

A57 Link Roads Examination National Infrastructure Planning Temple Quarry House 2 The Square Bristol BS1 6PN 37 Stafford Road Sheffield S2 2SF

1st November 2021 CPRE PDSY Anne Robinson Unique Reference: 20029243 A57 Link Roads TR010034

Dear Case Team

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

We wish to attend the Preliminary Meeting on Nov 16/17 and also wish to make an oral submission. Keith Buchan of MTRU, and Dr Andy Tickle and myself from CPRE PDSY would like to attend. I will be leading on the submissions and asking Keith Buchan to explain if necessary.

We wish to raise a question of clarification about procedural issues at the Preliminary Meeting and to propose an Issue Specific Hearing is held.

1. We believe that there are a number of omissions to the DCO documents. We consider these to be basic to this sort of application and have been asking the applicant to supply much of the relevant information since March 2021. We have supplied a list (below) of documents that are outstanding to our requests for information but a key problem has been the complete lack of technical dialogue. As Mr Buchan said in his relevant representation the missing information is essential in the first instance to scrutinise the work supporting the scheme. Secondly, it would help us greatly in finalising and appraising better performing alternatives to the proposed scheme. The scrutiny point is important - in 2007 a scheme was abandoned after serious flaws were found in the modelling. When would be the appropriate time to raise these omissions in the examination process?

President: Dame Fiona Reynolds

CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire

for the countryside, for communities, for the future



2. We understand that it is up to the ExA to determine the need for and the content of the Issue Specific Hearings. However, we wish to propose that an Issue Specific Hearing is held on the need for the scheme and alternative solutions. We also consider that the context for carbon appraisal in terms of targets and values has changed since the applicant undertook the assessments presented to the Examination, and an ISH might be appropriate in these circumstances. We understand of course that the ExA will have its own view on how to handle these issues but wanted to make our position clear to you.

Finally, Dr Andy Tickle and myself from CPRE PDSY also wish to attend the Open Floor Hearing on Nov 18/19.

Yours sincerely



Anne Robinson Campaigner

List of Omissions

- 1. Normal Transport Appraisal documentation compliant with by WebTAG and the Treasury 5 Case model
- 2. Transport modelling and forecasting documentation, including a model validation report (LMVR) for either the SATURN or local models (e.g. VISSIM) or any other validation and calibration information
- 3. Detail of the TUBA outputs underlying the economic and environmental cases
- 4. Origin and destination of traffic
- 5. Carbon assessment worksheets
- 6. Information not available in the Transport Assessment Report
 - i What models were used in addition to SATURN for the junctions?
 - ii What are the costs for signalising Junction 4 and what were the traffic impacts of doing this without the full scheme?

President: Dame Fiona Reynolds

CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire

for the countryside, for communities, for the future



iii The Transport Assessment states that variable demand modelling was undertaken through Diadem but there are many options:

- a. Which DIADEM elements were switched on and off?
- b. How was walking and cycling included?
- c. How was public transport included?
- d. What are the forecasts or assumptions for the local modelled area (to also mode split transparent) for:

Public transport (today - 2025 - 2040)

Cycling (today - 2025 - 2040)

Walking (today - 2025 - 2040)

vii Are the time savings in Figure 7.7 to the junctions at each end but not through it? Are there more details of real origin and destination pairs and zone to zone timings?

viii Queue length data for key junctions?

- 7. With respect to the 2015 Trans Pennine Feasibility study Stage 2 report annex we requested:
 - A list of the 'complementary sustainable measures' which the Department for Transport/ Highways England assessed in the addition to an HGV control scheme for the EAST'
 - ii. Any detail of the individual components or how they were assessed such as travel behaviour programmes, bus or cycle priority

President: Dame Fiona Reynolds

CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire

for the countryside, for communities, for the future