

SEMMMS PUBIC ENQUIRY

MR & MRS GILCHRIST
111 MACCLESFIELD ROAD

The Inquiring Authority's opening statement at this public enquiry refers to a White paper titled "A New Deal for Transport – Better for Everyone".

Given the facts I have reviewed throughout the consultation process and this public enquiry I have heard no evidence to support how this and other stated objectives will be achieved.

I have also heard no evidence to support the fact this is what the majority of the public wants. The survey (core document 5013) that has been spoken about frequently was only sent to 85,000 people. Let's be mindful of the fact the population of Stockport alone is 283,000 (from Stockport Council's website). Having reviewed the 2011 Census the total number of households in Stockport was 122,000 so let's use this number to provide a realistic view of the public's opinion.

The only survey we received offered the option to vote in favour for Scheme 1 or Scheme 2, there was no option to object to the whole scheme. We therefore registered our opinion via the comments box on the document and directly with the Council.

If Sue Stevenson's figures are correct in that there was a total of **9,031** respondents, then we should be conducting the same calculation against the number of households in Stockport which would conclude that the Authority are making a £300million decision on a mere 7.4% total response of our households.

Let's review in some detail the figures provided in Sue Stevenson's document:-

You quoted:-

4,506 strongly in favour

1,707 in favour

This is a total of **6,213** - If we apply this to the total number of households this actually gives a true in favour percentage of 5.09% not 49.9%.

This is certainly not a 49.9% in favour as alluded to in the document; it is only 49.9% of the 9,031 people that responded to the survey.

I am deeply concerned that the figures stated are not a representation of the whole Borough. If you send questionnaires to only 30% of the boroughs affected – such as Bramhall and Cheadle where car ownership is high voters will tend to want their money to be spent on the road. If you go to other districts where car ownership is not so high then you would expect a different result.

Please note ten years ago **250,000** leaflets were distributed and a mere **3%** of them were returned in favour of building the road. This proves that this time we have no meaningful result. It would have been more valid to cast the net this wide again to provide a genuine view of the public instead of enforcing new roads, multiple junctions, increased air pollution, destruction of green belt and the adoption of a scheme that is against every element of the corporate responsibility a council should have.

When the SEMMMS report was filed in 2001 the public opinion showed that what the public actually wanted was:-

- Better road maintenance, pavements and footpaths
- An extended metrolink service
- Better bus services
- Cheaper public transport
- Traffic calming in residential areas

It is evident from the communication I have had with residents in my imminent area that there is not a full understanding of the plans and the affects to the local area. While the Authority continually confirms they have met the required criteria for this process, it goes without saying any information that would provide a detailed overview of the detrimental effects of this scheme and enable the public to make an informed decision has not been pro-actively shared. Indeed the first I knew of a Side Road Order was when it landed on my door step – hardly a consultative approach.

I refer to Sue Stevenson's statement of objectives and draw your attention to several points starting with the objective 3.1 titled "*improve amenity, safety and health*"

I can confirm this is most certainly not the case for us, in fact we will receive the opposite of the assumed benefits that you have stated:-

Let's start with

- **Minimised accidents**

- As stated in our objection this will not be the case as the new road lay out will make it impossible to enter and exit our property safely. In fact if the road scheme was already in place and we applied for permission to build our home as it currently stands, permission would not be granted on the basis that it would not meet the minimum vehicular access and safety requirements

- I would also like to draw your attention to The Highways Agency Volume 6 Section 2, Part 7 TD41/95 , 1.9...which states “Accident Records for all roads are set out in the Casualty Report (Road Accidents in Great Britain 1992) show that in Urban areas 70% of accidents now occur at junctions and accesses

There has been no consideration given to the fact that the increase in traffic brought to us by this scheme will also increase traffic flow to the Tesco garage directly next to our house. With this factor and the Ashbourne Road exit, we most definitely will not be able to access our drive safely

- **Reduce noise levels**

- We have already heard the evidence confirming traffic will increase in our area particularly with the standing traffic which will occur on the new proposed road lay out outside our home
- We will also be subject to increased noise levels throughout the build phase and our quality of life will deteriorate significantly

- **Improve air quality**

- An increase in traffic will most definitely **not** improve air quality in our own personal situation. The new road layout will by its very nature encourage more cars onto the road which will subsequently increase air pollution. A more corporately responsible Authority would have prioritized public transport methods above the increase of motorists
- In addition our view will be changed for the worse, and quite frankly, so will our lives with the upheaval we will experience over the years of construction and the potential decrease in value of our home

Section 7.6.1

Refers to a variety of communication methods: - as someone who was directly affected by this scheme, we did not receive full communication of the consultation phases until several calls were made to Sue herself, many of which were left unreturned before initial contact was finally made.

The exhibitions referred to were certainly not communicated to us at any point which is unacceptable considering we are a resident of one of the most affected areas. Our attendance was only as a result of finding out about the meeting by word of mouth. Therefore it cannot be concluded that you have sought feedback from enough people in the affected area. In the session attended the facilitator at our meeting didn't write any

notes down so I cannot understand how you can provide a statement that you recorded feedback throughout, as in our own individual case this did not happen. Clarity on the impact to us personally was only achieved after several requests were made for an individual meeting. These requests were finally in December 2013. Throughout the meeting it was acknowledged that we would have increased difficulty in accessing our property.

I now refer to section 8.15 where long lists of concerns are highlighted, all of which directly contradict the exact stated objectives of the scheme. I draw your attention to the stated point that there was “local preference in the Hazel Grove area to the north of the proposed Scheme for Option 2 at Macclesfield Road”. Why have the people that are most affected not been listened to? If you are going to change our lives forever, affect the price of our houses, our view and personal quality of life both in the build phase and completion would you not as a minimum at least take the option the local residents were happier with.

My objection will continue to stand as nothing I have been offered in meetings with the Authority or heard subsequently in this hearing has convinced me that there is sound ground to withdraw my objection. Access in and out of my home will no longer be safely possible with the proposed addition of 2 lanes and a junction – I am looking forward to the Inspector having visibility of this.

Given the continued inaccuracies throughout this process and indeed this hearing such as errors on figures and corrections on documents, you will understand why I am of the opinion that any figures given are not accurate. I hasten to add there is already a sign on a lamp post near our home which has Bramhall incorrectly spelt – testament to the standard of work we have seen so far and not very encouraging of things to come.

Consistent lack of communication has been a theme throughout this project, with the only contact received from the Authority being when we proactively sought it. A clear example of this was when I arrived on Tuesday 30th September having taken time off work to present our objection only to be given a schedule to show I was not required until today. When I asked Miss Hallam she advised me that I was emailed however on checking her records it became evident that in fact there was no email address recorded for me.

In addition the special delivery package I received on 12th September reference 68C16944 containing the summaries for this enquiry were addressed to a Mr and Mrs Anthony Gilchrist. This is not how my name has ever been recorded on the electoral role; I was not christened or have never been known as Anthony.

I have listened to the plans presented by Mr Huda and am at a loss to understand how we can justify removing all the Greenland required to build this road and replace it with multiple traffic lanes encouraging more cars on the road who will be pumping out emissions and decreasing air quality. This is certainly not reflective of the corporately responsible society we strive to be. Most organisations have a sustainability policy where car sharing and cycling to work is encouraged, yet the Authority are spending £300million on encouraging increased traffic on local residential roads.

Having spoken to Mr Malik last week regarding the proposed mitigation measures I am still finding it very difficult to understand how such a large project can go ahead without prior knowledge of what these systems will be.

I also refer to Mr Malik's proof of Evidence Volume 3/1. Having discussed the traffic impact of the scheme in general and meeting the scheme objectives I quote paragraph 6.59 "while travel times are not reduced for all journeys, on the whole the journey time improvements outweigh the increases in journey time, particularly in the peak hours. Overall therefore this outcome is considered to be partially met". Again not many projects, particularly with such a high value are even started when only some objectives have been met.

In conclusion,

The SEMMMS Project team is proposing a road that will increase traffic in areas that surround the scheme. The evidence in favour is very much based on guidance without common sense. The Authority will, if the scheme goes ahead, prove the theory that new roads induce traffic towards them. The traffic analysis that the Authority has produced on their website confirms this in their 'A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road- Phase Two Consultation Final Report'

Please note that on each visit from the council to our home, not once has anyone actually attempted to make the maneuver themselves and have chosen to park in Ashbourne Road or the Fiveways' car park.

I would urge you to consider the facts I have provided on both the scheme and my own personal circumstances. Given the location of our home just after Ashbourne Road and the Tesco garage: - access to and from our property will be unsafe and requires much further individual consideration.