

THE HIGHWAYS ACT 1980
-and-
THE ACQUISITION OF LAND ACT 1981

THE HIGHWAYS (INQUIRIES PROCEDURE) RULES 1994
COMPULSORY PURCHASE (INQUIRIES PROCEDURE) RULES 2007

REFERENCE: LAO/NW/SRO/2013/40 and LAO/NW/CPO/2013/41

REBUTTAL PROOF

-of-

James McMahon in relation to the Proof

of

Greg Willman, 36 Cromley Road, High Lane
The Metropolitan Borough Council of Stockport
acting on its behalf and on behalf of
-Manchester City Council -and-
Cheshire East Borough Council

to be presented to a Local Public Inquiry on the 30th September 2014 to consider
objections to

THE METROPOLITAN BOROUGH OF STOCKPORT (HAZEL GROVE (A6) TO
MANCHESTER AIRPORT A555 CLASSIFIED ROAD) COMPULSORY PURCHASE
ORDER 2013

THE METROPOLITAN BOROUGH OF STOCKPORT (HAZEL GROVE (A6) TO
MANCHESTER AIRPORT A555 CLASSIFIED ROAD) (SIDE ROADS) ORDER 2013

Parveen Akhtar
Head of Legal and Democratic Governance
The Metropolitan Borough Council of Stockport
Corporate and Support Services
Town Hall, Stockport SK1 3XE

This rebuttal proof of evidence sets out the Council's response to the objector's proof in relation to their objection to the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road Compulsory Purchase Order and/ or Side Road Order that was submitted to the Department for Transport by Greg Willman, 36 Cromley Road, High Lane.

This rebuttal proof is presented by the Council's Project Director for the A6MARR scheme. James McMahon, however, contributions to this rebuttal have been made by the Council's Expert Witnesses as indicated alongside the responses.

The Expert Witnesses contributing to the responses to the objections submitted are as follows:

| Expert Witness | Initials | Proof of Evidence Name and Reference Number |
|-----------------------|-----------------|--|
| James McMahon | JMcM | Volume 1 |
| Naz Huda | NH | Volume 2 |
| Nasar Malik | NM | Volume 3 |
| Paul Reid | PR | Volume 4 |
| Paul Colclough | PC | Volume 5 |
| Jamie Bardot | JB | Volume 6 |
| Alan Houghton | AC | Volume 7 |
| Sue Stevenson | SS | Volume 8 |
| James McMahon | JMcM | Volume 9 |
| Henry Church | HC | Volume 10 |

| <p>Objector 51: Greg Willman 36 Cromley Road, High Lane, Stockport, SK6 8BP</p> | | | |
|--|--|--|----------------|
| Element of objector proof | Objection | Response | Expert Witness |
| 51/R01 | <p>The issue here in my submission is that the traffic modelling for this scheme in relation to the A6 is defective, not fit for purpose and has, astonishingly, never been examined by anyone outside SMBC.</p> | <p>The traffic modelling to support the A6MARR project has been designed and undertaken in line with the current government guidance and the outputs from the model meet the government's technical guidance in respect of accuracy. The modelling reports and the model validation report contained in the transport assessment confirm that the traffic model used for the A6MARR is fit for purpose. The model has been developed by experienced consultants on behalf of the project team in accordance with existing technical guidance.</p> <p>The transport modelling reports were submitted as part of the business case to be considered by the Department for Transport who gave the business case Programme Entry Status. They were also submitted as part of the Planning application, as part of the Transport Assessment, which was considered by the three local planning authorities.</p> <p>The process of traffic modelling adopted for this scheme is no different than that for any other major highway scheme in the country. The traffic model has been developed and validated in accordance with national guidance issued by the DfT through WebTAG. The DfT has had a detailed scrutiny role in relation to the validity of the model and there has been extensive dialogue with the DfT over a number of years relating to the traffic models. In giving Programme Entry approval to the scheme, the DfT has</p> | JMCM / NM |

| | | | |
|--------|--|---|--------------|
| | | satisfied itself in respect of the soundness of the model and that the scheme provides very high value for money as demonstrated through the outputs of the traffic models used in the economic assessment. | |
| 51/R02 | <p>The SEMMMS scheme is a funnel in shape and the A6 is the spout.</p> <p>A funnel cannot work if the spout is blocked.</p> <p>It is therefore fundamental to the efficacy of the entirety of the road scheme that the traffic on the A6 not be “blocked”.</p> | <p>On the one hand Mr Willman accepts the traffic modelling when it initially showed a 30% increase along the A6, but at the same time he claims that the A6 “funnel” is blocked and thus implies that there cannot be any traffic increase along this road, leading him to conclude that this will prevent the A6MARR scheme from delivering its objectives.</p> <p>The A6 to the east of the proposed scheme is a busy road but it is not “blocked”. Whilst a substantial increase of up to 30% along this road is not desirable, there is no question that the road can carry increased levels of traffic over a 24 hour period. The latest traffic forecasts indicate an 11% to 16% increase in traffic with the completion of the scheme including the enhanced mitigation measures. The road is able to carry this level of traffic increase.</p> | NM |
| 51/R03 | <u>In short, and the nub of “Lord Reid’s One issue” in this matter is that it is an accepted precondition of the building of the entirety of the scheme that the</u> | There is no specific pre-condition relating to a limit in the level of increase in traffic on the A6 preventing the scheme from proceeding to construction. There is a Planning Condition placed by Cheshire East Council which requires | NM/ /JMCM |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | <p><u>very specifically stated figure of “11 to 16%” be reached if the scheme in it’s entirety was to be allowed to be built and the spout of the funnel not be blocked.</u></p> <p>So quite clearly when the scheme document was drafted <u>specific</u> “enhanced mitigation measures” must have been programmed at that time into the traffic modelling in order to reach the “11 to 16%”, otherwise, how was such figure that was placed in the scheme document as a precondition of construction reached?</p> | <p>a satisfactory package of mitigation measures to be agreed with the Council, prior to the road opening that will be expected to limit the increase in traffic to the levels indicated through the Planning Application.</p> <p>For traffic modelling purposes, the exact details of these mitigation measures are not required, but rather it’s the impact of these measures that is important and this has been reflected in the traffic modelling. The details of an appropriate mitigation scheme will be developed with input from the public and presented to the local planning authority in order to discharge the planning condition. A Delivery Agreement is being prepared between Stockport Council and Cheshire East Council for the development and implementation of the mitigation measures.</p> <p>For modelling purposes, an increase in journey time of between 1 and 3 minutes has been modelled along the A6 east of the scheme to reflect the potential mitigation measures. This increase in journey times is based on knowledge of the likely speed impacts of the range of measures that could be considered for this corridor.</p> <p>The traffic model indicates that this level of change in journey time leads to a reduction in traffic transfer to the A6 and this is reflected in the published forecasts showing an 11-16% increase on the A6.</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>The forecast increase in traffic along the A6 as a result of the scheme is due to traffic re-routing from other less suitable roads to the A6 because there is now a small time advantage in using this route than the other routes currently used by traffic. The mitigation measures will be designed to limit this time advantage which in turn will limit the level of traffic re-routing to the A6. This does not mean forcing traffic to use longer routes through villages but rather, limiting the volume of traffic that is likely to transfer off other routes with the completion of the scheme.</p> <p>The planning conditions for the relevant Local Authorities say;</p> <p>Cheshire East Council Prior to the new sections of the scheme hereby approved being brought into use a scheme detailing a package of mitigation measures (intended to restrain, alleviate and manage traffic flow increases at locations identified and to levels indicated through enhanced mitigation as shown in figures 9.6 and 9.7 in the submitted Transport Assessment) has been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Such scheme shall include details of and a methodology and timetable for delivery of the measures, a programme for review, surveys and monitoring of the impact of the measures and if required reappraisal of an addition to the agreed package of measures. The new sections of road shall not be brought into use until the measures have been</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>implemented in accordance with the approved details unless the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority has been obtained. (note: this includes mitigation measures for, but not limited to, Disley Village Centre, the A6 corridor, Clifford Road Poynton and B5358 Station Road / Dean Road Handforth. Where this condition requires approval or consent by the Local Planning Authority those matters shall be referred to the Council's Strategic Planning Board.</p> <p>Stockport Council</p> <p>Prior to the new sections of the scheme hereby approved being brought</p> <p>into use a scheme detailing a package of mitigation and complementary measures intended to restrain, alleviate and manage traffic flow increases at locations identified and to levels indicated in Table 9.3 A6MARR: Forecast Annual Average Daily Traffic (Base Year, 2017 Without A6MARR, 2017 With A6MARR plus Mitigation) and shown in Figures 9.6 and 9.7 in the submitted Transport Assessment has been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Such scheme shall include details of and a methodology and timetable for delivery of the measures, a programme for review, surveys and monitoring of the impact of the measures and if required reappraisal of and addition to the agreed package of measures. The new sections of road shall not be brought into use until the measures have been</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|

| | | | |
|--------|---|---|-------------|
| | | <p>implemented in accordance with the approved details unless the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority has been obtained.</p> <p>The transport assessment for the scheme states “Traffic modelling of the A6MARR scheme previously predicted an increase in traffic of up to 30% on the A6 through High Land and Disley. The introduction of enhanced mitigation measures markedly reduces this increased traffic flow to between 11 to 16%, as shown in Figures 9.6 and 9.7.”</p> | |
| 51/R04 | <p><u>So if SMBC had no EHM when they appeared before C East ,some considerable time after publication of the scheme document, what exactly did they programme into the model prior to the completion of the scheme document to reach the required; “11 to 16%” they accept is a precondition of the scheme being built at all?</u></p> <p>It is my contention that there have never been any “enhanced mitigation measures” and the scheme document as drafted is a complete fraud and the reference on page 33 of the Statement of Case to the improvement of a t-junction, a trendy roundabout without traffic lights and, lastly</p> | <p>For modelling purposes, an increase in journey time of between 1 and 3 minutes has been modelled along the A6 east of the scheme to reflect the potential mitigation measures. This increase in journey times is based on knowledge of the likely speed impacts of the range of measures that could be considered for this corridor.</p> <p>The traffic model indicates that this level of change in journey time leads to a reduction in traffic transfer to the A6 and this is reflected in the published forecasts showing an 11-16% increase on the A6.</p> <p>The transport assessment for the scheme provides the following details of the proposed advanced mitigation measures and as can be seen from the planning conditions</p> | NM/ JMcM |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | <p>and bizarrely, don't use it at all, is merely an afterthought having got this monstrosity past the voting Councillors.</p> | <p>above their detailed design will need to be agreed with the planning authorities.</p> <p>“ These enhanced mitigation measures seek a balanced approach to managing the predicted traffic on the A6 through High Lane and Disley by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • better managing traffic flows for local residents at the A6 Buxton Road/ Windlehurst Road junction through a local junction improvement scheme; • enhancing the local district centre environment in Disley village through the introduction of shared-space type interventions; and • limiting the attractiveness of the A6 to longer distance traffic which would otherwise switch from other cross-county routes with the A6MARR in place. This will be achieved through a combination of gateway treatments and reduced speed limits. <p>9.66 Indeed, these enhanced measures build upon the package of mitigation measures promoted as part of the Phase Two consultation which focussed on improvements to non-motorised user facilities, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cycle lanes on sections of the A6 between Hazel Grove and New Mills Newtown where practicable; • a new pedestrian refuge on the A6 Buxton Road at Wellington Road; • a new Puffin crossing on the A6 Buxton Road outside the Church/ War memorial in High Lane; • new uncontrolled pedestrian crossings with refuge islands on Windlehurst Road; • a new pedestrian refuge on the A6 Buxton Road | |
|--|---|--|--|

| | | | |
|--------|--|---|------|
| | | <p>West outside Lyme Park to link bus stops and the park entrance; and a new cycle link between Disley and High Lane/ Poynton through Lyme Park.”</p> <p>The scope of the traffic mitigation measures is as stated within the Transport Assessment which was part of the planning applications that were approved by the three Local Planning Authorities (LPAs). The associated planning conditions confirm that the detail of these measures require to be developed and agreed with the respective highway authorities prior to implementation. The Delivery Agreement has been put in place in relation to the 3 local authorities taking forward and implementing the said traffic mitigation measures, confirming, therefore, that is it appropriate to leave the detail of the mitigation measures to a later stage.</p> | |
| 51/R05 | <p>This is a political road solely designed to service goods traffic from the East Coast ferry ports to Manchester Airport that is a technical fraud and which will cause irreparable damage if the Inspector allows such fraud to continue.</p> | <p>The concept of a relief road in the area has been around since the 1930's, is well documented in the 1960's and the Highways Agency has protected a route for decades. Specific plans for a Relief Road have been around since 2001 when the South East Manchester Multi-Modal Strategy (SEMMMS) recommended that the three councils work on developing plans for improving transport in the area for the benefit of both local communities and the local economy. Throughout each stage of the SEMMMS scheme, detailed assessments have been undertaken to analyse the need for the proposed Relief Road. Results identified the following main reasons for the development of the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Relieve existing traffic congestion and address poor | JMCM |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>connectivity which constrains the economy through lengthening journey times. Current congestion reduces labour market catchments and business-to-business activity as well as creating delays on designated freight routes (e.g. the A6) which, in turn, generates productivity losses for businesses;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Address the current poor access to/from the east to Manchester Airport which acts as a barrier for economic growth and regeneration; · Improve the existing poor transport links in communities throughout south Manchester in particular relating to the east-west highway network; · Relieve current congestion on current roads, where average peak time vehicle speeds of less than 10mph have been recorded on many parts. This congestion has led to journey times that are longer than all other 'large' urban areas across the UK, including those in London; · Reduce existing trips using residential streets as well as passing through local centres which will in turn reduce levels of pollution, road traffic incidents and journey times; · Relieve current congestion problems along the A6 and in local centres including Gatley, Bramhall, Heald Green, Hazel Grove, Poynton, Wilmslow, Handforth and Cheadle Hulme which currently affect accessibility and lead to delays; · Improve existing poor environmental conditions in local communities caused by the high volumes of traffic passing through the areas to reach other destinations; and · Relieve currently congested conditions for pedestrians and cyclists which results in non-motorised transport users facing problems of safely accessing education, employment and leisure facilities. | |
|--|--|---|--|

| | | | |
|--------|---|--|-------------|
| | | <p>The objector is therefore incorrect in stating that <i>“This is a political road solely designed to service goods traffic from the East Coast ferry ports to Manchester Airport”</i>.</p> <p>Detailed information about the scheme benefits and any adverse impacts are set out within the scheme’s business case.</p> | |
| 51/R06 | <p>This brings me onto the involvement of the Department of Transport or not as the case may be as evidenced by the annexed copy email of 19 May 2014 from the DoT (Appendix 1) which further evidences the simple fact that no-one outside SMBC has looked at either their software or their traffic modelling and I have today emailed Mr Sunderland of the DoT demanding that his Department, immediately, intervene and examine such traffic modelling of SMBC before the Public Inquiry commences and provide his answers on “Lord Reid’s One Issue” to the Inspector in order that the Inspector not be denied the truth that has been denied to the rest of us to date.</p> <p>Call me old-fashioned but as I assumed there would be some form of accountability on the part of SMBC with regard to a £350 million project by central government vis-à-vis the Department of</p> | <p>The traffic modelling has been undertaken by the Highways Forecasting and Analytical Services division of Transport for Greater Manchester in conjunction with the Systra consultancy. Atkins have had a management and review role in relation to the traffic modelling and the DoT has performed its scrutiny role.</p> <p>The traffic models for this scheme are based on the Greater Manchester County wide models that are used as the basis for all major transport schemes across the conurbation, including Metrolink. The models are therefore very well recognised.</p> <p>The Department of Transport has considered the transport modelling reports provided as part of the business case submitted to them in October 2012.</p> <p>Their representative states in his email that when examining the business case they have considered the design and parameters of the model so they are satisfied that its outputs are appropriate.</p> <p>The transport modelling reports produced by experienced</p> | NM/ JMCM |

| | | | |
|--------|--|--|------|
| | <p>Transport into the technical efficacy of the scheme just in the event that that those proposing the scheme have got it wrong I also assumed that SMBC would provide the Councillors with full transparency of the scheme before they asked them to vote on it.</p> | <p>consultants were also considered by the three local planning authorities as part of the planning application.</p> <p>It is therefore not correct to say that that <i>“no-one outside SMBC has looked at either their software or their traffic modelling”</i></p> | |
| 51/R07 | <p>It is accepted by SMBC, as I formally complained at the Council’s failure to grant the same, that I formally requested an extension of time of the Planning Timetable before the Councillors be required to vote in order that, specifically, “Lord Reid’s Issue” be responded to and resolved which was refused by the Council and yet you will note if the Inspector chooses to view the video of the C East Meeting that the Chair of the Council, a Coalition member, specifically bemoaned the fact that the Councillors had been denied sight of such EHM and a full explanation of “Lord Reid’s Issue” whilst at the same time being asked to vote on the scheme which the Inspector may agree makes a mockery of any accountability of the truth.</p> | <p>Stockport Council is aware of complaints the objector has made regarding your request for an extension to the planning application consultation period being refused. However it was investigated at both Stage 1 and Stage 2 levels and the Council’s response indicated your complaint was not upheld.</p> | JMcM |
| 51/R08 | <p>So why are SMBC doing it if they know it won’t work?</p> <p>The answer is that they know the scheme will cause such damage, Disley are already requesting a bypass before the</p> | <p>The scheme has been the subject of detailed analysis and development considering all aspects of its design and potential impacts. The scheme has received Programme Entry Status from the Government and Planning Permission subject to conditions.</p> <p>It is understood that the desire for a High Lane /Disley</p> | JMcM |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | <p>scheme has even been built(!), that the 1988 rejected bypass from Hazel Grove via New Mills and the Strines Valley to the Whaley Bridge motorway roundabout will have to be funded by central government to address the vandalism that is this scheme causing the complete destruction of that area of outstanding natural beauty that occasions the Peak District National Park as will the Park as a result and the reason it was, rightly, rejected at that time.</p> | <p>bypass was raised at Cheshire East Council's cabinet meeting in May 2014 and a clarification was subsequently issued by Cheshire East Council where Cheshire East Council advised that:</p> <p><i>“Traffic modelling confirmed that an acceptable level of traffic increase can be achieved on the A6 corridor through Disley without the delivery of significant new road building. Having said this, a new bypass of Disley / High Lane would provide a long term solution to the problems of heavy traffic and should not be ruled out. It is recognised that if such a scheme were to come forward it would involve cross boundary working with neighbouring local authorities and take time to develop.</i></p> <p><i>There is still support for the scheme locally and our first steps would be to confirm the local and cross boundary views.”</i></p> <p>Cheshire East, Derbyshire ,High Peak and Stockport Councils and Transport for Greater Manchester commissioned a study on the A6 Corridor and the potential impact of future developments. The study produced a report and proposed as one of its potential longer term measures;</p> <p>□ High Lane-Disley Bypass: In 2001 the SEMMMS 20-year plan examined proposals for a single carriageway bypass of the A6 through High Lane and Disley. The options considered fell wholly within Stockport Metropolitan Borough and Cheshire East. Derbyshire County Council did not wish, at the time, to promote a bypass of the A6</p> | |
|--|---|--|--|

| | | | |
|--------|---|--|-------------|
| | | <p>between Disley and the Chapel-en-le-Frith bypass. For initial appraisal purposes a High Lane-Disley Bypass is assumed to comprise approximately 6km of single lane carriageway which would connect with a proposed signalised A6MARR junction to the west and at a new roundabout to the east of Disley. In terms of highway impact the scheme has a clear positive impact on the A6 through High Lane and Disley along with a provisional BCR of 6.2. However, without further enhancements to the A6MARR SATURN highway traffic model, it is not possible to assess whether a High Lane-Disley bypass would have any strategic impacts on the routing of traffic originating in or destined to the Peak District National Park, or on traffic passing through the Park. Significant work is required to identify and develop a scheme and preferred route alignment.</p> <p>See Core Document 5017 for the consultation draft of the A6 Corridor Study.</p> | |
| 51/R09 | <p>I petitioned SMBC to provide a demonstration of their traffic modelling by way of real-time micro-simulation in order to provide a video-presentation of the traffic modelling specifically with regard to the A6 and in order to provide substantiation of the reduction to “11 to 16%”. SMBC have refused despite having international software engineers (Atkins Global) who could easily provide the same.</p> | <p>Following Mr Willman’s repeated requests, a model demonstration workshop was organised to show the live, operation of the traffic model and to provide complete transparency in how the traffic forecasts have been derived without any manual manipulation of the results. The date and time were arranged following discussions regarding his availability following the initial invitation on the 9th July 2014.</p> <p>The invitation to the workshop was extended to the local Green Party, PAULA and the High Lane Resident’s Association. The workshop was arranged over a one and a half day period on 5 and 6 August 2014.</p> <p>Subsequent to the date being agreed Mr Willman and then PAULA on Mr Willman’s behalf requested that the</p> | NM/ JMcM |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| | <p>In preference, SMBC know their scheme is defective and intend to deceive the Inspector as they have the public by a myriad of documents when as Jayne Hallam, your Programme Officer, kindly pointed out to me it was perfectly appropriate for Councils acting in the public interest to provide such micro-simulation evidence to provide clarity and it is my contention that the reason why SMBC will not is because they wish to hide the truth from the Inspector.</p> <p><u>I would ask the Inspector to require micro-simulation of the “Lord Reid One Issue” as already requested by myself in order to provide the clarity, honesty and transparency that SMBC have so far denied the public as they continue to perpetrate the fraud which they know is this scheme.</u></p> <p>I have in my professional life been involved in accident reconstruction by way of video presentation to Judges on major incidents. The software to reformat SMBC’s data on “Lord Reid’s One Issue”</p> | <p>date was changed and stated that would not attend. As other people had agreed to attend that day and had arranged time off work the event was held.</p> <p>Having initially accepted the invitation, the Green Party declined to attend the workshop via an email received on the evening prior to the workshop.</p> <p>On the 5th and 6th of August, the Council’s traffic modelling consultants held a demonstration of the traffic modelling undertaken in support of the scheme to enable objectors with specific concerns about traffic modelling to better understand the process. The objector was invited to this demonstration. The methodology of the demonstration of the A6MARR traffic model on 5th and 6th August allowed attendees to see that the forecast average daily traffic flows for the A6 through High Lane and Disley reduce from a previously predicted additional up to 30% increase to an increase of 11-16% when the enhanced mitigation measures are included. The content of the demonstration was designed to specifically meet the objector’s demands.</p> <p>Detailed Notes of the workshop were produced and agreed with all attendees and these are appended to this rebuttal (Appendix A). The final paragraph of these notes is relevant:</p> <p><i>“It was agreed by all that the model demonstration confirmed the integrity of the modellers and its reporting. And that the program they had used had produced a result which predicted changes in the daily traffic flow from up to a 30% increase in traffic on the A6, to a reduced level (up to a 16%) and that this may be brought about by the</i></p> | |
|--|---|---|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>is standard in the computer workplace and can easily be facilitated to provide in the space of 5 minutes a video presentation slice of the scheme in relation to the A6 to the Inspector as he drives up the A6 as to whether the EHM will provide the reduction in traffic flow as ridiculously alleged by SMBC.</p> | <p><i>introduction of enhanced A6 mitigation measures through the 1-3 minute increase in journey times.”</i></p> <p>Prior to the date of the model demonstration workshop, Mr Willman asked for the workshop to be postponed and instead requested a micro-simulation model be prepared to show the package of mitigation measures and their impact on traffic flow.</p> <p>The Council has used the most appropriate traffic modelling tool for the scale and scope of the highway scheme it is promoting. Micro-simulation is not the appropriate tool for this and it will not provide any more definitive information than is already available. Micro-simulation, as the name suggest models traffic flow and interaction at the ‘micro’ level; it models individual vehicles and provides a powerful tool for understand vehicle interaction, generally in localised areas. It is used for example, in congested urban areas to understand the effects of traffic management measures or another example is its use in modelling traffic merging and weaving movements at motorway slip roads. Whilst micro-simulation models have the ability to undertake traffic assignment (i.e. routing of traffic), their prime role is in examining and providing a visualisation of traffic interaction.</p> <p>Conversely, the prime role of strategic models, like the one</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>used for the A6MARR scheme, is to understand local and longer distance traffic movements and changes in traffic flows and patterns resulting from changes to the highway network. This is why strategic traffic models are used to assess all major highway proposals.</p> <p>The issue of predicted traffic increase along the A6 is one of traffic re-assignment (or re-routing) from other roads. This effect can only be accurately modelled and understood using a traffic model that has the appropriate level of network coverage, as does the A6MARR traffic model. For micro-simulation to be useful as a tool to model the reassignment effects of the A6MARR scheme, a significant part of the south Manchester and north Cheshire / Derbyshire highway network, including the A6MARR scheme would need to be coded in micro-simulation.</p> <p>In addition, in order to properly reflect the “micro” level of modelling detail, much greater detail of network definition would be required otherwise a degree of accuracy would be associated with the output that would not be reflected in model input. This would require significant modelling effort and resource. Even if this were to be undertaken at significant additional public expense, the principle of traffic routing and route choice would remain the same as it is in the current A6MARR model. The key issue here is not the level of modelling detail but simply a better understanding of the cause of the changes to traffic route. Had Mr</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>Willman attended the model demonstration workshop then this would have been explained in detail as set out in the notes of the workshop, where the attendees were satisfied with the logic of traffic routing through the explanation provided to them.</p> <p>Micro-simulation is not an appropriate tool for this and a localised micro-simulation model will not be able to reflect the wide area traffic routing that is likely to take place with the construction of the A6MARR scheme. The existing traffic modelling outputs are fit for purpose and have been utilised in supporting the planning application, business case, scheme development and identification of traffic mitigation measures.</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|

Rebuttal Volume 30/2
25th September 2014

THE HIGHWAYS ACT 1980
-and-
THE ACQUISITION OF LAND ACT 1981

THE HIGHWAYS (INQUIRIES PROCEDURE) RULES 1994
COMPULSORY PURCHASE (INQUIRIES PROCEDURE) RULES 2007

REFERENCE: LAO/NW/SRO/2013/40 and LAO/NW/CPO/2013/41

REBUTTAL PROOF

-of-

James McMahon in relation to the Proof
of
Greg Willman, 36 Cromley Road, High Lane
The Metropolitan Borough Council of Stockport
acting on its behalf and on behalf of
-Manchester City Council -and-
Cheshire East Borough Council

to be presented to a Local Public Inquiry on the 30th September 2014 to consider
objections to

THE METROPOLITAN BOROUGH OF STOCKPORT (HAZEL GROVE (A6) TO
MANCHESTER AIRPORT A555 CLASSIFIED ROAD) COMPULSORY PURCHASE
ORDER 2013

THE METROPOLITAN BOROUGH OF STOCKPORT (HAZEL GROVE (A6) TO
MANCHESTER AIRPORT A555 CLASSIFIED ROAD) (SIDE ROADS) ORDER 2013

VOLUME 2 - APPENDICES

Parveen Akhtar
Head of Legal and Democratic Governance
The Metropolitan Borough Council of Stockport
Corporate and Support Services
Town Hall, Stockport SK1 3XE

Appendix A Traffic Model Demonstration Workshop 5th August 2014 Meeting Notes

Meeting Notes

| | | | |
|-------------------------|--|----------------------|---|
| Project: | SEMMMS A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road | | |
| Subject: | Traffic Model Demonstration Workshop | | |
| Date & time: | 5 th August 2014, 10:00am | | |
| Meeting place: | Atkins, Manchester | | |
| Present: | Angela Broad (AB) Barry Sequeira (BS) Darrell Williams (DW) Jim McMahon (JM) Nasar Malik (NM) Gary Rowland (GR) | Representing: | High Lane Residents Association (HLRA) HLRA HLRA Stockport Council Atkins Atkins |

| ITEM | DESCRIPTION | Action |
|------|---|--------|
| 1 | <p>Scope of Workshop</p> <p>JM introduced representatives of the High Lane Residents Association to the meeting.</p> <p>JM explained that workshop had been convened in response to requests for access to the traffic modelling to demonstrate and verify the integrity of the model and its reporting with specific reference to the impact of the A6MARR scheme on the A6 through High Lane and Disley with the inclusion of enhanced mitigation measures.</p> <p>JM explained that a note of the discussion at the workshop will be produced and circulated to the attendees as a draft for agreement.</p> | |
| 2 | <p>Non-technical explanation of A6MARR Traffic Model</p> <p>NM explained that Atkins is one of the UKs largest engineering and transport planning consultants, who undertake traffic modelling and scheme assessment for major highway schemes across the country and internationally, working to high professional standards. All modelling work is undertaken in strict accordance with national government guidance and is subject to scrutiny by the DfT. The model for the A6MARR is no different. It has been approved as fit for purpose by the DfT who have had a scrutiny role on model development and the preparation of future year traffic forecasts.</p> <p>NM explained that the A6MARR model is based on the Greater Manchester Transport Model but has been updated and enhanced to the south and east of the conurbation to ensure appropriate network representation in areas where the scheme could affect traffic routeing, and validated to a 2009 base year.</p> <p>AS queried the basis for a 2009 base year. NM explained that the model has been developed from a variety of sources over the years but including a substantial amount of actual origin-destination trip data derived from traffic surveys across the study area for this scheme, many of which were carried out in 2009. NM explained that additional traffic surveys including</p> | |

| | |
|----------------------|----------------|
| Next meeting: | N/A |
| Distribution: | All attendees |
| Date issued: | 07 August 2014 |

| ITEM | DESCRIPTION | Action |
|------|---|--------|
| | <p>roadside interviews on the A6 carried out in 2011 have been incorporated in the model, and that it was general DfT guidance that the base year would only be updated after 6 years.</p> | |
| | <p>DW requested confirmation as to the extent of the model area that was coded in detailed SATURN simulation compared to buffer network coding. NM explained that the whole of Greater Manchester was coded in SATURN simulation and that this was extended for this scheme to include north Cheshire, and as far as Disley on the A6. NM referenced that details of this are set out in Appendix B of the Scheme Business Case.</p> | |
| | <p>DW queried why the validation had not been updated following Design Freeze 7. NM explained that reference to the Design Freeze referred to the status of the scheme design and it should not be confused with model validation which reflects the ability of the model to replicate base year travel patterns. NM explained that the DfT has accepted that the model is accurately reflecting traffic flows and travel conditions across the network in the base year.</p> | |
| | <p>NM explained that the model has been developed following standard industry practice and DfT guidance in developing future year traffic models from the base year model with and without the scheme in place. Again, the DfT has accepted the traffic forecasts produced by these models. This practice includes the development of an uncertainty log prepared in consultation with local authorities based on the level of certainty of future schemes/ developments coming forward.</p> | |
| | <p>DW queried as to why it would appear that the Waters Wilmslow science & technology park development had not been incorporated in the 2017 forecasts, and whether this undermined the credibility of the model. NM said he would investigate this matter and report back, explaining that uncertainty log represented information known at a point in time and was reliant upon the information supplied by the planning authorities. NM explained the inclusion of site specific development traffic was controlled to National Transport Model forecasts within the matrix development process, further details of which are set out in Appendix B to the scheme Business Case.</p> | NM |
| | <p>Post Meeting Note: <i>The Waters development was included in the 2017 Optimistic Scenario at the time of the traffic forecasts but it was not included in the Core scenario. This was because, although it had planning permission, the development was subject to the signing of a satisfactory Section 106 Agreement with the local authority. Given the distance of the site from the A6MARR, and the fact that the traffic model predicts a reduction in traffic past this site as a result of the relief road, it is not considered that the omission of this site from the Core scenario would have had any material implication for the published traffic forecasts. This site is included in the Core Scenario in our latest uncertainty log which will be used for any model update required as part of the Full Approval Business Case submission to the DfT.</i></p> | |
| | <p>NM explained that in simple terms, the model routes traffic onto the road network using a calculation of the journey cost along competing routes using a combination of travel time and distance. As one route attracts traffic, the speeds along the route are adjusted by the model to reflect the volume of traffic and thus alternative routes become attractive for these journeys and a proportion of traffic is then allocated to the 'cheaper' routes. This process is repeated numerous times by the model until it reaches a</p> | |

| ITEM | DESCRIPTION | Action |
|------|--|--------|
| | <p>point of stability where the traffic flows on routes remain largely unchanged between model iterations.</p> | |
| 3 | <p>Traffic Routeing in the A6 Corridor</p> <p>NM presented diagrams showing the predicted change in traffic flow in the A6 corridor following completion of the A6MARR scheme under the ‘with mitigation’ and ‘enhanced A6 mitigation’ scenarios.</p> <p>NM explained that the additional traffic attracted to the A6 with the construction of the A6MARR is traffic that is already making an east-west journey in the broad corridor; it is not new traffic.</p> <p>NM described how some of the traffic currently on other routes to the north and south of the A6 is attracted to the A6 with the construction of the scheme as the A6 route becomes a quicker route.</p> <p>NM explained that modelling of the enhanced mitigation measures is simply a means through which to limit the speed advantage for the A6 in order to reduce the level of traffic transfer (or re-routing) from these other routes to the A6. The modelling of the enhanced mitigation measures results in a modest 1-3 minute increase in journey times along the A6.</p> <p>NM explained that the actual measures to be implemented will only be finalised following due process of public consultation and approval by the local authorities. For modelling purposes however, the speed reduction that has been modelled reflects a range of measures including a Poynton style ‘shared space’ facility at the Fountain Square junction in Disley, an additional pedestrian crossing in High Lane, reducing the speed limit and gateway treatments.</p> <p>NM explained that implementation of an enhanced mitigation strategy prior to completion of the A6MARR would have no discernible impact on traffic flow, as the traffic targeted by the enhanced mitigation measures is not on the A6 at present – it is traffic that is only attracted to the A6 with the scheme in place. So whilst early implementation of the enhanced mitigation measures would add delay to existing traffic and may push some traffic off the A6 and onto other routes, it clearly cannot remove traffic from the A6 that is not currently on the A6.</p> <p>AS queried whether reassignment of traffic other cross-country routes was predominantly private car. NM explained that the model separately assigns 5 user classes, car (commuting), car (on employer’s business), car (other), light goods vehicles and heavy goods vehicles and confirmed that the change in traffic reassignment related predominantly to private car.</p> | |
| 4 | <p>Enhanced Mitigation Measures – Discharge of Planning Conditions</p> <p>JM explained that implementation of enhanced mitigation on the A6 was a condition of the planning permission prior to opening of the A6MARR.</p> <p>JM explained that the actual measures to be implemented will only be finalised following due process of public consultation and approval by the respective local authorities (Stockport Council and Cheshire East Council).</p> <p>JM explained that for enhanced mitigation measures in Stockport the Council will bring forward options for consultation to build consensus that these will achieve the desired outcomes predicted by the traffic modelling. Working together the two authorities will ensure that the package of</p> | |

| ITEM | DESCRIPTION | Action |
|------|---|--------|
| | <p>measures will ameliorate the impact of the A6MARR scheme through a modest 1-3 minute increase in journey times along the A6.</p> <p>DW queried what modelling tools would be used for to assess the effectiveness of the enhanced mitigation measures put forward for implementation. NM explained that the SATURN model will be used to model the impact of the package of measures in terms traffic assignment using output from a combination of sources including, for example, discrete junction modelling, empirical data from before and after surveys of similar schemes elsewhere and changes to free link speeds.</p> <p>AS/DW queried the nature of the proposals for the A6/ Windlehurst Road junction. JM explained that the Council is in negotiation with the Highways Agency (HA) to facilitate the inclusion of left turn lane on the south-eastbound carriageway. GR added that MOVA signal control would also be implemented to enable the junction to respond dynamically to vehicle demands to improve traffic throughput. A plan showing the area of land owned by the HA is attached to these minutes.</p> <p>AS queried whether there were any proposals to amend the entrance access arrangement to Lyme Park, which currently leads to queues block back to Disley when special events are on. JM explained that access to Lyme Park is within Cheshire East and whilst it was not thought that any specific modification were required in the context of the A6MARR scheme, as the issue were more operational, he would make contact with Cheshire East representatives for them to review the access arrangements with Lyme Park during events and report back.</p> <p>BS queried why the increase in traffic along the A6 was quoted as being between 11-16%. NM explained that these figures referred to different sections of the A6 between Disley and High Lane, and reflected the different traffic levels on these sections of road rather than being a range of flows for a single section of road.</p> | |
| 5 | <p>Demonstration Model Run(s)</p> <p>JM explained that a day and a half had been set aside to provide a full demonstration of the model to verify its integrity.</p> <p>NM explained that there are three scenarios that require to be modelled: These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2017 without the A6MARR • 2017 with the A6MARR and including the initial mitigation measures. This represents the scenario used in the phase two consultation that showed up to a 30% increase in traffic on the A6 • 2017 with the A6MARR and including the initial mitigation as well as the enhanced A6 mitigation. This represents the scenario agreed between the promoting authorities subsequent to the phase two consultation that showed a reduced level (up to a 16%) of increase in traffic on the A6 <p>NM explained that the A6MARR traffic model consists of three one-hourly time period models. These are a Morning Peak Hour, an Inter-Peak Hour and an Evening Peak Hour. Therefore, three models need to be run for each of the three scenarios, making a total of nine model runs to complete the full exercise. Each model run could take up to 45 minutes to complete.</p> | JM |

| ITEM | DESCRIPTION | Action |
|------|---|--------|
| | <p>GR explained that the comparison spreadsheets require as input, data extracted from the completed model runs from each time period, and that the average daily traffic estimates were based by combining and factoring the outputs for each of the model time periods based on expansion factors derived from an extensive database of traffic counts held by the TfGM Highways Forecasting and Analytical Services department.</p> | |
| | <p>DW presented his calculation of AADT along a section of the A6 through High Lane and queried the small variance compared to that reported. NM explained that the small variance was in part due to the day-to-day variation in traffic flow on the A6 itself and also the estimated AADT flows reported and based on area wide expansion factors, since it would not be practicable to have separate factors for every (section) of road. NM explained further that the important issue is that there is consistency in how the factors are applied between model scenarios.</p> | |
| | <p>GR demonstrated how the comparison spreadsheet could simply be reset by deleting the SATURN output data from the spreadsheet.</p> | |
| | <p>GR demonstrated that the SATURN data input and output files were created in 2013 in advance of submission of the Transport Assessment and had been not modified since and that to recreate model runs it was necessary to using the same version of SATURN (10.9.24).</p> | |
| | <p>Those representatives of the HLRA who attended the workshop, considered it unnecessary for the SATURN model to be re-run for all model scenarios and time periods and that one model run demonstration would suffice. DW selected the 2017 inter peak period with A6MARR and enhanced mitigation for purpose of the model run demonstration.</p> | |
| | <p>GR explained the processes involved in extracting both the traffic flow and journey time from the SATURN model run and demonstrated that the live model run had re-produced the same output as the previous model results.</p> | |
| | <p>It was agreed by all that the model demonstration confirmed the integrity of the modellers and its reporting. And that the program they had used had produced a result which predicted changes in the daily traffic flow from up to a 30% increase in traffic on the A6, to a reduced level (up to a 16%) and that this may be brought about by the introduction of enhanced A6 mitigation measures through the 1-3 minute increase in journey times.</p> | |