



# Transport Activists' Roundtable North West

www.nwtar.org.uk

## NW TAR CORE GROUP

Convenor:

[Redacted]

Members:

[Redacted]

Webmaster:

[Redacted]

Mr. Daniel Hyde (and Ms. Kay Sully),  
Assistant Case Officer (and Case Manager), A556 Knutsford- Bowdon Scheme,  
The Planning Inspectorate,  
Temple Quay House,  
2 The Square,  
Bristol, BS1 6PN.

Sunday, May 19<sup>th</sup>, 2013

Your ref: TR010002

Dear Mr. Hyde (and Ms. Sully),

### HIGHWAYS AGENCY APPLICATION RE. A556 KNUTSFORD-BOWDON SCHEME

We acknowledge receipt of your responses of May 15<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> to our submission of May 9<sup>th</sup>, 2013. They appear to be contradictory. The first says you are rejecting our representation as it was *“submitted after the submission of the proposed scheme”*. This implies that the North West Transport Roundtable (NW TAR) did not take part in the Highways Agency (HA) consultations whereas we actually participated at every opportunity and objected each time. However, the point to impress on you is that the HS2 issue has arisen after the HA consultations closed. It is not clear whether or not this was apparent to you when you first wrote but your second letter seems to be saying the opposite to the first and that our representation is considered acceptable.

For your information, we made two Freedom of Information requests to the HA in March this year in an attempt to establish what, if any, contact there has been between the HA and HS2 Ltd. This revealed that there was some but, if what we have seen is the extent of it, then it was minimal. It does not appear as though, when HS2 Ltd were exploring possible alignments for HS2 Phase Two or even after the preferred route was announced, it caused the HA to pause and reflect and reconsider the A556 scheme in any way. If this supposition is correct, then it is quite extraordinary.

We initially appealed to you (in our letter of May 9<sup>th</sup>) to refuse to accept the A556 scheme because of the lack of public consultation on the A556 Knutsford-Bowdon Improvement vis-à-vis HS2 Phase Two. Whether or not you consider the consultation argument we made in our last letter is an acceptable one, we would now like to put to you that the application from the HA does not comply with the DCLG guidance on nationally significant infrastructure projects. Criteria no. 5 of the application form is: *“The application information must be provided to a sufficient degree of detail that will enable the Commission (and all other interested parties) to appropriately consider the proposal. If the applicant considers it is infeasible to provide full and final details of any element of the proposal at the point of submitting the application, the applicant should clearly set out its reasoning for this”*. (Sept. 2009, p.1).

We put it to you that this criteria has not been met because of the lack of any mention of HS2. We urge you not to proceed to examination. Thank you  
Yours sincerely,

[Redacted] Convenor, & [Redacted] Core Group Member, NW TAR  
[Redacted]