Save Swallow's Wood & Alternative Proposals on Transport

A57/A628 Mottram-Tintwistle Bypass and A628/A616 Route Restraint Measures

Proof of Evidence: Volume 3

Presented on behalf of Alternative Proposals on Transport and Save Swallow's Wood

by

Dr. Alena Vencovska

1. ECONOMIC VALUE?

1.1. The net present value, that is the difference between the present values of benefits and costs, which is used to justify the case for building the Bypass in the economic terms, is largely based on journey time savings, that is, on the differences of the forecast journey times between certain locations under the DM and the DS scenarios. In the Economic Appraisal Report we find that: "*Travel time savings are the largest element of benefit at £59m for consumers, £89m for personal business users and £32m for freight users.*"

Or again in the Economic Impact Report, Section 2.8: "*The key to the Scheme's benefits are time savings on the Route*" (i.e., on the route A57(T)/A628(T)/A616(T)).

1.2. Unfortunately, data concerning the predicted journey times are scarce in the traffic reports, and they are given for 'illustration' of the savings. The only set of figures to be found in the Economic Appraisal Report are in Table 6, and from there we can see that the forecast savings in minutes for journeys between the M1 (Jn35a) and the M60 (Jn 24) are as given below[1].

	AM Peak		Inter Peak		PM Peak	
	East	West	East	West	East	West
2015	3	14	5	7	--	--
2030	4	16	9	7	--	--

Table 1: DM-DS, between the M1 (Jn35a) and the M60 (Jn 24)

1.3. From Table 4.7 in the Forecasting Report we can extract the forecast savings in minutes for journeys between Townhead Farm and the M67 Bypass terminal roundabout[2]:

	AM Peak		Inter Peak		PM Peak	
	East	West	East	West	East	West
2015	5.5	16	7	5	11	5.5

[1] The figures for the PM Peak are not given.
[2] In fact, the DS-DM figures appear to be extracted in the report into Table 4.9 (first half), but since the figures in table 4.9 differ by 0.5 in three places from what we get, we use table 4.7.

	AM Peak		Inter Peak		PM Peak	
	East	West	East	West	East	West
2030	6	18.5	9.5	6	12.5	7.5

Table 2: DM–DS, between Townhead Farm and the M67 terminal roundabout

1.4. Somewhat late in the day (HA-CLA-4-INSP-AD) we get some more figures, and although they are rather ill-described - as travel times 'between M1 and M67' - we can reasonably conjecture that they are travel times between M1 (Jn35a) and the M67 Bypass terminal roundabout since we are told where the *observed* travel times in the newly provided table came from, and looking up the source tells us that they are between these two locations. From the new figures then we can work out the forecast savings in minutes (in 2015 only) for journeys between M1 (Jn35a) and the M67 terminal roundabout to be as in the following table:

	AM Peak		Inter Peak		PM Peak	
	East	West	East	West	East	West
2015	3.5	14.5	5	6.5	9.5	7.5
2030	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table 3: DM-DS between M1 (Jn35a) and the M67 terminal roundabout

1.5. Combining the information from Tables 3 and 2 above, we find that the forecast journey times between the M1 (Jn35a) and Townhead Farm under the DS scenario differ from those under the DM scenario as specified (in minutes) in the following table:

	AM Peak		Inter Peak		PM Peak	
	East	West	East	West	East	West
2015	-2	-1.5	-2	1.5	-15	2
2030	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table 4: DM-DS between the M1 (Jn35a) and Townhead Farm

But that for example means that except during the AM Peak, in 2015 the DM forecast time for the journey from M1 (Jn 35a) to Townhead Farm (i.e. travelling west) is longer than the DS forecast time, in other words, the combined effect of the traffic lights at Midhopestones, Langsett, Flouch, A628/A6024 and A628/6105, of

the proposed speed restrictions, and of the additional traffic on A628 (20% at Woodhead, 34% at Crowden)[3] is *to speed up the journey by 1.5 or 2 minutes*!

1.6. Concentrating just on the traffic lights listed above, since the South Yorkshire police describes the traffic at their planned locations as free flowing at the moment, it would be hard to argue that the DS journey time between M1 (Jn 35a) and Townhead Farm should not be expected to be longer by - at least – their combined effect as compared to the DM journey time between M1 (Jn 35a) and Townhead Farm.

1.7. The forecast combined delays caused by the five junctions in 2015 could be estimated by adding the 'maximum' delays for each of them, as given in Table 13, HA/TSE/10/4, although the fact that we are told the 'maximum' and not the average delays at junctions would somewhat reduce this. The fact that even the HA expert had troubles distinguishing how 'maximum' differs from average in this context[4], and that according to him speaking on July 10th it should be 'average' anyway suggests that the reduction surely should not be big. The data are available only for the AM and PM Peaks and summing the delays on the trunk roads in the appropriate directions we obtain the following combined delays in seconds:

	AM Peak		Inter Peak		PM Peak	
	East	West	East	West	East	West
2015	235	313	--	--	257	274
2030	326	375	--	--	304	272

Table 5: Delays due to the traffic lights between the M1 (Jn35a) and Townhead Farm *(in seconds)*

Rounding the figures to the nearest half minute we get, in minutes

[3] The percentages are obtained from the HSE/TSE/10/4 Table 6.
[4] Cf. B. Witten, Inquiry transcript, July 3rd, July 10th

	AM Peak		Inter Peak		PM Peak	
	East	West	East	West	East	West
2015	4	5	--	--	4.5	4.5
2030	5.5	6	--	--	5	4.5

Table 6: Delays due to the traffic lights between the M1 (Jn35a) and Townhead Farm *(in minutes)*

The DS journey times between the M1 (Jn35a) and Townhead Farm thus should be longer then the DM journey times by at least the values appearing in the above table, but as seen in Table 4, the forecasts give something entirely different.

1.8. Combining the information from Tables 1 and 3 allows us to see what the modelling says would happen on M67 (where the figures are available to work it out).

	AM Peak		Inter Peak		PM Peak	
	East	West	East	West	East	West
2015	- 0.5	- 0.5	0	0.5	--	--
2030	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table 7: DM-DS between the M67 terminal roundabout and the M60 (Jn 24)

Again, this is absurd: the additional 18% volume of traffic forecast on M67 under the DS scenario as compared to the DM scenario is not going to speed up the journey along the M67 to Manchester during the Inter Peak period. It could conceivably be argued that half a minute is a negligible time difference and that the four figures in the above table should be understood as saying that the Bypass will have no influence on the journey times on M67 in the AM Peak and Inter Peak periods. However, as regular commuters to Manchester are very well aware, there are already long delays in the mornings caused by too much traffic, and the additional 18% volume of traffic must add some significant time to the journey to Manchester.

1.9. The conclusion that the claimed journey time savings are wrong cannot be avoided.

1.10. The next question that arises in this context is why (apparently) only the changes in journey times between M1 (Jn 35a) and M60 (Jn 24) have been considered for the net present value.

1.11. In the Economic Impact Report, in the context of justifying the CONTRAM model, we learn that three broad categories of traffic need to be considered:

local to Manchester
commuting between Glossop and Tameside
longer distance traffic between South Yorkshire and Manchester

What about the categories 1 and 2? About commuting between Glossop and Tameside we learn from Table 6 in the Economic Impact Report that the journey times in the DS compared to the DM scenario are expected to improve on average by 2 minutes, although no details are given as to the times of the day. This is really hard to believe because in 2015, although there will be 22% less traffic on A628 in Hollingworth under the DS scenario then under the DM scenario, there will be *more* traffic on Woolley Lane[5], and on Mottram Moor - where the traffic for Ashton does not experience great delays at the moment - there would be, for example, in the AM Peak period more that 4 minutes delay[6] at Mottram Moor Link Junction. Clearly more data is needed to clarify the situation.

1.12. Concerning the category 1, there is a complete lack of information about the forecast journey times between the villages of Glossopdale and Longendale and Manchester.7

[5] Using Table 6, HA/TSE/10/4 and assuming A57 North of Glossop Spur is Woolley Lane, cf. 3.6.3 below.
[6] Table 13, HA/TSE/10/4
[7] See Part 2 and the appended information for evidence of efforts to obtain this information from the HA in the past 18 months.

1.13. In the case of the Bypass alone, without the Spur road, there is little doubt that the figures should show considerable delays for commuters from Glossopdale. Going back to the economic justification for the Bypass, *these delays should be taken in account and monetised as costs, or minus-benefits, which would cause a dramatic further plunge of the net present value.*

1.14. *W*e conclude that the justification for the claimed net present value of £121 million[8] is highly questionable.

2. COMMUTING TO MANCHESTER FROM GLOSSOPDALE AND LONGENDALE

2.1. The Bypass without the Spur: The Bypass scheme has been largely 'sold' to local people as a package inseparable from the Spur. For example, the Public Information Leaflet (attached) produced by Tameside MBC and DCC and distributed in 2001 - along with a questionnaire - in over 10 000 copies, says about the spur that it "would form and integral part of the current proposals for the A57/A628 corridor which connects the Greater Manchester area with the South Yorkshire area". Hence the support for the Bypass in Glossop, Hadfield and Padfield, cf. e.g. letters of support from the MP for High Peak Tom Levitt SUP/2474/1 and from the councilor David Wilcox SUP/2476/W. They both express support for the Bypass if accompanied by the Spur. (I recall a discussion with councilor Wilcox when he described the possibility of the Bypass being built without the Spur as a 'catastrophe' for the area.) Any support for the Bypass in Glossopdale is predominantly based on the hope for reducing journey times people associate with its 'integral' component, the Spur road. I make this claim on the basis of personal experience of talking to residents, but it could be documented for example by a careful analysis of responses to the 2001 public consultation

[8] Table 18, HA/TSE/10/1

where almost every supporter ticks reduction of journey times as a most important factor, often adding a comment about it.[9] If the Highways Agency released the forecast journey times for commuters to Manchester, and the possibility of the Bypass being built without the Spur was appreciated, there would be as little support in Glossopdale for the Bypass as there is for its premature baby, the Rossington Park (i.e. none).

2.2. The Bypass with the Spur: Judging from the documents of the Highways Agency and Tameside MBC, it is unlikely that the journey times for local commuters to Manchester would improve even if the Spur was built with the Bypass. In fact, the recent Tameside MBC Unitary Development Plan, Policy 3 states that "the scheme [i.e. Glossop Spur] is not intended to increase capacity or improve journey times for general travel". And yet, over the years, the Spur has been aggressively promoted as a means to end 'paralysing traffic congestion', cf. the attached documentation regarding the 2005 newspaper survey carried out by Tameside MBC. Ending paralysing congestion clearly implies a promise of time savings for road users, hence the expectation created in local people which I mentioned above. It is entirely natural for such expectation to arise as a result of such propaganda in people who do not have the time or inclination to consult the figures, but it is wrong on part of Tameside MBC to use these people to achieve whatever ends they are pursuing. That ending congestion is not a realistic hope must be clear to Tameside MBC, even though there are no figures for delays at junctions for scenarios with the Glossop Spur – suffices to look at a comparison of traffic flows on relevant roads where delays occur already, and at the delays for junctions forecast to occur with the Bypass alone, where available. We give the figures for

[9] At the time of writing this, the results of the consultation were not available at the inquiry library, but the Programme Officer has requested assistance from Tameside MBC in this respect.

2015 for travelling *from* the local area *to* Manchester in the morning for illustration. They are as follows:[10]

	2005 Base Flows AADT	DS (Bypass) AADT	DS (Bypass + Spur) AADT	DS (Bypass) AM Peak Delay (in seconds) at junction
A57 South of Proposed Glossop Spur	14 000	16 850	27 650	–
A57 Mottram Moor + The Spur (iff applicable)	39 100	36 000	9 450 + 35 150 = 44 600	Mottram Moor Link Junction 259
Mottram Link	N/A	19 200	24 600	Mottram Showground 109
Bypass	N/A	32 000	34 600	M67 Terminal Roundabout 27
M67 West of Mottram	28 300	36 800	41 550	–

Table 8: 2015 DS forecast flows and delays, local to Manchester

2.3. So far it has been impossible to obtain any forecast journey times between the villages and Manchester, with or without the Spur. The Highways Agency was asked repeatedly under the Freedom of Information Act to provide them (cf. their Freedom of Information Questions and Answers webpage, copies of two documents attached) but they replied that these figures were not available and directed the enquiries to Tameside MBC, who did not provide them either (copies of some email correspondence attached). More precise and more reliable information about the traffic modelling is needed; otherwise the opinion of the local community will continue to be manipulated and influenced by unfounded promises.

3. SOME FURTHER POINTS ABOUT THE TRAFFIC REPORTS

3.1. In Section 4.1.1 of the Forecasting Report, some figures are given comparing 2005 observed and modelled traffic flows at locations which *'have been selected where*

[10] The figures are obtained from Tables 6 and 13, HA/TSE/10/4 and Appendix L of the Forecasting report.

traffic count data are available and where they are close to the location of the proposed Bypass and potentially affected roads'.

3.2. Why give figures for A6 Taddington bypass which is neither close nor potentially affected (by 1%)[11], and not give figures M67 West of Mottram? Or for A57 Mottram Road (Hyde), which is very close and spectacularly potentially affected according to the modeling[12] (by 100%)? Or for A624 or A560? There can only be one reason for choosing to give data for A6 Taddington Bypass in preference to these roads, and that is to make the data look better: the figures for M67 West of Mottram are clearly important and should be available.

3.3. In fact, upon closer scrutiny, the data does not look particularly good even as given: the A635 does not satisfy the validation criteria for the AM Peak, and since we are told that the figures are rounded to the nearest 50, A635 cannot be claimed to satisfy the validation criteria for the PM Peak period either since the observed and modeled flows – for all that we are told – can differ by up to 149 vehicles. The assertion that '*the traffic flow comparisons for 2005 indicate the traffic model is able to reproduce observed traffic volumes, in particular the traffic flows for the A628 and the key local competing routes of A635 and A57*' is unjustified in the case of the A635.

3.4. Some opponents of the scheme (residents of Hollingworth) claim that there is not all that much traffic except during the AM and PM peak periods. The proponents claim otherwise. In HA/TSE/10/1 B. Witten states that it can be seen from figure TSE5 of Volume 2 that '*there is relatively little diminution of flow between the peaks and this indicates that traffic congestion and queues do not occur solely during the morning and evening peak periods, but continue throughout the working day*'.

[11] Using Table 6, HSE/TSE/10/4.
[12] so much so that the modelling had to be adjusted (cf.6.7.5.3, 6.7.5.4 HA/TSE/10/1)

3.5. The figure referred to displays the hourly variation of traffic flows on Mottram Moor, which indeed falls only slightly between the peaks. However, it does fall. The amount of traffic getting through on M57 in Mottram during the peak periods is the maximum amount of traffic which can get through regardless of the length of the queue and it is sufficient for this full amount of traffic to get through that at the beginning of every green period there are enough cars for it to be fully used. Nothing further can be concluded from the information that almost as many cars as can get through do get through about the length of the queue, that is, unless the lengths of the green periods is being adjusted proportionally to the length of the queue, which I do not believe to be the case. In fact, in support of the opponents' claim we read in the Economic Impact Report, Section 2.4, that: "*the traffic survey data showed that for traffic joining the east-west route in the inter-peak period, there is relatively little risk of delay, but traffic arriving at the villages before 09:00 experiences delays of up to 30 minutes*".

3.6. Comments and Questions:

3.6.1. What could account for the DM traffic flow on A628 Wooodhead to be considerably lower in the optimistic scenario than the pessimistic and most likely scenarios in 2030? A similar effect less pronounced occurs for 2015 (provided we correct an obvious error in decimal place), cf. HA/TSE/10/4, tables 12 and 11. In 2030 it could conceivably be one of the three assumptions present in the optimistic scenario but not in the other ones, cf. HA/TSE/10/4, Table 5 but there appears to be nothing to account for it in 2015.

3.6.2. What could account for the DS-DM increases in 2030 of 500–5000 vehicles on Padfield Main Road, Bankbottom, Cemetary Road/Park Road and Station Road in Hadfield and Padfield that is indicated on the diagram of changes in local

traffic flows in Appendix F3, Forecasting Report? Why are these enormous increases not documented in precise figures and available for scrutiny and evaluation?

3.6.3. In Appendices F1 and L of the Forecasting report and in Tables 6 and 9 of HA/TSE/10/4, traffic flows are given for A57 South of Proposed Glossop Spur and A57 North of Proposed Glossop Spur whilst what is probably meant is A57 South of Proposed Glossop Spur and Woolley Lane. This should be made clear and in Appendix L, figures for A57 North of Glossop Spur *and* for Woolley Lane need to be given.

3.7. Finally, I would like to reserve the right to write a further submission when more information from the Highways Agency is available.

Our ref:
Your ref:

710
City Tower
Piccadilly Plaza
Manchester M1 4BE

13 March 2006

Dear [Name removed under Section 40 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000]

RE: GLOSSOP SPUR
FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000 REQUEST

I refer to your request made on 28th February 2006 for information under the above legislation. Your request asked how the Bypass with the Glossop Spur would improve the journey times of people in Glossop and Hadfield travelling to Manchester during the rush hours. Following this request a meeting was held with [name removed under Section 40 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000] and [name removed under Section 40 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000] at which it was confirmed that your request could be more appropriately dealt with by Tameside Borough Council and Derbyshire County Council who are the promoting authorities for the Glossop Spur Road.

At the same meeting a number of questions and requests were put to [names removed under Section 40 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000] and it was agreed that we would confirm the questions and issues raised and provide answers as soon as possible. The questions raised are listed as follows:

- Are there quality assessments for traffic modelling?
- Which sub-contractor carried out the roadside surveys? And on what dates?
- Is Stockport Bypass included in the "do minimum" scenario?
- How old is the Public Transport model?
- Please provide a copy of the traffic reports to Stephen Wagstaff at 58 Dial Park Road, Offerton, Stockport, Cheshire SK2 7LT.
- Please provide journey time improvements from the "do-minimum" to "with the bypass" scenario for the following trips at peak hours.
  - Glossop – Manchester
  - Hadfield – Manchester
  - Tintwistle – Manchester
  - Broadbottom – Manchester
- Please provide responses to the Questions and Answers article from the Glossop Advertiser article that was handed to [name removed] at the meeting.

Before I can transfer the request, I need your permission to notify the recipient organisations of your name and contact details. If you agree to this, please sign and return the declaration below.

Yours sincerely

[Name removed under Section 40 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000]

I [name removed under Section 40 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000] hereby authorise the Highways Agency to transfer my information request to Tameside MBC and Derbyshire CC.

Signature……

Our ref: 65/19/112
Your ref:

710
City Tower
Piccadilly Plaza
Manchester M1 4BE

7 April 2006

Dear [Name removed under the Data Protection Act]

A57/A628 MOTTRAM TO TINTWISTLE BYPASS

I refer to your meeting of 10th March 2006 with [name removed] and [name removed] and respond to the questions and issues raised as follows:

- *Are there quality assessments for traffic modelling?*

The Department for Transport (DfT) has initiated a website (www.webtag.org.uk) to provide detailed guidance on the appraisal of transport projects and wider advice on scoping and carrying out transport studies.

According to the DfT, the guidance is seen as a requirement for all projects/studies that require government approval. For projects/studies that do not require government approval the advice on webtag should serve as a best practice guide, according to the DfT.

- *Which sub-contractor carried out the roadside surveys? And on what dates?*

Roadside Interview Surveys (RSI's) specific to the A57/A628 Mottram-Tintwistle Bypass were carried out by the Paul Castle Consultancy under a commission from Mott MacDonald in March 2001. A total of 7 surveys were conducted between the hours of 0700 and 1900 as follows:

- RSI Station 1: The A628(T) Tintwistle (westbound towards Manchester) in the lay-by just over one mile east of New Road, Tintwistle.
  (Wednesday 7 March 2001)
- RSI Station 2: The A57 Woolley Lane (northbound towards the A628) at the Potter Road junction.
  (Wednesday 7 March 2001)

- RSI Station 6: The A6018 Roe Cross Road (south-eastbound towards the A57) mid-way between Stalybridge Road and Edge Lane.
  (Tuesday 6 March 2001)
- RSI Station 7: Broadbottom Road, Mottram (northbound towards the A57) adjacent to the bowling green and approximately one half-mile from the A57.
  (Wednesday 7 March 2001)
- RSI Station 10: The A57(T) Hyde Road (eastbound toward Sheffield) on the gated lay-by approximately 100 metres from the M67 roundabout.
  (Thursday 8 March 2001)
- RSI Station 11: The A57(T) Hyde Road (westbound towards Manchester) in the lay-by approximately 100 metres from the M67 roundabout.
  (Tuesday 6 March 2001)
- RSI Station 12: The B6174 Ashworth Lane (eastbound towards Broadbottom Road) adjacent to Abbey Gardens.
  (Thursday 8 March 2001)

Other RSI's from the Multi-Modal studies (SWYMMS and SEMMMS) and, indeed, other types of survey, were also used for the purposes of building the traffic model.

- *Is Stockport Bypass included in the "do minimum" scenario?*

At the time of preparing the traffic forecasts for the A57/A628 Mottram-Tintwistle Bypass scheme the Stockport Bypass was anticipated to be open by 2010 and so it was included in the Do Minimum assignments for both 2010 and 2025. Developments subsequent to the preparation of the forecasts would suggest that the Stockport Bypass will not now be open by 2010. However, as part of the ongoing works on the scheme the HA propose to test the sensitivity of the forecasts to removing the Stockport Bypass from the 2010 assignments. This will be coupled with a full review of all the assumed Do Minimum schemes.

- *How old is the Public Transport model?*

The Rail Passenger Model, modelled in VIPS, is validated to a base year of 2001. The "Local Model Validation Report – Rail Passenger Model" gives full details of the model.

- *Please provide a copy of the traffic reports to [name and address withheld].*

The information was provided on 17th March 2006.

- *Please provide journey time improvements from the "do-minimum" to "with the bypass" scenario for the following trips at peak hours.*
  Glossop – Manchester
  Hadfield – Manchester
  Tintwistle – Manchester
  Broadbottom – Manchester

The above information is not available.

- *Please provide responses to the "Questions that need answers" article from the Glossop Advertiser article that was handed to [name removed] at the meeting.*

With regard to the Glossop Advertiser article that was handed to [name removed], it is not the policy of the Highways Agency to enter into debate with the media. Should you have specific questions that you wish to pose, we will be pleased to respond accordingly.

Yours sincerely

[Name removed under the Data Protection Act]
Project Leader
MP North Team M2 Manchester