3 tonne ban; discussions will then be undertaken in relation to seeking a 3.5 tonne ban.

Difference in flows between 3 tonnes and 3.5 tonnes?

-Mr Helps: 3 tonne on Station Rd and a 7.5 tonne ban on The Ham have been modelled.

Mr Bullock has just said WCC would seek a 3.5 tonne?

-Modelling is 3.5 tonne, as that is calculation we use for traffic counts.

-A structural weight ban is normally set at 3 tonnes. 3.5 tonnes is a non-standard figure. Purely a quirk of how the regulations work.

3 tonne ban figures actually refer to a 3.5 tonne vehicles?

-3.5 tonnes has been modelled, even though it actually refers to 3 tonnes.

Pg8, 4.9, Implications of the weight restrictions. State that 2007 planning applications refers to HGV ban on Station Rd. In technical statement, part A, para 5.22, pg72, bullet. Once bypass is completed, there is likely to be an HGV ban on Station Rd.

-Agreed

WCC made it clear that an HGV ban would be included to maximise scheme objectives. Way before 2007 application WCC knew of structural problems with the bridge. Then ban itself was never a scheme objective as such, was it?

-No

Pg10, 4.17. State that bypass proposal includes weight restriction of 3.5 tonnes. The 2007 planning application didn't include that limit?

-Agreed

When Mr Helps gave evidence earlier in the inquiry, we discussed issues related to a ban.

-Through the course of this inquiry it has been made clear that ban needed

Not quite accurate to say proposal has weight limit of 3.5 tonnes?

-Yes

Ban not been subjected to Environmental Statement?

-Yes it has

What precisely has been modelled and assessed at 3.5 tonnes in terms of Environmental Impact Assessment?

-The HGV cut-off is at 3.5 tonnes – therefore that classification of HGVs has gone forward in noise and air quality calculations.

Network Rail have not given permission to release report due to inadequacies. Do you understand what they mean by 'inadequacies'?

-Not my position to speak on behalf of Network Rail. Consultations have made recommendations that Network Rail are not wholly comfortable with, and would like their engineers to look at.

Section 4.20, state that Network Rail requested 3.5 tonne weight limit?

-Yes

Section 4.23. WCC confident buses can be accommodated. Basis for that confidence?

-Previous work in relation to similar bridges, for example at Wilton. Consultants have been asked to confirm that exemption is possible.

Revisions to MSBC. Appendix K sets out comparisons between scheme cost estimates between E route and FW route. Clarify whether this has been revised or not?

-Remains unaltered.

And as far as the £7 million cost factored into the FW route for improvements to A36. Still have no clarification as to what improvements would be undertaken?

-Don't have anything further.

Not been revisited in terms of what the effect of the ban might be? At the time this was produced, we didn't have comparable figures for FW route with Station Rd ban?

-These are the costs for the FW route without HGV ban.

Are now in a position where we can know what the traffic flows are on FW route with the various bans in place?

-Do have figures

Is it WCC's case that given this new evidence, that has no effect at all on the scheme costs for the FW route?

-That assumes that we would implement weight ban with FW route.

Your position is that a HGV ban would not have impact on cost of FW route?

-Ban would have no impact.

Don't know what £7million improvements to A36 are, do we?

-Would refer back to previous evidence.

In terms of NPVs and COBA, the £7million have been factored in to analysis or not?

-Would have been in COBA.

Presumably the £7million spent on improving the A36 will have benefits in COBA terms?

-Mr Helps: The £7million would facilitate the FW route. More about facilitating the FW route than actually delivering overall improvements.

There would be no benefit to spending £7million?

-The benefit would be the facilitation of the FW route.

One of the advantages of the FW route would be that it served both a N-S and an E-W function?

-Don't serve the function of N-S as well as E route.

Is it the council's case that does not feature as a scheme benefit?

-Does feature as a benefit in that it completes the link to the FW route. Benefits are included.

The original MSBC, pg131, Table 7.6, FW bypass, Option Z. Costs of £43,515,000, which is different to the figure in Appendix K.

-That may be due to the way COBA is calculated.

Pg131. Total PVB of £153million. NPV of £109million. Those figures have been factored in to A36 improvements?

-Yes

No doubt about that?

-What is the point of that question?

The question is that will the £7million benefit other A36 users as well as users of the FW route?

- You are asking whether the £7million will improve journey times on the A36?
- The reason for having to spend that money is the increased flow on the A36 as a result of the FW route.
- Haven't included a benefit for existing A36 traffic.

Mr Yellowley: Have the improvements to the A36 been modelled as part of COBA?

- The improvements to the traffic using the FW route are included.

Mr Yellowley: Have the improvements to other A36 users been included in the modelled benefits of the FW route?

- No

Mr Langton: Could be accident savings as well as journey time savings.

Revision. Pg131. Compare and contrast. Been an explanation of the reduction of PVB for E route. In turn that has reduced the NVB. Looking at FW route, the NVB reduced from £109million to £80million. Largely attributed to reduction in consumer use benefits. What is that reduction attributable to?

- Had affected both schemes

Two reductions are completely disproportionate?

- Completely different schemes in terms of length and geography.

Reduction attributable to what?

- Questions raised regarding benefits at junctions in model. Investigated all the important junctions, and some corrections were made to the model, which has resulted to a reduction in benefits to both schemes.

Reduction to E route £4million. Reduction to FW route £29million.

- Demonstrates that FW route is less successful at attracting traffic from A350. When modifications made to model, it is normal that a longer route would have a larger reduction in benefits.

Flow diagrams. Seeking an explanation for why FW NPV should have been reduced so substantially, given that at a number of links, the FW route performs significantly better.

- 90% of traffic is not HGVs. When you look at changes to HGV flows, only looking at a small proportion of benefits.

In terms of percentage HGV reductions, what is attributable to E bypass and what is attributable to HGV ban, in percentage terms?

- All figures available, but not in percentage terms.

Only Hawkeridge Road modelled in relation to diversionary routes?

-Effect of ban has been modelled, Hawkeridge Rd is an alternative diversionary route.

-Minor roads may not be fully modelled.

Diversion via Yarnbrook roundabout.

-Sensible diversion

Mr Langton: Indication that disaggregation was done through national statistic.

Earlier you said disaggregation was done through looking at counts.

-Yes, misspoke earlier – disaggregation in fact done using national statistics.

Statement that police interest expressed in number plate recognition system.

-Mr Bullock. Wilts police consulted with Metropolitan police, and intended to investigate whether they had technological infrastructure.

Alternative enforcement measures?

-Could use traditional enforcement methods, e.g. signposting and police presence.

-Cameras

-Would have further discussions

Cost of implementation?

-Depends on technical issues.

Costs would be borne by whom?

-The police.

Mr Inwood

Why has it taken seven years for bridge issue to come to an head, just at time the bypass issue is being decided?

-Programme of assessing all railway bridges in Wiltshire. Report prepared in 2001. Process takes some time. Network Rail has register of at-risk structures, of which this bridge is one of many. Structure clearly has strength enough to remain standing.

Mr Bowley

Issue of public safety. Bridge could collapse at any time – weight limit is not the way to address the problem.

-Mr Langton: This is a matter between WCC and Network Rail. Not expressing view on bridge. Have dealt with bridges in the past – deciding whether a bridge is safe is a complicated issue. Is possible to have situation where some vehicles can be exempted.

Why is there no discussion at all of strengthening the bridge?

-That is a matter for WCC. The inquiry is into the bypass, not the bridge.

Mr Morland

The first issue that HPC were concerned with, was whether this ban is temporary or permanent.

-The responses are in relation to INQ3, which makes it clear that the ban will be in the long term. Have made clear this morning what will be happening in the short term.

HOC have queried the bridge clearance figures. Document does not state WCC's response. Are we right or wrong?

-Right.

Some reference this morning to town centre measures. Generally, none of those will happen unless bypass scheme goes forward?

-Agreed.

The 3 tonne weight restriction has been included in the DM scenario.

-The maps do not assume a 3 tonne weight limit.

Telling us that there will be a 3 tonne limit irrespective of the bypass?

-Without the bypass, the DM scenario might be different.

Extent to which weight limit necessary to make the scheme work, or necessary due to structural weaknesses of bridge. If the weight restriction is happening anyway, then the benefits or disbenefits of that weight restriction don't come into the benefits or disbenefits of the scheme?

-No, they don't come into the benefits of the scheme.

It is relevant to assess whether WCC's decision regarding the weight limit is rational.

-The proposal is for a bypass, with a weight limit on Station Rd.

-There is a need for a 3 tonne limit due to weakness of the bridge. The alternative route for vehicles is provided by the scheme. The 3 tonne limit would remain in place because of the bypass would provide an alternative route. If there was not going to be a bypass, there would have to be another viable alternative.

Is the bridge's lack of strength due to its age, or a defect in its design?

-It was adequate for its original purpose when it was constructed in 1899. Its weakness is not because it has deteriorated over time.

This bridge has performed adequately without a weight restriction for over a century. When did the Highways Authority first know it was a weak bridge?
-In 2001.

The first time this allegedly weak bridge came to public attention was when the 2007 planning application was made.
-No, the public weren't aware until 2007.

From the public's point of view, the issue has come before them as a result of the bypass planning application?
-Agreed

In Appendix C, you categorise emails from Network Rail as requesting a 3 tonne weight limit, though this doesn't appear to be entirely accurate.
-Network Rail have requested a weight limit. Backed up by a longer process, not limited to email itself.

If ban is temporary to allow for strengthening, then no responsible Highway Authority would disallow.
-The ban would not be temporary. It is a permanent ban. The only change to that is that it would be 3.5 tonnes.

No justification for Network Rail seeking a ban at a level below which they have liability.
-The strategy is for a permanent weight limit to be imposed.

If that proposal is accepted, there would be cost proposals. If any of those options went forward, where would the costs fall, and are the costs included as part of the bypass scheme. Benefits of limit are included in benefits of scheme, so therefore costs of limit should be included in costs of scheme.
-Could be a cost contribution from Network Rail, or from private developers. Need to talk to local businesses about whether they need high vehicles.

Cannot indicate whether all or part of costs would fall on public purse?
-Other potential contributors to this sort of measure. Cannot be certain at this early stage of the process.

The cost of strengthening the bridge would be less than weight limit.
-Cost of strengthening would not be less than weight limit.

If forcing HGVs to use different route, then presumably there are adverse costs to the operator. Does the modelling pick up the fact that HGVs would be using more expensive route?
-Yes. Route not necessarily more expensive. COBA still comes up with a cost benefit.

Was Ross Hillman surveyed?

-Wrote in at the same sort of time. Considered to supersede questionnaire.

Consequences of weight limit likely to force them from current site in Westbury.

-Quite a leap from what he said in his letter.

Other businesses must be in similar position. Whilst 3 tonne limit may have benefits for bypass scheme, may have adverse consequences for local businesses in employment areas both north and south of railway line.

-Have spoken to 72 local businesses. Wessex Chamber of Commerce do say that it would be unpopular with local businesses. Difficult situation would be relieved by bypass.

Mr Langton: This is a local issue, not one which the Secretary of State should be intervening in.

WCC have coupled the bridge strengthening issue with the bypass issue. Accept that a weight limit potentially cuts across the West Wilts Core Strategy and Options Paper, because the strategy had called for attracting new employment opportunities?

-Local employment will be well served by the bypass.

Link 18. Figures seem improbable, given significant HGVs still travel along that route.

-Mr Helps: HGVs between 3.5 tonnes and 7 tonnes.

How was analysis done?

-Analysed HGVs, suggesting that those were HGVs between 3.5 tonnes and 7 tonnes.

Mr Langton: The model defines HGVs as 3 tonnes. How have you dealt with routes which have an existing 7 tonne ban?

-Wouldn't have had an HGV ban on that link.

Does the model recognise the B3099 routes, which has an existing 7.5 tonne limit?

-It would appear not.

Mr Yellowley: Is this the case for the model as a whole?

-Other roads in the model do have bans.

-The B3099 was an isolated error. Generally existing HGV bans have been included in the model.

-The intention in the modelling would be to incorporate the HGV bans on existing links.

Re-examination

Mr Bullock. Taken to list of consultees. WWDC not one of consultees. What is WWDC's attitude to overall scheme?

-Supportive of scheme.

-WWDC were consultees as part of planning application.

Document 129. Pg11, para 4.23. Confident that buses could be accommodated. Any change from that position?

-No. Consultants looking at various measures. Further discussions will be held.

In a former life, what were you?

-A bridge engineer.

Do you foresee any difficulty in accommodating buses?

-No

Adequacy of businesses in consultation process?

-Focus on businesses that would be caused the most convenience. Clearly a tendency to pick on the larger businesses that would be served regularly by large HGVs.

WCC129 A. Appendix B. Additional representations. In addition to your exercise, was any other consultation undertaken?

-Len Turner undertook conversations. Struggled to attain formal responses.

-Believe he contacted all his membership.

Mr Helps. Asked questions in relation to delays on bridge as a result of shuttle working. Journey time benefit taken into account.

-Using professional judgement in my opinion that delays and savings likely to cancel each other out.

What was the area over which you were judging the journey time benefits?

-Wider area through Westbury.

COBA. Asked why the reductions in benefits were much less for the E route. In terms of the exercise that was carried out, was the exercise consistent for both the E and FW route?

-Yes

Inspector's Questions

WCC129. Para 4.5. Traffic flows showing reductions on existing A350 with HGV ban on Station Rd. Shown that HGVs would prefer to use bypass than town centre. Which scenario does this refer to?

-Refers to the bypass with the weight ban.

-Not unfair to say that this would still be the case even without HGV ban.

Add substantially to HGV flows on Fore St.

-The proposal is for the bypass with the weight limit. Comment that even with weight limit, HGVs would still use the town centre rather than the bypass.

-On Fore St, without a bypass and with a weight ban, HGVs would have to find a significantly longer route.

What evidence did you use?

-Without bypass there would be an increase in HGVs on Fore Street.

-The effect of the ban is to increase the vehicles on Fore Street.

Looking at re-routing of vehicles. Comments elsewhere suggest an increase in traffic being sent around Yarnbrook and Hawkeridge Road. Yet under DM scenario, the flow is reduced until Dursely Rd, when it increases. The increase in HGVs between Heywood and Bitterne Park is about 500. The increase between Yarnbrook is less than 200.

-Correct

-The effect of the ban is to change the HGV movements across a wider area.

No change in traffic coming from the south. Vehicles seem to stop at Heywood.

-This data is only 10% of the model. The actual number of HGVs in the model remains the same.

Issue of whether weight ban should be in the DM scenario. Benefits attributed to bypass.

-At the time of the modelling it wasn't part of the DM, but now it is part of the DM.

-In terms of the overall effect that would have on the benefits, does not have significant effect – 90% of traffic unaffected.

MSBC revisions. Scheme cost changes for FW route.

-The cost of the FW route bypass was revised by £2million.

Contradiction between Mr Bullock and Mr Helps.

-Mr Bullock: No change to Appendix K. NPV costs were always different.

Point is that the E bypass has not changed, but the FW route has.

-Were for the same year. Slight revision to FW route.

-Will have to clarify.

Still a disproportionate change between the figures for E route and FW route.
Was any investigation done with regards this?

-COBA for FW route re-analysed. Any other errors were then rectified.

Suggesting that there were other changes beyond those stated in position paper?

-Will cover this issue in the form of a written response.

Annex 7, changes to MSBC.

-Mentions 1.9% additional trips

This is a mistake and is not consistent with the texts. Should have been changed to 1.2%. The document we now have is dated May 2008. The document that was used in response to Mr Nicholson's evidence was the December 2007 version.

What had happened to the May 2008 version?

-Apologise for it not being issued

What explains the difference in the two figures?

-Between December and May, there was a refinement in the methodology and the variables that were used in the calculations.

The amount of induced traffic sensitivity test. The induced traffic is about halved, but the effect on benefits is greater. Compare Table 3.1, refer to different methods of analysis. The differences in benefits is not proportionate to the change in induced traffic.

-Different values used. Those small changes to some variables produce large changes in the reduction in benefits. Modelling incredibly sensitive to small changes.

-Work ongoing regarding this type of modelling in terms of substantiating modelling. At the moment the fixed-trip matrix approach is acceptable. When variables are changed, then this can produce quite large changes to the result. Still contend that meet criteria for fixed-trip matrix approach.

Should be variable trip matrix?

-Discussions over elasticity values are continuing.

TAG worksheets. COBA **R7**. Summary table.

-*Should be R7, not R6.*

Is that the latest version available?

-There was a R9 that was withdrawn for technical reasons. An R10 released in July. DfT advises that we continue to use R7.

Told us that you believe the B3099 does not have a restriction modelled.

-Correct.

Tell me again whether the other routes have a restriction modelled?

- Shows continuous length, whereas in reality restrictions are signposted, and HGVs can use sections of those links, but not as through routes.
- Possible that HGV is accessing area where a weight ban is in place for part of the route.

A condition regarding weight ban on The Ham suggested. No suggested condition for weight limit on Station Road. Would seem that if the limit is part of the scheme, then a condition is needed. Logical that might be necessary to have 7.5 tonne weight ban on Station Rd as a condition.

Regarding the MSBC, what is precisely the state of play in procedural terms?

- Been issued, but at very early stage within the department.
- Need to speak with RDA.

Two stage procedure, where document is looked at, then submitted. Which stage is it at?

- Beyond initial stage. Waiting for recognition that has been received.