

18/6/08 C = Charlie K = Khansari R = Randle I = Inspectors

C WWreg doc CD4.4 published in 1996 K- yes

C Has this been updated? K my evidence refers to this but no updates. Does refer to updates on certain aspects.

C 4.3 of proof. Diff access.. slow economic development. Pfr Whitelegg WHA p6 page 12

C para 5.10 table rankings of deprivation 2004 and 2007. 5.11 comments WW performs very well indeed source GVT data. Do you accept that? K - we pick on that. Towns in on A350 Wilts covers whole area. Segregate as in my evidence. South on A350 wages drop, population seem to be disadvantaged as you move away from the M4

C You accept GVT data WW is better off than 75%? K - I said that yes.

C Westbury specifically WW101. WWTrading Estate. Section the estate today. Vacancies at lowest levels 10 yrs.. management of estate effective. Do you accept that? K No. Accept at face value but doesn't tell me 75% or 90%. This should be read for what it is, an ad for the trading estate. I do know about property.

C Specific regeneration schemes for Westbury Town Centre WHA 102 5 towns initiative page 2 . regeneration of market place. More detail in WHA103 C dated 2007? K Yes. I must explain we work closely with WWDC. WWDC are funding and this is online for this year.

C last page of this doc. plans on schedule. Has work started? K contract still being worked up, completion scheduled for Dec

C Public consultation June - Oct. Rather large file produced yesterday. Mouchel P Report. K that is town centre improvements. Not part of application, part of programme to follow bypass, once traffic removed.

C Market place. K offline and deliverable. C without the bypass? K Again I repeat off line and deliverable.

C WHA 104 Response WWDC 2004 reg consultation page 4 Restructuring of the economy has been successful. Do you agree? K I do not have the knowledge to agree or disagree.

C No sig problem with unemployment in WWilts. Agree? K it must be true if there...contradictory. Local jobs will decrease...A no unemployment, B successful? K I think it's contradictory evidence in rest of doc, set in context, 2004 lot of discussion. PUA/city areas and position seems to have changed. Rural authority did object to this in certain areas. Sub region of Bristol. National debate at time of this doc. Not supporting link with PUA's

C CPO's and deliverability. Orders published. Not the first time in respect of an Eastern Bypass. K as far as I know these published in 2007 only ones.

C prior to this? Minutes of meeting 2/9/98/WCC Not heard of this. Agenda item 10 resolved no 4 make a CPO for a Westbury bypas... K doesn't mean they were published

C were they published K I do not believe they were. 2005-6 we asked for deligation again and published 2007. C was this resolved?

C 1st section of AppB cabinet report 16/12/05 authorised CPO to be made..do you see that? Yes that is it.

C 2005 app withdrawn K Yes. C did not apply K I cannot reply

C 2005 and 2007 applications different.....? K I disagree with that. **not a significant difference in 2005 and 2007 applications but minor changes in mitigation measures. SPO's and CPO's not significant changes.**

C BBB2Sc this a local improvement measure? K yes

C para 5 report to cabinet Westbury bypass progress as a local scheme K yes

C para 6 K Yes C para 8 on basis of **this** analysis - benefit for **drivers**, limited to these points? K I would think so

C p 3 risk assess - (2005) there have been changes since then? K yes we've established that

C these risks still exist? K No scheme can be risk free

C many risks attached to this scheme? K at this stage there are many risks. WCC continues to fund necessary resources to progress the scheme.

C GVT funding CD10.1 DfT 2007 p4 para 2.2 This scheme has not achieved programme entry? K No. C MSBC not yet to DfT? K No 23/6/08

C p26 programme entry 3 stages satisfy 1,2 &3? K just explain. have already satisfied... funding has changed several times during this period. It has 3 stage approval system. We have been in consultation with DfT last few months before application (goes in?) **SO FAR WE HAVE HAD NO**

MAJOR QUERIES SENT BACK. The way we have done this.. early contractor procurement scheme, procurement is complete. did this as WCC realised input would be vital especially for mitigation measures. Will give evidence (Osborne)

C This scheme still does not have programme entry. K I already said that

C regeneration important part of the scheme? K yes

C regen imp part of scheme economic impact report must be produced. Has it? K I cannot confirm that. In early draft it is mentioned but I cannot confirm.

C Regen CD5.3 MSBC May 2007 officers report to regulatory committee p41 para 204 onwards. There is no mention of regeneration elements of the scheme? K improving reliability to WWilts towns is how this will help but I haven't come across the word regeneration.

Mr Randle

Q HaywoodPCC. Are you aware of all correspondence? K No

R Letters referred to H PCC. 14/5 21/3/07 and would be considered under this policy. K No response to planning. Local authority can be planner and provider of permission. We use different departments for different purposes.

R 3 remaining letters. Copy of that from planning inspection? K No idea

Copy of letter to Sec of State? Can you answer? K No?

Can you help/ at time these letters sent 2007. Was it known that PI would be held? K Yes

Q from WHA CD 5.3 regul report. page 41 para 205 regeneration? Word regeneration did not appear? K yes

R same doc para 10? 1997-8 planning conference. What is position with regard to objectives and would it meet these? K Yes

R CPO Appendix B 1st item 2005 compulsory purchase. Reasons produced (in folder) doc with orders para 1.7 page 3 CPO has been made and published authorised 16/12/05 and amended 31/8/07 via delegated powers. K Yes I should have explained. R is it authorised K Yes

R Funding. Not cross-examined / Q are you aware that these matters have been considered and are aware that they are in the green folder K No R will return

WHA 104 RSS response Nov 2004. page 3 regeneration...para no unemployment council must be involved what does that mean? K Unforeseen problems in future.

R penultimate proximity to PUAs priority to make these towns self contained and stop out commuting = reduce traffic? What is relevance to out commuting? K Main objective to invite more investment to go with local jobs and higher paid jobs.

R Improvements of T links WWstrategy...WWDC region strat T improvement to A350. How does this scheme fit with this? K scheme is aimed at same objectives accessibility to employment sites AQ shared

R WHA 103 (102 no date) Nov 07. Improvements already in Westbury. Map shows A350 and market place. It would appear that there are granite sets and York flags to A350. Works off line can be carried out. What does this show of finalising the plan? K Work can only be completed when flow of traffic reduced on A350 or would cause delays. Town Centre improvement, accessibility walking cycling cannot do before bypass as not

R yesterday - departure application. Call in letter 11/7/07 para 2 Sec policy .. very selective.

Planning issues more than local. Nat policies. Local? K No Y=That is right

R climate change and later alternative route. Bypasses not acceptable how should a Western bypass be judged. K If roads bad for climate change then any road would be bad.

R PPS1 identity policy basis is forbidden. K Not at all and I did say yes. whole strategy complies to that policy and I didn't add MR Simpkins proof mentions that.

R policy imp climate to change has led to policy change, roads are forbidden. K No

R PPG13 Annex C infrastructure this application (Infrat?) K Y

R comply with NATA. How has it followed this guidance? K you will see MSBC will show this assessment.

R para 8.10 of proof new RSS. We are in middle of process. 8.11 you are also in App C contact with SWRA? K Y. Letter dated MAY 07 After plan app? K Y. Comment of last para growth in line with RPG 10 in line selective to improve safety.... env improvements.

R over the page K _ A350 is a regional significant road.....

R climate change known about then. K Y

R T Sust T Sy CD13.1 (no copy available of full doc) Climate change, forward, goal of T policy para set context para 3 longterm spending for roads.....continued investment...Does that include roads
K Y

R cost of policies.....Does that relate to roads as well as other aspects/ K All

R discuss doc. Edd and Stern page with photo it begins a process of debate sustained and sustainable. Is that the beginning? K it is a discussion doc

R page 28 para 214 depends on congestion, all modes congested..... How do we regard this?

Cong over all periods or localised/ Part or full picture? K read it again. You have to have increase capacity if there are sustained periods. R West ? K leave to others

R County CD2.9 LTP 01-06 2.10 and 2.11 Annex 1 WWSTS (not 1996 doc purple one) page 70 6.2 towns challenges para 3 integrated package multi modal measures safe and sust T choices. What you said yesterday? K Y

R page 3 of forward Vision for strategy .Balance pop growth ... inward investment.. journey distances.. The scheme should be seen as part of this as you pointed out? K Y most important to see it that way.

R page 4 annex Need 2.3 ... table.. obj and goal...Effect of scheme how many boxes would it tick K most if not all. Y, Y, Y Y Y econ Y accessY goods by rail part of strategy but not bypass schemeY rail passengers Y I(strategy not scheme)....access to P T Would directly effect all but 2, but those 2 indirectly

R Targets LTP 2 page 73? 5.1 no ref to road building? K Y page 74 investment priorities high = delivery of LTP ! schmes K refers to E bypass. E B K Y

R funding listing... Last resort K Y

LTP p 123? transport management 11.2 responsibility CC has duty....is it case that CC have responsibility ? K Y

R LYP page 148 ch 9 congestion 149 point made no ref to Westbury? K Y Did not know of cons process. Ch 4 cons 4.2 look what we find 7/10/ event? K Y

R Event in Westbury. Congestion top priority but not Westbury. What can Westbury achieve that others cannot? K build a bypass/ Was that known / K Y

R journey time surveys A350. When was Semington opened ? K mid 2004

Would that have effect on A350?k Y

R traffic growth page 231 table county wide. At Actual and target. what T K Increasing R what mean K heavier traffic.

R not aware of proposal for future LTP p227 15.4 perf ind.. targets 4 principle 3 benchmarking and feedback. " analysis expect to modify trend in future? K influence other initiatives rail and trunk road

R table 14.2 LTP 5 yr exp final 3 entries Harnham.... Westbury exp 18.9 m 08-09. Bypass taken into account in the targets? K Y

R your Appendix B Results of planning conference App 8 economic (**R we will paginate better next time!!!**)

Figures you went through no offer of soft measurs? K Y

need for bypass 3rd Q K I am on wrong page

K does W need a bypass 87% yes

R chair of conf app 1 consultation and put forward their ideas. What was this? K open door

R some debate PT and some CC bypass rail and bus town and cycling K all modes of transport looked at

What more could WCC do? K No more than this

R Parkmann 1999 report app to Papp. P report which follow are they inApp B K Y

R Confirm Structure plan before Inq. Matters concerned for others rather than yourself? KY

Inspectors Yarnbrook and West Ashton a scheme there a high priority have seen some proposals what is progress? K Resource allocation has been agreed for this year. option appraisal to be drawn up this year. Dept leave this. Did some appraisal in the past but fresh look this year to come up with a solution.

WW A361 has it gone forever? K I think it was from days before many other schemes on the network improved and that has gone..

Decision to move funding decision to region part of general policy not specific to Westbury K over £5m will be prioritised by region. Inspector Y

Inspector planning permission - outline consent granted in 2000? still extant.

K market - farmers market Trowbridge and Frome but not Westbury last Friday of month 4 stalls?