

Dear Inspector,

**Public Inquiry – A6 to Manchester Relief Road.**

Unfortunately, I am not only rather unwell but I also do not have access to the public purse to pay for Queens Counsel and experts but I have, nevertheless, out of courtesy to both you and Stockport Council responded herein to the Rebuttal of the Council to my Response and will do so, initially, by preface in anticipation of giving evidence to the Public Inquiry tomorrow, Friday 10 October 2014 and to save repetition.

I first encountered this scheme in November of last year when I took Mrs Fernyhough, my neighbour and who will be accompanying me to the Public Inquiry, to High Lane Resident's Association Meeting of that month, whose late husband, George Fernyhough O.B.E., ran such Association with distinction for 30 years, my first attendance despite originally moving to live in High Lane in 1967.

Whilst the Association is self-elected, does not represent the Village and only about 20 people ever attend I was concerned by what I heard about the SEMMMS scheme and realised that I was mistaken to assume that because so much money was being spent it was a scheme that was technically sound and when a Villager challenged the efficacy of the scheme he was rudely interrupted by Councillor Dowling who shouted out;

***"This road will be built. You people better just get what you can...( for High Lane )".***

I subsequently attended to see my MP, Sir Andrew Stunell, with Mr & Mrs Broad ( 2 of the only 3 people who attended Mr McMahon's later "Show-Trial demo! - See 51/R09 ) and pointed out to Sir Andrew that the Councillor was acting like a Judge saying you were guilty before he had even heard the evidence and that the Councillor should not be allowed to vote as a result of such action. Sir Andrew accepted that; "technically" I was correct. Councillor Dowling who is a senior Planning Councillor was on holiday when the SEMMMS scheme was voted on and did not take part in the vote the Committee of which are all Councillors of the Coalition.

I have been investigating this stinking political mess that is SEMMMS, ever since, simply trying to elicit the truth and I still await it.

As I left the Cheshire East Planning Meeting on March 18 2014 after addressing the Councillors and having stated not only with the endorsement of Councillor Mahon ( whom I had never met before that day! ) that the SEMMMS scheme was clearly defective and not fit for purpose, astonishingly, without any challenge, whatsoever, from any Councillor to my contention; a very senior Coalition Councillor approached my outside Macclesfield Town Hall who had just voted for the Scheme and almost apologetically stated to me;

***"Mr Willman, it takes a lot of courage to vote against something as big as this."***

I sincerely hope, Sir, that you have such courage, to act in the public interest and recommend to the secretary of State that this defective scheme which is not fit for purpose should be called in for a Public Inquiry with regard to the entirety of the scheme in the public interest.

The basis of such request is that it is self-evident from this Inquiry and before that Stockport Council have failed to comply with their duty of care to the public and have taken advantage of their public position in not being questioned on matters such as the traffic modelling which has not been examined by anyone outside the Council ( apart from their delivered results ) in favour of, as Mr Brendan Murphy of the Independent Group put to Mr Hill of Stockport Council when he refused to respond to Cheshire East Planning Committee on 18 March 2014 when this matter was voted on;

***"Your job is just to build the road, isn't it?"***

A serious allegation made to a public official acting in the course of their duty.

I am sure you will agree that the Council's "job" is to ensure the efficacy of all aspects of the scheme, including the traffic modelling, are clear and self-explanatory.

Whilst all that is clear both at this Public Inquiry and before is exemplified by Mr Williams ( the third and last of the 3 people to attend Mr McMahon's demo ) email dated 14 April 2014 to High Lane Resident's Association ( please note this is now a document before the Public Inquiry ) in responding to Mr Boylan's ( CEO of Stockport Council ) response to my request for clarity is;

***"obfuscation"***

A serious allegation against the Chief Executive of Stockport Council.

The Inspector will also note my email annexed thereto to Mr McMahon dated 14 July 2014 in which I ask to see the traffic modelling in a manner of format that the public can understand which I would contend is clearly not the intention of the Council as they pursue this politically motivated road.

The Council at this Public Inquiry in my respectful submission have no less, defiantly, attempted to mislead and deceive the Inspector in their perpetration of this fraud of a road scheme that by anyone's estimation is not only in it's present form defective and not fit for purpose but will cause incalculable damage not only to the South of Manchester but will also destroy the Peak District National Park through which most of the increased volume of traffic will be sucked from the east coast ferry ports to Manchester Airport whilst Mr Malik "fiddles" whilst this area "burns" by, ludicrously, alleging by mitigation of the traffic volume figures that the scheme is designed in terms of traffic modelling to "limit(ing) the attractiveness of the A6 to longer distance traffic..." when by anyone's estimation the road will clearly facilitate a goods-train of European goods vehicles to Manchester Airport which will be the Goods Depot of the UK such airport being the biggest capital intensive project in the UK since the Olympics and already more than adequately catered for in terms of transport by an established and highly effective motorway network.

I would contend that the position of Stockport Council with regard to this scheme is an insult to the intelligence of the Inspector let alone illogical and unacceptable and has only got this far as a result of Councillors being forced to vote politically rather than in the best interests of the public.

Edmund Burke once said All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing and whilst I may not be that good man I, nevertheless, reject the imposition of this fraud of a scheme on the public and would ask that it be reconsidered at a Public Inquiry of the entirety of the scheme in the public interest so that, thereafter, Councillors

be allowed to find the "courage" to require the truth which has so far been denied both them and the public.

Greg Willman – 9 October 2014.

Response to the Inspector in respect of the Rebuttal of Stockport Council;

Page 2;

*"The transport modelling reports"* referred to by the Council are the only evidence of traffic modelling that the D of T or anyone else outside the Council has seen as evidence of the efficacy of their traffic modelling.

Page 3;

*"Mr Willman accepts...a 30% increase along the A6".*

I don't nor ever have as pointed out to Mr Malik when he gave evidence to the Inquiry accept anything of the sort.

As I said to the Inquiry at that time I consider the figure is a significant understatement and there is no clarity of evidence before the Inspector to dispute my concerns.

The Council have got thoroughly confused with regard to my clear funnel/spout analogy.

It is without dispute that the A6 is the spout to the schemes' funnel which is why I have concentrated with regard to my Submission to the Inquiry on one issue which is that if the traffic volume created by the scheme blocks the spout none of the scheme can operate, especially, as it is my contention that the sole purpose of the scheme is to manage the huge increase in goods traffic that will use the A6 from the east coast in order to access Manchester Airport by the most direct route which is through the Peak District National Park which does not have the roads to cope and with regard to which there has been no risk assessment in order to ascertain the damage such un-controlled European traffic will occasion on such protected area of outstanding natural beauty and I would implore the Inspector to drive through the Peak in order to see for himself that such area cannot facilitate this scheme in it's present guise.

*"30% along this road is not desirable"*

If the Inspector will forgive me I laughed my socks off when Mr Malik lead by Queens Counsel paid for out of my council tax conceded when giving evidence before the Inquiry that such increase was;

*"not acceptable"*

And not, *desirable*, which wholly corroborates My Submission that such figure is, logically ( to use again a word Mr Malik favours when giving evidence ), not a figure which if incapable of reduction would allow the scheme to be built at all hence, and again logically, the decision to undertake further traffic modelling to reach a figure that would allow the road to be built which the Council decided was *"11 and 16"* ( although the Inspector will note 10-15% in the public consultation document as evidenced in OBJ/51/02 ).

What Mr Malik conceded above when lead by Counsel in giving evidence to the Inquiry is exactly what Mr McMahon said to me when we met and I found it amusing when he then attempted to renege on the same when I politely put such to him and respectfully requested of yourself that such first answer be noted, especially, when made by an experienced expert prompted by Counsel which serves to show yet again that Stockport Council seems to have a problem when it comes to figuring out the truth.

*"There is no specific pre-condition"*

Clearly there is if not specifically by implication.

You aren't going to build a road if the anticipated traffic volume will be, say, 500%, so it is only a matter of degree is deciding what is acceptable.

In this case, "11 and 16" or "10-15%" or, whatever.

Page 4;

*"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."*

Both Mr McMahon and ms Stevenson sprinkle their statements with percentage references to public approval without actually saying what questions were put to the public at a time prior to councillors voting on the scheme.

My Submission is clear that this scheme is a fraud on the public.

Stockport Council seem to think that they don't need to worry about the public now as they have a politically motivated planning condition that bears no relevance whatsoever to what they put to the public.

---

Did the Council on consultation say to the public;

We're going to build a road, we have no idea of the volume of traffic on the road and won't know until it is built at which time we'll try a few "mitigation measures" but can't promise they'll work as traffic modelling can only ever be, again to use Mr Malik's words, speculative!!

Stockport Council are a public body and do not have a mandate from the public to operate only in accordance with the above paragraph but that is exactly what they are doing and mark my words this is exactly what will happen if you allow this road to be built in it's present defective state.

I said to you at the beginning of the Inquiry that I did not believe that your Inquiry was designed for the public to be present.

This was not a reflection on your good-self but on Stockport Council who in the obstructive and misleading manner in which they have presented evidence in which you will note they could not even show Mrs Harrison ( Statutory Objector – who said to me that; *"They clearly didn't expect me to turn up and question it!"* ) on their scheme/slides something as simple as field gate that she could use to move her horses across the carriageway of the new scheme but the Council plumb new depths of obfuscation in their Rebuttal.



*"...the exact details of these mitigation measures are not required, but rather it's the impact of these measures that is important..."*

One might ask how on earth can you ascertain impact without actually knowing what will create that impact and I would if I may refer you to OBJ/51/02 and in particular page 55 reference 1163 which was the first document I ever accessed on this scheme and I remember referring this particular entry to both High Lane Resident's Association and Stockport Council as evidence of some bright spark having the temerity to suggest that depending on the nature of the imposition of any mitigation measures they should be considered in concert with any engineering scheme as it just might be that such mitigation measures may be so ineffective or onerous as to warrant the scheme not being built at all?

Not a problem here though as this is a political road in which even Coalition Councillors at Cheshire East commented on voting of the impropriety of voting on the whole of a scheme ( rather than outline planning permission which one Councillor stated was more appropriate ) without seeing all that it encompasses let alone be presented with alternative routes if indeed a road is necessary, at all, which it isn't other than to facilitate the Airport.

The Inspector will note in the other pages in OBJ/51/02 a wholesale contempt for the public's concerns in such consultation replaced by a standard response to every question stating that the response will be mitigation measures which they now state will not be necessary if the Planning Authority faced with a completed road feel understandably forced to accept irrespective of the effectiveness of such measures.

Yet further evidence of fraud.

*"developed with input from the public"*

The Council haven't got a clue how they will respond to traffic volume increase on the A6 and as I have contended in my Submission there are no mitigation measures and I don't believe there is even traffic modelling that supports this scheme.

Presumably, when the mitigation measures don't work the Council will blame the public?

Page 5;

*"This does not mean forcing traffic to use longer routes through villages"*

The above is a serious and complete contradiction of what Ms Stevenson stated to the recorded Cheshire East Planning Meeting on 18 March 2014 immediately prior to their voting on the scheme.

To quite raucous laughter, the Councillors positively teased Ms Stevenson into explaining how local people will access Stockport from the New Mills end of the A6 as she contended that local people would have to find alternative routes to Stockport as a result of the increased volume of traffic caused by the scheme. Ms Stevenson's specific response was that local people would be expected to get to Stockport via;

*"Pott Shrigley and Kettleshulme".*

Whilst the Inspector may argue that he is not instructed to respond to the main body of the scheme I am sure you will accept that the CPOs and SROs don't stand on their own

and I would ask that the Inspector view the recorded Meeting of 18 March 2014 if any of my recollections are questioned in any form, whatsoever, as quite clearly what Ms Stevenson stated at C East is exactly the opposite of the present contention of the Council and Mr Malik when he gave evidence to the Inquiry that the road traffic modelling in order to respond to the scheme does not require local people not to use the scheme but non-local traffic when the road will clearly attract long distance goods traffic to the airport.

There is total confusion on the part of both Ms Stevenson and Mr Malik the latter of whom expects us to believe that the scheme is designed in order to ensure the traffic volume increase of "11 and 16%" is met on the basis that long distance lorries will not use the road when clearly they will to access the Airport.

Such conflict goes to the credibility not just of senior people involved in the scheme but the scheme itself with regard to which Mr McMahon has even admitted in writing that he doesn't understand the traffic modelling and is, presumably, reliant on the smoke and mirrors provided by Mr Malik without understanding what his Council is committing itself to other than a political road.

*"The new sections of road shall not be brought into use until the ( mitigation ) measures have been implemented".*

So the £300 million road will be built and then demolished if the Planning Authority decide the mitigation measures don't provide the "11 and 16"?

This issue was actually raised at C East when a Coalition Councillor conceded that it was "ridiculous" to suggest that the above would take place and that to all intents and purposes if such proceeded as above there might as well not be any mitigation measures!

The public did not provide any approval percentage to the above which is further perpetuation of the fraud this scheme is and it was amusing at C East to watch the Councillors worry themselves over the simple fact that as they had not been told of any mitigation measures how would they know the "Mitigation Fund" would provide for them ( a matter that was also raised with concern by Councillor Alexander at the Marple meeting that voted on the scheme without response ) and were not best pleased when they were advised by the Borough Solicitor present that any additional cost would be borne locally by us the public without contribution from central government yet another matter not put to the public when Mr McMahon obtained his fatuous percentage approval meetings in favour of this flawed scheme!

Page 6;

*"timetable"*

What timetable?

Page 7;

*"unless the prior written consent of the ...Authority has been obtained".*

Stockport Council have it all worked out.

The mitigation measures don't measure up so they go back to the Authority to be allowed to proceed without any!

Job's a good'un.

Page 9;

*"It (is) appropriate to leave the detail of the mitigation measures to a later stage".*

The Council have no mandate from public consultation to act in this manner and are simply relying on the fact that this is a political road.

51/R05

The Council refers to the years that have elapsed in considering a road but has not provided any alternative routes as for example happened in 1988 when a similar scheme was proposed and rejected.

Page 10;

*"barrier for economic growth"*

Absolute utter nonsense.

We are talking about damage to a National Park destruction of ancient woodland and irreparable damage to the surrounding area when the Airport is already more than adequately serviced by present motorway networks.

This road is designed to do no more than shave a few bob off petrol bills at the expense of the environment and countryside and people that need to be preserved from such vandalism.

Page 11;

---

51/R06;

The rebuttal simply confirms that the D of T has seen nothing other than the reports of the Council a matter which Ms Broomhead of Stockport Planning confirmed to me would not be the case with a private developer who ironically would be required to provide ALL their traffic modelling software and data for consideration by the Council in the public interest.

It is my contention that Stockport Council have breached their duty of care both to the public and the Inquiry by not reformatting their data by reference to PARAMICS so that whether it be Mrs Harrison or the public we can all bearing in mind the venue watch the scheme on a level playing field in the public interest.

Page 12;

The last sentence of the Rebuttal to 51/R07 on the top of this page is quite simply a lie to this Inquiry and a serious breach by civil servants of their duty of care not just to the public but to the Inspector in responding to this Public Inquiry.

The Council have not responded to my Complaint in any manner or form other than to ignore it as they did my request that the planning timetable be extended so the Councillors see the mitigation measures when they voted which we all know now never existed in the first place.

Page 13;

*"a new bypass of Disley"*

The Parish Council of Disley have so little confidence in this defective scheme that they are demanding a bypass of it before it is even built!

Page 14;

51/R09;

Mr Boylan by email categorically refused to provide any demonstration as being an inappropriate use of resources.

I then received an email out of the blue offering it.

I made it clear in concert with all other groups including the Green Party & PAULA that we wanted to see a clear visual display of the Council's data.

Ms Stevenson at a Poynton meeting let it slip to Mrs Broad of High Lane that there would be;

*"Nothing to see".*

Which we then realised was simply a disgusting ruse by the Council to waste public money in order to tick our attendance off their Consultation List.

We asked for a rearranged meeting providing real-time micro-simulation of the A6 vis-a-vis the traffic modelling and Mr McMahon refused.

Mr McMahon refused to tell us who had been invited as he desperately tried to garner credibility for his sham demo that would show "nothing" and who Keith Buchan Traffic Expert of the Metropolitan Transport Research Unit in London also informed me would show nothing and yet Mr McMahon proceeded at such public expense with 3 rather than 50 attendees with his staff outnumbering those who attended and who had no idea what was going on as they watched a metaphorical big metal box bleeping and burping ( traffic modelling? ) and when asked to relay their understanding of what occurred to a public meeting of High Lane Resident's Association were embarrassingly no more able to explain it to those who attended as they were not meant to understand it themselves and I would like the Inspector to note that rather than forward the Meeting notes of 5 August 2014 to the attendees that was asked of Mr McMahon the first I saw of them was when they were served within the Rebuttal!

Those attending were not meant to understand Mr McMahon's demo and if Mr McMahon is alleging that those that attended understood anything that was presented to them and/or that such answered their concerns let them attend and explain what they saw to the Inquiry and we will see if we are any more the wiser than those who attended the Resident's Meeting.

I would contend that the above is not the action of a public servant acting in the public interest and simply yet further evidence of the fraudulent pursuance of this scheme at the expense of the public.

Meeting Notes



**Item 2**

*"The model for the A6/MARR...has been approved as fit for purpose by the DfT"*

It has not!

Please see the D of T email of 190514 annexed to my Submission.

All the DfT has seen is the Council's results it has not examined the software of Stockport Council as clearly stated.

Stockport Council is telling lies.

**Page 18;**

*"Micro-simulation is not an appropriate tool for this..."*

Above I stated that the proceedings were not designed to respond to the public.

I would refer the Inspector to OBJ/51/03 in which you will note PARAMICS not only being used on the SEMMMS scheme as referred to at para 3.14 page 18 but also the advocacy of the same by Transport for Greater Manchester.

In particular, The Inspector will note in the first paragraph of Rebuttal answer 51/R06 on page 11 The Council refer to the fact that they have used the same traffic modelling as Transport for Greater Manchester but without the PARAMICS advocated by such body despite the same having with the full knowledge of Stockport Council;

*"significant practical use in conveying scheme impacts to a non-technical audience...a fundamental advantage...(over SATURN)...in provid(ing) detailed assessment of the interactions-between-individual-vehicles...driver behaviours...replicating...strategies...particularly suitable as a tool to aid in the design of...detailed traffic management plans".*

But only when you want to tell the public the truth.

Greg Willman – 9 October 2014.

Me

To

jim.mcmahon@stockport.gov.uk

CC

Charlie.Sunderland@dft.gsi.gov.uk npcu@communities.gsi.gov.uk

andrew.gwynne.mp@parliament.uk Toni PAULA and 3 more...

14 Jul

Dear Mr McMahon,

Please provide the truth otherwise I will quite rightly not be attending your programming of the projected A6 Traffic flow expensively paid for via external contractors by the public.

If your staff understand it why pay outside contractors?

You say there will be no documentation referred to at such demonstration that you have not already disclosed.

You won't confirm there will be a clear visual explanation and refuse to respond to your Deputy's assertion that there will be nothing to see despite the cost to the public of such demonstration?

I do not represent HL Resident's Assoc but the annexed email advising them is I am sure you will agree damning of your Council as they note I seek the truth.

---

I want to actually see visually how you have reached your unfounded reductions in traffic flow on the A6 as I am not with respect prepared to be a party to a fraud on the public no matter how inadvertent such may be.

I am with respect no more prepared to take your word or that of Mr Boylan for it any more than anyone else.

Yours sincerely,

G Willman

From: Darrell Williams <[darrell@williadd.eclipse.co.uk](mailto:darrell@williadd.eclipse.co.uk)>

Date: 14 April 2014 20:28:19 BST

To: HelenRichardson <[helen.richardson21@googlemail.com](mailto:helen.richardson21@googlemail.com)>

Subject: Re: Fwd: FOR THE PERSONAL ATTENTION OF THE CEO, MR E BOYLAN, SMBC.

Hi Helen,

No new information has actually been supplied. Mr. Boylan has simply re-quoted the references that were either published with the Planning Application last November or in the Business Case, a year before.

Obviously the 30mph issue will not be in the Business Case documents because they pre-date the enhanced mitigation proposal. As far as the Planning Application documents are concerned, like Greg, I cannot find, in the documents released so far, any detailed numerical explanation of how the 30mph mitigation proposal achieves the stated percentage reduction in traffic. Nor is there any mention of attempts at modelling different scenarios with various different combinations of sections of road at different speed limits and comparing the results to arrive at a conclusion that openly explains how the optimum mitigation solution has been selected from all the possible options.

I think if it were a simple matter of providing a reference to a page number in a particular document, Mr. Boylan would have already have done this. Instead he seems to have chosen the route of delay and obfuscation, in the firm belief, no doubt, that he has complied with the minimum requirements of information disclosure for the Business Case and Planning Application.

---

So we are no further on in this matter than we were in November when the Planning Application was published. I wish Greg luck in his quest to obtain an answer.

Regards,

Darrell.

On 14/04/2014 18:32, HelenRichardson wrote:

Hi Darrell

All I can say is good luck and Thank you very much.

Regards

Helen

