

**Traffic Flow figures**

**Traffic flow not presented to public consultation**

Why were the traffic flow figures not made available for either of the public enquiries? This information must have been available as HE have used figures from 2015. Public consultations for other schemes show traffic flow figures. I made the following comment on this in my responses to the consultation in 2018 and 2020:

**Response ID ANON-GGT6-56YH-4**

**Submitted to Trans-Pennine Upgrade**

**Submitted on 2018-03-24 14:35:07**

*27. Traffic flow figures/Peak flow figures/Traffic forecasts/Junction analysis/Journey times*

*There is no mention of the traffic flow figures etc. in the documentation that has been released to the public. In previous public consultations for the bypass, the public has been shown traffic flow figures for the various roads in the area, at the consultation meetings. It is difficult to assess the merits of the proposed new road layout without these figures. Only three planning sites have been mentioned in the documentation and maps despite other large proposed residential estates both in Tameside and High Peak being known of by the local population. Surely this extra potential traffic volume must be significant.*

*A document titled 'Preliminary Local Traffic Information' IS available for the A303 Public Consultation. Why is a document like this not available for the Mottram bypass consultation? We understand that this may be the subject of a 'mini enquiry' to be planned for June, but as this is the formal public enquiry response we feel this comment needs to be made now.*

**Response ID ANON-C9Q5-UVNW-J**

**Submitted to A57 Link Roads - November to December 2020**

**Submitted on 2020-12-16 17:07:58**

*17. Traffic flow figures/Peak flow figures/Traffic forecasts/Junction analysis/Journey times - A document titled 'Preliminary Local Traffic Information' was available for the A303 Public Consultation, yet this information is not available for this consultation. We understand that this information will only be available prior to the planning application (DCO) submission, this is far too late.*

**Difference in figures**

The figures published in Transport Assessment Report (TR010034/APP/7.4) are vastly different for the figures available for 2015 that are available on [REDACTED]. If the figures published in the document are those used to design the scheme then this design must be compromised

	Mottram Moor	Hyde Road	Roe Cross	Back Moor	Wool Lane	Mkt St H'worth	Brook efield	M67	est MM East
HE 2015	29,200	19,300	14,750	10,950	16,450	15,950	14,800	28,500	18,300
Dft 2015	34,542	23,409	16,765	15,256	18,202	13,348	16,902	28,145	19,286
dif	5,342	4,109	2,015	4,306	1,752	2,602	2,102	-355	986

In document TR010034 - 6.3 Environmental Statement para 1.2.3 it is stated “*Much of this heavy traffic travels through local roads, which disrupts the lives of communities and makes it difficult and potentially unsafe for pedestrians to cross the roads. It is expected that these issues will only get worse with time if significant improvements aren’t made.*”, yet the figures for 2025 for the ‘do minimum’ show very little difference from the figures in 2015 Highways England have published, how do Highways England justify that?

	Mott Moor	Hyde Road	Roe Cross	Back Moor	Wool Lane	Mkt St H'worth	Brooke field	M67	est MM East
HE 2015	29,200	19,300	14,750	10,950	16,450	15,950	14,800	28,500	18,300
DM 2025	29,200	19,200	15,250	10,900	16,650	15,950	15,200	28,450	18,400
dif	0	-100	500	-50	200	0	400	-50	100

How can there be a reduction on Back Moor, Roe Cross and Market Street Hollingworth with the scheme than without it? Surely the scheme would make it more attractive for vehicles travelling from Stalybridge to the M67 to go through Mottram than to use Matley Lane, indeed the figures provided by HE suggest that to be the case. It would also attract more traffic to travel over Woodhead Pass and along Market Street Hollingworth if the aim on the scheme to improve connectivity between the Manchester and Sheffield city regions is met.

One might also question where the 25% increase in traffic using the M67 comes from if the scheme goes ahead.

	Mott Moor	Hyde Road	Roe Cross	Back Moor	Wool Lane	Mkt St H'worth	Brooke field	M67	est MM East
DM	29,200	19,200	15,250	10,900	16,650	15,950	15,200	28,450	18,400
DS	16,650	2,850	13,650	8,550	3,950	15,900	19,850	35,950	1,750
dif	-12,550	-16,350	-1,600	-2,350	-12,700	-50	4,650	7,500	-16,650

### Traffic ‘calming’ on Hyde Road

#### **TR010034-000299.8.2 Statement of common ground**

*16 January 2021 Meeting*

*A meeting with Tameside MBC to discuss detrunking works, specifically, traffic calming, road declassification and diversion routes. Agreement to 20 mph on detrunked Hyde Road.*

IF there are restrictions / calming on Hyde Road then even more vehicles will use Back Moor and Ashworth Lane. I understood that the policy of TMBC was only to use 20mph limits where there was a need for safety reasons. This seems to be a 20mph limit to deter vehicles from using the road.

### **Area at front of Property**

There has STILL been no consultation with the residents of the properties on Mottram Moor.

It has always been said that the ‘access road’ to the properties on Mottram Moor would come under Tameside, yet the plans provided for DCO suggest that the ‘detrunking’ would only be from past the junction of Mottram Moor and Back Moor.

The parking bays seem to have been removed from the documents that went to the public consultation.

We now find :- in 6.3 Environmental Statement, Chapters 1-4 Introductory Chapters, Table 3-7 Changes to the Scheme design since PRA (2017) and the 2018 consultation

Install more off-road parking	Originally, parking bays for Mottram Moor were included in the design. Following statutory consultation and discussions with the local community they were removed from design. However, further engagement confirmed they were desired so have been added back to the design. Following consultation with Tameside MBC, the initial proposal to provide parking bays was amended to 'on street' parking, as this is considered to require less ongoing maintenance, and provided additional space for soft landscaping. <i>Environmental Benefits:</i> The design fits into the context of its surroundings and provides additional function and facilities for local residents
-------------------------------	--

So the views of the people who live there have been overruled by the desire for 'less ongoing maintenance'. This makes a total mockery of any consultation, it may as well not have happened.

There is no vehicular access to the front of our property.

The entrance to the access road has been moved to the west nearer to the start of the left filter lane and further from the main junction.

A new bridleway has been added with a traffic light controlled crossing almost at the point where the access road used to join the main road.

There appear to be trees planted very close to houses and to the south blocking out light and causing potential problems to the property and services with root damage. Again NO consultation with the people who have to live here.

**Visual impact of embankment from rear of our property**

There is no mention that we can find of this in the document, nor does there appear to be any mitigating measures. In Highways England's documents the properties are described as 'low value housing'. It would seem that the residents of the properties on the north side of Mottram Moor have not been considered. It appears as though it is more important to protect the views from Mottram Church that to consider the impact of people who live in apparently low value properties.

**Noise pollution from embankment to rear of our property**

For the first time in any document from Highways England there is mention of the noise pollution to the rear of the properties on the north of Mottram Moor from the embankment.

The mitigation measure is 2.5m high noise barriers on the embankment which is positive, but there is no description of what they are. We are assuming that they are 'timber fencing' like those used at the junction of the Airport Eastern link road and the A523 in Hazel Grove (see image). If this is the case then they will have a detriment impact on the visual effect from the rear of our property which could be reduced by staining the timber green.



**Traffic Management Plan**

Paragraphs 2.6.2 and 2.7.1 both state that Mottram Moor will be reduced to only one lane eastbound. On 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2021 the inside lane was closed at the bottom on Mottram Moor during working hours and the traffic flow was blocked back past the junction with Back Moor. If Mottram Moor is reduced to one lane eastbound during peak periods the traffic will surely jam up even further making it difficult to exit Back

Moor onto Mottram Moor and causing longer delays on the A57 and M67 contrary to the stated aim 3.1.2 in the document.