

## MEETING TITLE

M4 Junction 34 to A48  
WelTAG Stage Two Review Group

## DATE

02<sup>nd</sup> October 2018

## TIME

09:00 – 11:00

## LOCATION

Vale of Glamorgan Council, Alps Depot, Wenvoe

## CHAIR PERSON

Emma Reed

## ORGANISER

Emma Reed

## MEETING MINUTES

Matthew Fry

## PARTICIPANTS

Emma Reed (ER)  
Head of Neighbourhood Services & Transport (Vale of Glamorgan Council)

Kyle Phillips  
Group Manager Transport Services (Vale of Glamorgan Council)

Cllr. Geoffrey A. Cox (GC)  
Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services & Transport (Vale of Glamorgan Council)

Cllr. Andrew Chiplen (AC)  
Pendoylan Community Council

Cllr. Abigail Phillips (AP)  
Peterston-Super-Ely Community Council

Cllr. Paul Fisher (PF)  
St Nicholas with Bonvilston Community Council

Cllr. Nick Craddock (NC)  
Welsh St. Donats Community Council

Cllr. Michael Morgan  
Peterston-super-Ely (Vale of Glamorgan Council)

Marcus Goldsworthy (MG)  
Planner (Vale of Glamorgan Council)

Michael Clogg (MC)  
Operational Manager for Highways and Engineering (Vale of Glamorgan Council)

Steve Pickering (SP)  
Countryside Services (Vale of Glamorgan Council)

Clive Moon (CM)  
Engineering Manager – Environment (Vale of Glamorgan Council)

Alison Thomas (AT)  
Regional Transport Manager (Welsh Government)

Roger Waters (RW)  
Service Director Highways and Streetcare Services (Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council)

Clare Cameron (CC)  
Project Development Officer Transport (Cardiff Capital Region)

Gwyn Smith (GS)  
South East Wales Area Manager (Sustrans)

Janice Hughes (JH)  
Technical Director Development Planning (Arcadis Consulting UK Ltd)

Matthew Fry (MF)  
Project Manager (Arcadis Consulting UK Ltd)

## APOLOGIES

Kevyn Jones (NAT)

Lois Park (Network Rail)

Michael Vaughan (ATW)

Richard Davies (Cardiff Bus)

Ian Gallagher (Freight Transport Association)

Tom Cotton (Road Haulage Association)

Mark Hopwood (GWR)

P Mulcahy (Bridgend CBC)

Paul Carter (Cardiff Council)

Anne Phillips (Public Health Wales)

ACTION	WHO	WHEN
<b>1. Apologies</b>		
1.1 ER welcomed all to the meeting and made a note of the following apologies received: Kevyn Jones (NAT) / Lois Park (Network Rail) / Michael Vaughan (ATW) / Richard Davies (Cardiff Bus) / Ian Gallagher (Freight Transport Association) / Tom Cotton (Road Haulage Association) / Mark Hopwood (GWR) / P Mulcahy (Bridgend CBC) / Paul Carter (Cardiff Council) / Anne Phillips (Public Health Wales).		
<b>2. Introductions (to include information about your role)</b>		
2.1 All attendees provided a brief introduction including their roles and representation on the scheme.		
2.2 ER reconfirmed that it is the responsibility of the Review Group to consider the technical WelTAG process that has been completed by Arcadis. The decision on the way forward remains the responsibility of the Vale of Glamorgan Cabinet.		
2.3 ER noted that all interests have been covered as part of today's meeting except health who were unable to attend.		
2.4 In addition to the Review Group process, ER confirmed that an independent consultant will be commissioned to technically review the WelTAG study.		
2.5 It was requested that the output from today's meeting and associated documents issued remain strictly confidential at this stage of the process.		
<b>3. Results of Consultation and WelTAG Stage Two Report – Arcadis Consulting (UK) Ltd</b>		
3.1 JH provided a formal presentation to the Review Group entitled 'M4 Junction 34 to A48 File Mile Lane Strategic Connections; WelTAG Stage Two Study; Confidential; 02 <sup>nd</sup> October 2018'.		
3.2 The key elements of the presentation encompassed a summary of the Stage One recommended options, development of highway options (including the Eastern and Western route alignments) and Parkway Station, impact assessment results, economic benefits and value for money, consultation and consultation responses, the preferred option and suggested next steps for the highway link and Parkway Station. Discussion was encouraged during the presentation to cover key items arising.		
3.3 The presentation was taken forward by JH as far as the Consultation Responses with the following initial dialogue ensuing.		
3.4 It was agreed that the Consultation Report was comprehensive and accurate, but attendees would welcome formal responses to the questions and concerns raised. JH confirmed that Arcadis had purposely not included responses to questions and queries raised in the same document to ensure that an objective report was established. ER to coordinate a formal response as requested.	ER	To be confirmed
3.5 Concerns were raised concerns that the Stage Two report was limited in the options that had been assessed whilst accepting that work had been completed in line with the defined brief. ER		

ACTION	WHO	WHEN
<p>commented that she was satisfied that Arcadis has fully completed the study in line with their scope of works, and that the work completed represents part of a wider strategic approach for potential connectivity with other strategic access studies throughout the region including those being considered as part of the City Region Deal.</p>		
<p>3.6 Clarification was requested by an attendee as to whether concerns that had been raised through the consultation process with regard to the transport modelling. In response JH advised that the concerns were not specific and that the transport modelling had been completed using the latest version [at the time of assessment] of the South East Wales Transport Model (SEWTM). The full WelTAG Business Case would need additional transport modelling completed using the latest version of SEWTM.</p>		
<p>3.7 A TUBA limitation referenced within the report was queried. In response JH noted that sensitivity analysis had been completed to support the assessment and that analysis would be refined at the next stage of any assessment. It was noted by an attendee that assumptions on the South East Wales Metro would be important factors to consider with regard to future mode shift away from use of the car. ER confirmed that SEWTM is an evolving model which does take into account multi-modal travel throughout the network.</p>		
<p>3.8 It was noted by an attendee that in their view the building of new roads will ultimately establish more vehicles on the highway network leading to increased CO2 emissions.</p>		
<p>3.9 The illustrative presentation of traffic modelling results within the report and which had formed part of the public consultation events was questioned. JH noted that the traffic flows are also shown within the WelTAG documentation and that the transport modelling had assumed no change to interconnecting junction arrangements (including at Sycamore Cross which could therefore be considered a constraint) that would inevitably be required as part of a final design proposal. The completion of traffic modelling associated with a full Business Case would need to consider new/ amended junction arrangements to fully capture impacts.</p>		
<p>3.10 It was queried whether the SEWTM and the impact assessment incorporates forecast changes in vehicle types especially with regard to how vehicles will be powered in the future. JH commented that the incorporation of advances in technology, especially with regard to the increasing emphasis on electric vehicles, is something we are aware is under review by DfT.</p>		
<p>3.11 With regard to a Parkway Station and following on from consultation completed with Welsh Government, MF noted that full Stage Two assessment was not possible owing to the status of the Wales &amp; Borders franchise at the time the study was completed. Consultation had been completed with Welsh Government to confirm this position.</p>		
<p>3.12 With reference to the consultation process, it was noted by an attendee that some people had not received a response. ER now believed that all Stage Two responses had been dealt with</p>	KP	23/10/2018

ACTION	WHO	WHEN
<p>however KP will make further checks. In addition, ER requested that clarification is also provided to the Vale of Glamorgan Council confirming the responses that have not been received.</p>	AC	23/10/2018
<p>3.13 The discussion regarding the Consultation Report confirmed that it is a detailed representation of issues. As such, some numerical changes would be unlikely to change the emphasis of the report.</p>		
<p>3.14 It was noted that that no additional comment/ themes were received by Welsh Government in addition to that already contained within the Consultation Report. It was also confirmed for the benefit of the process that Welsh Government has and will not be making decisions on the next steps of the study.</p>		
<p>3.15 There was some discussion around the the strategic case for change and it was subsequently queried why other more sustainable strategic solutions were not sought through the process. Further clarification was provided that this study does not represent a decision by Welsh Government and remains a feasibility assessment to inform future decisions.</p>		
<p>3.16 The reason why the do-minimum option had not been developed as an option including enhancement of the existing route through the Pendoylan corridor was queried. JH clarified that that is not what the do-minimum/ reference case represents with the option to enhance the existing route considered separately at Stage One. The do-minimum option provides the benchmark from which other 'do-something' options are assessed against. It assumes no specific investment/ enhancement of the existing highway or public transport other than what would be programmed through standard maintenance regimes and reactive works, together with the assumed continued delivery of existing public transport services. The online improvements through the existing corridor were considered in Stage One and were not selected to be taken forward due to the difficulties in delivery and impacts of an option.</p>		
<p>3.17 ER checked with the group that there were no further consultation comments to raise at this stage. All agreed.</p>		
<p>3.18 Following a query, MG confirmed that there are no proposals at Culverhouse Cross. JH reconfirmed that this study incorporates strategic assessment to the A48 with the potential to inter-link with wider regional studies.</p>		
<p>3.19 The presentation was completed by JH encompassing the preferred option and proposed Next Steps for a highway link and Parkway Station.</p>		
<p><b>4. Discussion, questions and comments from Review Group – All</b></p>		
<p>4.1 ER summarised the Review Group process to agree the way forward. It was noted that the group will need to make their decision based on the technical report only. The result will not establish a decision with regard to potential next stages of work with the Vale of Glamorgan Cabinet retaining the authority to approve the next steps. The resulting dialogue was based against the stated preferred option <b>(Western Alignment for</b></p>		

**ACTION**

**WHO**

**WHEN**

**the Highway Link and Parkway Station) and Next Steps (Highway Link and Parkway Station)** as outlined within the Stage Two report issued to the Review Group prior to the meeting (Improving Strategic Transport Encompassing Corridors from M4 Junction 34 to the A48; WelTAG Stage Two Outline Business Case; Confidential Final Draft for Review; September 2018; D03).

- 4.2 The Next Steps (Highway Link and Parkway Station) were subsequently presented to the Review Group, as included in the attached presentation.
- 4.3 In addition, JH noted a recommendation to include further consideration of flood issues as part of any next stage surveys and investigations.
- 4.4 There was general acceptance that the next steps approach represents a pragmatic way forward for the scheme in order to obtain sufficient information to enable decision making. In addition, the following items were captured as part of this acceptance:
  - Early initial investigation and survey assessment would be beneficial for any potential longer-term delivery of the scheme.
  - Application of updated transport modelling was important to capture the changes to network flows since completion of the Stage Two assessment, including assessment of new/ amended junction arrangements interconnecting with the proposed highway route. As the transport modelling is taken forward, its presentation to stakeholder and the public should be provided in a more simple interpretation.
  - For the highway link, the review of minor roads and whether it is necessary to retain all accessibility was noted as a logical idea.
  - Flood modelling will be an important aspect of the next stages including consultation with Natural Resources Wales (NRW). Updated flood models are to be issued imminently by NRW that could amend floodplain boundaries. A +1000-year post-opening scenario could also require assessment including the impact of do-something options downstream.
  - It will be important to understand the impact of new and redistributed traffic flows through lanes that could be affected by a new highway link. Resilience of the highway network should be considered to mitigate the potential for any adverse impacts.
  - The maintenance of existing roads already represents a pressure on budgets; a new road with no additional funds will only increase financial pressure on the local highway authority. This will need full consideration at the next stage.
  - The Parkway Station option needs to be seriously considered to support regional mode shift away from the car to more sustainable modes of transport. Some attendees recognised a Parkway Station as a priority for the region.
  - It was agreed that the impact of a new highway link would

ACTION	WHO	WHEN
<p>have a large impact on the Ely Valley. Residents of local community councils need to be kept informed of progress on the study to reassure and provide opportunity for dialogue.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was support for more detailed initial design work to be progressed with regard to the highway link and Parkway Station together with completion of detailed investigations and surveys. This would need to include a level of design that would identify land take requirements.</li> <li>• The next steps should incorporate a consultation plan for review by Welsh Government and identification of project stage gates to clarify what is being agreed and taken forward. Interested stakeholders and the public need clarity that the WelTAG study remains a feasibility assessment until any decision to formally implement an option is confirmed.</li> <li>• Whilst the Consultation Report was again recognised as an accurate assessment, a more detailed response to the themes and issues arising was reiterated [this action has already been captured within these meeting minutes].</li> <li>• Some attendees confirmed a preference for the 'bigger picture' to be captured as part of the next steps, comparing the preferred option retained within the study to other strategic proposals.</li> <li>• Implementation of early investigations and surveys was considered an important element in the development of the options leading to better informed decision making.</li> <li>• The options should all consider integration with Active Travel measures to ensure fully inclusive travel is established. This should be considered at the design stage and not at a later date.</li> </ul>		
<p>4.5 ER confirmed that monthly updates will be provided to community councils to inform local residents.</p>	ER	To be confirmed
<p>4.6 ER confirmed that the study will retain a dedicated internet page to provide information on the study.</p>		
<p>4.7 ER confirmed that an independent review of the WelTAG study will be commissioned.</p>	ER	To be confirmed
<p><b>5. Next Steps</b></p>		
<p>5.1 ER will establish a formal list of recommendations based on the consensus of today's Review Group meeting.</p>	ER	23/10/2018
<p>5.2 The meeting minutes and formal recommendations will be issued to the Review Group for their consideration and response. Once agreed this will be taken forward to the Vale of Glamorgan Cabinet for deliberation, followed by presentation to Scrutiny Committee before final consideration by Cabinet.</p>		
<p>5.3 The output from the independent review and Scrutiny Committee will also be presented to Cabinet prior to a decision being made.</p>		

ACTION	WHO	WHEN
5.4 With regard to timescales it is proposed that a final decision on the next steps will be completed by the end of December 2018. However, the programme is subject to confirmation.		
<b>6. Composition of the Review Group</b>		
6.1 ER confirmed that the composition of the Review Group would be subject to review as part of a next stage assessment. The process is reliant on the attendance of individuals.		
6.2 The possibility of NRW being represented on the Review Group was raised. It was noted by CM that there would likely be a charge for their involvement in such a process. ER clarified that NRW would be a statutory consultee regardless. Environment representation was already included as part of the Review Group.		
6.3 It was also queried whether the Woodland Trust could be represented on the Review Group. This will be considered but it is noted that they are a lobbying group rather than a technical consultee. In addition, ER will be meeting with the Woodland Trust separately to further hear their concerns following the extensive responses received as part of the Stage Two consultation process.		
6.4 GS noted that Sustrans would be opposed to road building but was keen to remain a key stakeholder on the process.		
<b>7. AOB</b>		
7.1 It was queried whether there would be any financial constraints with regard to taking the study forward. ER confirmed that funding would need to be identified and applications for funding would need to be completed.		
<b>8. Next Review Group Meeting</b>		
8.1 Date of next meeting to be confirmed		
8.2 ER thanked all for their attendance.		
<b>End</b>		