

SEMMMS – Is this a duplicitous and unacceptable fraud on the public?

Dear Inspector,

My Degree is Law, my position is totally apolitical and I have never protested against anything in my life.

In the course of my professional life I have amongst other matters acted for Composite Insurers who have insured schemes as big and as complex as this scheme and as I stated when I addressed the Cheshire East Planning Meeting on 18 March 2014 when this scheme was voted on I would not insure this scheme as it is not, technically, fit for purpose.

Lord Reid, a famous if dour Scots Judge once said:-

“There is only one issue, hardly ever two and rarely ever three. The skill is in ascertaining that issue.”

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.

Whilst there are many reasons why this scheme should not proceed, if I may, I will concentrate on the above “Lord Reid’s One Issue” which is the foundation stone upon which the entirety of the scheme rests.

The SEMMMS scheme is a funnel in shape and the A6 is the spout.

A funnel cannot work if the spout is blocked.

It is therefore fundamental to the efficacy of the entirety of the road scheme that the traffic on the A6 not be “blocked”.

Woodrow Wilson the American President once said;

“Rather than let me read the book let me speak to the author for half an hour”;

So I did, I met with Mr McMahon the Project Manager of the Scheme and his Assistant, Ms Stevenson.

Mr McMahon explained to me that SMBC had carried out traffic modelling when considering the proposed road scheme and had reached the conclusion that if the scheme was built the traffic volume on the A6 (the spout) would increase by; “25-30%” (see para 20.47/p34 of the Statement of case dated 16 May 2014).

Mr McMahon then went onto state that it was accepted that the road scheme could not be built on what is already an extremely congested arterial road if such percentage increase of nearly a third could not be reduced.

Mr McMahon went onto explain the need for “enhanced mitigation measures” (EHM) to reduce such anticipated increase in traffic volume of up to “30%” on the A6 if the scheme was to be built.

Mr McMahon, made the point that re-programming of the software with the introduction of EHM, spectacularly, reduced such “25-30%” **SPECIFICALLY** to “11 to 16%” and provided such reduction to such figure was reached the scheme could be built.

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 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.

So quite clearly when the scheme document was drafted specific “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?

Apparently, not.

At the Cheshire East Planning Meeting referred to above which was recorded on video and in which Councillor Mahon (Ind) supported my contention on presentation that the scheme was not fit for purpose, Councillor Brendan Murphy, Leader of the Independent Group, asked the representative of SMBC, who refused to explain the traffic modelling, what exact and specific EHM referred to in the scheme document were actually programmed into the model?

The response of SMBC was, verbatim, and without any further explanation;

“We have no published mitigation measures at this time”.

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?

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 and bizarrely, don’t use it at all, is merely an afterthought having got this monstrosity past the voting Councillors.

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.

What was Councillor Murphy’s response to SMBC contention that they had no enhanced mitigation measures despite referring to them in the scheme document as being fundamental to the efficacy of the scheme being built at all?

The Independent Group, rightly, proposed that the scheme not be voted upon by C East until such EHM were provided for their consideration!

What happened next?

The Coalition councillors who want this “Airport Road” voted against such demand to see the EHM and then voted for the scheme despite one such Coalition Councillor, watch the video, stating to guffaws of laughter that the only way such EHM would provide the reduction alleged would be by “magic” and another Coalition Councillor

commenting with concern that on a scheme as large as this he could not understand why anything other than Outline Planning Approval was being requested rather than a vote for everything when quite clearly issues, including that which might be referred to by Lord Reid, clearly remained outstanding in respect of any “sensible” explanation.

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.

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 Transport into the technical efficacy of the scheme just in the event 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.

Apparently, not.

I met for over 3 hours with Sue Broomhead of Planning at SMBC at two separate meetings prior to the vote by the Councillors on this scheme and asked that the traffic modelling issue as explained above be investigated in order that the Councillors quite rightly be fully briefed on the scheme before they were required to vote for it.

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.

So why are SMBC doing it if they know it won’t work?

The answer is that they know the scheme will cause such damage, Disley are already requesting a bypass before the 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.

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.

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.

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.

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” 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.

I am not alone in challenging the veracity of the scheme document.

Those candidates in the forthcoming General Election who live locally to the area have either voted against the scheme in Council as has the Coalition Councillor William Wragg who chose to do so because of his acceptance of the “Lord Reid One Issue”, further stating specifically with regard to the alleged traffic volume reduction that; “The figures don't add up”, or in the case of Darran Palmer who is also standing for the seat has stated that he is totally opposed to the scheme again for the reasons I have stated.

I have requested those that presently represent us, politically, to seek out the truth as I have set out in this letter and they have refused.

I am grateful for your attention.

Yours faithfully,

Greg Willman- 9 September 2014

Appendix 1

“Charlie Sunderland

To

Me

'Graham Martin'

19 May

Thank you for your e-mail. I am not sure why Stockport have characterised the model as “DfT's” model - it is not. They will have used the relevant proprietary software which will be held by their consultants who will have programmed the model for the local area. We do not have the model as set up by SMBC. Our role in this is to check that the design and parameters of models are such that they will give sensible outputs rather than running them ourselves and checking all the outputs.

I am copying this e-mail to Graham Martin in Stockport. G2

Charlie Sunderland

Department for Transport”