

**Supplementary  
Proof of Evidence:**

**Local Economic Impacts**

**Presented to the Public Inquiry  
in relation to  
Lancashire County Council Planning  
Application Reference: 11/05/1584  
Completion of the Heysham to M6 Link**

**Planning Inspectorate Reference:**

**APP/Q2371/V/07/1200928 &**

**APP/Q2371/V/07/1200929**

**Submitted by Alan James BSc.(Hons). MA. MLI on behalf of:**

**Transport Solutions for Lancaster and Morecambe (TSLM)**

**4<sup>th</sup> July 2007**

- 1.1 Lancashire County Council (LCC) have produced a further revised Economic Impact Report (EIR) dated June 2007. The principal revision is a further reduction in the estimated job creation attributable to the Heysham-M6 Link (HM6L), brought about by two changes:
- Deletion of 2 of the 6 economic development sites (Port of Heysham Industrial Estate and Royd Mill), reducing the total area of sites on which the job forecast is based
  - Revision of calculations to allow for some development in the 'Do-minimum' scenario, in contrast to the previous EIRs (July 2005, December 2006) which assumed no development on any of the sites if the HM6L were not built
- 1.2 The result of these changes is to reduce the "best estimate" of employment generation from 6,014 (July 2005) to 1,822 (December 2006), to 1,026 (EIR 2007 Table 6.2). The current estimate is therefore only just over half the 2006 estimate, and barely 17% of the original estimate submitted to DfT with the Major Scheme Business Case (MSBC) in July 2005. This recurring amendment of the employment forecast undermines the credibility of the EIR, and the latest reduction calls into even more serious question the Value for Money appraisal in the MSBC.
- 1.3 The two changes partly address issues raised in my Proof of Evidence on economic impacts for TSLM, paragraphs 4.12 and 4.13, which argues that the extent of available land was overestimated in the 2006 EIR, and that the "all-or-nothing" assumption on development of these sites with or without the HM6L was untenable.
- 1.4 The revised EIR endorses in principle the TSLM proof on these matters, but the revised forecast is still not acceptable, for the following reasons:-
- **Land availability:** there is still the issue of discrepancies between the EIR and the Local Plan, in particular the amount of land available at White Lund. The available area in the Local Plan for the 4 sites now under consideration is 28.8 ha compared with 39.4 ha in the 2007 EIR, a difference of 10.6 ha. Using the Local Plan figures, the starting area and thus the eventual jobs forecast would be 27% lower.
  - **Assumed take-up:** whilst the 2007 EIR now includes an allowance for some development on the 4 sites without the HM6L (Do-minimum), the percentage uptake, which averages 20% across the four sites (EIR 2007 Table 6.1), is still no more than an assumption based on "discussions with the Economic Development section of Lancaster City Council" (EIR 2007 section 6.2, third sub-para). No evidence is presented to justify that assumption, nor the assumed uptake with the HM6L for the "best estimate" (average 75% across the 4 sites, EIR 2007 table 6.2). The resulting 'forecast' uptake of land and subsequent job creation estimate therefore remain nothing more than a statement of what would happen under a given set of unsubstantiated assumptions.
- 1.5 A further important point from my main proof on economic impacts (4.13 last bullet) is that, whilst the scheme has now been compared albeit imperfectly with a 'do-minimum' scenario, it has still not been compared with 'do-something-else' scenarios - alternative transport packages which address local transport issues without major road construction.
- 1.6 This short supplementary statement does not alter any other aspects of my main proof of evidence.

Alan James  
4 July 2007