

**A57 Link Roads**

**TR010034**

**Draft Statement of Common Ground with  
High Peak Borough Council**

Rule 8(k)

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

November 2021

# Infrastructure Planning

## Planning Act 2008

### The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

### A57 Link Roads

### Development Consent Order 202[x ]

---

## **8.2 DRAFT STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND WITH HIGH PEAK BOROUGH COUNCIL**


---

<b>Rule Number:</b>	Rule 8(k)
<b>Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference</b>	TR010034
<b>Application Document Reference</b>	TR010034/EXAM/XX
<b>Author:</b>	A57 Link Roads Project Team, National Highways and Atkins


<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Status of Version</b>
0	[Date month year]	Deadline x

## DRAFT STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

**This Draft Statement of Common Ground has been prepared and agreed by (1)  
National Highways Limited and (2) High Peak Borough Council**

Signed.......... To be signed prior to examination  
Name (1) Andrew Dawson  
Project Manager  
On behalf of National Highways  
Date: 6.1.22

Signed.....

  
Name (2) Neil W. Rodgers  
Position (2) Executive Director  
On behalf of High Peak Borough  
Council  
Date: 11/01/22

# Table of contents

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1. Purpose of this document	5
1.2. Parties to this Statement of Common Ground	5
1.3. Terminology	5
1.4. Addressing Rule Six requirements	6
<b>2. Record of Engagement</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>3. Table of issues and matters to be agreed</b>	<b>13</b>
3.2. Issues Related to Rule Six Letter Annex E	13

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1. Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1. This Draft Statement of Common Ground ("SoCG") has been prepared in respect of the proposed A57 Link Roads scheme (previously known as Trans-Pennine Upgrade) ("the Application") made by National Highways Limited ("National Highways") to the Secretary of State for Transport ("Secretary of State") for a Development Consent Order (DCO) under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 ("the Act").
- 1.1.2. This SoCG does not seek to replicate information which is available elsewhere within the Application documents. All documents are available in the deposit locations and/or the Planning Inspectorate website.
- 1.1.3. The SoCG has been produced to confirm to the Examining Authority where agreement has been reached between the parties to it, and where agreement has not (yet) been reached. SoCGs are an established means in the planning process of allowing all parties to identify and so focus on specific issues that may need to be addressed during the examination.

## 1.2. Parties to this Statement of Common Ground

- 1.2.1. This SoCG has been prepared by (1) National Highways as the Applicant and (2) High Peak Borough Council (High Peak Borough Council).
- 1.2.2. National Highways (formerly Highways England) became the Government-owned Strategic Highways Company on 1 April 2015. It is the highway authority in England for the strategic road network and has the necessary powers and duties to operate, manage, maintain and enhance the network. Regulatory powers remain with the Secretary of State. The legislation establishing the then Highways England made provision for all legal rights and obligations of the Highways Agency, including in respect of the Application, to be conferred upon or assumed by Highways England (now National Highways).
- 1.2.3. High Peak Borough Council forms part of a two-tier system of local government for High Peak, alongside Derbyshire County Council. HPBC covers the town planning administration of the area where the south eastern works of the Scheme are located and provides local services such as waste and recycling services, parks and tourism services and housing services.

## 1.3. Terminology

- 1.3.1. In the tables in the Issues chapter of this SoCG, "Not Agreed" indicates a final position, and "Under discussion" where these points will be the subject of on-going discussion wherever possible to resolve, or refine, the extent of disagreement between the parties. "Agreed" indicates where the issue has been resolved.
- 1.3.2. It can be taken that any matters not specifically referred to in the Issues chapter of this SoCG are not of material interest or relevance to, and therefore have not been the subject of any discussions between the parties. As such, those matters can be read as agreed, only to the extent that they are either not of material interest or relevance to High Peak Borough Council.

## 1.4. Addressing Rule Six requirements

- 1.4.1. The document evidences the meeting of conditions set out within Annex E of the Rule Six letter from the Examining Authority, dated **XXXXXX**. High Peak Borough Council is a Category A interested party amongst other local authorities. The SoCG will address the following requirements within Annex E through the associated sections outlined in tables 1.1 and 1.2 below.

**Table 1.1: Section Six Letter Annex E Requirement for all category A-D parties**

Annex E Requirement	Relevant SoCG section
Applicable legislation and policy considered by the Applicant	1. Legislation and Policy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1 dDCO articles and associate schedules</li> <li>1.2 DCO Requirements</li> <li>1.3 Protective Provisions</li> <li>1.4 Other DCO matters</li> </ul>
The Applicant's assessment and the proposed mitigation measures: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The adequacy of the assessment and mitigation for each environmental topic. Consideration of scope, methodology, study area, receptors, and their sensitivity. Baseline conditions, how they were identified and whether all necessary information was obtained given the restrictions during the Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic</li> <li>2. The flexibility sought for the detailed design, construction, and operational phases. Whether the extent of flexibility adopted in the Rochdale Envelope for assessment and evidence is consistent. The extent of the Rochdale Envelope. How the reasonable worst-case scenario has been assessed.</li> <li>3. The magnitude and duration of construction and operational phase effects, mitigation, opportunities for enhancement, residual effects after mitigation and their significance, monitoring, and maintenance.</li> <li>4. Whether any scoping out of detailed assessment is consistent with applicable legislation and policy, including the National Policy Statement for National Networks and the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.</li> <li>5. Whether the assessment methodology reflects best practice, whether it has been applied consistently, and whether the assessment of significant residual effects is fully evidenced and reasoned o Uncertainty arising from Coronavirus (COVID-19).</li> <li>6. The application of professional judgements and assumptions.</li> </ol>	2 Assessment and proposed mitigation <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.1 Environmental assessment and mitigation                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.1.1 Adequacy of assessment for each environmental topic</li> <li>2.1.2 Adequacy of mitigation for each environmental topic</li> <li>2.1.3 Methodology</li> <li>2.1.4 Baseline conditions and coronavirus</li> </ol> </li> <li>2.2 Flexibility and worst-case scenario</li> <li>2.3 Construction and operational effects</li> <li>2.4 Scoping out of detailed assessment and National Policy Statement for National Networks</li> <li>2.5 Assessment of methodology and best practice</li> <li>2.6 Application of professional judgements and assumptions</li> <li>2.7 Mitigation and outline environment management plan</li> <li>2.8 Residual impacts and securing of mitigation measures</li> <li>2.9 Cumulative impacts</li> <li>2.10 The significance of each residual impact</li> </ol>

Annex E Requirement	Relevant SoCG section
<p>7. The need for and adequacy of outline/ draft mitigation and management strategies and plans, including the Outline Environmental Management Plan.</p> <p>8. Whether the mitigation measures, including embedded measures, are secured and are likely to result in the identified residual impacts, consistent with the Environmental Statement</p> <p>9. The assessment of cumulative effects and the other plans and projects included in the cumulative impact assessment</p> <p>10. The significance of each residual impact</p>	
<p>Whether the mitigation identified in the Environmental Statement is adequately secured by the combination of Requirements in the draft Development Consent Order with other consents, permits and licenses</p>	<p>3. Environmental Statement and DCO requirements</p>
<p>The draft Development Consent Order Requirements and associated provisions and documents; whether they are reasonable and relevant to planning and the development to be consented; whether they are enforceable and precise; whether they secure the proposed mitigation and monitoring; and whether any additional provisions are necessary</p>	<p>4. DCO requirements and associated provisions and documents</p>
<p>Matters for which detailed approval needs to be obtained, the proposed procedures for consultation on and the discharge of Requirements, and for approvals, consents, and appeals, including arbitration, and the roles of the local authorities and of other statutory and regulatory authorities</p>	<p>5. Matters for detailed review</p>
<p>The identification of consents, permits or licenses required before the development can become operational, their scope, management plans that would be included in an application, progress to date, comfort/ impediments and timescales for the consents, permits or licenses being granted</p>	<p>6. Other consents and permits</p>
<p>Opportunities for enhancement and environmental benefits.</p>	<p>7. Opportunities for enhancement and environmental benefits.</p>
<p>Human rights and equalities duties</p>	<p>8. Human rights and equalities duties</p>
<p>Any other relevant and important considerations</p>	<p>9. Any other relevant and important considerations</p>

**Table 1.2: Section Six Letter Annex E Requirement for only category A parties**

Annex E Requirement	Relevant LPA Issues sub-section
Compliance with local policy and the development plans, impacts on land use and the acceptability of proposed changes to land use	10.1 Compliance with local policy and development plans
The achievement of sustainable development	10.2 Achievement of sustainable development
The matters listed under the following headings in the ExA's Initial Assessment of Principal Issues: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Transport networks and traffic, alternatives, access, severance, walkers, cyclists, and horse riders</li> <li>2. Landscape and visual, green belt and good design</li> <li>3. The historic environment</li> <li>4. Air quality and climate change</li> <li>5. Noise, vibration, and nuisance</li> <li>6. Soils, ground conditions, material assets and waste</li> <li>7. The water environment, drainage, flood risk assessment, water frameworks directive</li> <li>8. Biodiversity, ecological and geological conservation</li> <li>9. Land use, social and economic, human health</li> <li>10. Other environmental topics</li> </ol>	10.3 Matters listed under assessment of principles
Whether potential releases can be adequately regulated under the pollution control framework, consistent the National Policy Statement for National Networks	10.4. Whether potential releases can be adequately regulated under the pollution control framework, consistent the National Policy Statement for National Networks
Any other relevant matters included in the ExA's Initial Assessment of Principal Issues	10.5 Any other relevant matters included in the ExA's Initial Assessment of Principal Issues
Any other matters on which agreement might aid the smooth running of the Examination and assist the ExA's recommendation to the Secretary of State	10.6 Any other matters on which agreement might aid the smooth running of the Examination and assist the ExA's recommendation to the Secretary of State



## 2. Record of Engagement

2.1.1. A summary of the meetings and correspondence that has taken place between National Highways and High Peak Borough Council between 2016 and March 2021 in relation to the Application, is outlined in Table 2-1.

**Table 2.1: Record of Engagement between National Highways and High Peak Borough Council**

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes (the topics should align with the Issues tables)
11/7/2016	Stakeholder Engagement Workshop	An early engagement workshop with all relevant stakeholders to discuss the challenges and objectives of the A57 Link Roads development, a review of the elements of programme and issues, the delivery process, potential for early delivery of package elements, Hollingworth and Tintwistle.
9/8/2016	Stakeholder Questionnaire	A questionnaire was sent to all stakeholders after the workshop above.
1/5/2018	Steering Group Meeting	A scheme update was provided, with queries on traffic figures and the format of consultation on the traffic figures. Stakeholders requested to receive the traffic data prior to the release of the information to the public. There were discussions around the Local Impact Report and an update was provided on air quality and noise.
09/10/2018	Meeting	Key issues identified at the meeting include lack of traffic flow data and associated impacts on noise and air, cultural heritage assessment, Melandra Castle, viewpoints, landscaping, and the requirement for further economic and regeneration information in the PEIR.
10/09/2020	HE Email	Request for inventory drawings regarding lighting
04/11/2020	HE Email	Request for air quality data
04/11/2020	HE Email	S42 consultation pack distribution
05/11/2020	HPBC Email	Receipt of S42 consultation pack
11/11/2020	HE Email	Check status of issues regarding previous scheme
11/11/2020	DCC Email	Response to state it was not satisfied previous issues had been resolved
12/11/2020	HPBC Email	Provided HE with air quality data requested
12/11/2020	HE Email	Provision of draft traffic data
12/11/2020	HE Email	Meeting set up
12/11/2020	DCC Email	Meeting set up
13/11/2020	DCC Email	Meeting set up and information on consultant identified to assess traffic data
13/11/2020	DCC Email	Meeting set up
16/11/2020	Various Emails	Meeting set up and contact information
16/11/2020	HE Email	Meeting set up - Woolley Bridge

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes (the topics should align with the Issues tables)
17/11/2020	HE Email	Information provide by email on Woolley Bridge proposed junction design
17/11/2020	DCC Email	Applicant received email from Derbyshire CC stating that it had assessed the traffic data provided for review and had a few questions about the modelling it wished to cover. The Consultee requested further information from Highways England.
17/11/2020	HE Email	An email was sent from Highways England to request their comments on traffic impact.
19/11/2020	HE Email	Email seeking confirmation of committed developments
19/11/2020	HPBC Email	Asked for clarification on committed development thresholds
19/11/2020	HE Email	Confirmed committed development thresholds
22/11/2020	HE Email	Meeting set up - general
22/11/2020	DCC Email	Meeting set up - general
23/11/2020	HE Email	Meeting set up - general
23/11/2020	DCC Email	Meeting set up - general
23/11/2020	HE Email	Meeting set up - Woolley Bridge design
24/11/2020	DCC Email	Meeting set up - Woolley Bridge design
26/11/2020	HE Email	Request for committed development information
27/11/2020	HE Email	Proposed meeting regarding air quality assessment results
28/11/2020	DCC Email	Example of SoCG between DCC and HE regarding A38 scheme
30/11/2020	HPBC Email	Meeting set up – air quality
30/11/2020	Meeting	A meeting was held to discuss additional traffic lane and signal design at Woolley Bridge Junction, traffic modelling.
01/12/2020	Meeting	A meeting was held between Highways England, HPBC and Derbyshire CC to discuss a number of landscape and cultural heritage issues.
03/12/2020	HPBC Email	Committed development information provided
08/12/2020	HE Email	Meeting set up - heritage
08/12/2020	DCC Email	An email was received from Derbyshire CC about the archaeological investigation methodology and Melandra Castle.
16/12/2020	HE Email	Request data on proposed housing development at Woolley Bridge
17/12/2020	DCC Email	Contact details for discussion regarding proposed housing development
17/12/2020	HE Email	Three-dimensional drawing of proposed Woolley Bridge Junction layout provided
17/12/2020	HE Email	Meeting minutes distributed for comment

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes (the topics should align with the Issues tables)
17/12/2020	DCC Email	Confirmation meeting minutes were a 'fair reflection'
17/12/2020	DCC Email	Joint response from HPBC and Derbyshire CC to the consultation, stating that they were making a holding objection based on the lack of information provided on traffic and environmental impacts.
18/12/2020	HE Email	Email to confirm GI methodology
04/01/2021	HE Email	Email to provide GA drawings regarding street lighting.
06/01/2021	DCC Email	Email providing details of Derbyshire's updated street lighting specification.
06/01/2021	DCC Email	Email regarding discussion about scheme layout presented and draft comments. Contact details were also provided.
11/01/2021	DCC Email	Email regarding a DCC development in the locality of the Scheme
14/01/2021	HE Email	Confirmed that the DCC scheme and A57 Link Roads do not overlap, although opportunities for joint drainage could be considered.
01/02/2021	HE Email	Details of highway maintenance boundary drawings provided and request for meeting in summer 2021
01/02/2021	DCC Email	Agreement to meet regarding street lighting in summer 2021.
09/02/2021	HE Email	Draft Scheme Layout sent for comment plus request for existing asset details, review of commencement and maintenance definition, materials pallet, and existing adoption boundaries.
03/03/2021	HE Email	Chasing response to GI methodology
22/03/21	HE Email	Chasing responses to draft layout email and
22/03/21	DCC Email	Details of materials pallet and information on future contacts
24/03/21	HE Email	ES Cumulative effects assessment and committed development definition
25/03/21	HE Email	Review of COSA Assessment requested
26/03/21	HE Email	Chasing response to GI methodology
31/03/21	DC Email	Details provided of residential development at Woolley Bridge Junction to be considered in HE design
06/04/21	HPBC Email	Confirmed that the High Peak sites identified within the COSA assessment do not belong to the Council. Requested additional policy added with regard to High Peak BC.
30/07/2021	HPBC Email	HPBC outlined details of Local Impact Report details submitted with DCO application following discussions between HPBC, DCC and Aecom. Email sets out details of Data Queries, Information Requests, and Gaps in Transport Assessment.
02/08/2021	HE Email	HE forwarded 30/07/2021 email to others at HE and Atkins to request comparison against questions posed by Aecom.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes (the topics should align with the Issues tables)
24/08/2021	HE Email	HE shared response to HPBC Link Road queries. HE attempted to follow up with a call but HBPC contact on annual leave.
3/12/2021	Meeting	Meeting between HPBC, NH and Atkins. Atkins discussed DCO process and SoCG matters. HPBC agreed to share outline for Local Impact Reports to support SoCG formation. Recurring meetings agreed and will be scheduled to support SoCG review with HPBC.

Note: Meeting invites are not included in the table above

- 2.1.2. It is agreed that this is an accurate record of the key meetings and consultation undertaken between (1) National Highways and (2) High Peak Borough Council in relation to the issues addressed in this SoCG.

### 3. Table of issues and matters to be agreed

#### 3.1. Issues Related to Rule Six Letter Annex E

Table 3.1: Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) Between National Highways and High Peak Borough Council (HPBC)  
 Table of Issues/Matters - Final Version dated 5 November 2021

SoCG Ref. Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	HPBC comment	National Highways response	Status
<b>1. Legislation and Policy</b>					
<b>2. Assessment and Proposed Mitigation</b>					
<b>2.1 Environmental Assessment and Mitigation</b>					

SoCG Ref. Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	HPBC comment	National Highways response	Status
<b>2.1.1 Adequacy of assessment for each environmental topic</b>					
<b>2.1.2 Adequacy of mitigation for each environmental topic</b>					
<b>2.1.3 Methodology</b>					
<b>2.1.4 Baseline conditions and coronavirus</b>					

SoCG Ref. Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	HPBC comment	National Highways response	Status
<b>2.2 Flexibility and worst case scenario</b>					
<b>2.3 Construction and operational effects</b>					
2.3.1	Outline Traffic Management Plan  [APP-186]	Construction traffic  Disruption	The Consultee believes that there will be disruption to local residents and businesses during construction phase of the Scheme.  Further details requested around the impacts of AQ on the ancient woodland around Shire Hill, in the short-term assessment	The Applicant has set out the potential construction impacts within the ES and Environmental Management Plan [TR010034/APP/6.3 and 7.2]  The majority of the Scheme will be built offline decreasing such impacts.  <b>ES:</b> APP-058 to APP-181  <b>EMP:</b> APP-183	Under Discussion
<b>2.4 Scoping out of detailed assessment and National Policy Statement for National Networks</b>					

SoCG Ref. Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	HPBC comment	National Highways response	Status
<b>2.5 Assessment of methodology and best practice</b>					
<b>2.6 Application of professional judgements and assumptions</b>					
<b>2.7 Mitigation and outline environment management plan</b>					
<b>2.8 Residual impacts and securing of mitigation measures</b>					



SoCG Ref. Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	HPBC comment	National Highways response	Status
<b>2.9 Cumulative impacts</b>					
<b>2.10 The significance of each residual impact</b>					

SoCG Ref. Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	HPBC Comment	National Highways response	Status
<b>3. Environmental Statement and DCO Requirements</b>					
3.1	Environmental Statement (ES)	Air Quality Methodology	The Consultee stated that air quality is a major concern. Since the last public consultation on the scheme in 2018, HPBC has designated Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) on sections of the A628 in Tintwistle and the A57	The Applicant's air quality assessment (in the ES [TR010034/APP/6.3] has taken into consideration the AQMA designated since 2018 in Tintwistle and Dinting Vale. The air quality assessment has been	Under Discussion

SoCG Ref. Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	HPBC Comment	National Highways response	Status
	[APP-061]	AQMAs	at Dinting. Detailed assessment is required.	undertaken in accordance with DMRB LA105 with the air quality study area determined on the basis of traffic change criteria given this guidance.	
3.2	Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-061]	Air Quality Methodology Dinting Vale	The Consultee questioned the air quality results at Dinting Vale.	The air quality assessment has been undertaken in accordance with DMRB LA105 with the air quality study area determined on the basis of traffic change criteria given this guidance. A detailed assessment of air quality has been undertaken for all areas where traffic changes are expected, which includes the Dinting Vale area. Full results will be reported in the Environmental Statement [TR010034/APP/6.3].	Under Discussion
3.3	Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-061] Air Quality	Air Quality Methodology Greater Manchester Clean Air Zone (CAZ)	The Consultee indicated that the potential impact of the Greater Manchester Clean Air Zone (CAZ) and associated risk of 'rat runs' should be considered.	The scheme traffic model has been revised and refined since the previous consultation in 2018. Additional routes that could be used as 'rat runs' have been included in the traffic model used to inform the assessment for the DCO application.  The Scheme is located within the CAZ boundary. The CAZ has been developed in parallel with the Applicant's scheme, so it was not possible to consider it in the traffic and air quality modelling. However, the air quality assessment undertaken, which does not include the CAZ, can be considered a worst case.  To be updated with the latest information of the GM CAZ, proposed date for	Under Discussion

SoCG Ref. Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	HPBC Comment	National Highways response	Status
				implementation is 30 <sup>th</sup> May 2022, with charging being implemented along the A57 and A628 throughout the borough of TMBC.	
3.4	Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-061] Air Quality	Air Quality Methodology Insufficient information	The Consultee stated that in the absence of traffic data it was unable to assess the air quality assessment outlined in the PEIR.	The Applicant will provide traffic modelling and air quality data within its DCO application. (Environmental Statement [TR010034/APP/6.3] and] Transport Assessment Report [TR010034/APP/7.4]	Under Discussion
3.5	Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-062]	Archaeology & Cultural Heritage Methodology Cultural heritage assessment	The Consultee suggested that the following assets should be included in the assessment; Scheduled Monuments and non-designated, valued assets in the immediate Longdendale landscape; Tintwistle and Langsett Conservation Areas and assets along the A57 extending to Ladybower.	The Applicant is to review the inclusion of these assets within the assessment in the Cultural heritage chapter (Chapter 6) of the ES [TR010034/APP/6.3].	Agreed
3.6	Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-062]	Archaeology & Cultural Heritage Methodology Melandra Castle	It indicates that the assessment of setting impacts to Melandra Castle should comprise a setting study following the five-step principle established in Historic England guidance and include appropriate viewpoint photography/ photomontages to show the potential impacts of the development.	The Applicant undertook the assessment in relation to this guidance.	Agreed

SoCG Ref. Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	HPBC Comment	National Highways response	Status
3.7	Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-062]	Archaeology & Cultural Heritage  Methodology  Melandra Castle	The Consultees stated it that it had requested additional viewpoints of Melandra Castle but could not see them within the consultation materials.	The Applicant stated that it currently had three representative Viewpoints in the vicinity of Woolley Bridge and Melandra Castle: a) View from the Woolley Bridge (A57) adjacent residential properties: b) View from Trans Pennine Trail c) View from PRoW HP12/72/3 adjacent Melandra Castle (SAM)	Agreed
3.8	Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-064]	Biodiversity  Methodology  Assessment	The Consultee expressed that as only a small part of the Scheme lies within Derbyshire it is difficult to understand the in/direct impacts as Derbyshire CC only has comprehensive ecological data within the count.	The Applicant will include its ecological assessments within the Biodiversity chapter (Chapter 8) of the ES [TR010034/APP/6.3] as part of the DCO application	Agreed
3.9	Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-064]	Biodiversity  Methodology  Surveys	The Consultee stated that the ecological surveys identified in the PEIR were acceptable.	Applicant noted	Agreed

SoCG Ref. Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	HPBC Comment	National Highways response	Status
3.10	Environmental Statement (ES)  [APP-063]	Landscape and Visual Impacts  Assessment  Land take for landscaping	The Consultee stated the Scheme's success will be dependent on assessment results, mitigation on identified impacts and how it will reinforce landscape character.	<p>The Applicant selected 31 representative viewpoints for the visual effects assessment, which were agreed with the Local Planning Authorities, (LPAs) PDNPA, Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council, HPBC, Derbyshire CC.</p> <p>It has scoped some of the viewpoints out (listed below) as the footprint of the Scheme has been reduced resulting in some viewpoints no longer representing receptors likely to experience a significant effect.</p> <p>The assessment of the indirect effects methodology has been reassessed.</p> <p>The Arcadis (2018) methodology was previously agreed with the PDNPA. Highways England will seek to discuss and agree these amendments with PDNPA, and discussions are ongoing.</p> <p>NH to provide evidence of this agreement</p>	Under Discussion
3.11	Environmental Statement (ES)  [APP-063]	Landscape and Visual Impacts  Assessment  Night time views	The Consultee queried whether night time views have constituted any additional viewpoints as at night the impact of lighting may cause new visual impacts.	In line with DMRB guidance (LA 107) a high-level night-time assessment will be undertaken for landscape and visual receptors which might be likely to be affected by the addition of artificial lighting from lighting columns associated with the Scheme.	Agreed

SoCG Ref. Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	HPBC Comment	National Highways response	Status
				The night-time landscape of the 1km study area has also been undertaken along with site visits to six representative viewpoints. The viewpoints were selected to obtain the most unobstructed night views of the Scheme and provide an accurate representation of the receptors along the Scheme corridor. The assessment considers the 'sight of light' and the effects of light on the character of an area, views and a general quality of life. The night-time assessment can be found with the summary schedules.	
3.12	Environmental Statement (ES)  [APP-063]	Landscape and Visual Impacts  Assessment  Ecology and lighting	The Consultee raised the impact of lighting on ecology.	The Applicant considered that vegetation would be retained in the area and plans for planting which would mitigate lighting impacts on ecology.	Agreed
3.13	Environmental Statement (ES)  [APP-063]	Landscape and Visual Impacts  Assessment  Planting	The Consultee indicates that planting in a linear form does not hide the route from view. It draws attention to the traditional setting and requests that enough land is made available to deliver the enhancements and mitigations of the Scheme. It states that attenuation ponds can be overengineered and should also consider biodiversity net gains.	The Applicant states that the mitigation will be landscape led and aligned with the existing landscape character. For each localised section of the route it has created scheme level character areas, which include naturalistic designs for SuDs and slopes. The focus will be on scope profiling around access tracks.	Agreed

SoCG Ref. Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	HPBC Comment	National Highways response	Status
3.14	Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-063]	Landscape and Visual Impacts  Assessment  River Etherow Bridge crossing	The Consultee indicated that that the Bridge crossing over the River Etherow is shorter than proposed and it should ensure a sufficient scale to allow the landscape and ecology of the river to 'flow' beneath it.	The Applicant stated that the impacts created by the Bridge will be reviewed in the ES [TR010034/APP/6.3] and any required mitigation included in the design.	Agreed
3.15	Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-068]  Population and Human Health	Socioeconomic assessment  Assessment  Economic and regeneration benefits	The Consultee stated that the PEIR and ES should include a more extensive and robust assessment of likely economic and regeneration benefits.  HPBC still feel the economic benefits remain unclear, whilst obvious benefits for journey in and out of the borough, what impact for shorter local journeys	The Applicant stated that strategic employments sites have been scoped out in accordance with PINS guidance. The Case for the Scheme [TR010034/APP/7.1], which will be part of the DCO application pack will consider the economic impacts of the Scheme	Under Discussion
3.16		Alternative options  Tintwistle	The current scheme only addresses the congestion issues on the A57 In Mottram, we would be supportive of further assessments beyond the current scheme that look to address the issues on the A628 in Tintwistle.	The various alternatives assessed are described in Chapter 3 of the ES, whilst these are note part of the proposed scheme we appreciate the view point of the consultee.	Agreed

#### 4. DCO Requirements and associated provisions and documents

SoCG Ref. Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	HPBC Comment	National Highways response	Status
<b>5. Matters for detailed approval</b>					
5.1	Flood Risk Assessment  [APP-056]	Future maintenance  Flood risk and drainage	The Consultee wishes to be engaged with the Applicant to identify future maintenance liabilities for the flood risk and drainage elements of the Scheme, which could be included in a SoCG.	Applicant agrees that ongoing discussions are required.	Agreed
<b>6. Other consents and permits</b>					
<b>7. Opportunities for enhancement and environmental benefits.</b>					



SoCG Ref. Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	HPBC Comment	National Highways response	Status
<b>8. Human rights and equalities duties</b>					
<b>9. Any other relevant and important considerations</b>					
9.1	Consultation Report  [APP-026]	Insufficient information  Lack of data in the PEIR – traffic/ environment	The Consultee expressed significant concern was expressed regarding the absence of environmental and traffic data published with the public consultation. It stated that the lack of information in the PEIR prevented it from developing a Local Impact Report or any other assessments of the Scheme’s impacts.	The Applicant has updated environmental and traffic data within the DCO Application. The traffic modelling has been altered following changes to the Scheme arising from consultation.	Under discussion

SoCG Ref. Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	HPBC Comment	National Highways response	Status
9.2	Consultation Report [APP-026]	Insufficient information  Lack of data in the PEIR	The Consultee stated that it's comments on the 2018 PEIR remain.	The Applicant will consider these issues within the DCO application and accompanying ES [TR010034/APP/6.3].	Agreed
9.3	Consultation Report [APP-026]	Insufficient information  Holding objection	The Consultee asked what additional information would be set out in the ES as it has a holding objection on the basis of limited information.	The information provided within the PEIR for consultation has been significantly progressed since the previous consultation. It sets out everything that will be included within the detailed Environmental Impact Assessment of the Scheme that can be found within the ES [TR010034/APP/6.3].  The Applicant has provided additional information in the ES within its DCO application, several items relating to environmental impacts are still under discussion.	Under Discussion.
9.4	Consultation Report [APP-026]	Insufficient information  Holding objection	The Consultee asked what additional information would be set out in the ES as it has a holding objection on the basis of limited information.	The information provided within the PEIR for consultation has been significantly progressed since the previous consultation. It sets out everything that will be included within the detailed Environmental Impact Assessment of the Scheme that can be found within the ES [TR010034/APP/6.3].	Under discussion

SoCG Ref. Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	HPBC Comment	National Highways response	Status
				<p>The Applicant will provide additional information in the ES within its DCO application.</p>	
9.5	RR-0240-15	<p>Relevant Representation</p> <p>General Air Quality concerns not previously highlighted in SoCG</p>	<p>Unfortunately, the assessments submitted in support of the Development Consent Order application also omit consideration of the impacts on the AQMAs. The Council is keen to explore the basis for this by examining the underlying assumptions and projections in the traffic modelling. Seemingly, traffic is projected to avoid the A57 through Glossop town centre by taking alternative routes such as Shaw Lane.</p>	<p>The Dinting Vale Junction, which is within the Glossop AQMA, has been considered in the air quality assessment presented in Chapter 5: Air Quality of the ES (APP-061). Other parts of the Glossop AQMA and also the Tintwistle AQMA do not include sections of roads that trigger the need for further assessment of air quality as discussed above. (R-869-14).</p> <p>The Scheme is forecast to result in an increase in traffic on Dinting Road and Shaw Lane. This route is currently a well-known and well-used alternative to the A57 through Glossop. This is because of traffic congestion and delays on Glossop High Street at certain times of day. The Scheme itself is not introducing any specific measures on this part of the network that would modify this traffic behaviour. However, the absolute increases in traffic flow due to the Scheme by 2040 are forecast to be relatively low at up to 91 vehicles per hour (less than 1 vehicle per minute each way) on Shaw Lane and up to 159 per hour on Dinting Road (less than 1 vehicle every 45 seconds each way).</p>	Under Discussion

SoCG Ref. Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	HPBC Comment	National Highways response	Status
				<p>This part of the road network is outside of the Scheme boundary and it is, therefore, a matter for Derbyshire County Council to address issues of traffic using alternative roads to avoid traffic congestion on Glossop High Street.</p>	
9.6	RR-0240-20	<p>Relevant Representation</p> <p>Emissions and modal shift</p>	<p>There is a lack of reference to, and acknowledgement of, the Government's strategic priorities of reducing emissions, and increasing modal shift to active travel.</p>	<p>Chapter 14: Climate of the ES has considered the relevant legislation in force, however it did not include the DfT's Transport Decarbonisation Plan as this was published in July 2021, after the DCO application in June 2021. The plan outlines a number of commitments by the Government to remove all emissions from road transport to achieve net zero target by 2050. Commitments that will have a direct impact on road user emissions from the Scheme will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An end to the sale of new petrol and diesel cars and vans by 2030</li> <li>• All new cars and vans to zero emissions at the tailpipe by 2030</li> <li>• All new L-category vehicles to be fully zero emissions at the tailpipe by 2035</li> </ul> <p>Current policy commitments mean that the greenhouse gas assessment presented in</p>	Under discussion

SoCG Ref. Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	HPBC Comment	National Highways response	Status
				<p>Chapter 14: Climate of the ES (APP-070) is considered to be an overestimate as the uptake of new electric vehicles in future years would be expected to be higher than the proportions used in the national projections included in Defra's Emissions Factor Toolkit (v10) used for the scheme assessment. Within the Emissions Factor Toolkit account is not taken for the increase of electric vehicles beyond 2030</p>	
9.6	RR-0240-22	<p>Relevant Representation</p> <p>Emissions and transport fleet</p>	<p>Vehicle emission factors take account of Department for Transport fleet projections including conventional vehicles (petrol and diesel) as well as hybrid and electric vehicles, but do not take account of government commitments to changes in fleet makeup, for example the phasing out of conventional fuel cars and vans by 2030.</p>	<p>The emission factors used for greenhouse gas (GHG) operational road traffic assessment were based on Defra's Emission Factor Toolkit (EFT) v10.1 published in Aug 2020. The emission factor projections go out to 2030.</p> <p>Summary information can be found via this link to the Defra website:  <a href="https://laqm.defra.gov.uk/air-quality/air-quality-assessment/emissions-factors-toolkit/">https://laqm.defra.gov.uk/air-quality/air-quality-assessment/emissions-factors-toolkit/</a>.</p> <p>Default fleet split assumptions, vehicle size distributions and Euro class compositions are based on a set of traffic activity projections from the Department for Transport (DfT) (Road Traffic Forecasts (RTF) 2018) and DfT car sale projections (April 2019) including the uptake of low carbon passenger cars and LGVs with electric and hybrid electric propulsion systems.</p>	Under discussion

SoCG Ref. Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	HPBC Comment	National Highways response	Status
				All of these data sources for the fleet projections predate the announcement to end the sale of petrol/diesel vehicles by 2030 and updated to these data sources have not yet been published. Previously it was assumed zero emission was to be achieved by 2050.	
9.7	RR-0240-28	Relevant Representation  Economy and Regeneration	We are keen to determine the implications of the scheme to the local economy. This theme will be considered as part of our Local Impact Report. HPBC has commissioned a Masterplan for the Glossop Gateway corridor from Woolley Bridge into Hadfield and Glossop town centre along the A57 with a view to maximising any potential opportunities and benefits which may arise from the scheme. However, as outlined above, this work cannot conclude without further consideration of the traffic flows.	The traffic data referred to has now been provided as per the response to RR-0240-2.	Agreed
9.8		Severance and safety for non-motorised users	The increase in traffic and congestion through Glossop could pose a safety concern in relation to key school walking routes, and affect shopping habits within the town centre – potentially affecting town centre vitality. This is not considered in the Environmental Statement.	The applicant has undertaken WHCR assessment in are and is looking to develop opportunities in the area as part of the scheme.	Under discussion
9.9		Public transport impacts	The increased local journey times would likely affect the timing and reliability of public transport services. This may lead to a decreased desirability to use these	The applicant will look to work with the relevant authorities to minimise any impacts of the scheme	Under Discussion

SoCG Ref. Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	HPBC Comment	National Highways Response	Status
<b>10. LPA Issues</b>					
<b>10.1 Compliance with local policy and development plans</b>					
<b>10.2 Achievement of sustainable development</b>					
<b>10.3 Matters listed under assessment of principles</b>					

<b>10.4. Whether potential releases can be adequately regulated under the pollution control framework, consistent with the National Policy Statement for National Networks</b>					
<b>10.5 Any other relevant matters included in the ExA's Initial Assessment of Principal Issues</b>					
<b>10.6 Any other matters on which agreement might aid the smooth running of the Examination and assist the ExA's recommendation to the Secretary of State</b>					



# Appendices

# Appendix A. Correspondence and Meeting Minutes

## A.1 Meeting Minutes

A.1.1 1st May 2018 – Trans-Pennine Upgrade – Steering Group Meeting

A.1.2 30<sup>th</sup> November 2020 – Woolley Bridge Junction

A.1.3 1<sup>st</sup> December 2020 – Environment

## A.2 Formal response to S42 Consultation

A.2.1 14<sup>th</sup> December 2020

© Crown copyright (2021).

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence:

visit [www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/](http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/)  
write to the Information Policy Team, **The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU**,  
or email [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk).

Printed on paper from well-managed forests and other controlled sources.

Registered office Bridge House, 1 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford GU1 4LZ  
National Highways Limited registered in England and Wales number 09346363