

**THE ROADS (NORTHERN IRELAND) ORDER 1993 AS
AMENDED BY THE ROADS (AMENDMENT) (NORTHERN
IRELAND) ORDER 2004
THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT (NORTHERN
IRELAND) 1972**

**REPORT ON AN INQUIRY HELD INTO THE
ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT, DIRECTION ORDER
AND VESTING ORDER
RELATING TO
THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE A2 SHORE ROAD
FROM SHORE AVENUE TO SEAPARK
AND INTO OPINIONS EXPRESSED IN RELATION
THERE TO.**

APPOINTED INSPECTORS:

**B H SLEITH
J MAGEEAN**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1. Introduction	3
2. Site Description	4
3. Case for the Department	5
3.1 Background to the Scheme and Statutory Procedures	
3.2 Development of the Scheme	
3.3 Scheme Design	
3.4 Traffic and Economic Appraisal	
3.5 Environmental Statement	
4. Oral Presentations	14
5. Oral Unscheduled Statements	37
6. Written Representations	38
7. Consideration	74
8. Recommendations	76
9. Acknowledgements	77
10. Annexes	78
1. Annex 1	Appearances
2. Annex 2	Documents
3. Annex 3	Abbreviations

1 INTRODUCTION

To: The Department for Regional Development

Sirs

We conducted a Public Local Inquiry at the Clarion Hotel, Carrickfergus on 8, 9, 10,11,12,15 and 16 October 2007 into the Environmental Statement the draft Direction Order and proposed Vesting Order prepared by the Department for Regional Development for a Scheme to improve the A2 Shore Road, Greenisland and into opinions expressed in relation thereto.

The Inquiry was held in accordance with Articles 139 and 67A of the Roads (Northern Ireland) Order 1993 as amended by the Roads (Amendment) (Northern Ireland) Order 2004.

The proposal for the improvement of the A2 (the Scheme) involves a combination of on-line widening with a partial by-pass.

As a result of the publication of the Environmental Statement, draft Direction Order and Notice of Intention to make a Vesting Order, 75 letters of representation were received within the period allocated. In addition we were presented with a considerable volume of correspondence and documents subsequently received.

A Pre-inquiry Meeting was held on 4 September 2007 at the Clarion Hotel, Carrickfergus involving matters of administration and procedure for the Inquiry. An outline programme for the Inquiry was arranged at this meeting.

We carried out an inspection of the route prior to the Inquiry.

This report contains the substance of the written and oral submissions made including a brief description of the Scheme together with our comments, considerations and recommendations.

**Brian Sleith
John Mageean**

January 2008

2 SITE DESCRIPTION

The A2 is part of the strategic road network and provides a link between the two urban centres of Belfast and Carrickfergus.

While most of the road has two lanes in each direction, a 2.5km section of the road at Greenisland does not have two running lanes in each direction and is a source of delays particularly at peak times.

The proposal is to widen the road from Shore Avenue to Station Road and provide a new off-line dual carriageway from Station Road to Seapark.

3 THE CASE FOR THE DEPARTMENT

3.1 BACKGROUND TO THE SCHEME AND STATUTORY PROCEDURES

Mr Hassard summarised the evidence set out in document DRD A2/26.

The A2 Shore Road is the main route between the two urban centres of Carrickfergus and Belfast.

At Greenisland the road is fronted on both sides by residential property. On the landward side lie the University of Ulster and Belfast High School.

The proposals to improve the A2 are consistent with the Regional Transportation Strategy for Northern Ireland 2002-2012, the Belfast Metropolitan Transport Plan 2015 and Belfast Metropolitan Area Plan 2015.

The plans confirm the need to address bottlenecks on the highway as one of the priorities.

The Department commissioned consultants to study alternatives for the improvement of the A2 Shore Road and to develop and progress a preferred scheme through the statutory procedure. The development of a scheme is carried out in three stages:

Stages 1 and 2 will be covered in the proof of evidence given by Susan Briggs.

The announcement of the preferred route was made on 14 June 2006.

As part of the Scheme development, an Environmental Impact Statement (document DRD A2/ 23) was undertaken. This is covered in proof of evidence by Nigel Hackett. The Environment Statement, draft Direction Order and Notice of Intention to make a Vesting Order were published in March 2007.

Stage 3 of the Scheme assessment will be covered in proof of evidence by Gordon Philpott.

The Department's Minister announced on 19 June 2007 that a Public Inquiry would be held in October 2007.

3.2 DEVELOPMENT OF THE SCHEME

Mrs Susan Briggs presented her evidence as set out in document DRD A2/27.

In accordance with the requirements of DMRB the feasibility study was carried out in 3 stages. Her evidence covered Stages 1 and 2

Stage 1: Preliminary Assessment

8 strategies were examined – two of the strategies offered potentially deliverable solutions. New road inland corridor and the existing road corridor improvements.

Stage 2: Route Option Assessment

The two strategies were assessed. The assessment considered in detail the key risk areas of severance, land and compensation costs, impact on private property, services, buildability and traffic management during construction. Fourteen options and variations were developed and assessed.

Engineering, environmental, traffic and economic issues were assessed and after public consultation, the Department concluded that the preferred option should be based on the combination of online widening and a partial by-pass.

3.3 SCHEME DESIGN

Mr Philpott summarised the evidence set out in Document DRD A2/28.

Following determination of the preferred option, an environmental statement was prepared, a Direction Order published and notice of intention to vest land published. The preliminary design provided for a 40 mph urban 2-lane dual carriageway by widening the existing A2 Shore Road from Shore Avenue (University) to Station Road approx 1.7 kilometres). A new 50 mph rural 2-lane dual carriageway would be provided from Station Road to Seapark (approx 1.5 kilometres). The online section would have a 2.5 metre wide footway on the inland side, a 2.5 metre wide central reservation and a 3.5 metre wide combined footway/cycleway on the shore side. The central reservation would restrict turning movements at all dwellings and access roads to left in/left out movements. The junctions at Shore Avenue, Shorelands and Station Road would be improved to signalised roundabouts and allow for U-turns needed to access properties.

The new off line dual carriageway would follow the same form as the existing dual carriageway to the north of the Scheme – grass verges, central reservations and 50 mph speed restriction. There would be no direct access; an accommodation bridge would be provided over the road along Whinfield Lane.

Immediately north of Station Road there would be a restricted junction to permit bus access to the bypassed section of Shore Road. A conventional roundabout would be provided at Seapark where the new road would connect to the existing dual carriageway. It would allow direct access to the bypassed section of Shore Road.

The Scheme was estimated to cost £55.2m at Qu 4 2006 prices and was considered to be economically robust, safe and buildable. It would provide benefits to all road users, including pedestrians and cyclists.

3.4 TRAFFIC AND ECONOMIC APPRAISAL

Dr Al-Azzawi presented his evidence as set out in Document DRD A2/29.

Traffic modelling was carried out using a base year of 2005. Future traffic flows were estimated for 2010 and 2025 using National Road Traffic Forecast (NRTF) growth factors.

The Department of Transport's Transport User Benefit Appraisal (TUBA) was used to undertake the transport economic efficiency of the Scheme. A 60-year appraisal period was adopted assuming the opening year to be 2010. The economic appraisal model included estimates reflecting a quantified risk assessment, optimum bias and construction and maintenance delays.

The result of the modelling exercise showed that the Scheme would return a Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) value of 2.1 and a Net Present Value (NPV) of over £65m discounted to 2002 prices (the Government baseline for project comparison), regarded as good indicators of the Scheme's strong performance.

A series of sensitivity tests were also carried out looking at the sensitivity of changes to the modelled estimates of time savings and vehicle operating costs as well as an increase in construction costs and a delay of one year to the works construction programme. All sensitivity tests produced positive NPVs and BCRs.

3.5 THE ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Introduction

The environmental assessment for the project was carried out under the following statutory instruments:

- Roads (Environment Impact Assessment) Regulations (NI) 1999;
- EC Directive 85/337/EEC (Annex 111);
- EC Directive 97/11/EC;
- Roads (Northern Ireland) Order 1993.

Annexes to Directive 97/11/EC identify classes of project where environmental assessment is either mandatory or discretionary. The Department determined that the A2 Shore Road Greenisland Scheme fell within Annex 111 of the directive and that an Environmental Statement should be prepared.

The Environmental Statement was prepared by the consultants Scott Wilson and published in March 2007. Notice of publication was placed in appropriate local newspapers and copies of the statement were made available for public consultation. Copies of the statement were also circulated to 36 statutory bodies for consultation.

The responses received from consultees were used in establishing the baseline scenarios for each specialist Environmental Statement chapter.

The Department further arranged for a public exhibition to be held in March 2007. A consultation brochure and questionnaire was provided at the exhibition for the local community and businesses to express their views.

The Department also decided that due to the public interest and the importance of the Scheme, a public Inquiry should be held before deciding whether or not to proceed with the project.

The Department maintained that it had complied with all relevant statutory legislation to ensure that widespread and detailed consultative opportunities were made available to both statutory authorities and the general public.

The environmental assessment focused on 12 key areas – land use, geology and soils, water quality and drainage, ecology and nature conservation landscape and visual effects, cultural heritage, air quality, traffic noise and vibration, pedestrians, cyclists, equestrians and community effects, vehicle travellers, disruption due to construction, policies and plans.

Where relevant, assessments have been undertaken with reference to the DMRB.

Land Use

Permanent land take would affect both residential and agricultural land.

Temporary land take for a contractor's compound would be required for approximately 24 months.

Mitigation Measures

Where severance would occur during construction access to properties would be maintained.

Compensation measures would be available where temporary and permanent land take and demolition occur.

Geology and Soil

There are no geological features that are of statutory importance. There would be some loss of agricultural soils but overall any adverse effect on geology and soils would be negligible

Mitigation Measures:

Primarily during construction, measures would be taken to ensure that potential soil impacts are minimised.

Water Quality and Drainage

With the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures it is predicted that there would be no significant adverse effects on the existing surface water quality, on upstream water levels or the quality of local ground water.

Mitigation Measures:

- During the operation, road runoff would be collected and converged to water courses. Interceptors would be installed at all outfalls and in addition a treatment pond is proposed to provide additional treatment to run-off to Jointure Bay Stream.
- Attenuation would be provided within the drainage system to ensure that the rate of discharge is appropriate to the water course.

Ecology and Nature Conservation

The ecological impacts have been described and evaluated in line with current guidance and taking into account legislation and policy frameworks.

No otter holts, bat roosts or badger activity were located during surveys.

Breeding birds and wintering birds were recorded.

Mitigation Measures:

- Landscape planting of native species will offset loss of potential breeding bird habitat;
- Timing of works will significantly reduce any potential disturbance to breeding birds;
- To prevent any impact on potential bat roosts in buildings and trees, sites will be examined prior to demolition or felling.

Landscape and Visual Effect

There will be a significant loss of local landscape character which will compromise the area.

The large scale elements, the Belfast Lough, the shore and the Carrickfergus Escarpment will not be significantly affected.

15 years after the project is implemented the significance of the effects will be moderately adverse.

Mitigation Measures:

- Replacement walls and hedges will replace some of the important elements within the urban area.

Cultural Heritage

No listed buildings or structures will be directly affected by the Scheme.

There will be a land take at Castle Lug.

There will be no impact on private parks or demesnes or on National Trust properties.

Mitigation Measures:

- The adverse effect of the land take at Castle Lug will be mitigated by recording any archaeological evidence that exists within the land take.

Air Quality

Air quality assessment has been carried out in accordance with requirements of DMRB.

There will be no significant effect on air quality due to the carrying out of the Scheme.

There would be improved air quality for the majority of properties between Station Road and Seapark.

Traffic Noise and Vibration

Noise levels were assessed in line with DMRB

The proposed carriageway will create a perceptible increase in noise levels.

The majority of properties adjacent to the main road will experience a decrease in noise levels.

Any vibration is generated by irregularity in the road surface. The predicted vibration level is not significant.

Mitigation Measures:

Where properties would exceed the accepted noise levels, the following measures will be taken:

- Low noise level road surface will be used between Jordanstown and Seapark;
- If necessary acoustic barriers and/or glazing will be installed.

Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects

The assessment was undertaken in accordance with the requirements of DMRB

The overall impact for pedestrians and cyclists will be an improvement of facilities.

There will be provision of a new improved cycleway and continuous pedestrian access along the main road.

The Scheme proposals will have an adverse community impact as a result of the demolition of the Spar retail unit.

Mitigation Measures:

- The contractor would ensure that access or alternative access for vehicle users, pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians is maintained at all times during construction;
- Appropriate permanent pedestrian crossings within the Scheme design will be provided.

Vehicle Travellers

The effect of the Scheme on driver stress is considered to be overwhelmingly beneficial.

Disruption due to Construction

The improvement of the A2 will result in a number of adverse impacts as a result of construction activity. These will include traffic management measures, noise intrusion, dust in the air and mud on the ground.

Mitigation Measures:

With careful management the significance of construction impacts should be reduced.

Policies and Plans

The improvement of the A2 Shore Road will have positive effects in terms of national, regional and local planning policies. The Scheme is supported and safeguarded by a number of planning policies including those enumerated in the Environmental Statement.

4 ORAL PRESENTATIONS

**Ob 61 Oth 18 Oth 37 BAM (NI) Ltd
Represented by Pragma Planning and Development
Consultants Ltd - Mr M Worthington**

The company supported the Scheme in principle subject to revised access arrangements to properties at 4-28 Shore Road. They claimed that their rights under HRA 1998 and ECHR were infringed. They offered alternative arrangements which would reduce the number of accesses from the properties to Shore Road.

Departmental Response

The options suggested by the objector entailed the use of land acquired by the Department under blight legislation and thus could not be made available to the Company to construct accesses. Any surplus land acquired under blight or by vesting would have to be disposed of in accordance with statutory provisions.

The accesses proposed by the Department would be up to the required standards. The Department would welcome a reduction in the number of accesses and was prepared to continue discussions with the objector towards that end.

Comment

We agree that a reduction in the number of accesses would be desirable but accept that combined accesses would have to be on land in the ownership of the Company.

**Oth 3 Carrickfergus Borough Council
Represented by Mr Cardwell, Chief Executive**

Mr Cardwell expressed the unanimous view of the Council in support of the Scheme which was crucial to the future prosperity of the Borough. Current congestion adversely affected the local economy – including tourism – the local environment and road safety. It also impeded response time for emergency services. The Council had considered the options developed by the Department and decided to support the preferred option as it would minimise disruption to existing properties and infrastructure as well as minimising traffic disruption during the construction period.

Departmental response

The Department welcomed the support of the Council.

**Ob 40 Oth 15 Oth 30 K J Livett & Mrs E R Livett 4 Schooner Court, Langley Hall
Represented by Mr H Mc Cracken, Consultant**

The grounds of the objection were that the Scheme would result in:

- A loss of existing amenities;
- Depreciation in value of their property;
- Unacceptable increase in noise levels.

The Langley Hall complex was a major development which had been before the planning Service and Roads Service five times and before the Planning Appeals Commission once. Purchasers of the properties in 2002 were entitled to conclude that the boundaries settled by Roads Service would not require further adjustment. Any encroachment on their already limited amenity land would have a significant and detrimental effect on the enjoyment of their property.

The objectors claimed that since houses 749 and 751 Shore Road were to be demolished and redeveloped the new road could be realigned away from their property with minimal effect on the new development.

When examined by the Department, Mr McCracken admitted that the amenity land affected was owned by a management company acting as trustees of all 18 owners in the Langley Hall development and accepted that there had been no objection to the Scheme by the company

Departmental Response

The Department's detailed rebuttal evidence is set out in Document A2 39, salient features of which follow.

The Langley Hall development had been set back in accordance with a protection line that was known at that time. Current design work necessitated a minor encroachment. A major reason for the proposed land take was to ensure that the road widening could be achieved while allowing traffic flows to continue on the existing road. The current proposal required a triangular wedge 33 m x 5 m at its widest part (approx 80 sq m). It was agreed that this could be reduced to a wedge 11 m x 1.25 m (approx 8 sq m). It was acknowledged that the piece of amenity land was of benefit to the residents but the loss of a small section had to be weighed against the overall community benefit arising from the Scheme.

Although a planning application had been submitted in respect of 749/752 Shore Road it had not been determined. The impact of any realignment of the Scheme could not therefore be assessed. In any event, realignment would also affect Nos 753,757 and 762 Shore Road and present access difficulties because of gradients.

Compensation for property depreciation is settled by negotiation with Land & Property Services and in the absence of agreement by the Lands Tribunal.

It is accepted that without mitigation the properties at Langley Hall would experience a minor increase in noise levels. However as low noise road surfacing would be provided the properties would benefit from a slight decrease in noise levels from existing levels.

Comment

We accept that by reducing the initially proposed land take the loss of amenity land should be significantly reduced. Further comment is expanded in paragraph 7.

Compensation for property depreciation is not a matter for this Inquiry.

We note that noise levels at this location should be marginally less than existing levels.

Ob 15 Ob 22 Oth 17 Oth 38

**Ms J Wilson, 55a Shore Road
Represented by Dr Braniff (Braniff Associates)**

In oral evidence Dr Braniff stated that his client supported the Scheme but had some concerns about the positioning of the access to her property and about accommodation works.

Departmental Response

The Department confirmed that:

- The proposed access to No. 55A would be moved to a more central position on the proposed Station Road roundabout;
- They had submitted updated details of accommodation works to Ms Wilson and that they would seek to agree the proposals as part of the Scheme development process.

Comment

Accommodation works are compensatable matters and not for consideration within the Inquiry.

Ob 70 Oth 25 Oth 46

Ms Sally Liya, 448 Merville Garden Village

The grounds of the initial objection were:

- The loss of mature trees would reduce the attractiveness of the area and reduce biodiversity;

- Nearby traffic controls (with pedestrian crossings) and removal of a high bank at adjacent property would aggravate noise and pollution

Supplementary points subsequently submitted were:

- The A2 has historical character which would be obliterated by a standardised road design
- The overall width of the road should be reduced in order to retain mature trees which exercise significant impacts on noise reduction, absorption of pollutants and as wind breaks;
- Future free-flowing traffic would lead to an increase in accidents;
- The accuracy of the models assessing noise and air pollution were questioned;
- An alternative cycleway should be provide away from the new road;
- Walkway links should be provided in the Greenisland area.

Ms Liya elaborated her objection in oral evidence emphasising in particular the need to retain the mature trees especially at the proposed Greenisland Station Road junction by some redesign of the road system at this location

Departmental Response

The Department's rebuttal statement (document A2 69) had been issued on 10 October 2007. The major issues are summarised below.

It was accepted that there would be a significant loss of trees but that not all were mature. A detailed tree survey (in accordance with British Standard "Trees in Relation to Construction" showed that almost three-quarters were considered to have poor form, condition or stature and that any existing value would be lost within 10 years. Mitigation measures would be put in place to ensure replacement planting.

In preparing the Environmental Statement comprehensive ecological surveys were carried out in consultation with EHS, RSPB and British Trust for Ornithology. No significant adverse impacts were identified.

British Standard BS8233 stated that a belt of trees less than 30 m deep offered no significant sound attenuation. Without mitigation the property would experience a minor increase in sound levels but low noise road surfaces would in fact result in a slight decrease in noise levels at this location.

A cultural heritage assessment was carried out and was included in the Environmental Statement.

Taking into account the change in traffic speeds the Scheme should still lead to major safety improvements, viz no right turns, improved footways and cycle-ways, improved junctions and assisted pedestrian crossings. The width of the central reserve was the minimum to permit pedestrians to cross along its length,

The cross section of the road would be designed to provide a good safe balance between the various road users. The shared cycleway would be based on National Cycle Network guidelines and would provide a safer cycling environment than at present. There was no route through the inland area of Greenisland which would provide a direct cycle route to Carrickfergus.

While pollutant concentrations may be marginally higher at roundabouts and junctions, the forecast concentrations at any location along the route would be within UK air quality standards.

The provision of walkway links in the Greenisland area was not an essential element of the Scheme.

Comment

We are content with the Department's response and note that the adverse effects of the Scheme would be off-set by the proposed mitigation works. We appreciate that the Scheme would impair the existing townscape of the section of the A2 to be widened but we are satisfied that the measures proposed in relation to boundary walls and new planting would go some way in mitigation.

While the provision of green walkway links in the Greenisland area may be desirable it would not be within the scope of the Scheme, rather a matter for other agencies to pursue.

Ob 69 Oth 20 Oth 39 The International Tree Federation represented by Mr Malcolm Lake.

The main objections and concerns were:

- Removal of large number of trees;
- Trees growing on part of land destroyed to become part of pavement/cycle path should be retained;
- Air quality will deteriorate due to felling of trees;
- Building or improving new roads will increase traffic;
- The present proposals will affect both sides of the road, by overlaying 4 lanes where 2 exist and so its impact will correspondently be greater than other parts of the A2 where the A2 has been built out into the sea;
- Heavy impact on Shore Road area of townscape character;
- Conflict between vehicles emerging from existing plots and cycle lane users;
- Difficulty of vehicles exiting existing plots into fast 4 lane road;
- The design should be reassessed, in particular the very complicated Station Road junction to see how traffic improvement could be achieved with smaller land take;
- There will be massive disruption during construction;

- Significant reduction to plot sizes and consequent loss to the amenity of the occupiers;
- Scheme was too costly for saving in travelling time;
- The proposed Scheme ignores reports from the International Panel on Climate Change and Stress Report;
- Mr Lake suggested that an alternative scheme should be considered. Suggestion provided.

Departmental Response

- The number of trees to be planted is over 800 compared to the number that will be felled, approx 235;
- Some of the trees would physically block the pedestrian/cycleway. They would not allow for the proposed segregated cycleway and footpath;
- The Environmental Statement shows that there will be no significant effect on local or regional air quality as a result of the Scheme;
- There is a bottleneck on the A2 at Greenisland and traffic flows are constrained by the bottleneck – the Regional Transportation Strategy promotes highway improvement addressing bottlenecks, and measures to improve public transport;
- The Scheme would support current policy to encourage a shift from private to public transport– the improvement proposals will make better provision of bus services;
- In some parts the Scheme will affect both sides – where possible the widening has been restricted to one side only. By including an off-line road for part of the Scheme, a significant part of the Shore Road will not be affected by the works;
- The number of trees to be planted is over 800. The objective of the Scheme is to remove the existing bottleneck. The mitigation measures recognise the townscape value of Shore Road;
- The proposed Scheme will provide a much safer environment for pedestrians and cyclists with wider footways and a shared footway/cycleway on the shore side;
- The Scheme is considered to provide major safety improvements. Driveways will be improved in layout and available visibility. The central reserve will prevent right turning movements across main road traffic flows;
- The Scheme includes an improvement of the existing traffic signal junction at Station Road;
- Signalised roundabouts will reduce delays at the junction and it is considered that the proposed design is an optimum design. The additional link to the by-passed section of Shore Road is primarily provided to retain the bus service along that section.
- Some adverse effects are unavoidable. The Department is developing measures to help minimise the inevitable disruption;
- The Department is seeking discussions with Translink to encourage use of public transport during construction period;

- The road improvement option that performed best included the on-line widening of Shore Road. Measures will be taken to minimise the impact on residential properties. Compensation for land loss, depreciation and other injurious affection will be paid if the vesting takes place;
- The Department is content that in removing the bottleneck from the A2 at Greenisland, the benefits are widespread including; accessing from driveways, pedestrian and cycling facilities, signal controlled pedestrian crossings between Jordanstown Road and Station Road;
- The Scheme has been developed in response to the need identified in the Regional Transportation Strategy and the BMTP proposals to widen the A2 at Greenisland from one lane in each direction to two lanes in each direction;
- The majority of traffic would probably continue along Shore Road which would retain its present problems and would not be able to cope with the traffic at peak periods.

Comment

We are satisfied with the Department's response. We are unconvinced that the alternative scheme proposed by Mr Lake is better than the preferred options for the following reasons:

- The significant impact on the University, schools, residential properties and community buildings (including churches);
- Shore Road would probably retain its present traffic problems.

Ob 43 Ob 45 Oth 14

**Mr & Mrs McCay, 132 Shore Road
Represented by Mr K Gillespie (Pragma Planning &
Development Consultants)**

The main issues raised by the objectors were:

- The ES was fundamentally and seriously flawed;
- The Scheme conflicted with BUAP 2001, BMAP and BMTP which indicated that the road improvement would be online;
- A vesting order in advance of BMAP would be premature and prejudice debate within BMAP;
- Their land would be incapable of beneficial use;
- The Scheme was a fait accompli with scant regard to objectors;
- The separation of interest between the Inspectors and the Department was unclear in contrast with planning inquiries;
- The Scheme was not in conformity with planning policy. There was no evidence that it conformed with prevailing legislation nor that it had the approval of the Minister;

- The Scheme would interfere with their enjoyment of their property due to noise and traffic pollution;
- Value for money criterion had overridden other factors.

By way of oral presentation Mr Gillespie raised a series of questions associated with the written objections and in addition queried:

- The description and status of the term “Townscape Character”;
- How the result of the public consultation could be deemed to favour the Scheme;
- Whether the Department had been approached and offered the land equating to the off-line part of the Scheme;
- Whether work had been done on “Plan B” if the Scheme were not to proceed;
- The exact cost of the Scheme in view of the varying figures quoted by the Department’s witnesses;
- Whether a strategic environmental assessment had been carried out into BMTP.

Mrs McCay in evidence stated that her family had resided in the property for 40 years and that they were the major land losers under the Scheme. She reiterated some of the issues raised by her representative in advocating that the road objective could be achieved by widening Shore Road as originally planned. She queried:

- Whether pressure had been brought to bear by the Department on those residents who had sold their properties under blight legislation;
- Whether surplus vested land would be offered back to former owners;
- Why no direct access was to be provided from her property to the Shore Road.

Departmental Response

The department’s written response (documents A2 42 and A2 44) stated, inter alia:

- The ES had been prepared in accordance with European directives and relevant Northern Ireland legislation;
- The road line shown in the relevant planning documents was indicative only of the land take that would be necessary to protect the line from development;
- It would not be appropriate to suspend all road activity pending the outcome of a new area plan. The Department had to act in accordance with the current planning position;
- Should land be incapable of beneficial use as a result of the Scheme, a suitable compensation package would be negotiated.

The Department declined on procedural grounds to reply individually to each of the questions raised orally. However in response to the allegation that the off-line section had been chosen because the landowner had offered up the land, it stated that the fact that the owner was an objector should be sufficient to answer the point.

The Department also stated that:

- Any surplus vested land would be offered back to the original owner;
- The result of the public consultation showed that the bulk of the public favoured the combined route or the on-line route and that over 50 per cent were opposed to an inland route;
- The road line shown in earlier plans was indicative only, emphasising that it indicated that land take would be equal on each side which could never be the case. While the BMAP team had stated that the Scheme differed from that shown previously it could be accommodated within BMAP.

Comment

Questions relating to the methodology of appointment of inspectors are matters for Roads Service.

- Most of the issues raised which were not specifically addressed by the Department had already been covered within the totality of written and oral evidence presented to the Inquiry and referred to in our report.
- The objector did not adduce any evidence that (a) a strategic environmental assessment should have been prepared in respect of the BMTP nor (b) that such an assessment would have been relevant to the Inquiry.
- Regarding the question re the status of Shore Road Area of Townscape Character, we note that it is a proposal in BMAP for designation.
- The objectors referred to the different costs of the Scheme quoted in the Department's written evidence. We note that in earlier cross-examination the Department's witness explained that the amount of £41.1 m was the figure discounted back to 2002 for Government comparison purposes; higher figures related to 2006 costs.
- We note that the Department did not send a written reply to the objectors' document Oth 14. We expect this to be rectified

**Oth 16 Hightown Enterprises Ltd
 Represented by Mr W Robinson (GM Design Associates) and Mr A
 Carrie (Dougall Baillie Associates)**

Hightown Enterprises owned 12.1 hectares of agricultural land which would be bisected by the proposed by-pass section of the Scheme. While supporting the Scheme in general it was necessary to safeguard their position. The objection related to the need for proper access to the part of the farmland truncated and isolated by the new road line. Ideally such access should separate farm traffic from the residential traffic using Whinfield Lane.

Elaborating on the objection in oral evidence Mr Robinson stated that the only current access to his client's land was at the north-west corner. The bisected land to the south of

the new road would have no access. He expressed his appreciation of the assurance given during his cross-examination of the Department's witness that an access would be provided where his client's frontage adjoined Whinfield Lane. However he asked that the access should be direct to the realigned Whinfield Lane to avoid conflict with residential properties. He also requested that such access together with junctions at the realigned Whinfield Lane should be adequate to cater for farm traffic.

Departmental Response

The Department stated that a direct access to the realigned Whinfield Lane would have to traverse land not within the draft vesting order but that the suggestion would be considered provided agreement could be reached with the landowner. Otherwise access would be provided at the frontage to existing Whinfield Lane.

Whinfield Lane is not particularly wide although it can accommodate some farm machinery at present. The new arrangements would cater for existing levels of farm traffic.

Comment

We are satisfied that the Department's assurances should meet the needs of the objector.

Oth 27 Oth 44 Sustrans Represented by Mr S Patterson, National Manager

The main grounds of the objection were:

- The proposed combined cycleway/footway would be too narrow;
- A green verge should be provided as a buffer between the cycleway and the road;
- Cycleways and footways should be segregated;
- Cycleways should skirt the rear of bus stop shelters;
- The footway on the inland side of the road between Loughside Road and Station Road should be widened to cater for cyclists;
- Seapark junction leading to the bypassed section of Shore Road should be redesigned;
- Cycle links should be provided to the High School and the University.

In oral evidence Mr Patterson accepted that land constraints prevented the ideal scenario for cyclists. He referred to the proposed 3.5 m cycleway/footway on the shore side and 2.5 m footway on the inland side and suggested that a 3 m facility should be provided on each side.

He emphasised:

- The problem of the intrusion of the side panel of bus shelters into the cycleway/footway considerably reducing the space for cyclists;
- The need for special facilities for cyclist on the by-passed section of Shore Road, particularly in view of current speed limits;
- The need for proper cycle facilities on link roads to the High School and the University;
- The importance of reducing the link from the by-passed section of Shore Road to Seapark junction from four lanes to two.

Departmental Response

The Department's detailed response is set out in R Oth 27 and R Oth 44

In view of the serious land constraints, the combined cycleway/footway of 3.5 m is the best that can be achieved and is in keeping with the National Cycle Network's guidelines. In order to provide a good quality long distance cycle route alongside the road it would not be appropriate to reduce the width at this location. Following completion of the scheme Roads Service would consider the possibility of designating the 2.5 m footway on the inland side as an unsegregated shared cycleway/footway. Where space is available within the vested land the footway could be widened on the inland side.

At detailed design stage Roads Service would consider whether cycleways could be diverted to the rear of bus shelters, subject to availability of land.

The Department agreed to consult Sustrans in due course re signage and cycleway surfacing.

As consideration of the Scheme has developed the proposed link from the by-passed section of Shore Road to Seapark junction would now be reduced to two lanes.

Traffic on the by-passed section of Shore Road would reduce considerably as it would be used largely by residents and service vehicles and should be appropriate for use by cyclists. Any layout alterations would have to be considered as a separate scheme. It was expected that the current speed limit would be reviewed in conjunction with the Police Service following implementation of the Scheme.

Comment

We accept that the Department has made a significant effort to facilitate cycle use within the Scheme. We agree with the objector that the intrusion of the side panels of bus shelters presents a hazard for cyclists and welcome the Department's assurance to consider the matter at detailed design stage.

Ob 16 Ob 33

**Mr F Anderson, Apt 5, Schooner Court
Represented by Mr Sammy Wilson MP MLA**

The objector stated in his letter that he was in favour of the road widening Scheme but he and his representative expressed objections and concerns at the present proposal and raised the following issues:-

- The road being routed through the communal garden area at Langley Park resulted in the road being adjacent to the properties. There was more than sufficient ground in the front gardens of properties on the seaward side of the A2 to accommodate road widening;
- Increase noise and air pollution.

Mr Wilson reiterated and elaborated on the written objections. He referred to the fact that construction work may extend beyond the vested line.

Departmental Response

- If the small portion of Langley Hall is not used, it will add to the disruption and time taken to construct the new line of the road. Services might have to be diverted;
- The Department cannot go outside the boundaries of land that they have vested;
- The properties are predicted to experience a minor decrease in noise levels from existing levels.

Comment

There was insufficient evidence to allow us to consider the possibility of re-alignment of the scheme at this location and the consequential effect on other property owners.

We accept that by reducing the initially proposed land take, the loss of amenity land should be significantly reduced. We comment further in paragraphs 7 and 8.

We note that noise levels at this location should be marginally less than existing levels.

Oth 5 Oth 23

**Mrs D Camlin, 1 Schooner Court
Represented by Ms R Orr**

The following is a summary of the objection:

- Loss of land – 35/40 sq m of an already very small garden would have a serious impact. A new boundary would be only 3 m from the back door. The property had been purchased on the understanding that adequate land had been set aside for the new road;
- Noise – increased noise levels would detract from the amenity enjoyed by the property;
- Vibration – the proximity of heavy vehicles would lead to risk of structural damage to the property;
- Visual – the removal of adjacent mature trees would have a major visual impact and alter the landscape character of the area with minimal opportunity for mitigation.

Ms Orr expanded on the grounds of objection in oral evidence. She suggested that the Scheme should be realigned at this location moving it towards the shore side of the existing road, especially since Nos 749 and 751 were to be redeveloped. She also queried why it was proposed to demolish some properties within 3 m of the new road line and not others.

Departmental Response

The Department's detailed response is set out in documents R Oth 5 and R Oth 23.

With regard to encroachment on property at Schooner Court, the Department responded similarly to the objection by Mr & Mrs Livett (see above) in particular emphasising that it was now possible to reduce the land take.

It was expected that with the provision of low noise road surfacing existing noise levels would actually decrease.

Traffic vibration would be low and unlikely to cause structural damage.

The existing boundary hedge would be replaced as part of the accommodation works. It was accepted that the Scheme would affect the local landscape but extensive mitigation measures would provide replacement boundary walls and the planting of trees and hedges.

The Department assured the objector that there would be no encroachment on the property beyond the vesting line.

Comment

We appreciate the impact which even the reduced land take would have on this small back garden. We comment further in paragraph 7

We expect that the draft vesting order schedule will be amended to reflect the reduced land need and note the Department's assurance that there would be no encroachment beyond the revised vesting line.

Ob 60 Oth 11 Oth 12 Oth 13 Oth 42

**East Antrim Farming LLP
Represented by Mr W Orbinson QC, Mr
A Ryan (Carson McDowell, Solicitors),
Mr R Agus (RPS Consulting Engineers)
and Mr D Donaldson (White Young
Green, Planning Consultants)**

The objector stated that his company had acquired its lands since the publication of the BMAP on the prospect of future development potential. There was no indication in the strategic map that a major road scheme was planned. It was contended that acquisition of the land for the Scheme was premature pending the BMAP Public Inquiry and prejudiced the outcome of that Inquiry.

It was claimed that failure to provide access to their lands would infringe the objector's rights under the (HRA) and the ECHR. A legal issue raised regarding the conduct of the Environmental Impact Assessment was to be addressed to the Department outwith the Inquiry.

Outline planning approval had been obtained for a commercial development on part of their land with access via PSNI land to the Seapark junction. While this section of the land was subject to the vesting order, it was claimed that access to the remainder land should also be to the Seapark junction.

Extensive oral evidence covered the foregoing, stressing in particular:

- The planning status relating to part of the land should be extrapolated to the remainder land;
- Since access to the permitted development was to be via the Seapark junction, similar access should apply to the entire land holding.

Departmental Response

The Department's detailed rebuttal is contained in document A2 59. It was stated that there had been adequate indication in the BMAP documentation of the proposed road scheme, that it had been identified in the Regional Transportation Strategy and that there

had been considerable public consultation in relation to the various options and the Scheme itself. The Department had to act in accordance with the current planning position and could not suspend all activity pending the outcome of a new area plan.

Matters relating to legal issues would be answered by the Department's legal adviser.

The compensation procedure would take account of current and future use of the land.

The land at present has a field access, though little used, to the A2. After vesting, this would not be replaced; the remainder land has access elsewhere to the public highway.

Comment

We are satisfied that the Scheme was adequately publicised in the course of the relevant statutory processes. We accept that it would be wrong to delay the Scheme pending the outcome of the BMAP public inquiry

We listened carefully to the arguments put forward on behalf of the objector in order to determine their relevance to the remit of the Inquiry.

We find that the question relating to the planning status of the land is not for us to determine.

The valuation of the remainder land is a matter of compensation, taking the planning status into account; the provision of access to the land is a mitigation measure and likewise a compensation issue. Neither is for us to determine. In the event of disputes appeal may be made to the Lands Tribunal.

The legal issues relating to the preparation of the Environmental Impact Assessment and to rights under HRA and ECHR (including the Greek Housing Association decision) are not matters for this Inquiry.

Oth 2 Oth 22 Oth 32 Oth 33 Oth 41

Mrs Joanne Elliot, 4 Langley Hall

Mrs Elliot appeared at the Inquiry and submitted photographs taken at various times and questioned the Department's witnesses and stated her objections.

Mrs Elliot's main objections and questions were:-

- No response to her correspondence;
- The proposal will seriously affect the health and well being of her family due to increased noise and air pollution;
- The Scheme will render her garden unusable;
- Value of her property will be decreased;

- Other options have not been given due consideration;
- Roads Service should provide legal representation and advice;
- The block of apartments at Langley Hall will be severely affected;
- There is vacant land directly opposite Langley Hall on the other side of the road. Why was this area not utilised?
- Access to and egress from any property will be adversely affected and the safety of her children affected.

Departmental Response

The Department's detailed written response is summarised below:

- The correspondence was not a formal objection but has been brought to the attention of the Public Inquiry;
- It is accepted that without mitigation the properties at Langley Hall would experience a minor increase in noise levels. As low noise level road surfacing is being proposed the properties are predicted to experience a minor decrease in noise levels from existing levels. On completion of the Scheme, there is a forecast of overall reduction in pollutant concentration at the property;
- Approximately 85 sq m of garden will be lost in its present form. Within the situation where the road alignment would be retained, this would reduce to approximately 7 sq m.
- The Department will compensate at current market value for the loss of any land affected by the Scheme. Owners of land which is vested have the right to appoint an agent who will negotiate on their behalf for any loss and depreciation to a property and other injurious affect;
- The Department reviewed the options and took forward three feasible options to a Public Consultation. The option that performed best was the combined route;
- The Department is not required to provide legal assistance nor is responsible for any expenses incurred;
- In the vicinity of Langley Hall some land is available for widening of the road where developments have been set back behind a protection line. The required width for the proposed road has changed from that considered necessary when the current protection line was established. As a result, the proposed Scheme cuts into the communal gardens of Langley Hall beyond the protection line;
- If the road widening is removed entirely from Langley Hall gardens, a new carriage-way could not be considered whilst allowing traffic to use the existing road unhindered. Providing accesses to properties on the shore side would become increasingly difficult due to slope of land;
- The Scheme is considered a safe solution. There will be improved pedestrian and cycling facilities. There will be assisted pedestrian crossings.

Consideration

We note that noise levels should be less than existing levels.

We welcome the proposed reduction in land take to 7 sq.metres. Further comment is expanded in paragraph 7.

Compensation for property depreciation is not a matter for this Inquiry.

We are content with the other responses to the objections.

Ob 63, Oth 9, Oth 10, Oth 35, Oth 36 Oth 40

Mr Paul Rowan, 33 Shore Road

1. In his letter of 20 April 2007 Mr Rowan objected to the scheme on the following grounds:
 - **Route feasibility:** there was no physical barrier to the construction of the road off-line along most of the route;
 - **Environment:** an off-line route would have least impact as more than 60% of its length would be through open land;
 - **Safety:** the varying road widths and speed limits and number of junctions encompassed by the Scheme would be less safe than an off-line route with uniform widths and speed limits and fewer junctions. The left turn only access from private properties would invite accidents. There would be no adverse effect on the existing road during construction of an off-line route;
 - **Economy:** an off-line route should produce cost benefits;
 - **Access and integration:** The Scheme would exacerbate problems for pedestrians and cyclists and increase the segregation of residents on the shore side of the road from the rest of the community;
 - **Public opposition:** The Department's interpretation of the results of the consultation process was questionable;
 - **Schools and churches:** The issues affecting schools and churches could be overcome.
2. During the course of the Inquiry the objector presented a written statements (document Oth 35 and Oth 40) which incorporated a proposed route variation described as S5V5 (the "Variation") and elaborated on it in oral evidence. He called as expert witnesses Mr Richard Agus of RPS Consulting Engineers and Dr Robin Patrick, Technical Director of Analytical Services and Environmental Projects – a specialist unit within the Department of Chemistry at Queen's University.
3. The objector claimed that in determining the preferred route the Department had not been objective in evaluating the data and had skewed its analysis. The full evaluation of only one option resulted in a stratagem aimed at disadvantaging the residents of Shore Road.
4. The Variation was designed with a speed limit of 40 mph extended also to the inland section of the Scheme between Station Road and Seapark (Scheme design 50 mph). The main features of the variation were:

- It provided a viable way to join the inland dual carriageway in S5-2-V4 to the existing Shore Road without damaging the property of Belfast High School;
 - It would overcome many of the major difficulties associated with the Scheme such as construction delays and traffic/pedestrian separation;
 - It would be the shortest route and likely to cost less to build;
 - It would produce the most efficient flow of traffic through Greenisland as well as intra the greater Greenisland area and would facilitate the operation of buses;
 - It would likely offer the greatest benefit/cost ratio to Government.
5. The objector queried some of the environmental impacts of the Scheme as assessed by the Department. Schedule V of his statement compared the impacts of the Variation with those of the Scheme.
 6. Mr Rowan questioned the validity of the Department's interpretation of the public consultation process. He claimed that the Variation would remove or diminish the adverse impacts on community interests and community severance arising from the S5-2-V4 option but accepted the need for more detailed work in that regard.
 7. The objector set out in Schedule VII of his statement a comparison of costs between the Variation and S5-2-V4 which showed that his proposal would produce a reduction in total cost of £0.6 million, attributable mainly to reduced property costs. A further comparison updating costs to 2006 levels showed that S5V5 would produce a saving of £3.2 million compared with the Scheme, suggesting value for money would not be in doubt.
 8. In a letter dated 17 September 2007 (document Oth 10) Mr Rowan submitted a secondary objection – without prejudice to the proposal outlined above. He argued that the proposed alignment of the Scheme between 29 and 37c Shore Road unnecessarily impinged on his property. In oral evidence he suggested that the line of the road should be straightened at this section, moving it landward away from his property.

Departmental Response

1. The following is a summary of the Department's rebuttal evidence (document A2 62) in response to the grounds of objection set out in letter dated 20 April 2007:
 - While there were no physical constraints to continuing the route through Greenisland that could not be overcome, it had not been considered the best option;
 - While an inland route would traverse more open land than the Scheme, it would impact on schools and churches, on land deemed as amenity land and on land zoned for housing. An environmental impact assessment had been carried out for all options but environmental consideration was only one criterion; the Scheme had been determined taking all criteria into account;
 - Road safety had been a primary factor in the development of the preferred route. Signalised roundabouts are used elsewhere in the UK and have been proved to be safe and readily understood by drivers. The roundabouts would be designed to

facilitate the left-in left-out movements at private properties; such movements were safer than permitting right hand turns across a dual carriageway. Varying road widths and speed limits are not unusual on main routes into cities. Roundabouts and junctions reinforce the message to drivers of relevant changes in road widths/speed limits. Traffic management measures would be developed to minimise disruption during the course of the construction works;

- The Department accepted that the inland route used in the consultation exercise was of comparable cost with the combined option but less economic and that with further design development the difference may have been eroded. However cost and economic performance was only one criterion; the combined option was chosen after considering all criteria;
 - The Scheme would reduce the degree of severance caused by the existing road by providing improved footways and assisted pedestrian crossings readily close to all bus stops, particularly at Belfast High School and Neill's Lane;
 - It was reasonable to conclude that most of those who preferred the online option would find the combined option also acceptable. While the results of the public consultation informed the assessment process, all three options had been considered against the five Government criteria;
 - The impact of the inland route on schools and churches had been assessed as objectively as possible.
2. The following matters were educed during cross-examination of Mr Rowan and his witnesses:
- The objector would have been satisfied had S5-2-V4 been selected as the preferred option;
 - He had initiated his action to produce alternative ideas when the combined route had been announced as the preferred option; RPS Consulting Engineers had been briefed in July 2007;
 - The Variation would affect more properties than S5-2-V4;
 - He had not appreciated the significance of the traffic modelling and economic modelling and thus was unable to produce comparable calculations for the Variation;
 - Apart from discussions with the Diocesan Chancellor re St Colman's Church no discussions had taken place with other landowners or community interests regarding the Variation.
3. Regarding the secondary objection the Department stated that Mr Rowan had failed to take the opportunity to question the Department's witness, Mr Philpott, who was responsible for the Scheme design. The Department was confident that the inclusion of the sliver of Mr Rowan's land was deemed appropriate and necessary for the road design. It was stressed that the provision of a pedestrian/cycle way alongside his property would result in moving the traffic further away than at present.

Comment

1. In order to ensure an orderly and efficient running of an Inquiry it is essential that all evidence should be exchanged between parties well in advance. The proposal had been submitted during the course of the Inquiry and thus could have been ruled inadmissible. However in the interest of fairness and openness we exercised our discretion to permit its presentation.
2. Before examining the detail of the proposal we note that throughout the objector's statement of evidence and in his oral presentation he accused the Department of bias and lack of objectivity in determining the preferred option. We did not find any substance in these allegations. Firstly the project assessment was carried out by a reputable firm of consultants who identified and examined a number of strategies and options that might provide a solution to the traffic bottleneck on the A2. No reason for bias or lack of objectivity was advanced and we found none. Secondly the project assessment was carried out in accordance with the DMRB– standards applicable to major road schemes throughout the UK. No evidence of deviation from DMRB was adduced.
3. The objector was critical of the decision that only one of the options was fully evaluated and sought to have a full and objective evaluation of his proposal carried out. We are satisfied that the project assessment was carried out in accordance with the criteria set out in DMRB. After identifying 5 strategies, 14 options were assessed in order that a preferred option could be recommended for detailed engineering, environmental and economic evaluation. We accept as standard practice that such detailed investigations are restricted to a single preferred option.
4. It is important to emphasise that this Inquiry into the Department's proposal cannot be turned into an Inquiry into an alternative proposal. We therefore considered the merits of the Variation to determine as far as possible whether, as a further option within the Stage 2 procedure, it might have been selected as the preferred option. We have compared the Variation with both options S5-2-V4 and the combined option since (a) it was described as a variation of S5-2-V4 and (b) S5-2-V4 was accepted by the Department as the most likely of the inland routes to be deliverable.
5. It was generally accepted that none of the options was the perfect solution to the traffic problem. Undoubtedly the Variation contained some advantage over the Scheme as did option S5-2-V4 but all factors need to be considered in order to reach a conclusion. We report in particular on three of the major factors which influenced the selection of the preferred route.
6. The Variation clearly involves the demolition of a greater number of properties than arising from S5-2-V4 or the Scheme. The fact that some of them have already been acquired (under blight legislation) cannot be discounted in any comparison.

7. The Variation is stated to be identical to S5-2-V4 except for the section between Belfast High School and Shorelands. It therefore has the same adverse effect in relation to Silverstream Primary School playing fields, the Greenisland housing estate, St Colman's Church and Ebenezer Chapel.
8. We emphasise, as stated in paragraph 4, that we have looked at the Variation within the framework of a Stage 2 option comparison. In that context revision of costs to 2006 levels is inappropriate. The objector did not present his economic assessment on a like-for-like basis with the Stage 2 assessment thus obscuring a valid comparison with the appraisal of the other two options.
9. In schedule VI of his statement the objector gave details of reductions in property costs compared with S5-2- V4 but otherwise in schedule VI no details were provided to corroborate the remaining elements making up the total cost of his proposal. While the comparison arrived at showed a slight reduction in favour of his variation we were not provided with any estimate of Net Present Value or Cost Benefit Ratio. We accept that such calculations are essential tools in the appraisal procedure and are crucial in the determination of a preferred option. In requesting a full evaluation of his proposal the objector acknowledged the limitations of the evidence in support of the Variation and on a number of occasions suggested that it should be regarded as an idea sufficient to warrant detailed comparison with the other options. Since all interested parties had been made aware of the selection of the preferred option in June 2006 we consider that an alternative idea even in sketch form could have been raised at that time, allowing for proper consideration.
10. Importantly, the views of landowners and communities affected by the Variation – which were not canvassed by the objector – could have been ascertained. Since the proposal was presented late in the day potential objectors did not have a voice at the Inquiry.
11. We attribute some weight to the admission by the objector that had S5-2-V4 been selected as the preferred option he probably would have been satisfied and may not have submitted his proposal. We do not consider that the evidence in support of the Variation is sufficient to conclude that the Variation would have been selected as the preferred option compared with S5-2-V4 or the combined option.
12. With regard to the secondary objection, no evidence was presented that an alteration of the road line was feasible. The objector conceded that any alteration would impact on property opposite. We note that the owner of the property opposite had not been afforded an opportunity to comment.

Ob 68 Ms A Bataille, 10 Abbey Park, Whitehouse

The objector raised queries in relation to:-

- The immense destruction of trees;
- Widening the road goes against any improvement of air pollution and the carbon levels;
- A new system should be devised to discourage people from travelling one per car;
- More research was required to know the reasons for travelling by car;
- Why not reclaim land from the sea and have a cycle path along the shore!
- Why not leave trees between the proposed cycle path and the main road!

Ms Bataille submitted photographs of the existing Shore Road and referred in general to the adverse effect the road proposals would have on the character of the area, the safety and health of residents and people using the road and the loss of wildlife.

Departmental Response

- Not all trees are in healthy condition and $\frac{3}{4}$ are considered to have poor form. Department have stated elsewhere that they propose to plant over 800 trees.
- The planting of new trees will offset the loss of trees. The vegetation will mature in time and release carbon into the atmosphere.
- Improvements have already been made to the infrastructure of the Belfast Larne railway which should reduce the number of vehicles along the road. By improving facilities for pedestrians and cyclists, the Scheme is consistent with current policy to seek to reduce reliance on the car.
- The improvement proposals make better provision for bus services to operate and the new cycleway will act to encourage people not to use the car.
- The reclamation of land from the sea was considered. Following discussions with the Environment and Heritage Service, it was assessed that this option would have a significant adverse effect on Belfast Lough. The strategy was not taken further.
- It would not be appropriate to leave trees between the cycle path and the road because of interruptions of visibility and safety.

Comment

We consider that the Department's response to the issues raised is satisfactory.

Ob 54 Oth 31

**The University of Ulster
Represented by Ms S Lockwood and Mr W Morrison.**

The University's concerns and objections:

- The University's right to a vehicular access at Meadowbank Lane should be maintained;
- The use of and the access to Meadowbank Lane is compromised by the proposed access to the Belfast High School;
- The vesting of land to provide a bus lay-by. A bus lay-by exists further along the A2 on the same side;
- Seek assurance that it will be acceptable to have sight lines over the bus lay-by and that the positioning of street furniture will not prejudice the sight lines;
- Seek full flexibility in the siting of an entrance on our full frontage;

The witnesses in their oral evidence emphasised the objections made in writing and expressed concerns:

- University wish to retain the right for vehicular access to Meadowbank Lane;
- The Department's proposal for provision of a bus lay-by across the frontage of University land – the lay-by will blight future development of the site.

Departmental Response

- The Department are content with the wishes of the University to retain a right of vehicular access to Meadowbank Lane;
- The agreed arrangement will not prevent vehicular access to Meadowbank Lane – the entrance will be moved towards Carrickfergus; the gradient and accommodation works will be such as required for vehicular access;
- It is considered that an additional bus stop is warranted;
- It is considered that provision of a bus lay-by would not be to the detriment of the use of the existing access. There would be reduced points of conflict as the access would be restricted to left in and left out movements;
- It is considered that the lay-by would not cause sight lines from the access to be unacceptable subject to the proper positioning of street furniture;
- The bus lay-by would limit flexibility in placing of an access in the event of a different access being desired but this was a matter for future determination;
- The Department is willing to continue discussions with the University about the position of the lay-by.

Comment

We are satisfied with the Department's response and note that the Department is prepared to engage with the University to see if a satisfactory outcome can be delivered concerning the access.

5. UNSCHEDULED STATEMENTS

We note the unscheduled statements made by members of the public during the course of the Inquiry.

1. Mrs Dickinson, Shore Road

Mrs Dickinson complained about the lack of civility shown by the Civil Service team in dealing with some objectors.

2. Mr M Simpson (Carrick Times)

Mr Simpson requested a copy of the traffic statistics referred to in Dr Al Azzawi's evidence.

3. Mr R Cameron, Upper Greenisland Road

Mr Cameron referred to the protected route status of the existing Shore Road which presumably would apply to the widened section. He claimed that this would be a constraint to the opening up of Meadowbank Lane and also to any significant development of the University's boatyard site.

He stated that there was a danger that the by-passed section of Shore Road could lose its protected route status, leaving the way open for major development which could create problems accessing Station Road roundabout.

4. Mr P O'Connor, Shore Road

Mr O'Connor suggested that it would be cheaper in the long run to build a new road straight through from Carrickfergus, bridging Station Road over to Shore Road.

5. Mr P Donaldson, Shore Road

Mr Donaldson said he was not directly affected by any of the proposals discussed at the Inquiry. However he wished to support and thank Mr Rowan for speaking generally on his behalf and (he claimed) on behalf of his neighbours.

6. WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS

Ob 01 Mr Douglas D Smyth, 2 Oldstone Close

The following is a summary of the objection:

- The loss of opportunity to establish a safe, fast single commuter route from the Belfast side of Carrickfergus to Jordanstown Road;
- The break up of the local community;
- The cost to taxpayer of the preferred option;
- The higher road safety risks attached to the proposed route;
- The larger residential developments will result in increased traffic which will negate the investment benefit of the Scheme;
- Destruction of a part of the “current unified historic roads”.

Departmental Response

The Department’s detailed rebuttal evidence is set out in document A2 01, main features of which follow:

- After initial assessment, three options were taken forward. The option that performed best was the combined route with on-lane widening and an inland by-pass;
- It is considered that provision of the dual carriageway has improved pedestrian facilities and in that respect it will reduce any severance caused by the road;
- The chosen option was comparable with the lowest cost on-line option. The cost is only one criterion that was taken into account;
- Road safety has been a primary consideration in development of the preferred option. Wider footpaths and signal controlled crossings will improve safety for pedestrians;
- Traffic growth forecasts have been taken into account in the economic assessment;
- The Environmental Statement includes recommendations to mitigate the potential impact of the proposed Scheme. A qualified archaeologist will monitor all disturbance of ground.

Comment

We accept that the Scheme will result in the loss of property and displacement of residents but we are satisfied that the measures proposed will improve the safety of pedestrian and vehicle users.

We are content with the Department’s response.

Ob 02 Ob 44 Ob 72 Ob 73 The Planning Service

Ob 02 was a routine acknowledgement letter – not an objection.

Ob 44 was a routine covering letter- not an objection.

Ob 72

The alignment of the Scheme did not mirror that proposed in the BMAP. The assessment of the Scheme should address the impact with regard to relevant planning matters. Adverse impacts should be minimised and appropriate mitigation measures put in place.

Ob 73

The BMAP Team stated that the Scheme would affect a number of zonings and designations which had been taken into account in the Environmental Statement. The Team was satisfied that the proposed mitigation measures would minimise the adverse effects of the Scheme.

Departmental Response

The comments had been noted

Ob 03 Rivers Agency

This was a routine acknowledgement letter – not an objection.

Ob 04 Ob 11 Ob 19 Environment and Heritage Service

1 Natural Heritage

- No nature conservation objections to the proposal providing mitigation measures detailed in the Environmental Statement are adopted and adhered to;
- In the event any evidence of protected species activity is discovered during site construction, all work must close immediately and further advice must be sought in order to satisfy the Wildlife (NI) Order 1985.

Departmental Response

- The ecological and conservation measures detailed in the Environmental Statement will be implemented;

- An ecological Clerk of the Works will be present during the Works to ensure that mitigation measures specified in the Environmental Statement are adhered to.

2 Land and Resource Management

The comments made in the correspondence were:

- If contamination is found to be present a suitable level of risk assessment needs to be taken to protect identified receptors within a conceptual model for the development;
- Environment and Heritage Service would welcome the opportunity to further comment if assessment and/or remedial measures may need to be considered.

Departmental Response

- The statutory requirements will be met if ground investigation identifies areas of contaminated land. Environment and Heritage Service will be added as a consultee within the contract documents for the project;
- Environment and Heritage Service will have the opportunity to comment on any further site investigation and if the project is to be procured as Design and Build, they will be a consultee within the contract documents.

3 The Built Heritage

Advance archaeological testing and excavation has been recommended in order to minimise potential disruption at a later stage. A detailed programme of archaeological works will have to be agreed in advance of these works;

Design details for the new public and vehicular access arrangements at Castle Lug remain to be finalised.

Departmental Response

- The scope of advance work is currently being considered. A detailed Programme of Archaeological Works will be prepared for consideration and agreement with the Service;
- The proposed mitigation outlined in the Environmental Statement will be implemented;
- The Department will consult with the Senior Inspector with regard to design details for new public and vehicular access arrangements and acquisition of lands.

Comment

We are satisfied with the Department's responses

Ob 5 Oth 21

L & M McAteer, 76 Shore Road

The objection related to:

- The loss of part of their garden and driveway;
- The need to culvert all rather than part only of the stream running alongside their driveway;
- The need for triple glazing to offset increases in noise levels;
- The increase in traffic pollution.

Departmental Response

The Department acknowledged that there would be a significant loss of land across the front of their property. The Scheme was determined after public consultation and was designed to minimise the inevitable loss of residential housing and gardens but in a scheme of this nature some loss of land is unavoidable.

For the purpose of the Scheme there was no need to culvert the whole of the stream. It was expected that with the provision of low noise road surfacing the property should experience a small decrease in noise levels compared with existing levels.

Air quality standards would comply with accepted UK standards. Moreover it was forecast that on completion of the Scheme there should be a reduction in pollutant concentrations at the property.

Comment

The loss of land is an unfortunate consequence of the Scheme which is necessary in the wider public interest. We are content with the Department's response.

Ob 07

Mr N Bentham, 7 Schooner Court

The following is a summary of objection:

- The route shows it is necessary to enter land belonging to apartments at Schooner Court.
- Why can the layout of the road not be routed along the edge of vested land on the seaward side of the road?

Departmental Response

The Department's detailed rebuttal evidence is set out in document A2 07, main features of which follow:

- The proposed Scheme cuts into the communal garden at Langley Hall beyond the protection line because the required width for the proposed road has changed from that considered necessary when the protection line was established;
- The proposal required a triangular area over a frontage of approximately 33m by 5m at its widest part. This could be reduced to approximately 11m by 1.25m at the northernmost edge of the gardens;
- The improved road line cannot wholly avoid Langley Hall grounds without adversely affecting the ease of construction;
- Re-alignment would present access difficulties to properties on the shore side due to the slope of the land.

Comment

We accept that by reducing the proposed land take the loss of amenity land is significantly reduced. We comment further in paragraphs 7 and 8.

Ob 08 C Allan, 2 Joymount, Carrickfergus

Mr Allan wrote in full support for the Scheme.

Departmental Response

The Department expressed thanks for the support.

Ob 9 Ob 39 Newtownabbey Borough Council

Ob 9 The Council had no objection to the vesting of its land included in plot 78 of the vesting order schedule.

Ob 39 The Council's Planning and Consultation Committee welcomed the Scheme for the road improvement.

Departmental Response

The Department expressed thanks for the comments and expression of support.

Ob 10 Oth 19 C G de Fleury, 6 Bradford Gardens, Carrickfergus

The objection was that the proposed scheme shows roundabouts at the University, Station Road and Seapark junctions. This design is unsafe and should be reconsidered.

Departmental Response

Signalised roundabouts can be provided in a smaller area of land than conventional.

The left in and left out movement will increase safety as will the incorporation of pedestrian crossing facilities.

Signals are also located on the exit carriageways – these will only be in use when called upon by pedestrians. This is considered to be safe and beneficial – pedestrian activity will be low at most times.

Comment

We agree with the Department's response.

Ob 12 Rosemary Kerr, 194 Shore Road

The summary of Ms Kerr's concern and queries:

- Hope that there will be no walls erected in any part of the improvement. These increase vehicle noise;
- Current vehicle traffic speed on A2 Shore Road;
- Problem of pedestrians crossing road in safety.

Departmental Response

The Department's response is set out in document A2 12, salient features of which follow:

- No walls of any significant height are proposed and it is unlikely that noise levels will be increased. Where any significant impact will occur which affects noise levels, mitigation measures are proposed;
- Does not relate to the proposed Scheme – this matter was therefore referred to the Traffic Section of Roads Service;
- Does not relate to the proposed Scheme – this matter was therefore referred to the Traffic Section of Roads Service.

Comment:

We accept that the Department's response is satisfactory.

Ob 13 Ruth and Sam Snodden, 2 Kingsland Crescent, Carrickfergus

, The objectors' comments and concerns were:

- We are looking forward to the proposed improvements being completed;
- Concerned about the interim congestion management and the traffic problems during the two years of construction;
- Public transport is poor and leads to increased traffic on the A2 – Department should discuss with Translink;
- Buses crossing the dual carriageway at the Station Road junction.

Departmental Response

The Department's detailed comments are set out in document A2 13.

- The Department wishes to express thanks for the comments and support;
- The Department is developing measures to help minimise the disruption during construction;
- The Roads Service are seeking discussions with Translink to identify measures to encourage increased use of public transport;
- Northbound buses will make a right turn movement from the new dual carriageway north of Station Road on to the by-passed section of Shore Road. In the remainder of the Scheme, right turn movements in and out of minor roads accesses and driveways will be eliminated.
However the buses are highly visible, have excellent forward visibility of approaching vehicles, are few in number and other motorists would be expected to assist buses crossing any queues.

Comment

We accept the Department's response. We agree that the bus-crossing arrangement while not ideal is feasible.

Ob 14 RSPB Northern Ireland represented by Ms Claire Ferry,

RSPB supported the Scheme but requested that:

- the mitigation measures be included as a condition of development.
- that the ecological Clerk of Works undertakes a survey to ensure that breeding birds will not be affected.

Departmental Response

- The mitigation measures detailed in the ES will be included as conditions of development within the Employers Requirements for the contract;
- To avoid impacts upon breeding basic species, mitigation measures will be taken in accordance with the DMRB.

Comment

We accept the Department's response.

Ob 16 D E. Taylor, 74 Shore Road

Objection Summary

- Noise of the traffic will be greater and hinder the environment.

Departmental Response

- The potential impact of transportation noise on properties has been calculated with reference to current UK standards, the Calculation of Road Traffic Noise (DOT 1990).
- Mitigation measures have been recommended in the Environmental Statement to reduce the impact under the target level.
- As low noise road resurfacing is being proposed, the property is predicted to experience a minor decrease in noise levels from those existing.

Comment

We are satisfied with the Department's response.

Ob 18 Ob 37 Oth 8 Police Service for Northern Ireland

The original objection related to the area of land proposed for vesting. Agreement had been reached and the objection was withdrawn prior to the Inquiry

Ob 21 Mr Stephen Stringer, 17 Shore Road

The grounds for the objections were:

- The correct decision has not been reached between the options that were considered. The combined option will present great difficulties during construction and at best only double the capacity of the road;
- The proposed development will destroy the townscape character;
- The decision making process was not transparent and did not describe how the various factors were weighted but could have been affected by political, social or religious factors.

Departmental Response

The Department's detailed rebuttal is contained in document A2 20, the summarised comments were:

- The Department reviewed the options available to improve the A2 and the option that performed best was the on-line widening with an inbound by-pass;
- The Environmental Statement included mitigation measures relating directly to construction impacts;
- The Scheme will be adequate to cater for predicted traffic flows;
- Mitigation measures will be taken to minimise the effect on Townscape Character;
- The Scheme's assessment and appraisal were carried out in accordance with Government guidance;
- The Scheme proposed has been developed in response to the need to address the bottleneck at Greenisland;
- No political or religious groups have attempted to influence the assessment process. Local residents groups have expressed their views. All responses were considered.

Comment

We are content with the Department's reply..

**Ob 24 Mr and Mrs G Sinclair, 1a Station Road
 Represented by J A McClelland and Sons (Aucts) Ltd**

The grounds for objecting to the Vesting Order were:

- No written details of accommodation works etc have been provided for consideration.

Departmental Response

- Accommodation works drawings were forwarded to Mr and Mrs Sinclair on 13 February 2007. Discussions with landowners and their agents are ongoing.
- Road Service will seek to agree the detailed accommodation works proposals as part of the Scheme development process.

Comment

We are satisfied with the Department's response.

Ob 25 Mrs M C Barr, 110 Shore Road Represented by J A McClelland and Sons (Aucts) Ltd

The grounds for objections to the Vesting Order were:

- No written details of accommodation works etc have been provided for consideration.

Departmental Response

- Accommodation works drawings were forwarded to the landowner Mrs M C Barr on 15 January 2007. Discussions with landowners and their agents are ongoing.
- Roads Service will seek to agree the detailed accommodation works proposals as part of the Scheme development process.

Comment

We are satisfied with the Department's response.

Ob 26 Mr and Mrs H P Donnelly, 1 Station Road Represented by J A McClelland and Sons (Aucts) Ltd

The grounds for objections to the Vesting Order were:

- No written details of accommodation works etc have been provided for consideration.

Departmental Response

- Accommodation works drawings were forwarded to Mr and Mrs Donnelly on 13 February 2007.

- Roads Service will seek to agree the detailed accommodation works proposals with the landowner and their representatives as part of the Scheme development process.

Comment

We are satisfied with the Department's response.

Ob 27 Mr A McAlister, 26 Whinfield Lane Represented by J A McClelland and Sons (Aucts) Ltd

The grounds for objection were:

- No written details of accommodation works etc have been provided for consideration.

Departmental Response

- Accommodation works drawings were forwarded to Mr McAlister on 3 March 2007 following discussions.
- A3 drawing extracts from the EIA were forwarded to Mr McAlister in June 07.
- Roads Service will seek to agree the detailed accommodation works proposals with the landowner and the representatives as part of the Scheme development process.

Comment

We are satisfied with the Department's response.

Ob 28 Northern Ireland Electricity PLC

The grounds for objection were:

- The Northern Ireland Electricity equipment is situated within the location. They were prepared to withdraw their objection in the event that:
 - NIE's rights to retain and access their equipment is preserved;
 - Any expense incurred in relocating the equipment would be reimbursed.

Departmental Response

- Roads Service have no plans to restrict or inhibit access to any NIE plant or equipment;
- Roads Service are currently discussing with NIE's technical personnel and it is expected that this process will meet the requirements as set out in the correspondence received

- Should any NIE plant require to be relocated, the Department would invoke the procedures and codes of practice set out in the Street Works (NI) Order 1995.

Comment

We accept the Department's response.

Ob 29 Phoenix Natural Gas

Phoenix Gas commented on the correspondence:

- Wish to draw attention to the pipeline supplying gas to large portions of the system. Critical that they should be informed at least one week prior to commencement of work.

Departmental Response

- The Department is currently discussing details of the Scheme and it is expected that this process will fulfil Phoenix requirements.
- Should any gas infrastructure require to be re-located as a result of the proposed Scheme, then the Department would invoke the procedures and codes of practice set out in the Street Works (NI) Order 1995.

Comment

We are satisfied that the Department has dealt satisfactorily with the Phoenix concerns.

Ob 30 Miss G M Boyd, 4 Station Road

The summary of Miss Boyd's concern is:

- Car access to my home is dangerous because of the volume and speed of the traffic at the Station Road junction.
- In the proposed plan for Station/Shore Road, no allowance has been made to alleviate these difficulties.

Departmental Response

- A signalised roundabout is proposed which will be a fundamental improvement of the existing traffic signal junction at Station Road.
- It is considered that the proposed junction arrangement is an optimum design.
- Road widening work further along Station Road would involve acquisition of garden areas from a number of properties and it is considered that this is unwarranted.

Comment

We accept that the Department's proposals for improving the junction are of optimum design.

Ob 31 Oth 6 Pamela Webber, 11 Bates Park, Greenisland

The following is a summary of the objections:

- There has been no contact with some of those directly affected by the Scheme;
- widening will necessitate using some of the car parking space which is in front of the apartments;
- Small delays are a small sacrifice to make to avoid the cost, disruption and loss to individuals homes;
- Cause of delay is the number of drivers stopping at the side of the road to let children out opposite Belfast High School;
- People choose to live further out if road provision is improved;
- Mature trees would have to be felled;
- The felling of trees would have noise implication for the flats;
- The Department should have considered providing a car ferry.

Departmental Response

The Department's detailed responses are included in documents A2 30 and R OTH 6.

The major responses are summarised below:

- The Department has made significant effort to advise people. Leaflets were distributed advertising the public exhibition and events that have been held;
- The Scheme will not require loss of parking space;
- The majority of benefits arose from time surveys by those using the road and the assessment process has weighed this against the disruption to affected landowners;
- Provision of a second lane will help to ease the situation concerning drivers stopping to drop off and collect children;
- development growth is a matter for the planning process – there is no justification to retain an inadequate road infrastructure;
- Trees and shrubs will be replaced where possible;
- Trees offer little way of acoustic screening, therefore the removal of a single line of trees should not affect the traffic noise;

- A car ferry service was not considered.

Comment

We are satisfied with the Department's response. No evidence was presented to us as to the viability or otherwise of a car ferry service.

Ob 32 Mr J and Mrs H Carvell, 18d Shore Road

The following is a summary of the concerns:

- that the proposed entry to the lane between 18 and 20 Shore Road will only be widened part of the way up;
- An island as proposed at the bottom of the lane. Will oil tankers be able to make this entry without hitting the island?

Departmental Response

- The Department accept that it would be prudent to extend the works to the edge of the houses 18-18a as requested. The Department is content for this to be done as accommodation works;
- The proposed access will be a significant improvement on the existing access especially for larger vehicles.

Comment

We are satisfied with Department's assurance.

Ob 33 Oth 7 Mr Joseph Gibson, 8 Station Road

The following is a summary of the concerns:

- Lives will be blighted when a new slip road will be built. Work will be carried out directly outside front door;
- Concerned about compensation for disturbance;
- Difficult at the present time to exit or access property – faster traffic will compromise safety.

Departmental Response

The Department's detailed responses are included in documents A2 32 and R Oth 7.

The major points are summarised below:

- The Environmental Statement includes details of mitigation relating directly to construction impacts. Work opposite the property would be undertaken within a relatively short period of the whole works contract;
- Property owners in the vicinity who are not losing land are not eligible for disturbance compensation;
- It would not be possible to provide any specific improvement of the situation at the property without extending the road widening further along Station Road. This could not be done unless gardens from a number of properties were acquired.

Comment

- We are content with the Department's response and note that there seems to be sufficient open space around Mr Gibson's dwelling to permit him to construct a turning facility.

Ob 35 Prof and Mrs K Farahmand, 37a Shore Road

The following is a summary of the objections and concerns:

- The majority of the people concerned locally do not accept that the chosen route is the best route. Only 16% of questionnaire respondents considered the combined option the best;
- Half of the respondents perceive the reasonable options have not been fully examined;
- This stretch of the Shore Road is unique regarding unbroken sea views, view of natural beauty and direct access to the shore line;
- The proportion of heavy goods vehicles would give further reason to take the route inland. The inland option despite cutting through residential Greenisland would allow more open ground for a greater part of length;
- The improvement Scheme will increase the speed and flow of traffic and not create a link with any larger traffic network plan;
- The inland option has not been fully examined.

Departmental Response

The Department's detailed responses are included in documents A2 34.

The major responses are summarised below:

- All three options put out to public consultation were considered against the five government criteria and after public consultation, it was considered that the preferred option should be the combined route;

- Full and proper environmental assessment of all options was taken into consideration;
- The proposed Scheme will not introduce changes in access to the shoreline or views towards the sea. Views towards Knockagh escarpment will be affected but mitigation measures are proposed;
- The proportion of HGV's is approximately 4% which is relatively low for a strategic route. The inland option, while taking the route through more open ground than the combined option, would cross land including church grounds, school playing fields and areas zoned for housing;
- The Scheme will provide major safety improvements;
- The cost is only one criteria and the combined option was chosen after considering all criteria.

Comment

We accept that the combined option was chosen after considering all relevant criteria following public consultation.

Ob 36 Oth 28 Mr and Mrs Denis Anderson, 42 Shore Road

The main objections are:

- The road widening will remove most of the front and rear garden, 6/7 mature trees will be felled and the results of the Scheme will make vehicular access and parking impossible;
- Access to the garage will not be possible;
- Loss of privacy, amenity and quality of environment;
- Bad decision making, entrenched thinking and poor planning;
- Stability of house and services could be affected;
- No parking provision for visitors and delivery men.

Departmental Response

The Department's detailed responses are included in documents A2 35 and R Oth 28.

The salient features are summarised below:

- It is acknowledged that the proposed Scheme will result in a significant loss of land of properties fronting the Shore Road;
- Mitigation measures have been proposed. Liaison with the owner is ongoing to reach an agreed solution concerning access to the garage. Accommodation works proposed facilitate access for cars via a new rear access;

- There will be an overall improvement to the quality of the environment for non vehicular users in that the Scheme will provide, less traffic congestion, wider foot paths, signal controlled crossings and a central reserve will make crossing the road safer;
- The Scheme proposed has been prepared in accordance with standard Government guidance set out in DMRB and has been developed as a response to a need to address the bottleneck at Greenisland;
- The stability of the house will be taken into consideration in the design and construction of the works;
- Visitors and delivery men will be able to use the new rear access.

Comment

We are satisfied with the Department’s proposals and note that discussions with Mr Anderson will continue to try to reach a solution concerning access to the garage

Ob 38 Mrs Mary and Mr Alan Campbell, 57 Shore Road

The comment and objection were:

- Requested if possible that for safety reasons, preference is to exit onto the ‘old’ Shore Road but latest plans show exit onto a three lane road;
- Object to a bus stop located beside owners’ property. Would it not be possible to relocate the bus stop a little towards Carrickfergus?

Departmental Response

- The Department is content that the private access can be transferred to the by-passed section of Shore Road;
- It would be beneficial to separate the bus stop area from the adjacent shared footway/cycleway. The Department is therefore content to move the bus lay-by approximately 30m northwards.

Comment:

We are satisfied with the Department’s revised proposals.

Ob 41 John Martin, 15 Shore Road

The objector stated:

- The Scheme was less safe than the inland option,;
- There was no provision for bus lay-bys;

- The inland option would permit traffic flow to be maintained during construction;
- The inland option would result in two roads to serve all traffic.

Departmental Response

The Department's rebuttal was detailed in document A2 40:

- The inland route would be a safe option. However the preferred route would be no less safe and in developing the Scheme, road safety had been a primary consideration eg right turning movements, wider footways providing improved visibility to and from driveways and side roads and a safer environment for pedestrians and cyclists, signalised pedestrian crossings. On the other hand an inland route might encourage pedestrians to cross other than at assisted locations.
- It was agreed that the inland route would be easier to construct than the Scheme. However traffic management during construction would be of main concern and measures were being developed to minimise the inevitable disruption. Translink would be consulted to identify special public transport measures during the construction period;
- It was accepted that the Scheme would not provide the opportunity presented by the inland option to segregate through traffic from local traffic. However the objective of the Scheme was to remove the bottleneck.
- The Department stated that bus lay-bys would be provided wherever possible but in some cases could not be built without unjustifiable acquisition of residential property.

Comment

We are satisfied with the detail of the Department's response but see our comments in paragraph 7.

Ob 42 Sharon Martin, 15, Shore Road

The objection stated that:

- The townscape character of Shore Road would be seriously damaged;
- More houses would be affected by the Scheme than by the inland option.

Departmental Response

The response in document A2 41 stated:

- The Scheme included mitigation measures that recognised the townscape value of Shore Road including replacement of all boundaries with stone walls or hedges to provide continuity of design with the existing urban fabric. The Scheme also

provided for soft landscaping treatment including replacement of trees and hedges;

- It was accepted that the number of houses affected by the Scheme would be more than in the inland option, although fewer houses would be demolished. The number of houses indirectly affected (noise, etc) would be less than in the inland option.

Comment

We are satisfied with the Department's response.

Ob 46	Mrs I Patrick	}	43, Shore Road
Ob 47	Dr R A Patrick		

Dr Patrick did not offer oral evidence in support of the objections but chose to speak in support of the case presented by Mr Rowan

The grounds of the objections were:

- the character of the road would be destroyed, particularly with the loss of the mature trees;
- proposals to build apartment blocks on this section of the road would increase traffic volumes, as would continuing development in the general area;
- the traffic arrangements would increase the safety risk for residents accessing the new road;
- off road parking should be provided at the High School;
- the Scheme would simply move the traffic more quickly to other bottlenecks;
- better signal phasing would improve the traffic flow at Greenisland Station Road junction;
- it was questionable that the gains of the Scheme would outweigh the impacts;
- the Scheme was a political compromise which would increase property on the Carrickfergus side of Shore Road at the expense of those on the Belfast side;
- road construction would cause disruption;
- the inland route would address many of the concerns listed and would offer a number of advantages.

Departmental Response

The Department stated:

- the Scheme included mitigating measures that recognised the townscape character of Shore Road and which included the provision of replacement stone walls, trees and hedges and other soft landscape treatment;
- the Scheme was considered to be a viable solution to the traffic problems at Greenisland and allowed for traffic growth unhindered by the current constraints;
- the Scheme was a safe solution, providing major safety improvements. Driveways would be improved in layout and available visibility;
- the provision of a second lane should help ease the situation caused by dropping off and collecting children at the High School;
- the purpose of the Scheme was to remove the bottleneck at Greenisland – not to address the overall capacity of the A2 into Belfast;
- improving the signal phasing at Greenisland Station Road would not accommodated traffic flows at peak periods. The capacity of the junction is limited by its layout;
- the Scheme has been developed through various stages in order to determine the preferred option. The economic assessment showed that it had positive financial benefits and provided good value;
- the decision making process was set out clearly in the Scheme Assessment reports. Residents groups from Shore Road and the inland area of Greenisland had expressed their views and all responses taken into account;
- traffic management during construction would be of major concern and mitigating measures would be developed to minimise the inevitable disruption to road users. Measures to encourage greater use of public transport would be explored;
- an inland route would offer a number of advantages, particularly in relation to ease of construction but would cause substantial severance in the area of Station Road Greenisland. The impact on schools and churches had to be based on current commitments.

Comment

We are satisfied with the generality of the Department's response. We comment in paragraph 7 on matters affecting the rationale of the Scheme.

Ob 48 Oth 45 Linda & Paul Donaldson, 765 Shore Road

The objection is summarised as follows:

- Even with increasing lanes from 2 to 4, the introduction of roundabouts with traffic controls is unlikely to decrease journey times or driver stress;

- As BMTP proposed a quality bus corridor between Carrickfergus and Belfast it is likely that one lane would become a bus lane thus reducing the capacity of the road to a single lane in each direction;
- The major disruption due to construction would result in no benefit;
- Noise and vibration levels would increase due to the number of stops at traffic lights and to increased traffic;
- The Scheme does not address two major problems (a) dropping off children at Belfast High School and (b) traffic entering Shore Road from Station Road Greenisland;
- The Department had stated that land would be acquired on the landward side whereas vesting applied also to the shore side;
- Residents on the shore side would be isolated by the new road resulting in a loss of sense of community;
- Safety hazards would affect residents (accessing the road) and cyclists;
- The character of the road would be destroyed;
- The Scheme has no spare capacity to cater for the planned expansion of Greenisland and Carrickfergus.

Departmental Response

The Department's response is detailed in document A2 47 summarised as follows:

- The purpose of the Scheme was not to permit uninterrupted traffic flow but to reduce the bottleneck caused by the current reduction from two lanes to one in each direction. Junctions and controlled crossings are essential in an urban road system;
- By improving traffic flows, bus journey times would benefit thus enhancing reliability and encouraging greater use;
- It was accepted that disruption would occur during the construction period. Traffic management at that time would be of major concern and various mitigation measures would be planned to minimise the problem. The Scheme would result in improved journey times and reduction in driver stress;
- An air quality assessment was carried out – detailed in Chapter 14 of the ES. Forecast concentrations would not be in breach of current UK standards. It was expected that there would be a reduction in pollutant concentrations over current levels;
- Should noise levels exceed accepted standards, appropriate mitigation measures would be put in place. Vibration levels from traffic are low and unlikely to impact on nearby buildings;
- The provision of a second lane would permit traffic to pass vehicles dropping off children at Belfast High School. The improvement of the Greenisland Station Road junction should accommodate more traffic than at present;
- By encroaching on gardens on both sides of the road at this location it was possible to avoid demolition of houses;
- Integration of Shore Road residences should be enhanced by proposed improvements to footways and facilities for pedestrian crossings;

- The Scheme would provide major safety improvements by improving layout and visibility at driveways, footways and cycleways;
- The Scheme included mitigation measures that recognised the townscape value of Shore Road including replacement of all boundaries with stone walls or hedges to provide continuity of design with the existing urban fabric. The Scheme also provided for soft landscaping treatment including replacement of trees and hedges;
- Future traffic flows were based on NRTF growth factors. While aware of areas proposed in the BMAP for housing no allowance had been made for resultant traffic growth in the absence of committed development proposals. The Scheme would be adequate for currently permitted developments.

Comment

We are satisfied generally with the Department's response on matters of detail. We comment in paragraph 7 on the following issues:

- The possible future provision of a bus lane;
- Traffic problems caused by dropping off children at Belfast High School;
- Possible effect of proposed housing development in Greenisland and Carrickfergus.

Ob 49 A MacFadyen & D Rooney, 12 Shore Road

The following is a summary of the objection to the vesting of their home:

- BMAP identified potential increases in housing and industrial/commercial development in the Carrickfergus area all of which would attract heavier and more intensive traffic on the Shore Road leading to intensification of noise, fumes, smell, dust and vibration;
- the townscape character of the local area would be destroyed;
- safety issues could arise in relation to cyclists, pedestrians and access from dwellings;
- the Scheme would lead to Shore Road community isolation;
- the cost of the Scheme did not fully reflect the compensation issues.

Departmental Response

The detailed response is set out in document A2 48. Salient points are:

- the Scheme was determined after detailed examination of a range of options and following public consultation. It was considered that widening on the landward side from Shore Avenue to Shorelands junction offered the optimum solution;
- it was forecast that there would be a slight decrease in noise levels and pollutant concentrations on completion of the Scheme. Extensive research has shown that

- vibration levels from traffic are low and that traffic induced vibration would not cause any significant damage to buildings;
- the Scheme included mitigating measures that recognised the townscape character of Shore Road and which included the provision of replacement stone walls, trees and hedges and other soft landscape treatment;
 - the Scheme was a safe solution, providing major safety improvements. Driveways would be improved in layout and available visibility. The Scheme would provide a much safer environment for pedestrians and cyclists with wider footways and shared footway/cycleway on the shore side;
 - the Scheme would enhance the current facilities for residents on the shore side accessing the inland side. In addition to the improved footways. Assisted pedestrian crossings would be provided at the main junctions and reasonably close to bus stops;
 - the cost of compensation was only one criterion. The scheme was chosen after considering all relevant criteria.

Objectors' reply to the Department's response

Before the end of the Inquiry we received a further letter from the objectors in response to the Department's rebuttal (A2 47). They disputed a number of the Department's conclusions and in particular stated:

- the introduction of traffic controlled roundabouts (4) and (2) pedestrian crossings would introduce more bottlenecks and was unlikely to reduce journey times and driver stress;
- the possibility of a bus corridor should have been taken into account in the traffic modelling;
- the proposed roundabouts and pedestrian crossings would result in increased levels of emissions;
- the potential housing and industrial development outlined in BMAP should have been taken into account in the traffic modelling and in the context of the three main options.

Comment

In line with comments on other objections we are satisfied with the generality of the Department's response. We comment in paragraph 7 on those issues pertinent to the rationale of the Scheme.

The following matters arose during his questioning of witnesses:

- Referring to the NRTF growth factors determined by the Department, he queried why figures representing 60% of low growth factor and 40% of high growth factor were used. Should traffic demand exceed design forecasts there would be no scope for future road improvement. Estimates on the basis of worst case scenario would therefore favour an inland route;
- Referring to paragraph 3.19 of document A2 29 he asked why no account had been taken of the areas proposed for housing within BMAP and whether account had been taken of the trend to redevelop large single dwellings on the A2 for multiple use;
- He suggested that the current bottleneck arose at two choke points both traffic light controlled and queried the effectiveness of the Scheme in view of the additional number of traffic signals which would have to be provided on-line;
- He asked whether traffic noise would increase because of starting and stopping at traffic controls.

Departmental Response

In response to the written objection the Department replied (document A2 52):

- The inland route would be a safe option. However the preferred route would be no less safe and in developing the Scheme, road safety had been a primary consideration eg preventing right turning movements, wider footways providing improved visibility to and from driveways and side roads and a safer environment for pedestrians and cyclists, signalised pedestrian crossings. On the other hand an inland route through Greenisland might encourage pedestrians to cross other than at assisted locations;
- The Scheme included mitigation measures that recognised the townscape value of Shore Road including replacement of all boundaries with stone walls or hedges to provide continuity of design with the existing urban fabric. The Scheme also provided for soft landscaping treatment including replacement of trees and hedges;
- It was accepted that the number of houses affected by the Scheme would be more than in the inland option, although fewer houses would be demolished. The number of houses indirectly affected (noise, etc) would be less than in the inland option;
- It was accepted that the Scheme would not provide the opportunity presented by the inland option to segregate through traffic from local traffic. However the objective of the Scheme was to remove the bottleneck;
- It was also accepted that the Online section of the Scheme offered no opportunity for further development to meet future needs but the same would apply to the inland section unless additional land were acquired;
- It was agreed that the inland route would be easier to construct than the Scheme. However traffic management during construction would be of main concern and measures were being developed to minimise the inevitable disruption. Translink

would be consulted to identify special public transport measures during the construction period;

- The Department made considerable efforts to advise the public of the proposals – public exhibitions, public and private meetings, press advertisements, web site, availability of documents for inspection.

Arising from cross-examination the Department stated:

- Traffic forecasting was carried out in accordance with standard government procedures which enabled competing projects to be compared on a like for like basis. Higher growth forecasts would have exaggerated the benefits arising from the Scheme and would have enhanced the economic case;
- Planners had been consulted on housing development in the area but the Scheme had to be based on committed development. When future planning applications are being considered road engineers would assess the capability of the road to accept relevant increases in traffic;
- The bottleneck was not caused by the existing traffic lights but was due to the carriageway capacity, sightlines, lack of overtaking opportunity, etc. The physical changes to the various junctions together with improved traffic controls would undoubtedly improve traffic flows.

Comment

We are satisfied generally with the Department's response to the specific matters raised.

We realise that there is no one perfect solution to removing the traffic bottleneck. While it may be ideal to have two roads at this location which would separate local from through traffic, we accept that that was not the purpose of the Scheme; other considerations had to be taken into account. We comment in paragraph 7 on some fundamental issues which may affect the basis of the Scheme.

Ob 55 Department of Agriculture & Rural Development

DARD raised no objection to the Scheme.

Ob 56 Mary Stevenson, 35 Shore Road

The objection related to the following:

- A clearly argued case had not been presented for the Scheme;
- The combined route would not be as safe as the inland route;
- The townscape value of Shore Road would be destroyed;
- Construction of the Scheme would cause considerable disruption – especially from noise and dirt.

Departmental Response

The Department's detailed response is set out in document A2 55.

- The decision making process was set out as clearly as possible in Stage 1 and Stage 2 SAR. The final comparison of options was shown in Tables 9.2 to 9.4 of Stage 2 SAR. Three feasible options were taken forward to public consultation in March 2006. Results of the public consultation were considered in conjunction with the government's criteria of safety, economics, environment, accessibility and integration.
- The Department's response on matters re safety, townscape value and construction disruption is similar to those recorded earlier in this report.
- Although construction of the Scheme would include requirements and restraints to minimise the impacts of the works, some adverse effects would be unavoidable. The ES includes details of mitigation measures relating directly to construction impacts.

Comment

We have commented elsewhere on similar objections.

We would add that we would expect the contractor to initiate appropriate liaison arrangements with locals and organisations throughout the period of the contract.

Ob 22 Ob 57 W & E McFadden, 36 Shore Road

The objectors stated that:

- The loss of land would seriously affect their use and enjoyment of their home;
- There was no provision for an alternative entrance to their buildings;
- There would be considerable increased traffic noise with the road being closer to their house and also there would obviously be substantially increased traffic flow;
- The proposed road works would result in a considerable deterioration in the general environment of the district both on a temporary and permanent basis;
- Their Bed and Breakfast business would be seriously affected at the time of the construction of the new road and by the overall long term effect as they believe that they would not receive the benefit of passing trade which they presently enjoy.
- They would no longer have access to enable them to store their boat.

Departmental Response

- The response re noise and environmental deterioration has been recorded earlier in this report;

- It was accepted that the Scheme would result in significant loss of land across the front of the property. This was an inevitable consequence of the need to resolve the traffic bottleneck problem in the best possible way;
- Accommodation works had been discussed with the objector which would permit access for vehicles/trailers;
- With regard to loss of business, access to the property would be maintained during construction and traffic management arrangements would be developed to minimise disruption to road users. As stated above permanent access would be provided under the Scheme.

Comment

We note that the question of access has been resolved. Matters re compensation are not relevant to this Inquiry.

Ob 58 Mrs E Robinson, 38 Shore Road

The objector stated that:

- The loss of land would seriously affect her use and enjoyment of her home;
- There was no provision for an alternative entrance to her buildings;
- There would be considerably increased traffic noise with the road being closer to her house and also there would obviously be substantially increased traffic flow;
- The proposed road works would result in a considerable deterioration in the general environment of the district both on a temporary and permanent basis.

Departmental Response

- The objector has agreed with the Department's proposal to provide access to the rear of her property via Shorelands;
- The response to the issues relating to noise, etc has been recorded above.

Comment

We have no further comments

Ob 59 Oth 29 Belfast High School, 740 Shore Road

The objection was subject to satisfactory conclusions to discussions with the Department on the following matters:

- The reinstatement of the school's bus park area and associated driveways;
- The provision of landscaping and retaining walls where required;
- The provision of a pedestrian crossing, controlled by traffic lights, on the Shore Road – the exact location to be agreed;
- Lack of provision on the shore side of the road for parents dropping-off children.

Departmental Response

Proposals on the first 3 issues have been discussed with the school and agreement has now been reached. It was not intended to provide a lay-by opposite the school. The provision of a second lane in each direction should help ease the situation at peak periods

Consideration

We note that most of these matters have been resolved. We comment in paragraph 7 on the latter issue.

Ob 62 Mr & Mrs Topping, 26 Shore Road

The objection related to:

- The possible return of any surplus land;
- The type of boundary;
- Access to the property;
- A restrictive covenant in the title;
- Sewerage services to the property.

Departmental Response

As the property had been acquired under blight legislation, it was now in the ownership of the Department. Matters re boundary, access and sewerage become the concern of the Department as owners. Any surplus property acquired under blight need not be offered back to the former owner.

Comment

We have no comments.

Ob 64	A & K McCamley	} Tenants of farm at 160 Shore Road
Ob 65	Denis Boyd	

The objections referred to:

- Disruption to community and individuals;
- Disruption of farming activities due to the loss of land and the difficulty in working the remaining smaller, irregular shaped fields;
- Location of the overpass – an underpass would be preferable;
- The height of the road would reduce light to dwellings on Whinfield Lane;
- Increased use of Whinfield Lane would exacerbate the problem of exiting to Shore Road.

Departmental Response

The response is detailed in documents A2 63 and A2 64. The following is a summary:

- The Scheme was developed after public consultation and publication of feasible options. The ES provides for mitigation measures during construction;
- It was accepted that the Scheme would have an impact on the farming business. Accommodation works would be discussed and agreed with the landowners. Matters re loss, depreciation and injurious affection fall within the compensation process;
- The location of the overbridge took account of all the users of Whinfield Lane. An underpass at the same location would not be practical due to the presence of sewers and storm water culverts. Raising the road to provide space would incur considerable expense and would be much more intrusive. Providing an underpass clear of the sewers and culvert would call for a diversion of 500 metres for the users of Whinfield Lane and would cause drainage problems;
- The location and design of the overbridge should ensure that its effect on adjacent properties in Whinfield Lane would be reduced to a reasonable level;
- There should be no significant increase in traffic using Whinfield Lane and in any event the stretch of Shore Road at the exit from the Lane would be bypassed and would cater for local traffic only.

Comment

We consider that the Department's response on these issues is reasonable.

As we have stated elsewhere matters re accommodation works, loss, etc are compensatable and not for this Inquiry to determine.

**Ob 66 Dorothy Allen, Barbara Stacey and June and Steven Montgomery -
owners of farmland at 160 Shore Road**

It was stated that the owners were not objecting to the Scheme but were seeking clarification on issues such as access, accommodation works, etc.

Departmental Response

The Department has written to the solicitors acting on behalf of the owners and shall arrange discussions.

Comment

.
This objection is linked to objections Ob 64 and Ob 65. We have no further comment.

Ob 67 Department of the Environment

The Department of the Environment welcomed the use of low noise road surfacing over the entire length of the Scheme and asked for clarification about the use of acoustic barriers.

The Department had no comment on the air quality section of the Environmental Statement.

Departmental Response

The use of low noise road surfacing negated the need for acoustic barriers although acoustic glazing would be necessary at two properties.

Ob 71 Joyce Brett, 13 Shore Road

The objector stated that the road should go through the grounds of Belfast High School.

Departmental Response

The preferred route was chosen after considering all the criteria and particular regard was paid to the effect of an inland route introducing traffic to areas where there was none already.

The residents of Greenisland came out strongly against the inland option.

Comment

We have no specific comment in this case but comment in paragraph 7 on issues affecting the basis of the Scheme.

Ob 74 Oth 26 Oth 43 Mr Bill Pitcaithley, 28 Victoria Avenue, Whitehead

The gist of the objection was that the traffic congestion could be reduced by a system of traffic controls viz:

- Belfast bound traffic exiting Greenisland Station Road to Shore Road should turn left towards Carrickfergus and return towards Belfast via the Seapark roundabout;
- A system of fairly permanent green light controls be applied to inner lanes;
- The proposed 4-lane inland route should be reduced to a 2-lane road and link into Greenisland Station Road.

Mr Pitcaithley elaborated on his idea in documents Oth 26 and Oth 43. In particular he emphasised that some savings in journey times could be achieved, albeit not to the same extent as the Scheme, but without the need to demolish or otherwise interfere with private property. He queried the time saving element of the economic appraisal. He added that it may help if Shore Road were widened from Jordanstown Station Road to Silverstream.

Mr Pitcaithley did not present his objection orally at the Inquiry but took the opportunity to examine witnesses in pursuance of his objection.

Departmental Response

The Department's detailed response is set out in document A2 72 and in documents R Oth 26 and R Oth 43.

- The Department welcomed such an innovative approach but illustrated why it would not produce an acceptable solution to the bottleneck problem. Aspects of the suggestion had been considered in the examination of scheme options. Basically it was established that junction improvements alone would be insufficient to cope with current let alone future traffic demands; additional road capacity was essential. The idea ignored the impact of all the other junctions and the need to improve the very poor facilities for pedestrians and cyclists;
- It would not be practical to have a trial run of the idea and computer simulation would not be warranted;
- It rejected the suggestion of partial widening of Shore Road.

Comment

We accept the Department's rationale that the capacity of the road was crucial to the solution of the bottleneck. We were impressed with the novel approach proposed but accept that it would not be appropriate in this case.

We assume that the suggested partial widening of Shore Road would be in furtherance of the traffic control system. We saw no merit in it in isolation.

We have no evidence to cast doubt on the accuracy of the travel time element of the economic appraisal which was carried out in accordance with standard government procedures.

Ob 75 Mr Nigel McMahon, 1 The Glade, Greenisland

Mr McMahon queried whether the noise assessment carried out at locations 18 and 20 were applicable to his property. He wished to discuss the possible provision of:

- An acoustic barrier;
- Additional planting as a noise reduction measure;
- Acoustic glazing.

Departmental response

The Department stated that noise impact assessed specifically at the objector's property predicted an increase of 1.7dB but with the reduction generated by the low noise road surfacing actual impact should be less than the existing levels. Accordingly there would be no need for an acoustic barrier, planting nor acoustic glazing. In any event tree planting would offer very little by way of acoustic screening. There was therefore no proposal to landscape No 132 Shore Road in order to screen the objector's property.

Comment

We are satisfied with the Department's response.

Ob 76 Mr David Wilson, 55 Shore Road

The objection raised the following concerns:

- The loss of the local townscape character;
- The need for a safety audit to substantiate that the Scheme would be no more dangerous than the existing road;
- The overall environmental impact (quoting moderately adverse after 15 years);
- The air quality figures at the university, Shorelands, Station Road and Seapark;
- The environmental impact on natural habitats (bats, rookeries, trees, etc);

- The traffic congestion at Whiteabbey village.

He alleged that the Scheme was designed to facilitate developers open up new land and raised other planning issues. He stated that the Scheme would not improve traffic from the B 90 into Shore Road. He queried the system of land valuation.

Although Mr Wilson did not formally present his objection at the Inquiry, he raised other issues when questioning witnesses in relation to:

- Tree loss and damage;
- The savings in travel times.

He alleged that the combined option (the Scheme) was initiated by a local Greenisland group and subsequently adopted by the Department.

Departmental Response

The Department's response was detailed in document A2 74. The salient points were:

- It was accepted that the Scheme would have an impact on the landscape as assessed in Chapter 12 of the ES. The Scheme would include mitigation measures which recognised the townscape value of Shore Road;
- The safety audit was carried out and was available for inspection. A few minor issues were to be resolved. The Scheme would be no less safe than the existing road;
- The objector's reference to the overall environmental impact related to the impact on landscape (see above). The ES reviewed all possible issues and receptors and it was considered that the overall benefits outweighed the adverse effect of the Scheme;
- It was accepted that the pollutant concentrations may be higher at junctions and roundabouts but forecast concentrations at any location along the route would not be in breach of UK air quality standards;
- In the preparation of the ES fully comprehensive ecological surveys were carried out in consultation with EHS, RSPB and British Trust for Ornithology and mitigation measures agreed. No significant impacts were identified. Statutory agencies were consulted re the Belfast Lough Ramsar site. No adverse effects were anticipated. The Scheme would necessitate the removal of 235 trees. Mitigation would include the planting of 800 native trees;
- The purpose of the scheme was the removal of the bottleneck- not to increase the capacity of the entire A2 – and it received priority because it is part of a strategic route within the Regional Transportation strategy;
- The Scheme was developed independently by the Department's consultants after examination of a range of options. The Department would deal with all planning applications on their merits at the time they are submitted;
- The Scheme would increase the capacity of the Station Road/ Shore Road junction and thus reduce the delay to traffic exiting Station Road;

- Any disputes arising from the valuation of land may be referred to the Lands Tribunal.

Comment

Most of these matters have been referred to earlier in this report. Generally we are satisfied that they have been adequately dealt with by the Department.

Any questions re compensation values are outwith this Inquiry.

Ob 77 Northern Ireland Fire & Rescue Service

The Fire & Rescue Service sought confirmation that fire hydrants adjacent to the improved section of Shore Road would remain in good condition and continue to be available during and after the works.

Departmental Response

The Department confirmed accordingly.

Oth 1 Ulster Angling Federation

Ulster Angling Federation submitted an objection with the following concerns:

- They do not wish to see existing rivers/streams culverted;
- They had not received a reply to letter addressed to the Roads Service dated 12 August 2007.

Departmental Response

The form of structure will be determined in consultation with the appropriate authorities, Rivers Agency and Environment and Heritage Service. The Ulster Angling Federation will be kept informed.

A reply had been sent on 5 September 2007.

Comment

We are satisfied with the Department's response.

Oth 24 Ulster Society for the Protection of the Countryside

While acknowledging the need for the Scheme the Society expressed regret at the loss of woodland and individual trees, the encroachment into a designated green belt, the compromising of the landscape wedge and the loss of habitats. The Society requested that the maximum mitigating measures be taken.

Departmental Response

The Department had set out in the ES the detailed mitigation measures which would be taken, including the replacement of trees and hedges.

Comment

We are satisfied with the Department's response.

Oth 34 Dr E Ellis, 53 Shore Road

The main issues raised in the objection were:

- the proposed cycle track would be a death trap;
- replacement saplings would be a poor substitute for the loss of the mature trees;
- some residents had sold up having been persuaded by Roads Service that the Scheme was a fait accompli;

- there would be an increase in traffic noise;
- property values would decrease.

Departmental Response

The gist of the Department's response was:

- the Scheme would provide a much safer environment for cyclists and pedestrians with wider footways and a shared footway/cycleway on the shore side;
- acknowledging that many trees would be removed, not all were mature and not all in healthy condition. A tree survey had indicated that in many cases the existing value would be lost within 10 years;
- the claim that residents had been persuaded to sell was refuted. Blight procedure was an option available to property owners adversely affected by the Scheme;
- with the provision of low noise road surfacing the property was predicted to experience a slight reduction in noise levels;
- land owners affected by vesting have the right to appoint an agent to negotiate compensation for loss, depreciation or injurious effect.

Comment

We are satisfied with the Department's response. Compensation issues fall outside the remit of the Inquiry.

7. CONSIDERATION

1. We were presented with 75 letters of objection/representation which had been received by the Department within the stipulated time following publication of the Environmental Statement, Direction Order and vesting schedule together with the Department's rebuttal evidence relating to each.
2. We were also given a considerable volume of additional correspondence received after the stipulated period and indeed throughout the course of the inquiry. Prior to the conclusion of the Inquiry the Department supplied us with detailed responses to the additional correspondence. In the interest of openness and fairness we decided to consider all of this documentation within the remit of the Inquiry.
3. A number of objections related to the proposed vesting of land at Langley Court. We note that this development obtained planning approval and Roads Service consent in compliance with the road protection line applicable at the time. We appreciate that as road schemes advance to design stage, earlier protection lines may have to be encroached in the wider public interest. But we also appreciate that it was reasonable for the purchasers of the properties in 2002 to conclude that the development line agreed then would not have to be adjusted.
4. We note that the Department has agreed to reduce the land take at Langley Hall but consider that as the detail of the Scheme design develops, the possibility of avoiding the area should be examined, particularly since land on the shore side has been included in the vesting schedule.
5. A number of issues were raised by objectors which may impinge on the effectiveness of the Scheme:
 - **Quality Bus Corridors.** We note that the Regional Transportation Strategy 2002-2012 planned for the introduction of Quality Bus Corridors on the main radial routes in Belfast. Indeed the Shore Road corridor is specifically mentioned in the BMTP. Should such a corridor be provided on the Shore Road it would effectively reduce the peak hour capacity to one lane. There was no indication in the Department's evidence that this was a factor in the comparison of route options.
 - **Belfast High School.** The Scheme did not provide for a lay-by on the shore side for dropping off children at the High School. We are not entirely convinced by the Department's statement that the provision of a second lane would help to ease the situation. At peak hours we anticipate - two free flowing lanes approaching the school - the inner lane becoming blocked by school drop-offs - traffic in the inner lane changing lane to avoid the

blockage. If a lay-by is not to be constructed we consider that the impact of this factor ought to be measured in an inland/combined route comparison.

- **Traffic Forecasts.** The Department stated in evidence that future traffic flows in both Stage 2 and Stage 3 assessments were calculated using National Road Traffic Forecast growth factors with no account of potential housing or other development within BMAP. In support of this approach the Department asserted that it had the advantage of identifying whether the Scheme could stand up economically without being supported by new land use developments. We refer to the Government's News Release dated 30 November 2004 launching the publication of BMAP and BMTP which emphasised BMTP had been developed in conjunction with BMAP to ensure integration of transport and land use. To demonstrate compliance with this strategy of integration we consider that estimates of likely traffic growth arising from BMAP should be included in a supplement to the Stage 2 traffic model to identify any impact on the results of the original comparison.
 - **Future Road Development.** We note the Department's acceptance (A2 52 para 5) that on-line widening offers no opportunity for further road development to meet future needs. The Department stated: "In practice, the same can be said to be true of all the inland options considered unless additional land and property acquisition was undertaken to further future developments". We do not consider this to be a valid counter argument.
6. We consider that the foregoing should be examined in the context of an extended Stage 2 comparison in which account should also be taken of:
- the Department's acceptance (A2 46 para 11c) that an inland route would be of benefit in providing greater capacity through Greenisland and thus afford more options in emergencies;
 - the proposition that an inland option would provide the opportunity of segregating through traffic from local traffic.
7. We wish to highlight the following extract from the Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Report (para 6.28) as a backdrop to the examination set out above

"Thus in economic terms the most likely inland solution option would be Option S5-2-V4 inland by-pass parallel to the Shore Road via Belfast High School. It has the most affordable cost and, possibly, the potential to give value for money,"

8. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. We recommend that the Department carry out an extension of the comparison between the inland option S5-2-V4 and the combined option (now the Scheme) taking into account the factors set out in para 7 of this report.
2. Subject to the above, we recommend that the impact of the Scheme at Langley Hall be re-examined in the light of design development, at least to the extent of temporary use of the land in question for construction purposes with subsequent reinstatement.
3. We recommend that the Department sends a written reply to Mr & Mrs Mc Cay's document Oth 14.

9. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We wish to place on record our thanks to Mr C McBurney, the programme officer, for the painstaking and unstinting service he provided us with throughout our work on this Inquiry. We also wish to thank Ms Kay Hendrick, the stenographer, who carried out a long and difficult job with great ease and for providing us with the transcripts so quickly after completion of the Inquiry.

10. ANNEXES

ANNEX 1

APPEARANCES

For the Department

Mr. F. O'Reilly	Barrister
Calling as Witnesses:	
Mr. B. Hassard	Roads Service
Mrs. S. Briggs	Scott Wilson
Mr. G. Philpott	Scott Wilson
Mr. M. Al-Azzawi	Scott Wilson
Mr. N. Hackett	Scott Wilson
Mr. S. Hetherington	Scott Wilson

Respondents

	Represented by:	Called Witnesses:
BAM (NI) Ltd.	Mr. Worthington	
Carrickfergus Borough Council	Mr. Cardwell	
Mr. & Mrs. Livett	Mr. McCracken	
Ms. J. Wilson	Dr. Braniff	
Ms. S. Liya	Herself	
International Tree Foundation	Mr. M. Lake	
Mr. & Mrs. McCay	Mr. K. Gillespie	

Hightown Enterprises Ltd.	Mr. W. Robinson	Mr. Carrie
SUSTRANS	Mr. S. Patterson	
Mrs. D. Camlin	Ms. R. Orr	
Mr. F. Anderson	Mr. S. Wilson MP MLA	
East Antrim Farming LLP.	Mr. W. Orbinson	Mr. R. Agus Mr. D. Donaldson
Mrs. J. Elliott	Herself	
Mr. P. Rowan	Himself	Mr. R. Agus Dr. R. Patrick
Ms. A. Bataille	Herself	
University of Ulster	Mr. S. Lockwood Prof. W. Morrison	
Mrs Dickinson		
Mr M Simpson		
Mr R Cameron		
Mr P O'Connor		
Mr P Donaldson		

ANNEX 2

DOCUMENTS

Department of Regional Development

DRD A2/1	Regional Development Strategy for Northern Ireland 2025
DRD A2/2	Regional Transportation Strategy for Northern Ireland 2002-2012
DRD A2/3	Regional Strategic Transport Network Transport Plan 2015
DRD A2/4	Belfast Metropolitan Transport Plan 2015 (web site)
DRD A2/5	Belfast Metropolitan Area Plan 2015 (web site)
DRD A2/10	Preliminary Public Consultation
DRD A2/10A	Preliminary Public Consultation Addendum
DRD A2/11	Traffic Surveys
DRD A2/12	Preliminary Sources Study
DRD A2/13	Stage 1 Scheme Assessment Report
DRD A2/14	Road Safety Audit
DRD A2/15	Stage 2 Public Consultation
DRD A2/16	A Contractor's View
DRD A2/17	Soil Mechanics
DRD A2/18	Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Report
DRD A2/19	Stage 3 Scheme Assessment Report
DRD A2/20	Departmental Statement
DRD A2/21	Draft Direction Order
DRD A2/22	Notice of Intention to make a Vesting Order
DRD A2/22A	Vesting Order Schedule
DRD A2/22B	Vesting Order Maps
DRD A2/23	Environmental Statement
DRD A2/24	Responses received to publication of proposals
DRD A2/26	Background to the Scheme and Statutory Procedures
DRD A2/27	Submission on Development of the Scheme
DRD A2/28	Submission on Scheme Design
DRD A2/29	Traffic and Economic Appraisal
DRD A2/30 & 30A	Submission on the Environmental Statement
DRD A2/31	National Road Traffic Forecasts

RESPONDENTS

	Title	Author or On behalf of
Oth. 1	Submission	Ulster Angling Foundation
Oth. 2	e-mail dated 10.9.07	Mrs. J. Elliott
Oth. 3	Submission dated 9.07	Carrickfergus Council
Oth. 4	Letter dated 6.9.07	Ms. M. Eakin
Oth. 5	Letter dated 14.9.07	Mrs. D. Camlin
Oth. 6	Letter dated 17.9.07	Ms. P. Webber

Oth. 7	Letter dated 16.9.07	Mr. J. Gibson
Oth. 8	Letter dated 15.8.07	PSNI
Oth. 9	Letter dated 17.9.07	Mr. P. Rowan
Oth. 10	Letter dated 17.9.07	Mr. P. Rowan
Oth. 11	Submission	East Antrim Farming LLP.
Oth. 12	Submission dated 9.07	East Antrim Farming LLP.
Oth. 13	Submission dated 9.07	East Antrim Farming LLP.
Oth. 14	Submission	Mr & Mrs. J McCay
Oth. 15	Submission	Mr. K. & Mrs. E. Livett
Oth. 16	Submission dated 9.07	Hightown Enterprises Ltd.
Oth. 17	Letter dated 18.9.07	Ms. J. Wilson
Oth. 18	Submission	BAM (NI) Ltd.
Oth. 19	e-mail dated 21.9.07	CG. De Fleury
Oth. 20	Submission	International Tree Foundation
Oth. 21	Letter dated 18.9.07	L. & M. Mc Ateer
Oth. 22	Letter dated 4.9.07	Mrs. J. Elliott
Oth. 23	Letter dated 14.9.07	Mrs. D. Camlin
Oth. 24	Submission	Ulster Society for the Protection of the Countryside
Oth. 25	Letter dated 26.9.07	Ms. S. Liya
Oth. 26	e-mail dated 27.9.07	Mr. W. Pitcaithley
Oth. 27	Submission dated 2.10.07	SUSTRANS
Oth. 28	Letter dated 29.9.07	Mr. D. Anderson
Oth. 29	Letter dated 1.10.07	Belfast High School
Oth. 30	Submission	Mr. K. & Mrs. E. Livett
Oth. 31	Letter dated 4.10.07	University of Ulster
Oth. 32	e-mail dated 1.10.07	Mrs. J. Elliott
Oth. 33	e-mail dated 2.10.07	Mrs. J. Elliott
Oth. 34	e-mail dated 9.10.07	Dr. E. Ellis
Oth. 35	Submission dated 9.10	Mr. P. Rowan
Oth. 36	Submission	Mr. P. Rowan
Oth. 37	Submission	BAM.(NI).Ltd.
Oth. 38	Submission dated 10.10.07	Ms. J. Wilson
Oth. 39	Submission dated 10.10.07	International Tree Foundation
Oth. 40	Submission dated 10.07	Mr. P. Rowan
Oth. 41	Submission	Mrs. J. Elliott
Oth. 42	Submission	East Antrim Farming LLP.
Oth. 43	e-mail dated 14.10.07	Mr. W. Pitcaithley
Oth. 44	Submission	SUSTRANS
Oth. 45	Submission dated 15.10.07	L. & P. Donaldson
Oth. 46	Letter dated 16.10.07	Ms. S. Liya
Ob.01	Letter dated 14.3.07	Mr. D. Smyth
Ob.02	Letter dated 15.3.07	The Planning Service
Ob.03	Letter dated 16.3.07	Rivers Agency
Ob.04	Letter dated 16.3.07	Environment & Heritage Service

Ob.05	Letter dated 19.3.07	L. & M. McAteer
Ob.06	Letters dated 21.3.07 & 23.4.07	Ulster Angling Federation Ltd.
Ob.07	Letter dated 23.3.07	Mr. N. Bentham
Ob.08	Letter dated 23.3.07	C. Allan
Ob.09	Letter dated 23.3.07	Newtownabbey Borough Council
Ob.10	Letter dated 23.3.07	CG. de Fleury
Ob.11	Letter dated 26.3.07	Environment & Heritage Service
Ob.12	Letter dated 26.3.07	Ms. R. Kerr
Ob.13	Letter dated 24.3.07	R. & S. Snodden
Ob.14	e-mail dated 29.3.07	RSPB Northern Ireland
Ob.15	Letter dated 28.3.07	Ms. J. Wilson
Ob.16	Letter dated 2.4.07	Mr F Anderson
Ob.17	Letter	D Taylor
Ob.18	Letter dated 3.4.07	Police Service Northern Ireland
Ob.19	Letter dated 4.6.07	Environment & Heritage Service
Ob.20	Letter dated 2.4.07	Environment & Heritage Service
Ob.21	Letter dated 3.4.07	Mr. S. Stringer
Ob.22	Letter dated 3.3.07	Mr. W. McFadden
Ob.23	Letter dated 3.4.07	Ms. J. Wilson
Ob.24	Letter dated 3.4.07	Mr. & Mrs. G. Sinclair
Ob.25	Letter dated 3.4.07	Mrs. M. Barr
Ob.26	Letter dated 3.4.07	Mr. & Mrs. H. Donnelly
Ob.27	Letter dated 3.4.07	Mr. A. McAlister
Ob.28	Letter dated 22.3.07	Northern Ireland Electricity
Ob.29	Letters dated 15.3.07	Phoenix Natural Gas
Ob.30	Letter dated 3.4.07	Miss G. Boyd
Ob.31	Letter dated 11.4/07	Ms. P. Webber
Ob.32	Letter	Mr. & Mrs. Carvell
Ob.33	Letter dated 10.4.07	Mr. J. Gibson
Ob.34	Letters dated 29.3.07, 5.4.07, & 30.5.07	Mr. F. Anderson
Ob.35	Letter dated 4.4.07	Prof. K. and Mrs. A. Farahmand
Ob.36	Letters dated 10.4.07	D. & J. Anderson
Ob.37	Letters dated 11.4.07 & 12.7.07	Police Service of Northern Ireland
Ob.38	Letter dated 16.4.07	M. & A. Campbell
Ob.39	Letter dated 13.4.07	Newtownabbey Borough Council
Ob.40	Letter dated 13.4.07	K. & E. Livett
Ob.41	Letter dated 17.4.07	Mr. J. Martin
Ob.42	Letter dated 17.4.07	Ms. S. Martin
Ob.43	Letter dated 18.4.07	J. & L. McCay
Ob.44	Letter dated 19.4.07	The Planning Service
Ob.45	Letters dated 29.5.07, 18.7.07, 20.4.07, & 22.6.07	J. & L. McCay
Ob.46	Letter dated 19.4.07	Ms. I. Patrick

Ob.47	Letter dated 19.4.07	Dr. Patrick
Ob.48	Letter dated 19.4.07	L. & P. Donaldson
Ob.49	Letter dated 18.4.07	Mr. A. MacFadyen & Ms. D. Rooney
Ob.50	Letter dated 20.4.07	Mr. & Mrs. Greer
Ob.51	Letters dated 18.7.07 & 20.4.07	Ms. M. Eakin
Ob.52	Letter dated 20.4.07	Mr. & Mrs. Stringer
Ob.53	Letter dated 17 April 2007	F. Woods.
Ob.54	Letter dated 19.4.07	University of Ulster
Ob.55	Letter dated 18.4.07	Dept. of Agriculture & Rural Development
Ob.56	Letter dated 19.4.07	Ms. M. Stevenson
Ob.57	Letter dated 18.4.07	Mr. & Mrs. McFadden
Ob.58	Letter dated 18.4.07	Mrs. E. Robinson
Ob.59	Letter dated 19.4.07	Belfast High School
Ob.60	Letter dated 19.4.07	East Antrim Farming LLP.
Ob.61	Letters dated 17.5.07, 3.5.07, & 20.4.07	BAM (NI) Ltd.
Ob.62	Letter dated 20.4.07	Mr. & Mrs. Topping
Ob.63	Letter dated 20.4.07	Mr. P. Rowan
Ob.64	Letter dated 23.4.07	Mr. A. McCamley
Ob.65	Letter dated 23.4.07	Mr. D. Boyd
Ob.66	Letter dated 23.4.07	Ms. D.Allen, Ms. B. Stacey, & J. & S. Montgomery
Ob.67	Letter dated 23.4.07	D.O.E. Environmental Policy Division
Ob.68	Letter dated 21.4.07	Ms. A. Bataille
Ob.69	Letter dated 21.4.07	International Tree Foundation
Ob.70	Letter dated 20.4.07	Ms. S. Liya
Ob.71	Letter dated 20.4.07	Ms. J. Brett
Ob.72	Letters dated 17.8.07 & 25.4.07	The Planning Service
Ob.73	Letter dated 16.4.07	Mr. W. Pitcaithley
Ob.74	Letter dated 22.4.07	Mr. N. McMahan
Ob.75	Letter dated 18.4.07	Mr. D. Wilson
Ob.76	Letters dated 6.07 & 1.6.07	Northern Ireland Fire & Rescue Service

Department of Regional Development Reply to Respondents / Representative

Ref	Title	Sent to
R Oth. 1	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	Mr. R. Marshall
R Oth. 2	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	Mrs. J. Elliott
R Oth. 3	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	Carrickfergus Council
R Oth. 4	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	Ms. M. Eakin
R Oth. 5	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	Mrs. D. Camlin
R Oth. 6	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	Ms. P. Webber

R Oth. 7	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	Mr. J. Gibson
R Oth. 8	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	Ms. A. Chambers
R Oth. 9	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	Mr. P. Rowan
R Oth. 10	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	Mr. P. Rowan
R Oth. 11	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	East Antrim Farming LLP.
R Oth. 12	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	East Antrim Farming LLP.
R Oth. 13	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	East Antrim Farming LLP.
R Oth. 15	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	Mr. K. & Mrs. E. Livett
R Oth. 16	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	Hightown Enterprises Ltd.
R Oth. 17	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	Ms. J. Wilson
R Oth. 18	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	BAM (NI) Ltd.
R Oth. 19	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	CG. De Fleury
R Oth. 20	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	International Tree Foundation
R Oth. 21	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	L. & M. Mc Ateer
R Oth. 22	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	Mrs. J. Elliott
R Oth. 23	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	Mrs. D. Camlin
R Oth. 24	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	Ulster Society for the Protection of the Countryside
R Oth. 25	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	Ms. S. Liya
R Oth. 26	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	Mr. W. Pitcaithley
R Oth. 27	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	SUSTRANS
R Oth. 28	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	Mr. D. Anderson
R Oth. 29	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	Belfast High School
R Oth. 30	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	Mr. K. & Mrs. E. Livett
R Oth. 31	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	University of Ulster
R Oth. 32	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	Mrs. J. Elliott
R Oth. 33	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	Mrs. J. Elliott
R Oth. 34	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	Dr. E. Ellis
R Oth. 35	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	Mr. P. Rowan
R Oth. 36	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	Mr. P. Rowan
R Oth. 37	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	BAM.(NI).Ltd.
R Oth. 38	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	Ms. J. Wilson
R Oth. 39	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	International Tree Foundation
R Oth. 40	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	Mr. P. Rowan
R Oth. 41	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	Mrs. J. Elliott
R Oth. 42	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	East Antrim Farming LLP.
R Oth. 43	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	Mr. W. Pitcaithley
R Oth. 44	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	SUSTRANS
R Oth. 45	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	L. & P. Donaldson
R Oth. 46	Letter dated 24 TH Oct 07	Ms. S. Liya
A2 01	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Mr. D. Smyth
A2 02	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Rivers Agency
A2 03	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	The Planning Service
A2 04	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Environment & Heritage Service
A2 05	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	L. & M. McAteer

A2 06	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Ulster Angling Federation Ltd.
A2 07	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Mr. N. Bentham
A2 08	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	C. Allan
A2 09	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Newtownabbey Borough Council
A2 10	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	CG. de Fleury
A2 11	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Environment & Heritage Service
A2 12	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Ms. R. Kerr
A2 13	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	R. & S. Snodden
A2 14	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	RSPB Northern Ireland
A2 15	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Ms. J. Wilson
A2 16	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	D. Taylor
A2 17	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Mr. F. Anderson
A2 18	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Police Service Northern Ireland
A2 19	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Environment & Heritage Service
A2 20	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Mr. S. Stringer
A2 21	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Mr. W. McFadden
A2 22	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Ms. J. Wilson
A2 23	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Mr. & Mrs. G. Sinclair
A2 24	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Mrs. M. Barr
A2 25	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Mr. & Mrs. H. Donnelly
A2 26	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Mr. A. McAlister
A2 27	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Northern Ireland Electricity
A2 28	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Phoenix Natural Gas
A2 29	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Miss G. Boyd
A2 30	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Ms. P. Webber
A2 31	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Mr. & Mrs. Carvell
A2 32	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Mr. J. Gibson
A2 33	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Mr. F. Anderson
A2 34	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Prof. K. and Mrs. A. Farahmand
A2 35	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	D. & J. Anderson
A2 36	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Police Service of Northern Ireland
A2 37	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	M. & A. Campbell
A2 38	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Newtownabbey Borough Council
A2 39	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	K. & E. Livett
A2 40	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Mr. J. Martin
A2 41	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Ms. S. Martin
A2 42	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	J. & L. McCay
A2 43	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Hightown Enterprises Ltd.
A2 44	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	J. & L. McCay
A2 45	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Ms. I. Patrick
A2 46	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Dr. Patrick
A2 47	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	L. & P. Donaldson
A2 48	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Mr. A. MacFadyen & Ms. D. Rooney
A2 49	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Mr. & Mrs. Greer
A2 50	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Ms. M. Eakin
A2 51	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Mr. & Mrs. Stringer

A2 52	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	F. Woods.
A2 53	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	University of Ulster
A2 54	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Dept. of Agriculture & Rural Development
A2 55	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Ms. M. Stevenson
A2 56	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Mr. & Mrs. McFadden
A2 57	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Mrs. E. Robinson
A2 58	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Belfast High School
A2 59	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	East Antrim Farming LLP.
A2 60	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	BAM (NI) Ltd.
A2 61	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Mr. & Mrs. Topping
A2 62	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Mr. P. Rowan
A2 63	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	A. & K. McCamley
A2 64	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Mr. D. Boyd
A2 65	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Ms. D.Allen, Ms. B. Stacey, & J. & S. Montgomery
A2 66	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	D.O.E. Environmental Policy Division
A2 67	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Ms. A. Bataille
A2 68	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	International Tree Foundation
A2 69	Letters dated 19 th Sept 07 and 10 October 2007	Ms. S. Liya
A2 70	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Ms. J. Brett
A2 71	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	The Planning Service
A2 72	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Mr. W. Pitcaithley
A2 73	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Mr. N. McMahan
A2 74	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Mr. D. Wilson
A2 75	Letter dated 19 th Sept 07	Northern Ireland Fire & Rescue Service

ANNEX 3

ABBREVIATIONS

BCR	Benefit Cost Ratio
BMAP	Belfast Metropolitan Area Plan
BMTP	Belfast Metropolitan Transport Plan
BUAP	Belfast Urban Area Plan 2001
dB	Decibels
EHS	Environmental & Heritage Service
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ES	Environmental Statement
ECHR	European Convention on Human Rights
HRA	Human Rights Act 1998
NRTF	National Road Traffic Forecasts
SAR	Scheme Assessment Reports
RSPB	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
TUBA	Transport User Benefit Appraisal