

## High Peak Green Party – Submission 2

Responses to the initial submission made by High Peak Green Party by NH are summarised below, along with questions and concerns raised by these responses.

- **Traffic on the A57 and A628 will increase but this will be balanced by decreases in other parts of the road network.**  
We find this contentious, given that increases are also expected on several minor roads in the area - New Road Tintwistle (50%), Norfolk Rd (21%) and Dinting Rd (45%), and small but significant increases on the A6016 Primrose Lane, A57 High St East, Shaw Lane and Cemetery Rd. All these roads have households living adjacent to them and Dinting Road has a school. In addition, there does not seem to be any consideration given to induced traffic. The response states that flow will be faster. Isn't it likely that faster flow will be an inducement to some who currently use public transport to revert to travel by car, particularly given the current state of public transport in the area?
- **Emissions will increase, impacting air quality but "not significantly".**  
There are several AQMAs in the area, where traffic is forecast to increase, and we would contend that any increase in an area where action is already required to reduce emissions is a matter for concern.
- **There will be an increase in carbon emissions but probably not enough to impact government targets when taken in isolation.**  
As the same could be said about many schemes – road building and other – at what point is the cumulative affects of these schemes on government targets to be considered?
- **It would be too complicated to place and enforce restrictions on HGVs because of the different authorities involved and lack of resources to enforce such restrictions.**  
While we recognise that radical change in the way transport is managed is challenging, we consider that the current approach of managing problems by increasing capacity is unsustainable and will not work. Actively managing how freight is moved around must be considered.
- **Everything possible is being done to alternatives to private motor vehicles (public transport, cycling, walking and riding) but "modal shift" to alternatives is not realistic or practicable for all journeys.**  
Nowhere, did we state that all journeys could be made via alternative means, but rather that a consistent effort is needed to make it encourage people to use alternatives, for example by making public transport more affordable and reliable and by making active travel (walking, cycling, riding) safer. We see that there are some provisions for cycling, but they are not consistently applied or nearly enough to make journeys to work over several miles practicable. For example:
  - there appear to be plans to restrict use of road by cyclists and walkers at certain points but no indication of alternative routes for those affected.
  - On the A57 close to Mottram moor there appears to be a single new footpath/cycle/bridal way that then terminates so that users must use the road. It does not seem to connect to the existing path at Mottram moor.

We believe that this perfectly illustrates the problem of attempting to address the problem of transport in this piecemeal way. The new road was always going to be a partial solution to traffic congestion. There needs to be a wide-ranging review of transport, in which all issues are examined taking into account the urgent need to tackle the climate and ecological emergencies

We have canvassed the views of members of High Peak Green Party who live in the area directly affected by the road scheme. The following issues are taken from their contributions:

### Hidden Demand

Nowhere in the scheme do I read about modelling for potential hidden motor vehicle demand currently within the Glossop (or Sheffield) area; people who currently avoid driving their cars due to the traffic situation. That could include someone like myself who chooses to ride their bicycle, but also people who take the train from Glossop towards Manchester. If the road is built, more of these residents may choose to drive if the queues are reduced, which overtime may cause them to increase again. Also, I haven't seen an estimate for how many lorries currently choose to use the M62 to access Northern Manchester when travelling from South or East of Sheffield, who may choose to use the A57 if traffic wasn't such an issue.

While I appreciate these numbers are difficult to estimate, they shouldn't be ignored. A potential unintended consequence of this scheme is that residents/lorry drivers change their behaviour and choose to drive more frequently, offsetting any initial gains in traffic reduction and potentially adding to emissions. An alternative scheme that seeks to use the significant funding from this project and invest it into improving and/or subsidising the public transport networks could have a positive impact on traffic levels on the A57, with a much more positive environmental impact (both in emissions and construction).

### Economic Case

The economic case appears to be built on a number of assumptions about time saving that are not clear to the lay-reader of the Case for Scheme or Transport Assessment Report.

There is no sensitivity analysis present which doesn't give the reader an impression of the best and worse cases with your model and whether this represents value for money. As far as I can tell you aren't allowing for the potential increase in road use demand highlighted above that a new road connection might lead too; if additional demand materialises the assumptions in the model would be void.

### Climate and Sustainability

Decades ago, when a bypass for this area was first proposed, we did not face a climate emergency in the way we do now. We need to do everything we can to keep global warming to 1.5 degrees in order to protect our planet from further catastrophic damage. Building a new bypass with the subsequent increase in emissions will not help us to achieve this target. Also, experience shows that building new roads increases demand and does not solve the problem of congestion in the long run. We need to decrease our reliance on car journeys.

Instead, I think we need a sustainable and joined-up approach to resolving the traffic problems which affect Glossopdale. . Investing in lower carbon forms of

travel would be more sustainable than this scheme, for example lowering the cost of the train into Manchester (which is costly especially at peak times) and increasing the supply of carriages; upgrading cycleways into Manchester and towards Stockport. The bus service could also be improved. I understand that the recently opened Manchester to Sheffield bus service over the Snake Pass is to be scrapped.

### Active Travel

I haven't seen any provisions for cycle lanes within your proposal. As a cyclist who regularly rides up the A57 I can tell you it is not a pleasant experience. Cycle lanes within the proposal would be highly beneficial and could encourage more residents to ride rather than drive.

### Construction Period

If the construction is approved, I would like to know your plans for mitigating traffic spill over into other areas of Glossop during the construction period. I live on High Lane on the way out of Simmondley heading towards Charlseworth. This road is already used in rush hour as a rat-run for cars to access the M67 via Broadbottom/Hattersley. During the construction period, with road works taking place at the A57 bottleneck I would be interested to know how you will avoid an overflow of traffic on to High Lane and through Gamesley/Broadbottom, on what are minor roads, not suitable for high volumes of traffic.

### Air Quality

Projections for the proposed bypass indicate substantial increases in traffic and related emissions on the A57. The projection for Brookfield is 31%. This section of road leads directly to Dinting C of E primary school. The school sits within the Dinting Vale Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) identified by High Peak Borough Council. It has been designated an AQMA due to identified exceedances of the annual mean nitrogen dioxide objective. I am concerned that the proposal will further reduce air quality in this area with damaging health effects especially for children and the elderly. I regularly walk through this AQMA and the air is acrid with pollution.

I am concerned that this proposal would also increase traffic on Simmondley Lane, leading to both increased noise and air pollution.

### Road safety

I often observe the problems on the A57 by Dinting school just before school starts. Many pupils are dropped off by car with cars parked dangerously half on the pavement, on each side of the road. With faster moving, and increased traffic as a result of the proposal, the potential for accidents at the beginning and end of the school day will be increased.

In addition, there is a major housing development of 130 houses planned on land adjacent to the A57 opposite the school. The proposal is for a new access road to be built to join the A57. This would lead to further congestion around the school.

### Increased traffic on the Snake Pass.

Traffic on the Snake Pass (much of it within the Hope Valley ward of High Peak) is projected to increase by 38%. This means it is also likely to increase traffic into the Hope Valley. Hope Valley villages are already experiencing serious congestions due to rising visitor numbers and any road upgrades that encourages through traffic between Manchester and Sheffield are likely to exacerbate this.

The Snake Pass is often blocked by snow and accidents. In such cases, traffic is likely to turn off the A57 at Ladybower. This will cause increased congestion, pollution and disruption to the villages in the Hope Valley and affect the amenity of the National Park for visitors. Bamford, which is already quite dangerous for pedestrians, owing to blind bends and narrow pavements on the main road, will be particularly affected by this.