

**Report: A172 Dixons Bank/Stainton Way Highway Improvement Scheme Public Consultation Scheme Exercise, Author, Cllr Lewis Young.**

The report states that it 'considers the key issues raised' by the consultation.

**Comments:**

Page 1 – Impact of the decisions:

Implementation of the proposed scheme may improve the flow of traffic – there has been zero evidence supplied to support the council's belief that commuters would filter left, increase their journey distance by over 50% and risk the regular queues on the A19 and A66 into Middlesbrough.

Implementation of the proposal will significantly impact on the occupiers of the significant number of properties that access Dixons Bank directly and back onto Dixons Bank. To say otherwise is disingenuous and is a misrepresentation of the truth.

Page 2, bullet 2.

There is no 'potentially' about it – 'will' is the correct word.

Page 3, bullet 8.

As stated, if there was an 'absolute strategic need' identified for a new road link from Swans Corner to A1085, then further housing development should not have taken place without it. Therefore, no further development should now proceed.

Page 3, bullet 12.

The model boundaries used by ARUP (presumably defined by Middlesbrough Council) was fundamentally flawed in that it failed to include, and therefore model, A171 traffic flows and the impact of the introduction of west facing slip roads A171/A174. It also assumed the existence of unbuilt roads and cherry picked 'rat run' routes to be included in the model. This suggests that the model was constrained to provide the answers that the council wanted, rather than provide a true assessment.

Page 5, bullet 22.

There are obvious improvements that can be made to the operation of the traffic signals at the Southern Cross junction and Gunnergate Lane (including removal of the latter traffic lights). At numerous meetings and through numerous communications we have suggested that the signals are improved and tested before any further work is considered. This suggestion has been stonewalled by the council. This indicates that there is an ulterior motive of the council to avoid implementation of signal improvements without the road widening. Improvements can be made without the road widening – if you don't understand how, just ask someone who does.

Page 5, bullets 24 - 30

This has been written as if the council had a plan to consult. The reality is that the council planned to conduct the absolute minimum consultation (seven properties) and ignore the rest. Council officers, as part of a rear-guard action, attended local community council meetings. The consultation was expanded, and the deadline extended because of formal complaints, not an act of goodwill by the council. The meeting at Chandler's Ridge Academy was attended by the Mayor, but no new

information was provided, questions were responded to, but not answered satisfactorily, and the Mayor was present but contributed virtually nothing.

Page 6, bullet 32.

Delete all 'perceived' as there were flaws in the methodology, there were shortcomings in the consultation process (and still are), and it is certain that property values will be reduced by the proposed scheme – just ask yourself; if I were buying a property on Dixons Bank, would I offer less knowing that the road is to be moved 4 metres nearer and/or become a three-lane carriageway? I defy anyone to say that it would not prompt a reduction in offer price.

Page 7, bullet 37.

Environmental issues are inevitable when a busy carriageway is moved from ~8 to ~4 metres away from a property boundary.

Page 7. bullet 39.

There is a significant difference between an urban 30-mph carriageway and a 40-mph carriageway, so this is not a meaningful comparison. Furthermore, the personal injury accident rates are already higher than the default accident rate for roads of this type (Ref: Redcar and Cleveland Council / Middlesbrough Council, East Cleveland Gateway - A scheme Review, June 2005, Faber Maunsell Report, section 2.5).

Page 8, bullets 44 – 47.

As stated, the model includes roads that don't exist, and excludes roads that should be included and modelled with potential improvements (west slip roads on A171). The model has been constrained to provide answers in-line with the council's intent – flawed.

Page 9, bullet 48.

Unsubstantiated and therefore untrue statement.

Page 9, bullet 50.

The current building plan will see the greenfield sites south of Middlesbrough almost totally exploited by 2030. What is the timeframe for the JSTNA and where is the evidence that this complements interventions that includes this scheme?

Page 9, bullet 53.

It is clear, from the wording of this paragraph and the fact that not one single point or idea raised through the consultation has been adopted by the council, that there was never any intent of the council to listen to the residents or act on the outcome of the consultation. The council merely acted, following complaints, to appear to follow due process, knowing full well that it would ignore any proposals arising from the consultation. To argue otherwise, is an insult to our intelligence.

Page 9, bullet 54.

In other words, Middlesbrough Council and Cllr Lewis Young in particular, don't care about the detrimental environmental impact on the affected residents.

Page 10, bullet 55.

There remains opposition to this scheme as it is fundamentally flawed and therefore a waste of money. It would also negatively impact on the environment of many residents and cause huge disruption during its implementation. The council has failed to do the right thing over the last 25-years and build a proper, fit-for-purpose by-pass. As the council has no plan 'B', it is obvious that the council had no intention of taking any notice of the output from the consultation.

Page 10, bullet 56.

The council has failed to conduct surveys or provide empirical evidence to support the assumptions that commuters will decide to increase their travel distance by 50% to the centre of Middlesbrough by turning left onto Stainton Way and thereby risking frequent queues on the A19 & A66 following the addition of an extended north filter lane on Dixons Bank.

Page 10, bullet 57.

The impact would be MAJOR, not minor as suggested.

Page 10, bullet 58.

Doing the right thing is an option, as opposed to wasting £1.7 million on doing the wrong thing.

Page 11, bullet 60.

The agreement to hold a consultation (although the output was to be ignored) was following formal complaints, not through any desire by the council to do things properly from the outset.

Page 11, bullet 63.

Putting all the traffic growth down one arterial road, namely A172, Dixons Bank, does not improve resilience, it reduces resilience through increased dependence on a single route. This simple, fundamentally incorrect statement proves that the council is not competent to manage the road network.