

**From:** [Daniel Wimberley](#)  
**To:** [A57 Link Roads](#)  
**Subject:** Preliminary meeting & Open hearing 1  
**Date:** 01 November 2021 21:59:22  
**Attachments:** [outline of points re "preliminary meeting" v2b AS SENT.doc](#)

---

Dear Case Team,

[A57 link Roads \(TR010034\)](#)

Preliminary Meeting November 16/17 and Open Floor Hearing  
November 18/19

My name is Daniel Wimberley and my Unique Reference is 20029775

I would like to attend and speak at both the Preliminary Meeting and the Open Floor Hearing.

At the Preliminary Meeting I would wish to speak, as needed, in support of any or all the points I make in the attached document entitled "outline of points re "preliminary meeting" v2b for ExA."

At the Open Floor Hearing I would wish to comment on three matters:

- 1) the many many relevant representations which have been made in support of the scheme, the gist of these representations and the weight which can be put on them, especially in the light of information which has come to light after the public consultation.
- 2) the role and responsibility of the ExA in considering this application for a DCO, in the light of the Climate Emergency.
- 3) the impact this scheme may have on me personally even though I live in the relatively far away village of Bamford, less than 10 miles from Sheffield as the crow flies.

Please let me know that this is all in order – the weight of documentation is daunting, and especially so when one has various ailments, even for a well-educated and paper-minded person such as myself!

Yours sincerely

Daniel Wimberley

## POINTS ABOUT THE “PRELIMINARY MEETING”

### General remarks

1. In what follows, when I refer to the public I do so in the widest sense. The “public interest” is a phrase which shows that everyone is included in the term “public” – from children to pensioners, from able-bodied to the disabled, from any ethnicity and heritage, from richest to poorest, and so on.
2. Specifically the public includes individuals, local authorities, statutory consultees, professionals representing clients, NGO’s, academics, journalists as well as “all the above”.
3. Throughout I am assuming that the Nolan principles apply to the entire EiP process. For reference, they are stated in the footnote. <sup>1</sup> I would sum them up as: “in all matters, the object of a public body acting under these principles is to serve the public interest in the best way possible.”

### Points of procedure

4. It would be helpful to the public (see above for who is included in this) if the relevant representations were searchable. As it is, to find any specific information is like looking for the needle in the proverbial haystack. I myself had difficulties, and in fact in the end, I gave up. This is not as it should be, and I ask that, even now, it be put right.
5. There should be a transcript of all oral hearings as well as the live stream. This enables all members of the public (see above for who is included in this) to follow proceedings in real time, with the (preserved) livestream being a probative back up.

- 
- <sup>1</sup> NOLAN PRINCIPLES: **Selflessness:** Holders of public office should act solely in terms of the public interest.
  - **Integrity:** Holders of public office must avoid placing themselves under any obligation to people or organisations that might try inappropriately to influence them in their work. They should not act or take decisions in order to gain financial or other material benefits for themselves, their family, or their friends. They must declare and resolve any interests and relationships.
  - **Objectivity:** Holders of public office must act and take decisions impartially, fairly and on merit, using the best evidence and without discrimination or bias.
  - **Accountability:** Holders of public office are accountable to the public for their decisions and actions and must submit themselves to the scrutiny necessary to ensure this.
  - **Openness:** Holders of public office should act and take decisions in an open and transparent manner. Information should not be withheld from the public unless there are clear and lawful reasons for so doing.
  - **Honesty:** Holders of public office should be truthful.
  - **Leadership:** Holders of public office should exhibit these principles in their own behaviour. They should actively promote and robustly support the principles and be willing to challenge poor behaviour wherever it occurs.

From: [REDACTED]

6. At these hearings there will be strong advantages if participants can question HE directly and I suggest that this be the default position. If this facility is abused then the ExA can always intervene. The alternative is for participants to ask the ExA to put specific questions to the scheme's proposers for them, in which case there needs to be agreement about how this will work.
7. There should be oral hearings on any matters which are a) important and b) contentious. The rationale for this is that I don't believe these matters can be entirely be thrashed out in written to-and-fro, but will be better done by conversation. This applies more obviously in some areas than others.

### **Points about topics**

8. Firstly I suggest that the oral hearings include the following four most vital matters:
  - a. **The public consultation :** The (in)adequacy of the public consultation exercise carried out by HE in late 2020. This topic includes the possible need, mentioned by at least one relevant representation, for the ExA to discover the general public's views on the scheme now that the traffic data is available to all, and therefore the predicted effects of the scheme can actually be set out and understood.
  - b. **The traffic predictions :** Whether the traffic predictions are correct, or if they might be wrong, and/or what range or variation there might be. This involves testing the predictions, the methodology, assumptions and research underlying them and the way the methodology was applied.
  - c. **The effects of the predicted traffic flows :** The effects of the predicted flows, positive and negative, on people's health and on the social and economic aspects of people's lives, and how many people will be affected. This includes a comparison with the "do-nothing" scenario; b) specific and generalised impacts on the Peak District National Park and c) the impacts on cyclists, horse riders and pedestrians using the proposed new routes which run along the side of the new road.
  - d. **Aims, history, and scope of the scheme :** The aims of this scheme, at the point it has now evolved to, and an evidence base showing that these aims are fulfilled by the scheme are notable by their absence, so far as I can see. (I will ask HE in the near future to provide this, or point me to where it can be found).

What the aims of the scheme actually are, how these can best be met and whether the road is the best and most cost-effective way to meet them are fundamental questions (obviously) and they need to be addressed.

In particular, this would include the issue of why the "Tintwistle and beyond" bypass option was not pursued. It also includes the current and previous Value for Money (VfM) calculations carried out during the history of this scheme, and comparison with rail-based solutions for freight, when HGV's are so big a part of the problems.

9. I further suggest that these four matters be taken in the order stated, and also near the top of the running order, because they are so fundamental to so many of the issues connected with this scheme.
10. Secondly, I suggest that the oral hearings should also include the following vital matters:
- a. **government policy** : What consideration has been given by HE when preparing this scheme in its various guises over the years to government policy and legislation, especially as these apply to climate change, equality (including “levelling up”), national parks, and air quality, and in particular, to changes in such policy and legislation? This includes consideration of alternative solutions to the traffic problems of this area.
  - b. **government guidelines** : What consideration has been given by HE when preparing this scheme in its various guises over the years to guidelines on public expenditure in particular on preparing and assessing capital projects, in particular, to changes in such guidelines? This includes consideration of alternative solutions to the traffic problems of this area.
  - c. **non-roads-based alternatives to the scheme** : What alternatives to the scheme now being proposed were considered by HE? How well would such alternatives have fulfilled the stated aims, and addressed health, social and economic issues? Why were these alternatives not included in any way in the public consultation? What were the consequences of this omission on the responses, and did this omission and its consequences contradict a) government policy, legislation and guidance, and b) the Nolan principles?
  - d. **the Manchester green belt** ; What are the implications of the government’s new emphasis around valuing natural capital on the case for the scheme? Has this new agenda been incorporated in the thinking behind this scheme and the case for considering alternative approaches?
  - e. **air quality** : Air Quality needs very careful examination as there are legal protections in place for the public. What is the impact of the scheme on air quality throughout the study area, and in particular on AQMA’s in and near to the study area? Are there legal implications? Are there conflicts with other existing plans and / or guidelines?
  - f. **Economic “growth”** : This argument for new road capacity is often used to support road schemes but should be looked at carefully, and this should be by “live” examination. The need for a careful look is underlined by two factors in particular: first, the need to redefine growth in the light of the imperative for us all to behave in a sustainable fashion, including climate change, and the need to take on board and include in all calculations and assessments changing patterns of living stimulated by the pandemic.

Daniel Wimberley

Monday, 01 November 2021