

NOTES ON CROSS-EXAMINATION OF NICK HELPS – 18/19th JUNE, 2008

- Q: There are difficulties with peak hour congestion in Westbury? NH: YES
- Q: Of that congestion in peak hours, what contribution to it is the school run? NH: The School run can be in the a.m. peak
- Q: What percentage? A: We look at traffic flows during term time and then school holidays.
- Q: That is simplistic as they take holidays during the holiday period so traffic flows lower, so all school runs count against reduction we see in school holiday periods – cannot all be attributed to school runs – what percentage? NH: I do not have a figure.
- Q: You do not have a figure. You have no figure for peak hour proportion, one of many journey trips in the am peak, and cannot identify them.
- Q: Do you have any evidence about progress of School Travel Plans within the Westbury area? NH: Do have a School Travel Plans Officer and lots of schools.....
- Q: Schools in Westbury have School Travel Plans? NH: Do not have data
- Q: Out-commuting in am peak N-bound. What is percentage of peak hour congestion for out-commuting? NH: No data to hand. The out-commuting data comes from the Census but for that specific criteria is not to hand.
- Q: Any evidence about % out-commuting N-bound that are employed by WWDC or Wiltshire CC in Trowbridge? NH: The only way to have that data is surveys of CC staff and also WWDC.
- Q: Not something which is in traffic model? NH: No information to hand
- Q: Does Wiltshire or WWDC have Work Place Travel Plans in place? NH: Generally CC does, but not aware of status in DC.
- Q: Public transport capacity travelling between Westbury and Trowbridge. Do you have any evidence to put to the Inquiry on the capacity? NH: There are bus passenger surveys taken by CC, particularly on services contracted to Council, and also data collected for regional Western Wiltshire model on public transport. In comparison with amount of data – very small figure, small amount travelled. Do not have data on capacity.
- Q: When CC first embarked on model for Western Wiltshire Area – went up to Ch’ham and included Westbury in data collected for multi-modal modelling, making reference to actual level of trips taken? NH: Was quite small compared to number of car trips.
- Q: Same question in respect of rail – rail travel between Westbury/Trowbridge am - % of capacity unutilised? NH: Mainly relates to boarding/alighting counts and rail company also collect own data but no figure showing what capacity is.
- Q: In terms of modal splits – no current evidence as to what present situation is? NH: Very specific region.
- Q: Take a wider perspective. Travel by residents from Westbury – more data which is included within evidence at 2 – 2.23 of brief.
- Q: If this scheme is completed, how will you know what change will be made in terms of shifts to other forms of transport? NH: Because of the effects of traffic in Westbury, there will be an increase.
- Q: That is a judgement on your perception of the quality of the walking environment and impact that traffic has on that. Therefore, taking that that where it is in model, and the scope of road scheme you will have difficulty in assessing changes in walking flows? NH: Expert opinion – upward in walking.
- Q: But no indication of scale? NH: No, because of difficulty of data collection
- Q: Applies to walking, cycling, bus use? NH: Bus use – yes. Rail use – yes.
- Q: WHA109 – AAT flows at bottom of first page – Haynes Road Westbury. NH: Have figures for weekday and whole week.
- INSP: Grid of numbers – a row of numbers. What do numbers? Would it be helpful if I find original file AADT data – the first figure given for Haynes Road is 14,765 NH: 1996 – Yes
- Q: Following year that reduced to 13,920? NH: Yes
- Q: Further reduction in flow in 1998, then increase to 14,008, slightly higher? NH: Yes

- Q: Then reduction in year 2000, increase in 2001, no figures for 2002/3 but increase again in 2004, slight reduction in 2005 and 2006 a further reduction – fluctuations? NH: but latest figure ...
- Q: In percentage terms less than 1% - 350 vehicles – OK – 1.8% NH: Yes
- Q: Over an eleven year period we have had less than 2% traffic growth through Westbury? NH: Yes
- Q: Fourth left. No.96 Heywood, N of Westbury, which will be affected by scheme. Ref.No: 96 Site L2 there the first figure is for 91 NH: Yes Heywood affected
- Q: 13,531: 2006 – 14,122 + 80 in 2007. 1991 – 2006 figure % difference is 4.2% NH: Yes
- Q: = 4.3% increase at A350 north of Westbury NH: Yes agreed
- Q: No very substantial growth for sixteen year period
- Q: There is advantage over A350 Corridor in number of bypasses – that around Warminster – may not be A350; bypass around Frome; Chippenham; Semington – so we may compare and contrast with post bypass – not much in terms of traffic, but purported economic benefits NH: Repeat.
- Q: No.71 – Chippenham Western Bypass in 1998 – 13,083 and in 2006 – 20,469. In space of eight years a 36% increase in traffic – you accept? NH: I make it higher – increase of 7,387 = % of 56%!
NH: Yes, agree. Row 72 – much smaller increase of 20%
- Q: In road traffic terms, increases of 20%? NH: The reason is these roads are new roads. When they open not necessarily taking new traffic so whilst agree an increase it = a decrease elsewhere.
- Q: Increases on this corridor on bypasses built in last eight years total increase of 56% traffic flows. NH: Qualify – 1998 figure very low, lower than 1999.
- Q: When you have new road you have to take account of when road implemented. NH: Accurate counts, but take issue with the fact that there is a difference between 1998/1999. Opening year you would have very significant % increase as going from nothing.
- Q: Notwithstanding, in eight year period an increase of 56% NH: On that particular piece of road, and reduction elsewhere.
- Q: Semington – 76. In 1991 – 15,786 NH: Yes agreed.
- Q: Increasing in 2007 to 21,199 NH: Yes
- Q: % - 24% rise with a bypass
- INSP: Only one line attributed to Semington? NH: Because it says A Semington. Those flows consistent with what flows were. New figures are on bypass. Q: It would have been on old A350 through Semington – 34% increase NH: Yes
- Q: Those stretches of A350 corridor, have you looked at those that have not had benefit of bypasses and have seen increases in 1 – 4.3% range - those bypassed have seen increases in the range of 35 – 56%!
NH: Where new road scheme you need to look at bypassed road and bypass.
- Q: Projected figures for this scheme - APP F Part A of ES. First take you to Drawing No. 3 which compares Do Minimum with Eastern Bypass. Drawing No. 4 shows do minimum/Eastern bypass in centre of Westbury. Drawing No. 5, do minimum compared with Option Z – Far Western. Then in drawing 6 we have centre of Westbury for Far Western Route Z. Just clarify situation in terms of the HGV ban modelling. The projections for the eastern bypass are predicted on the HGV ban on Station Road? NH: Yes
- Q: The figures for the Far Western Route Z are not predicted with a ban on Station Road? NH: Correct.
- Q: The do minimum scenario is not based, does not have an HGV ban on it? NH: Correct
- Q: So, not exactly comparing like with like? NH: Well, the Far Western Route gives access to W.Wilts Trading Estate and then down towards Standerswick – no need for a ban on Station Road, it is not as essential.
- Q: So essential so far as the first scheme is concerned? NH: Yes, essential
- Q: Do we have a do minimum model with a ban on Station Road? NH: That would require – be slightly unusual, because HGV would come up through Westbury, carry on, go up to Yarnbrook and

back down from north. To put in HGV ban would be too late because HGVs would have already come through Westbury.

Q: From the south? NH: Yes

Q: The HGV ban is we are not looking at like for like – one has an HGV ban? NH: The eastern route requires an HGV ban and western route, it is not such a strong requirement to have that ban.

Q: Drawing 004 – we are looking at figure between “do minimum” east with HGV ban on B3097 Station Road. To NW of that we have figure of HGVs “do minimum” = 160/ with eastern bypass nil. Presumably that nil is attributable to the ban, not the bypass? NH: Eastern Bypass provides an alternative road. The alternative could be a longer diversion through Westbury

Q: Comparison FWRoute – ban on Station Road not necessary? NH: It would still reduce HGV travel avoiding further roads if you add the above on the Far Western

Q: So comparison between eastern and far western is not an equal one? NH: In terms of origin/ destination it is a comparison because you are showing distribution of traffic.

Q: But large majority – over 90% - are general traffic and that is what model is demonstrating. Minor changes.

(Had to change notebooks a number of times to continue taking notes – at this stage am having difficulty choosing where to stitch them together again!)

2.4 NH: It is not intention of proposed bypass. 2009 proposed scheme would produce up to 50% reduction in HGVs. 54%/88% Warminster Road, a meaningful threshold of change.

2.5 It is correct that the Route Z is predicted to carry more HGVs? NH: Because E/W carries A361/ A350 but far less effective in Westbury where there is less than half the traffic relief. 84% - 66 compared to 99.

6.12 Not isolated – HGV ban on Station Road Westbury – Tackling congestion and Journey Time Reliability – tackling pinch points. 2.10.8

2.10.11 Statement 2.18 TAG map not to substitute transport performing badly when skill shortages have a much more important part to play – under performing area. WWilts is under performing area.

2.1.1.1 “or” means a fixed demand assessment is acceptable. If it meant one of the criteria , but it is mid for both ten and fifteen year. COBA part, but important part. Fixed trip matrix used.

COBA 11 – updated two years ago so DfT continue to support this methodology.

Government policy to use COBA, therefore cannot be questioned at this Inquiry

CH: Doesn't put forward an alternative to assess value for money of road schemes

WHA 107: Clarify that the requirement to undertake these tables - “New Deal for Transport” – does the DfT approach to undertake precisely in this way and produce the small table in this way and followed in case of Westbury? A: Did not affect traffic with HGV ban on Station Road.

CH: Could you produce this? A: It could be done, and it would show with the HGV ban on Far Western Route they would just simply divert to option Z.

CH: So taking them off Station Road could do that? A: Quite

CH: When was ban on Station Road introduced into bypass, not from the start,? A: It was to remedy the HGV – during the modelling process, but it was obviously before. During the time would have been in the region of the time in the work, pre the first 2005 application? A: Do not know.

CH: Essentially the scheme element is by no means a firm scheme element. It is part of the scheme used but what if it is not enforced? WCC are not responsible for enforcement. A: But if it was implemented, the CC would request police take action and CC would also discuss with offending companies, or suppliers, to ensure the ban is enforced and is done on voluntary basis.

CH:: In terms of Model of HGV within Westbury, what is attributable to HGV ban, and what is not? A: ? what is meant?

CH:: 004 – B3098 – Do minimum HGV = 312
 With Eastern Bypass = 12

How much of that reduction of 300 if attributable to the scheme for the bypass, and how much to the ban on Station Road? How much attributable to construction of Bypass? A: Shortest local route would continue through Westbury. Requirement of ban to ensure - and again SoS be assured, that if Planning Permission is granted for the scheme, that this will be implemented. List of Conditions and Planning Permission Condition that WCC required to enact traffic regulation on road.

CH:: First implementation – and enforcement? A: WCC would be to enact a Traffic Regulation Order to meet its requirements and a Condition, would also be added to monitor HGVs on road. Were it to be avoided police would be involved to find out why it is flouted.

CH: If you construct the new road and HGV bans implemented and difficulties are.... A: If you construct new road you would get a high degree of compliance, then police involved and prosecutions.

CH: What surety? A: Whole series of Traffic Regulations and CC in discussion with the Police. Would ask Chief Constable to make resources available and I would hope he would and there would be enforcements, painting a picture – hypothetical picture between Police, property owners

CH: The Planning Application says that you would seek to introduce a ban once the scheme is in place. As far as HGV reductions within Westbury town centre – no ban on Ham Road – what is attributable to bypass and what to HGV ban? A: Whole point of proposal is to relieve – the only way scheme will be constructed is to have a ban in place. The CC has made clear the HGHV ban is part of the scheme.

CH: It is not a part. A: It is a commitment the CC has made, part of the package as discussed with Kansari yesterday.

CH: The scheme is part of the wider package? A: part of scheme to put in town centre measures.

CH: That wider package of measures, no matter what that might be, it is not part of this application in fact? The traffic ban requires a Traffic Regulation Order? A: It does require a separate local process, if the decision is to permit this scheme.

CH:: Beyond HGV ban, traffic calming, taking various measures to make Westbury town centre more attractive for walkers, whole package of transport improvements: A: That package of town centre measures did not require planning permission, but are covered in the scheme. CC made commitment and if Traffic Orders are required to implement them, this Inquiry does not require those Conditions to receive Planning Permission.

CH:: So, if the CC commits itself to doing something, it will be done. A: Part of the scheme and part of costings.

CH: When did it commit itself to building the Westbury Bypass? A: The Preferred Route was reconfirmed in 2002 – the Eastern Bypass Preferred Route adopted 1998. More work on Western routes later.

CH: Then ten years? A: Was revisited - This package of measures is not part of PA.

CH: Not part of Environmental Statement? A: Any costings for scheme includes costings for measures.

- CH: But in terms of ES Assessment there has been no assessment of this package of measures? A: You are suggesting they would have detrimental effects?
- CH: Not suggesting anything. A: They take advantage of reduction of traffic..
- CH: Why is that in the Environmental Assessment, as technically they did not have to be in environmental Assessment as not part of Planning Application? NH: Work. There are preferred options for these measures but did not require full Environmental Assessment because CC has powers to effect these schemes.
- CH: The package has not been assessed in ES nor assessed in any other way? NH: The major environmental effect is the road, did not require an ES in the same way as new road construction.
- CH: Accept Eastern scheme will result in increased traffic on certain parts of the Corridor. NH: Some increases on certain lengths?
- CH: Yarnbrook and West Ashton – Drawing OO3. NH: Some do have increases, there is a re-distribution of traffic from centre of town, and some of links have changes in traffic.
- INSP: Yarnbrook/West Ashton, for example – what numbers? NH: On 003, just south of North Bradley –
 ?? Where End?? 483 HGVs 572
 With all vehicles/do minimum: 10,613
 With Eastern 11,141
- INSP: Yarnbrook vehicles stay same? Just north of Haynes Road :
 All vehicles 13,423 - 14,565
 HGVs 228 - 323
 NH: YES
- INSP: Next point – similar figures :
 13,822 increases - 14,983
 228 - 323
 NH: Showing re-distribution
- CH: West Ashton and Yarnbrook already pinch points, particularly Yarnbrook. This scheme does nothing to alleviate that – at certain points it exacerbates it. NH: There are changes in places, it will change levels of delay and increase some links' use.
- CH:: What effect on journey time reliability? A: Additional piece of evidence, in addition to schedule the TAG worksheets as assessed to our ?middle area? 19% reduction in stress. Takes the model of the network shown on these plans.
- CH: Except Yarnbrook as pinch point in need of attention NH: not a part of this scheme?
- CH: We have no intimation at all as to when a scheme to relieve Yarnbrook will come into effect? NH: Yes that is correct.
- CH:: Do we have, as part of ES Impact, all these increases in terms of delays, congestion, air quality? NH: We have an impact of any delays as that is included in COBA.
- NH:: Congestion? NH:: Included in COBA
- CH:: Noise? NH: Ask expert
- CH:: Air Quality: NH: Ask expert.

- CH: HGV ban in Station Road – if necessary they will have traffic regulation order in place. Inform Inquiry what the procedure is> NH: The procedure would be for the CC to advertise their intention to have traffic order – press advertisement – period of consultation and CC will discuss if they want to confirm the order.
- CH: How long would that take? NH: Depend whether there were any objections. Would be within a year, possibly less.
- CH: Objections from various people in units on Westbury Trading Estate? NH: Not associated with opening of bypass.
- CH: If there were objections? NH: CC would still confirm the order if it was assured bypass opened by the time order came into effect – so happen at the same time.
- CH: HGV ban – essential part of the scheme, and the scheme is part of a broader package of measures? NH: Yes
- CH: Which should ease traffic flow? NH: No, not ease traffic flow.
- CH: Sofaras objections to this scheme are concerned – has seen Officer Report “improved transport links to facilitate, to ease transport of goods to encourage businesses to locate and facilitate still very much objectives? NH: Yes.
- CH: Scheme part of broader package of measures? NH: There is town centre measures, not actual part of planning application because they can be dealt with under the Highways Act.
- CH: Town centre measures consist of what? NH: There is a report on town centre measures (checks) it may be document – banter – asked if copies were available and you have one and also have (INSP) Westbury Town Centre Preliminary Drawing WHA 111 – does not have copy? No.
- CH: Within that document is there a summary of town centre measures that will be carried out? NH: Are you going to take questions about traffic model, or engineering measures of scheme which should be put to Mr. Stokes?
- CH: We have the town centre measures set out in WHA 111, part of the package, what else does the package consist of? NH: The lorry ban we discussed; specific to this scheme, these are the main elements of this scheme. Application; town centre measures and the proposed HGV ban. But when we talk about package, there is the whole WWST package which was part of LTP1 which covered whole area from Chippenham to Warminster which included variety of measures to assist all motor transport, so this set of measures for Westbury are part of that whole WWST Strategy.
- CH: Anything about it in LTP2? NH: Was discussed yesterday - about real time bus passenger system implemented from Salisbury to Bath, including Westbury, where real time bus information with satellite is implemented on corridor from Salisbury
- CH: So have scheme within local package – town centre measures and lorry ban? NH: Well, LTP 1 were aspirations, but unfortunately some of aspirations, it is the CC intention to lobby for other improvements, particularly on railways. There have been improvements, minor, like cycle parking at stations to trying to regain the frequency on the rail service – lobbying of rail operators, etc., rather than capital work which County can take – and that also goes for Westbury Railfreight Terminal. That is something which CC would like to see, because where railfreight grants work, it is for the operators to make application and given grants – it is not permissible for the CC to use its resources to actually invest in railfreight facilities – and same true for new rail infrastructure – not possible for the DfT would prefer funding through other mechanisms other than LTP. Corsham Grant made and accepted, but unfortunately the rail service was withdrawn and did not go ahead. Lot of efforts to do new infrastructure because rail service, it ?? upon us – withdrawn by operator.
- CH: Town centre improvements – can you summarise what they are? NH: Cannot be criticised for not covering that.

CH: Soft measures are important – and could make the purported need for the bypass as less necessary?
INSP: You have report now is there not?
CH: The inference from Mr. Helps yesterday was that all these town centre measures could be implemented without planning permission? NH: It might be, for these engineering schemes, and we have a witness for engineering. Be best put for that.
INSP: Traffic modelling
CH: Will further planning permissions be required? NH: Kansari – I am not planning expert, or highway.
CH: No further planning permissions will be required, and given that these, the town centre measures, are part of the local package, I am trying to clarify the position with regards further planning permissions?
SR: More like fishing exercise – not sensible use of Inquiry time. Mr. Hopkins to express view - dealt with out of Inquiry time and agreement reached, but the reality is, this is not a question of whether planning permission required.
CH: Environmental Impact Assessment - that may follow on from whether planning permission required. where development is involved? NH: Had a brief – all measures are within the highway – do not require any land acquisition, therefore, CC can use its powers under the Highways Act 1980. In the CA there would be discussions with WWDC, but wide powers – usually implemented when planning permission given so not required for any of these.
CH: Take it up with Mr. Simpkins?

WHA112 – Advertisement – with inducement to participate – passed to NH to read it.

INSP: Can you help Mr. Helps with date of this document? NH: 3rd May 1999.
CH: It relates to WWSTS – to improve opportunity for walking, cycling, Government objective of encouraging modal shift? NH: Yes, package. Involved in production of this document – an A3 sheet delivered to all households in this area.
CH: Measures could include 20 mph zones in pedestrian areas, improved facilities for bus passengers, road closures, plus new cycle routes; bus information; improved train services – is that in place?
NH: No.
CH: One-way system that makes specific reference to the Westbury Bypass, making the inference that they could be implemented without the bypass? NH: Difficult without reducing traffic flow.
CH: Without the eastern bypass – the 20 mph limit in Westbury? NH: That could be implemented in Westbury. 20mph have been introduced in some residential areas but cannot confirm they are in Westbury.
CH: 20 mph, without an eastern bypass? NH: Do not know that there are in in the residential area – one of other witnesses may be able to assist with that – Mr. Slater.
CH: Pedestrian priority at junctions as part of raised tables, etc. these measures are included in the town centre measures? NH: No – planned to be introduced in conjunction with the bypass.
CH: Nine years ago? Have crossings been introduced in Westbury? They are measures within town centre measures? NH: The reason why these measures have not been introduced in Westbury – with the post bypass situation, the measures would be different with the bypass with reduced traffic flow, so rather than invest in measures, then take them out and put in stronger priority measures, it was decided to put in wholesale measures with construction of the bypass.
CH: The only specific reference made to the ... is the potential for one way with contraflow bus lanes
NH: That option was not taken forward.

- CH: Improved facilities for bus passengers – have new cycle routes been introduced in Westbury since 1999? NH: Not aware of any. Mr. Stokes will be able to assist, they are certainly proposed as part of the town centre
- CH: LTP1 Page 95 – summarised from previous documents, except there are a number of measures which could be implemented in Westbury which would affect traffic flows, that have not been – without a bypass? NH: Yes
- CH: Take Page 95. Here we see a Map of Westbury with various measures outlined. Traffic calming zones, bus priority, cycle network, many round about existing A350. Traffic calmed contraflow. Then you see the note on the map itself, referring to a proposed Westbury Bypass – potentially both E and W; further public consultation will take place on this issue, when this was to be so far as the Council was concerned – all could have been put in place without a Westbury bypass? NH Yes, not clear here a decision had been made to definitely pursue an eastern bypass.
- CH: ? 1998? NH: There was a re-examination after 1998.
- CH: Question was, all measures outlined could be implemented with a western bypass? NH: These measures are proposed as part of having a bypass scheme
- CH: And it is clear here that the western routes were still being looked at then? NH: Yes, they could have been implemented with a western bypass scheme.
- CH: Is there anything set out there which could not be implemented with a western bypass scheme? NH: No, they could be implemented, if a western route had been acceptable
- CH: Public transport access to trading estate – can you tell me about bus services to this site, if one is living on Warminster Road and work on WWTE. How would one get there by public transport? NH: There are services along Station Road from the town centre and there is a less frequent service which goes 264/265, then walk from stops.
- CH: Our witness, Mr. Edwards, is giving evidence on public transport, I will come back to that. Mr. K in re-examination yesterday, on targets being met on LTP2, concluded that this scheme would have been included within the assessment of the targets? NH: Yes, he gave that evidence.
- CH: Is that your view? NH: The data collected, which is shown in ?trends? is without the bypass. Future projects would have been met with any schemes which the CC believed had a reasonable chance to be implemented. How that would affect the ?trends?, that is a matter for how target set as to what final objective was, but I suspect that the overall targets would include the Westbury Bypass go ahead.
- CH: Included in future projects – were Yarnbrook/West Ashton included? NH: No, do not think so.
- CH: Goes back to Government Policy – new road schemes should be matter of last resort? NH: Other measures considered first.. No embargo on new road building, and that is set out in his rebuttal.
- CH: Mr. K's rebuttal, this is a local improvement scheme? NH: Local in sense that it is the A350 – accept local scheme;
- CH: Mr. K's Rebuttal, Page 12 – he refers to various road schemes, the context is set on Page 11, both within and elsewhere by DfT – A350 Semington/Melksham Diversion completed 2004. When was planning permission granted for that scheme? NH: Sometime prior to 2004 and that was WCC scheme.
- CH: Bodmin/Indian Queens ? one of HA schemes, completed in 2007/08, but presumably authorised sometime prior to that? NH: A30 Bodmin/Indian Queens, a trunk road, major route.
- CH: A38 Dobwells – trunk road? NH: It is in Cornwall, all promoted by HA.
- CH: You're not suggesting these schemes are comparable to the Westbury E. Bypass? NH: The A30 designated a Primary Route which means it connects centres of population which are primary destinations. Westbury not. People are going to other primary destinations so that is status of A350. The fact it is not a trunk road, whether a road is a trunk or not is often historic. Some roads are put forward for de-trunking, and not de-trunked, i.e. A36. No set criteria, no clear criteria as to

whether road should be de-trunked or not, and believe A350 has some characteristics. Some trunk routes have much higher flows, but has characteristics so distinction is not completely clear: The HA is authority for them, but some are or are not and definition is not quite clear cut.

CH: All schemes would have been authorised or approved by whichever body sometime prior to publication of the supplement to PPS1? NH Yes, and prior to publication of discussion document “Towards a Sustainable Transport System”

Regeneration:

CH: It would be helpful if you had the Officer’s Report May 2007, CD 5.13? NH: Yes, have document.

CH: Page 2 – we see there objectives of the scheme set out as defined by 97/98 Planning Conference First bullet: “Improved transport links in order to facilitate economic regeneration”. Very much consequent part of ?? ? NH Yes.

CH: come onto Officer’s Report, Page 25 – he lists the official Report into scheme benefits, Para; 98/99 sets out what the officer considers the situation to be in Westbury. Paragraph on air quality, two paragraphs on Westbury and Westbury Town Centre, talking about walking and cycling and over page, specific paragraph on WWTE – Major Employment Area – poor access, especially for heavy goods vehicles – narrow roads – poor alignment.....IMPROVED ACCESS MOST SIGNIFICANT ELEMENT OF THIS SCHEME and infers an economic element – traffic flows, accidents ? NH: Yes

CH: Going to your Proof – second – on wider benefits, starts P.29 NH: Yes

CH: Question put to Mr. K, he could not answer it, how many local jobs will this scheme create? NH: **No assessment.**

CH: The Guidance for major schemes requires where there is a regenerative element to the scheme, as we saw yesterday, economic report to be produced? NH: Yes

CH: 2007 Guidance – CD 10.1 Page 37: Wider analysis 4.4.10 “where regeneration is an important element then promoters should always Clearly this is where regeneration constitutes an important element – if you recollect Parkman in 1999 said that as a standard bypass scheme it is not Government Policy, then WSPCC (Business Case) is supposed to be submitted next Monday? NH: Week beginning 23rd.

CH: Have the DfT required an economic case, or on what basis have they not required it? The Guidance within NATA and supporting mech. It specifically mentions deprived areas, and where the benefits of the scheme and it requires Economic Impact Assessment, particularly where area has been identified as deprived and very low economic activity, so take it to mean where scheme cannot be justified on other grounds, you can use economic benefits. NH: In case of Westbury, benefits can be shown through COBA in EAR because the other supporting information which would have assisted the DfT in making funding allocations

CH: And presume because WW does not fall within area of economic deprivation .. NH: Yes, that is correct.

CH: Cambridge Econometrics sets out distances from national road network – Page 39 of proof - the Cambridge Econometrics Report provided with 4-5 pages of Tables, there is no test. All CE have produced is the tables in document. NH: They produced many tables – recognised as leading authority on economic projects, so were commissioned by Regional Assembly to undertake some work on how we have employment projections; what employment projections should be for the strategic towns and cities in SW and this work was assisted by LAs in collecting data. These 4-5 pages have been produced for the Inquiry, because the other tables are not relevant.

- CH: Yes, I requested copies of them from Council because they were referred to, but not accepted as documents.
- SR: Is the request being made, when a specific question made we have done utmost to get information before Inquiry (?!!!!!) Was what was required by Mr. Hopkins? If information is, then request that all the information be produced, or not.
- CH: I made a request, having seen evidence – they had not been provided so I made request for copies and what I was provided with was these five pages. If Mr. Helps is saying to me now, that there are other relevant documents produced, then clearly we are disadvantaged by not having them. NH: In Appendix L there is information that is relevant to WW and Westbury. There will not be other information relevant – the information we can discuss is included within AP. L
- CH: Provided by Economic Officer? NH: Yes
- CH: In Survey Report? NH: It used data that was produced, useful data and is relevant to this Inquiry.
- INSP: Question whether information collected by CE, not complete commission to CE, but data collected by CC, using ???? statistics and putting it in format which allowed comparisons to be made between different towns and cities. No new data collection, but pulling together data collected?
- CH: So we have all relevant data on which this economic case is based? NH: Yes
- CH: WW connectivity to major road network. Connectivity to key elements – how would you define? NH: Connectivity can be defined in the quality of the network in respect of the standard of the network and also the distances to key destinations.
- CH: And the area does not feature “well” compared to Para 9.2? NH: Not feature well – it is distance to high standard road, such as dual carriageway, motorways.
- CH: Table 2 of WHA116, if we compare Westbury with Poole, would Poole be described as economically deprived and in need of regeneration? NH: Schemes such as the bridge, key aspect of that scheme is regeneration of the dockside and areas around the harbour. Poole is in need of regeneration;
- CH: ? deprived area? NH: Parts of area which the Council considered.
- CH: Connectivity to road network, is Westbury better placed than Poole? Journey to centre of London – similar. Nearest place on network, nearest motorway, surely Poole much worse placed? NH: The distance to places you state are similar for some.
- CH: 2.20: Heathrow 95.3 m: Journey time: 1.52 - Poole 1.54 etc. etc. NH: By choosing location at coast you are bound to find - draw a circle around Poole and half is in the sea so bound to find it is further.
- CH: If your hypothesis is correct, that distances from what is described as the motorway network is correct, then one would expect Poole to be exhibiting numerous symptoms of economic decline? NH: You are taking me to a town which has completely different characteristics to Westbury. Questions of validity of hypothesis – do you presume connectivity to good road network..... any failure to
- CH: That is case County put forward. NH: Yes, Poole actually, although a port of SW, is very much more linked to SE in relation to connectivity. Possibly because of A350 course through Dorset to Poole, but Poole looks to towns to the east as part of economic region. Westbury on other hand is firmly within SW, but has high distances from dual carriageways and motorways compared to other towns, near the bottom end of linking of all these issues.
- CH: What evidence do you bring to this Inquiry that good access to motorways and trunk road network gives rise to clear economic benefits? NH: That is not what saying in evidence. I was stating facts that have been collected as part of the work between CE and the CC.

- CH: Para. 9.5 DEFRA highlights numbers of people in Wiltshire are lowly paid with deprivation.. Are you suggesting that the fact in 13.54 – “paid less than two-thirds of wage”, is that caused by low access to trunk roads and motorway network? NH: The evidence I can give, and it was mentioned in Mr. K’s brief – we hear comments from employers who are looking to develop land, there is no direct proof, what my evidence gives is a number of characteristics which set out that in WW particularly going on to other aspects in my brief which appear to be for Westbury give us some evidence to suggest - why is Westbury different from other areas and can be taken to mean this work provides information from which we can say why Westbury is exhibiting these trends. One of reasons we believe retail flow is poor, because it is not just poor access, environment of town centre is poor, holding back economic activity.
- CH: Where is evidence for that retail? NH: Figures in L in Mr. K’s brief.
- CH: That is caused by poor road access – where is evidence? NH: It is hypothesis that we argue, with data, whether or not you have 100% proof.
- CH: You have data and effects or facts? And it would be for the Inspector to judge whether or not the case is made!
- CH: What is evidence to show that improving road access will lead to improvements in minimum wages? NH: It is not possible, you cannot prove by 100% that without doubt there is cause and effect. Data is presented – L of Mr. K’s proof – which shows characteristics are used to demonstrate that Westbury is under performing in a number of areas and WW in a number of areas. Road improvements and reduction of traffic in Westbury will remove causes of under performance.
- CH: What other reasons? Do you agree there are all sorts of other factors which can contribute to relatively under-performing? NH; I accept there are other factors.
- CH: It is not a matter that a road will raise GDP employment levels? NH: Advantage we have in this area, we have had roads in these areas, Council could have taken evidence from there.
- CH: This is true, that is basis, but none of evidence has been produced. NH: That is correct.
- CH: 9.6 Work Place based figures – it can be assumed that those on lower wages do not tend to travel for lower paid jobs. NH: No evidence to support that
- CH: An assertion – people on low wages do not spend money on commuting long distances and if you increase medium wages, than people would be able to travel further and the converse is as applicable? NH: Not if you match rates with housing.
- CH: Possibility of reducing commuting – but could increase it? NH: Depends
- CH: Or commuting could remain the same? NH: Correct
- CH: 9.8 Measure importance for local business. Clearly there is one, surely important, element of local business that can contribute to local economy – staff – schools? NH: Yes
- CH: From specific aspect of someone’s business, distance/networks, it is one factor of many – happens to be interpreted - on which there has not been produced any evidence? NH: Correct.
- CH: Tourism – 700,000 visitors from March – November – what assessment of role of tourism in Westbury? DO we have any evidence? NH: There is no evidence at all.
- CH: There is no assessment of likely impact of this scheme on Westbury either? NH: Except that Westbury could take advantage post scheme – could frame itself as tourist destination.
- CH: Has possibility, that with bypass round the town – it would take visitors out of Westbury, they would avoid Westbury and not go into the town? NH: If you take traffic out, it becomes more attractive.
- CH: You may think that – where is the evidence? NH: No evidence.
- CH: 9.11 High Priority. Identified in Community Plan, increased range of shops and businesses in town centre. Where is evidence that eastern bypass would increase range and number of shops in town centre? NH: The figures given in App. L of Mr. K proof do show this is an unusual fact about Westbury, it is link between population and retail flow and the type of retail flow. It is quite

marked compared to some other WW towns and that is taken as evidence that one of the contributory factors is likely to be level of traffic going through Westbury, stopping people from shopping here. Residents travel further afield when in other towns they would be more likely to meet their needs by shopping in their town – quite a difference.

CH: They do not have large supermarket out of town? NH: But the retail offer is poor based on population.

CH: Has there been any analysis as to range of shops, what sort of shops and places the people of Westbury wish to see in the town? NH: Feel sure they have made requests, particular opportunities, but we did not have evidence.

CH: No evidence?

CH: 9.13 Population – housing increases, but number of jobs has not kept pace. Where is evidence?

NH: There are perhaps tables in App. L which has that information.

CH: I can see nothing in App. L about housing and local jobs not keeping pace? NH: That evidence could have been provided but has not been.

CH: Impact of traffic having detrimental effect on town? NH: This again, local concerns are expressed in many ways, sometimes verbally.

CH: Hearsay, but no evidence? NH: No evidence before this Inquiry.

Rebuttal: 2.5 – four lines up from bottom – 66% reduction in HGVs for Far West option? NH: Yes

CH: Was that Far West 66% reduction in Haynes Road? NH: meaningful new evidence.

CH: 2.8 – With regard to A350 journey time indicated – is it not surprising that journey time reliability measurement - seen as being one of major parts of scheme – and only surveyed twice a year! NH: The resources devoted to collecting data are quite substantial. All the data decisions are made on how frequently they can be undertaken and I am letting Inquiry know that is because of the large number of indicators sampled.

Very much hope that some of this rings bells of recognition Charlie! Sorry for delay - Anne

Then

4.478 COBA but have feeling that this is a part of ANDREW NICOLSON's! Included here in case it is useful to you. Here goes :

- AN: Journey times in para. 2.12. Variations in journey times – high journey time of 21.30s. – is this the average figure, single figure or maximum duration? NH: Single figure journey times surveys taken in June 2007 – that was maximum.
- AN: SATURN modelling: Is Saturn capable of modelling journey time reliability in terms of journey time variation in journey times? NH: Have provided journey time reliability information as ? sheet to support the summary table, produced this month, WHA 108 day to day variation? NH: The assessment undertaken was in this evidence for the reliability of time which is presented as ? sheet to support DfT specific system. Work undertaken showed that the reliability improvement is.
- AN: Thank you – this is the evidence you have? NH: 19% reduction in stress. DfT take as ?frequency? evidence – this shows it improves journey times and that work is done in COBA.
- AN: 3.30 Middle validation. 3.11 twice, clearly it is important a practical model validated Government Guidance. You tell us you did at 3.90, you conducted fresh traffic surveys, interviews and counts – was that the basis of validation? NH the additional roadside interviews. The validation was done with roadside interview surveys in 2005 for data for the model, not for validating model.
- AN: Count and journey time, is this in 3.11, automatic count data. Paragraph 3.13 – 87% of 7/700 were modelled close enough to forecast these were minor roads. NH: standard had to meet was 85% and was made in excess of that - 87%.
- AN: Next figure – 82% - 2,700. These within the 85% - but it was 82%. This is outside 85% or closer wasn't it? NH: Contradiction there, but outside the 85%.
- AN: 15% or more error in validation of model for 2007. Do you expect the model and its fluctuations to get more accurate in future years, or will it diverse more from actual flows? NH: When you have a basic model and add it to future years, you are adding traffic growth and scheme. You are not trying to improve model then, you want to replicate it and present the future situation. With the proposed scheme you may actually be getting a more robust model as having new link, such as proposed bypass, it is more to predict with certainty that scheme than the old road.
- AN: Whether model is likely to get closer to reality than further from it, not talking about reality to model. NH: Easier to predict characteristics and flow on proposed scheme than the other, less junctions for future year. It is possible we have a more robust model for that length and as trafficto that link, it will be more robust.
- AN: What should next question be? COBA benefits mainly dependent on traffic flows and journey time saving. Journey time savings? NH: It does depend on traffic flows and the network is integral part of model.
- AN: How important to COBA is accurate traffic modelling? NH: When you are contemplating a traffic model drawing to represent present situation, as much as possibly accurate, it is model, so trying to get close to reality and so create a robust situation.
- AN: Is the traffic forecasting a main input into the COBA? NH: Yes
- AN: In evidence and County's evidence, I was looking for any mention of induced traffic and could not find anything? NH: In Rebuttal evidence I am saying the work I have undertaken does not suggest there will be induced traffic. Initial evidence, fixed trip matrix, so does not include induced traffic. Only take sensitivity work to assess whether there would be induced traffic.

- AN: Government work Roads & Bridges asks for it to be done? NH: Only if the level of induced traffic preliminary assessment undertaken a sensitivity test.
- AN: Why not in the Council's evidence? NH: Ongoing work. Undertaking further work on behalf of DfT – ensure DfT are content when assessing Business Case, so that they will accept the Model as robust.
- AN: Have you not done any of this when Environmental Statement was produced? NH: Tests were undertaken but demand modelling tests.
- AN: Demand modelling sensitivity? NH: Not for Environmental Assessment stage.
- AN: I have exhibited a model, you have dealt with it in Rebuttal? NH: It is what it seems to be, a Report by Mouchel Parkman on variable demand preliminary assessment Westbury started 12 September 2007.
- AN: Address it in Rebuttal? Seem to accept it was done for or by Council for scheme. Should the Inquiry rely on this document that I have exhibited as the County's Preliminary Assessment Variable Demand? NH: At date of Report, that was the extent of work at September 2007.
- AN: Another more recent report? NH: Because work is still ongoing, no report on sensitivity tests. These are sensitivity tests which if they meet criteria for DfT will mean that the modelling work will be valid, not a replacement for work which