Proof of Evidence

Pamela Woolner
North East of England Green Party

1 My objection is partly personal, as a resident of Tyne and Wear, and partly on behalf of the North East of England Green Party. In that capacity I represent not only our members but also the significant proportion of the population who, through their votes for the Green Party, show their concern about issues such as traffic and pollution.

2 It seems clear that the fundamental reason to object to the proposed additional Tyne Tunnel is that its building would increase traffic. The fact that new road building tends to create more traffic is well known (e.g. see Correa, 1989: Appendix 1) and is finally being acknowledged by planners and governments. The proposers of this tunnel actually admit that, should it be built, it would increase traffic.

3 The New Tyne Crossing Environmental Statement (non-technical summary, May 2002) makes this clear on page 4 where a graph shows average weekday traffic through the existing and proposed road tunnels. The current level of traffic of 34 000 vehicles per day is predicted to rise to 43 000 by 2021, but it is further predicted that if the new tunnel is built this number will instead be 52 000. So, according to these figures, the new tunnel would double the expected increase in traffic volume. The proposers of this tunnel are not just intending to provide for expected, and already problematic, traffic increase but instead aim to encourage a much bigger increase.

4 There are many reasons why traffic increases must be avoided and, in fact, reversed. The most obvious current problems with the over use of private cars are pollution and their tendency to cause death and injury. Road transport is the biggest single cause of a number of known air pollutants (see Tables 2.12, 2.14 & 2.8; Digest of Environmental Statistics N.20, DETR, 1998: Appendix 2). Of deaths due to transport, the vast majority are the result of road traffic (see Table 2/3; Mortality Statistics, Office for National Statistics, 1998, 1999 & 2000: Appendix 3), with many of those killed being children, pedestrians and cyclists.

5 It is sometimes argued that both pollution and car accident rates are being reduced from year to year. However, the mortality statistics of recent years do not support this conclusion and anyway this fails to address the enormous social costs of dependence on cars. As an example of this, many commentators have pointed out that the freedom of children to move about independently has been dramatically reduced as traffic has increased. Undoubtably, we can all think of other ways in which our choices and behaviour have been altered within our own lifetimes.

6 These are all rather general points but help to demonstrate how unacceptable it is to encourage traffic growth, as this proposed tunnel clearly would. While such increase in traffic would be a major and immediate problem for those living near the new tunnel, I hope I have made clear the wider implications of encouraging more cars onto our roads.

7 More specifically, across the region, there is reason to be concerned about the knock-on effects in other areas caused by increased traffic on the A19 on Tyneside. It is well established that even temporary relief of congestion in one place can lead to intensified problems at the next 'bottleneck'.

8 Teesside already suffers from traffic problems not dissimilar from those on Tyneside that a new tunnel is supposed to cure (see Appendix 4) and the negative impacts of a new Tyne Tunnel would only add to these. If the proposed tunnel were to succeed in its stated intention of opening up employment and development opportunities to the north of the Tyne, it follows that some of the additional traffic attracted to the tunnel would be from all parts of Teesside. If roads succeed in making travel easier, they also inevitably encourage longer distance commuting patterns.

9 Thus a new tunnel would bring added congestion throughout the Tees-Tyne stretch of the A19, with a particular 'pinch-point' on the already over-used Tees Fly-over. For people on Teesside, that is not good news. There will be still greater demand for new roads as a 'sticking plaster' solution to rising traffic, just as is happening on Tyneside, and open spaces, for example along the 'East Middlesbrough Corridor', would be threatened.

10 In common with everyone else, I cannot support these specific assertions with firm statistics. To my knowledge, there are no authoritative projections of traffic increases on Teesside arising from the construction of another Tyne Tunnel. However, common sense, experience and knowledge of the area all strongly suggest that the proposed tunnel would have a damaging effect on road traffic flows at least as far as Teesside. I believe that the onus is on the tunnel proposers to show that this is not the case. Otherwise, it seems clear that the proposed tunnel has the potential to cause suffering across the north east region.

11 In other parts of the country, councils are finally recognising the problems of increasing traffic and planning accordingly (e.g. Manchester' investment in a tram system; London's congestion charges). Meanwhile, in the north east, I think this tunnel proposal demonstrates that we are still not taking the problem seriously.

They are not deterred by the loss of life resulting from motoring, so is it likely that they will change their habits through the predictions of scientists about global warming and the greenhouse effect? All the information on the various toxic emissions from cars was known and publicised twenty years ago[1] and the only effects have been a lower tax on "green" petrol and the prospect of compulsory catalytic converters, neither of which measures affect the greenhouse issue.

We have to be *won* back from car-dependency. And in a society dominated by central government, this means a policy of attracting people back onto an improved public transport system by manipulating fares. The alternative, of manipulating taxes on car ownership or on fuel, or of sophisticated road pricing devices, would simply penalise the poor, leaving the roads to the rich, the show-offs and the expense-account drivers.

Some of us have for many years advocated free public transport in towns and cities, either for ideological reasons or as a cheaper solution than any other to the task of winning people out of cars. The pendulum of opinion has moved away, but will swing again as the intolerable dilemmas of an individually motorised society oblige governments to retreat. It is glaringly obvious that a whole series of demands on the politicians and policy-makers can be shared with others of all political persuasions. Let me list these.

1. No more motorways. They defeat themselves. As Charles Correa puts it, "traffic engineers have to postulate a traffic 'solution'. So they usually come up with an expensive system of freeways, tunnels, flyovers, and so forth. Yet we know that such palliatives are short-lived; ease of movement encourages more journeys, thus clogging the arteries once again. *Journeys always multiply to the point of clogging* – it is a kind of Parkinson's Law in transport planning!"[2] The evolution of, say, the M25 around London illustrates this dramatically.

2. Invest in railways. No-one can dispute the overwhelming evidence that railways can carry passengers more safely, take up less land, cause less pollution and cost less money than trying to move the same numbers by road.[3]

3. Push the transport of freight from road back to rail. This is a fiscal matter. If the Treasury assessed the *true* cost to the economy of moving goods by road, as opposed to rail, it would manipulate the overheads accordingly.

4. Demand urban rapid transit systems, meaning trams or light railways as the automatic means of getting about in towns. They are safer and more economical of energy. It is true that this may simply involve transferring the emissions of carbon dioxide to a power station somewhere else, so it depends on how the energy is generated. This is a different issue. But undoubtedly rail-borne public transport entails the least demand on energy sources.

5. Find economical rural alternatives. Learn from the experience of the poor half of the world with "jitneys" or collective taxis, or from the Swiss institution of the Post-Bus.

6. Calm traffic in towns, by simple measures to keep it out and to give priority to pedestrians and cyclists.

These six simple demands would revolutionise transport in Britain. I deliberately refrain from any discussion of the desirability of changing our ways of living so as to reduce the need for transport, whether of people or goods. I am aware of Arthur Moyse's reminder that one of the constant dilemmas of anarchists is that of what advice to offer to a social system that they condemn. Thoughtful people of any political complexion can find themselves agreeing with these six priorities.

Throughout this book I have mentioned the experience of Switzerland and the Netherlands, simply because those countries have reached a consensus of opinion that favours a transport policy for all. I attribute this to different traditions of political and social concern. Britain by comparison has had a Ministry of Transport since 1919, which has invariably concerned itself with roads and cars, to the neglect of every other means of mobility for people or goods. Opponents of decentralisation always cite the need for a national and central plan for transport. But one of the interesting by-products of the debate over the siting of a Third London Airport in the 1970s was the fact that Britain did not have, and never has had a national transport plan.[4]

Those countries which I hold up for admiration are not seen as so admirable by their own citizens. In Zurich, despite its superb tramway system, running like clockwork, everyone deplores their own inability to agree on keeping cars out. In the Netherlands, in spite of its programmes for traffic calming, for phasing out car use in the towns, its cheap, universal and nationally co-ordinated public transport policy, I heard nothing but grumbles. Motorists were outraged at the impossibility of parking in the cities, Green advo-

Appendix 1
Correa, C (1989) 'The New Landscape: Urbanisation in the Third World'
Quoted in Ward, C (1991) 'Freedom to go: after the motor age'.
185/0/2

Table 2 - *continued*

England and Wales

ICD 9 code	Underlying cause (excludes deaths under 28 days for individual causes)		Age - group						
			All ages	Under 1	1-14	15-44	45-64	65-74	75 and over
E800-E999	**EXVII External causes of injury and poisoning**	**M**	**10,455**	**35**	**234**	**5,080**	**2,368**	**871**	**1,867**
		F	**6,062**	**25**	**132**	**1,283**	**902**	**607**	**3,113**
E800-E949	Accidents and adverse effects	M	**6,054**	19	201	2,521	1,150	589	1,574
		F	**4,590**	15	112	601	506	444	2,912
E800-E848	Transport accidents	M	**2,293**	1	103	1,383	400	147	259
		F	**855**	1	64	328	146	108	208
E800-E807	Railway accidents	M	**48**	-	2	33	8	3	2
		F	**5**	-	1	3	-	1	-
E804	Fall in, on or from railway train	M	**3**	-	-	3	-	-	-
		F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
E804.1	Passenger on railway	M	**2**	-	-	2	-	-	-
		F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
E804.8	Other specified person	M	**1**	-	-	1	-	-	-
		F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
E805	Hit by rolling stock	M	**41**	-	2	28	7	3	1
		F	**5**	-	1	3	-	1	-
E805.0	Railway employee	M	**1**	-	-	-	1	-	-
		F	-	-	-	-	-	-	
E805.2	Pedestrian	M	**21**	-	2	14	3	2	-
		F	**1**	-	1	-	-	-	-
E805.8	Other specified person	M	**5**	-	-	3	1	1	-
		F	**4**	-	-	3	-	1	-
E805.9	Unspecified person	M	**14**	-	-	11	2	-	1
		F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
E807	Railway accident of unspecified nature	M	**4**	-	-	2	1	-	1
		F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
E807.2	Pedestrian	M	**1**	-	-	1	-	-	-
		F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
E807.9	Unspecified person	M	**3**	-	-	1	1	-	1
		F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
E810-E819	Motor vehicle traffic accidents	M	**2,126**	1	94	1,284	358	140	249
		F	**816**	1	57	310	141	104	203
E810	Motor vehicle traffic accident involving collision with train	M	**1**	-	-	1	-	-	-
		F	**1**	-	-	1	-	-	-
E810.0	Driver of motor vehicle other than motorcycle	M	**1**	-	-	1	-	-	-
		F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
E810.1	Passenger in motor vehicle other than motorcycle	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		F	**1**	-	-	1	-	-	-
E812	Other motor vehicle traffic accident involving collision with another motor vehicle	M	**854**	-	9	551	157	60	77
		F	**317**	-	12	133	63	54	55
E812.0	Driver of motor vehicle other than motorcycle	M	**459**	-	-	248	100	45	66
		F	**150**	-	-	75	42	14	19
E812.1	Passenger in motor vehicle other than motorcycle	M	**99**	-	8	66	12	4	9
		F	**142**	-	12	35	19	40	36
E812.2	Motorcyclist	M	**291**	-	-	234	45	10	2
		F	**14**	-	-	13	1	-	-
E812.3	Passenger on motorcycle	M	**2**	-	1	1	-	-	-
		F	**11**	-	-	10	1	-	-
E812.6	Pedal cyclist	M	**1**	-	-	-	-	1	-
		F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
E812.9	Unspecified person	M	**2**	-	-	2	-	-	-
		F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
E813	Motor vehicle traffic accident involving collision with other vehicle	M	**122**	-	24	44	28	16	10
		F	**21**	-	2	10	7	1	1
E813.5	Rider of animal; occupant of animal-drawn vehicle	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		F	**1**	-	-	-	1	-	-
E813.6	Pedal cyclist	M	**122**	-	24	44	28	16	10
		F	**20**	-	2	10	6	1	1
E814	Motor vehicle traffic accident involving collision with pedestrian	M	**466**	-	47	160	81	46	132
		F	**266**	-	26	51	42	34	113
E814.2	Motorcyclist	M	**4**	-	-	4	-	-	-
		F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
E814.7	Pedestrian	M	**462**	-	47	156	81	46	132
		F	**266**	-	26	51	42	34	113

Table 2 Series DH2 no. 27

Table 2 - *continued*

England and Wales

ICD 9 code	Underlying cause (excludes deaths under 28 days for individual causes)		Age - group						
			All ages	Under 1	1-14	15-44	45-64	65-74	75 and over
E800-E999	**EXVII External causes of injury and poisoning**	**M**	**10,413**	**33**	**235**	**5,014**	**2,303**	**887**	**1,941**
		F	**6,112**	**34**	**102**	**1,273**	**962**	**585**	**3,156**
E800-E949	Accidents and adverse effects	M	**6,187**	18	193	2,567	1,142	607	1,660
		F	**4,607**	15	82	583	516	441	2,970
E800-E848	Transport accidents	M	**2,274**	4	102	1,428	391	148	201
		F	**758**	1	39	294	125	100	199

Table 2 - *continued*

England and Wales

ICD 9 code	Underlying cause (excludes deaths under 28 days for individual causes)		Age - group						
			All ages	Under 1	1-14	15-44	45-64	65-74	75 and over
E800-E807	Railway accidents	M	**40**	-	-	30	5	3	2
		F	**5**	-	-	3	1	1	-
E804	Fall in, on or from railway train	M	**2**	-	-	2	-	-	-
		F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
E804.1	Passenger on railway	M	**2**	-	-	2	-	-	-
		F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
E805	Hit by rolling stock	M	**36**	-	-	26	5	3	2
		F	**5**	-	-	3	1	1	-
E805.0	Railway employee	M	**2**	-	-	2	-	-	-
		F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
E805.2	Pedestrian	M	**28**	-	-	19	5	2	2
		F	**4**	-	-	2	1	1	-
E805.8	Other specified person	M	**3**	-	-	3	-	-	-
		F	**1**	-	-	1	-	-	-
E805.9	Unspecified person	M	**3**	-	-	2	-	1	-
		F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
E807	Railway accident of unspecified nature	M	**2**	-	-	2	-	-	-
		F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
E807.9	Unspecified person	M	**2**	-	-	2	-	-	-
		F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
E810-E819	Motor vehicle traffic accidents	M	**2,114**	4	91	1,341	353	135	190
		F	**723**	1	35	278	119	99	191
E810	Motor vehicle traffic accident involving collision with train	M	**2**	-	-	1	-	-	1
		F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
E810.0	Driver of motor vehicle other than motorcycle	M	**2**	-	-	1	-	-	1
		F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
E812	Other motor vehicle traffic accident involving collision with another motor vehicle	M	**846**	3	11	567	156	55	54
		F	**257**	-	3	109	50	36	59
E812.0	Driver of motor vehicle other than motorcycle	M	**430**	-	-	246	99	43	42
		F	**123**	-	-	65	27	13	18
E812.1	Passenger in motor vehicle other than motorcycle	M	**93**	3	11	55	12	5	7
		F	**118**	-	3	31	20	23	41
E812.2	Motorcyclist	M	**314**	-	-	261	45	6	2
		F	**4**	-	-	4	-	-	-
E812.3	Passenger on motorcycle	M	**4**	-	-	3	-	1	-
		F	**11**	-	-	8	3	-	-
E812.9	Unspecified person	M	**5**	-	-	2	-	-	3
		F	**1**	-	-	1	-	-	-
E813	Motor vehicle traffic accident involving collision with other vehicle	M	**71**	-	15	32	17	2	5
		F	**18**	-	2	6	8	-	2
E813.2	Motorcyclist	M	**1**	-	-	1	-	-	-
		F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
E813.5	Rider of animal; occupant of animal-drawn vehicle	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		F	**1**	-	-	1	-	-	-
E813.6	Pedal cyclist	M	**70**	-	15	31	17	2	5
		F	**17**	-	2	5	8	-	2
E814	Motor vehicle traffic accident involving collision with pedestrian	M	**464**	-	52	173	80	50	109
		F	**255**	-	28	47	31	49	100
E814.2	Motorcyclist	M	**4**	-	-	4	-	-	-
		F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
E814.7	Pedestrian	M	**460**	-	52	169	80	50	109
		F	**255**	-	28	47	31	49	100

1998

Appendix [illegible]

Table 3 - *continued*

ICD 9 code	Underlying cause* (excludes deaths under 28 days for individual causes)		Age-group All ages	Under 1	1-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	80-84
E800-E848	**Transport accidents**	M	**2,273**	-	21	19	55	243	268	261	230	197	141	119	143	105	77	78	89	94	65
		F	**830**	2	21	21	23	92	64	54	44	37	22	34	34	38	39	56	52	82	54
E800-E807	Railway accidents	M	**39**	-	-	-	2	6	4	6	3	2	2	6	3	2	-	-	1	1	1
		F	**3**	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
E805	Hit by rolling stock	M	**36**	-	-	-	1	5	4	5	3	2	2	6	3	2	-	-	1	1	1
		F	**3**	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
E805.2	Pedestrian	M	**22**	-	-	-	1	3	4	3	2	1	1	2	2	1	-	-	1	1	-
		F	**3**	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
E810-E819	**Motor vehicle traffic accidents**	M	**2,083**	-	20	16	50	232	258	240	216	184	119	105	124	86	68	69	79	89	61
		F	**795**	2	18	21	23	89	62	53	39	34	21	33	32	36	38	54	52	77	52
E812	Other motor vehicle traffic accident involving collision with another motor vehicle	M	**836**	-	2	4	5	72	105	110	103	80	54	45	62	46	26	26	32	29	19
		F	**296**	-	5	2	5	30	19	22	22	15	10	20	15	20	20	19	22	24	11
E812.0	Driver of motor vehicle other than motorcycle	M	**472**	-	-	-	-	36	58	50	46	32	29	30	39	34	19	17	28	22	16
		F	**157**	-	-	-	-	13	15	15	13	10	9	14	9	14	9	14	6	6	8
E812.1	Passenger in motor vehicle other than motorcycle	M	**87**	-	2	4	5	16	14	10	6	3	1	3	4	1	3	5	3	5	2
		F	**120**	-	5	2	5	15	1	6	4	2	1	2	6	5	11	5	16	18	3
E812.2	Motorcyclist	M	**271**	-	-	-	-	18	31	49	51	45	24	12	19	10	4	4	1	2	1
		F	**10**	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	4	1	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
E813	Motor vehicle traffic accident involving collision with other vehicle	M	**107**	-	-	3	16	15	5	7	5	9	6	10	4	4	6	8	2	4	3
		F	**25**	-	1	-	5	1	2	2	1	2	1	3	1	1	1	3	1	-	-
E813.6	Pedal cyclist	M	**103**	-	-	3	16	15	5	7	5	9	6	9	4	3	6	8	1	4	2
		F	**24**	-	1	-	5	1	2	2	1	2	1	3	1	1	1	3	-	-	-
E814	Motor vehicle traffic accident involving collision with pedestrian	M	**482**	-	14	8	19	24	38	34	25	26	26	22	29	18	21	24	38	42	27
		F	**280**	-	10	17	8	21	14	12	7	8	4	1	5	8	11	28	17	41	34
E814.7	Pedestrian	M	**476**	-	14	8	18	22	37	34	24	26	25	22	29	18	21	24	38	42	27
		F	**280**	-	10	17	8	21	14	12	7	8	4	1	5	8	11	28	17	41	34
E815	Other motor vehicle traffic accident involving collision on the highway	M	**245**	-	1	-	1	44	39	35	34	24	20	16	9	6	3	1	3	6	2
		F	**42**	1	-	-	-	7	10	3	2	5	-	1	3	2	-	2	2	-	1
E815.0	Driver of motor vehicle other than motorcycle	M	**144**	-	-	-	-	29	23	16	10	14	15	10	6	6	2	1	3	6	2
		F	**20**	-	-	-	-	3	5	3	-	3	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	-
E815.1	Passenger in motor vehicle other than motorcycle	M	**29**	-	1	-	1	11	7	5	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		F	**17**	1	-	-	-	4	4	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	1	2	-	1
E815.2	Motorcyclist	M	**70**	-	-	-	-	4	9	14	20	10	3	6	3	-	1	-	-	-	-
		F	**1**	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
E816	Motor vehicle traffic accident due to loss of control, without collision on the highway	M	**160**	-	2	-	-	27	29	21	24	24	5	6	8	5	5	1	1	1	1
		F	**48**	1	1	1	-	9	4	6	5	1	1	5	3	1	2	-	3	1	2
E816.0	Driver of motor vehicle other than motorcycle	M	**93**	-	-	-	-	13	17	9	17	13	3	4	6	3	4	1	1	1	1
		F	**26**	-	-	-	-	5	3	6	3	1	-	4	1	-	1	-	2	-	-
E816.1	Passenger in motor vehicle other than motorcycle	M	**33**	-	2	-	-	14	8	3	-	2	-	1	-	2	1	-	-	-	-
		F	**20**	1	1	1	-	4	1	-	-	-	1	1	2	1	1	-	1	1	2
E816.2	Motorcyclist	M	**33**	-	-	-	-	-	4	9	7	9	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
		F	**1**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
E818	Other noncollision motor vehicle traffic accident	M	**18**	-	1	-	1	3	3	2	2	1	1	-	-	-	1	2	-	1	-
		F	**10**	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	1
E819	Motor vehicle traffic accident of unspecified nature	M	**231**	-	-	1	8	46	39	31	23	20	7	6	12	6	6	7	3	5	9
		F	**90**	-	1	1	4	19	13	8	1	2	5	3	5	4	4	2	5	7	3
E819.0	Driver of motor vehicle other	M	**67**																		

Appendix 4

Teesside Traffic Congestion

On Teesside the A19 is the main north-south artery. Immediately to the south of the River Tees is the intersection with the main east-west artery, the A66. Traffic on the A19 Tees Fly-over quickly rose to well above its design capacity and there continues to be very heavy peak flow congestion in that area.

In an effort to ease that congestion, a study has been undertaken to look at a second Tees crossing. This proposal first won official sanction as a rail crossing with an option of an additional road. However, the rail element is rarely mentioned now. Instead, this new crossing is argued to be a solution to current congestion on the Tees Fly-over and a new means of access to the A19 for traffic from the eastern parts of the Teesside conurbation