

Obj51/02

Jayne Hallam

From: Greg Willman <gregwillman2001@yahoo.co.uk>
Sent: 30 September 2014 09:35
To: Jayne Hallam
Subject: Amendment to objection no.51.

Dear Jayne,

I hope you enjoyed your run.

You will have noted my concern at what I believe is SMBC's deliberate mess of drafting my Objection, which they never ran past me, for the purposes of the Inquiry so such would not be brought to the attention of the Inquiry or other Objectors who might want to consider my contentions and as agreed I enclose my Objection for substitution in the documentation and I would respectfully ask that it be brought to the attention of the Inspector and Inquiry from the onset and I confirm that if deemed appropriate by the Inspector I am happy to read it out before the Inquiry proceeds in order to ensure all are aware of my Objection which I believe is the intention of SMBC that such not be the case.

"The Traffic modelling for the SEMMMS scheme is defective and not fit for purpose and inappropriately for a scheme of this magnitude and cost has never been examined outside SMBC let alone independently checked in the public interest.

In particular, and by way of exemplifying such defect the modelling contends that the volume increase in traffic on the A6 which is the spout to the funnel that is the scheme will increase by up to a third whilst it is the case that SMBC have no sensible evidence, whatsoever, to show how such volume increase will be reduced to a very specific stated "11 and 16%" as contended by SMBC and yet such specific reduction is a precondition of the scheme being built at all.

I and others have asked that SMBC reformat their data to a 5 minute video display to show the Inspector how their ~~mythical "mitigation measures" will respond to the increased traffic flow of a third on the A6 by reducing the same~~ to the stated "11 and 16%" and whilst this can easily be facilitated at little cost by real-time micro-simulation vis-à-vis PARAMICS and other software which the Inspector will be familiar with as are Atkins Global the agents of SMBC it is the case that SMBC have, categorically, refused to provide such transparency of evidence despite their duty of care as a public body preferring a myriad of convoluted documentation in order to deceive the public.

I am concerned that SMBC are not acting as a public body with the attendant duties required of such a body that such entails but are proceeding as a private developer with no responsibility to the public.

This is a political scheme that will destroy the Peak District as it will suck goods traffic from the east coast ferry ports direct to the "Airport Road" that is this scheme whilst such traffic is already catered for within the parameters of the existing motorway network and I implore the Inspector to require of SMBC the transparency and honesty of such video display which is not uncommon at such Inquires and which will if required show quite conclusively that such scheme is a fraud on the public and should not be allowed to be built in it's present guise and should be independently investigated in any event in the public interest."

I unfortunately do not have my smartphone with me so I will not be able to respond to any reply.

Regards,

G Willman - Obj51.

On Mon, 29/9/14, Jayne Hallam <JayneHallam@personaassociates.co.uk> wrote:

Subject: RE: REQUEST FOR ADJOURNMENT OF PUBLIC INQUIRYSEMMM; Subject Access Request expired without compliance on 24 September 2014.

To: "Greg Willman" <gregwillman2001@yahoo.co.uk>

Date: Monday, 29 September, 2014, 21:37

Dear Mr Willman

Thank you for your email I
have passed this to the Inspector

Regards

Jayne

-----Original Message-----

From: Greg Willman [mailto:gregwillman2001@yahoo.co.uk]

Sent: 29 September 2014 14:37

To: anwar.majothi@stockport.gov.uk

Cc: Jayne Hallam

Subject:

REQUEST FOR ADJOURNMENT OF PUBLIC INQUIRYSEMMM; Subject Access Request expired without compliance on 24 September 2014.

Dear Mr Majothi,

You have confirmed in writing

to me that the time in which your Council is required to respond to my Subject Access Request at your Council in respect of my request for data and documentation in relation to my name and address in so far as the same relates to SEMMMS expires on the 24 September 2014.

As you refused to respond to my formal written Request for an extension of the Planning Timetable your actions of which were criticised by the Chairman of the Cheshire East Planning Committee when I brought such to their attention in denying the Committee the opportunity to see some evidence of your mythical mitigation measures so you have refused, again, to respond in the public interest as a public body in failing to respond to my access request designed to see some evidence of how your council has responded not to me but also internally in explaining the traffic modelling on SEMMMS which I respectfully contend is defective and not fit for purpose.

You have sent me half a dozen A4 pages

detailing a few emails sent by me when there has been considerable correspondence between myself and your Council on the the traffic modelling and I consider your actions yet further evidence of a refusal on the part of the Council to show the truth of such traffic modelling in the knowledge that it is defective.

I,
therefore, formally, and respectfully, request of the Inspector that the Public Inquiry be adjourned in part or in toto at the behest of the Inspector in order that your disgraceful actions be remedied if necessary by the Inspector so that the truth will be placed before the Inspector.

I, and others,

have already asked that you reformat your traffic modelling data by way of real-time micro-simulation on the A6 slice of the scheme in order to show the truth of your scheme as is perfectly within the ability of your agents Atkins Global so that the Inspector be shown a 5 minute video displaying the interaction of your traffic modelling with the "mitigation measures" so that such will show how you will reduce an alleged increase in traffic volume of up to 30% (my guess is that it is likely to be more!) as stated in your Statement of Case to a very specific;

"11 and 16%" and you have refused and in preference have chosen to throw hundreds of pages of intelligible documents and data at the Inspector as referred to by High Lane Resident's Association in the enclosed email correspondence between their Chairperson and Mr Williams in which your Chief Executive, Mr Boylan, is accused of "obfuscation" in responding as a public servant to a public examination of your scheme.

I am sure you will accept the gravity of such contention made at your Council.

I mean no disrespect when I say your approach whether argued as "obfuscation" or otherwise is not conduct befitting a public body and I note that in my submission to the Inspector you have not challenged Mr Sunderland's email of 19 May 2014 to both myself and your Mr Martin that, astonishingly, in a scheme the cost of which exceeds £300 million it remains the case that no-one outside your Council has checked your software, programming or data in order to refute my contention that your scheme is defective and as a result is not fit for purpose and that it would not be in the public interest to proceed further without a totally independent assessment of your traffic modelling by an independent expert in the public interest and the results presented by way of real-time micro-simulation video presentation to the Inspector and it is my considered belief that the reason you are not providing a video examination as requested by all who refused to attend your demonstration of the traffic modelling in which only 3 people attended and were outnumbered by your staff is because you are fully aware your scheme is defective.

I request again, of the Inspector, that the prevarication and refusal to provide the truth by Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council be addressed by the granting of an adjournment as requested in this email in the public interest in order that the Council disclose all internal consideration of my correspondence to the Council in my quest for an answer to the truth as referred to by Mr Williams in the enclosed email in order that such disclosure provide for the Inquiry the truth that has so far been denied the public rather than the "obfuscation" referred to by Mr Williams of High Lane.

I am grateful for your attention.

Yours faithfully,

~~G-Willman-Obj51.~~

From: Darrell Williams <darrell@williadd.eclipse.co.uk>
Date: 14 April 2014 20:28:19 BST
To: HelenRichardson <helen.richardson21@gmail.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.

From: Eamonn Boylan <eamonn.boylan@stockport.gov.uk>

Date: 4 Jun 2014 13:41

Subject: FW: THE TRUTH IS AN
APPROPRIATE USE OF RESOURCES;

To: "Greg Willman (gregwillman2001@yahoo.co.uk)"
<gregwillman2001@yahoo.co.uk>

Cc: "GWYNNE, Andrew (andrew.gwynne.mp@parliament.uk) " <andrew.gwynne.mp@parliament.uk>

Dear Mr Willman

I refer to your email of the
16th May 2014.

I understand you have formally objected to the Compulsory Purchase and Side Road Orders for the scheme. Your emails, and the additional issues you raise regarding the scheme, will be forwarded to the Department of Transport as objections so that they can be considered as part of the statutory process.

From

your email we have identified the following additional
objections:

- You state that the scheme is technically defective.
- You state that you accept our model is fit for purpose but you are concerned that the programming of it by our external agents is not fit for purpose.
- You wish to see the model run and believe that this will only take minutes and that it is unreasonable for the Council to state that it is a waste of resources to facilitate and commission this.
- You consider that to state we have wrongly refused to respond to all of the following submitted by you:
 - Request last year for an extension of the consultation period so that such traffic modelling could be watched and the same then considered by Councillors before they voted; o Complaint at such refusal; o Freedom of Information Request in respect of watching the computer being programmed as further requested by Mr McMahon."

Once these and the issues you

have raised previously (i.e. those raised after you submitted your original objection to the Department of Transport regarding the Compulsory Purchase and Side Road Orders) have been considered by the Council a formal response will be sent to you. I understand the Project Team have both written and spoken to you previously and also offered to meet in April and early May to discuss your concerns but you were not available on the dates suggested and have not offered alternatives. The offer to meet you to discuss your objections is still available if you would like to suggest a date.

Officers from the Development Management Service and the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road Team have previously met you on several occasions to discuss your concerns and have referred you to the information you previously requested which can be found on the website.

Officers have also provided you with web links and copied and sent you extracts of this information. They have also sent you the output information from the model as you previously requested.

In addition to the model output information previously sent to you I now enclose a traffic flow spreadsheet (with explanatory notes) and copies of SATURN flow difference plots and output journey times along the A6 under each scenario which I consider addresses your specific concerns in relation to the programming of the model by our specialist consultants.

I would urge you to make contact with the Project Director of the scheme, Mr McMahon telephone number 0161 474 4800, to discuss your objections to the Compulsory Purchase and Side Road Orders.

Regards

Eamonn Boylan

