

A57 LINK ROADS

TRO10034

DEADLINE 2 JANUARY 14TH 2022

ANSWERS TO ExA's FIRST WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Questions 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.5, 3.6a, 3.7, 3.9, 3.12, 3.13 and 3.14

CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire Branch

Unique Reference: 20029243

Questions

3.1 and 3.2 Several points

There must be serious doubt about the effectiveness of the model to represent the impact of the scheme on the Greater Manchester and Sheffield city regions. This is summarised in Section 13.7 of “*Trans-Pennine Upgrade: Stage 3 Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report*” supplied by NH to CPRE and submitted to the DCO by them. In the CPRE consultant’s report it says:

- Both Sheffield and Manchester are excluded from the detailed modelling
- Because of the base model’s overall size and strategic nature the networks within both cities are limited

For this reason the modelling cannot represent the impact of the scheme on traffic patterns in Greater Manchester.

In relation to travel between the two cities, it is limited for two reasons:

- the cities themselves are outside the ADM and modelled at a low level of detail
- access to the A628 is included in the ADM but strategic routes which are likely to be affected to the North and South are not.

In addition it is worth noting in relation to wider economic benefits that the current scheme is designed to slow the worsening of congestion, not reduce it compared to the present day. There appears to be no account of the increased attractiveness of rail, and to an extent bus, which will have similar or potentially improved journey times compared to today.

3.3 The scheme is being presented as standing alone. However it is quite clear that, if this were part of a larger scale cross Pennine proposal, the whole assessment would be different. The issue of breaking up large scale schemes and assessing them separately was discussed by the Government’s Standing Road Advisory Committee on Trunk Road Appraisal in the 1980s and 90s. The conclusion was that schemes should be presented as a whole, particularly when clearly related to a corridor or wider area.

The second issue is that, if there were to be larger scheme it is far from clear how this would fit with it, given its Southern alignment.

Finally there is the problem of the M67 “wet end” – the name transport planners often give a section of motorway which is connected to a network of much smaller scale.

Conurbations generally try to moderate the impact by traffic control measures and using lanes for other purposes such as bus priority. In simple terms this scheme just pumps the traffic slightly faster in to and out of the wet end.

3.5 See the comments in 3.1/2

3.6 a, 3.7 and 3.9 We have no comment on the acquisition of traffic data for the present day. However we make the comment on 3.6a and 3.7 that the assumption of traffic growth in this area of Greater Manchester is not in line with TfGM’s 50-50 policy. This shows a fall

in traffic by 2040 of approximately 17%. Most of this scheme is within Greater Manchester. GM traffic is an important part of the traffic using the road and should be factored in to the forecast. Nor is the DfT Decarbonisation Strategy target of 50% walking and cycling for trips within towns and cities represented in the forecast.

3.9 As well as the comments in 3.7 which also apply here, CPRE considers that the original options assessment was flawed but is now very much out of date. The carbon cost is also out of date and equally important the carbon reduction required by Government policy is undermined rather than supported. There is no assessment against Government health objectives.

3.12 Although a meeting has been held, NH have not yet undertaken a continuing technical dialogue with CPRE over the ban and sustainable transport measures, despite our requests. Some material has been supplied but very late and incomplete. NH do not seem to have commented on alternatives to any great extent and the report which is part of the CPRE submission covers this issue in much greater detail and responds to this question.

3.13 As part of preparing alternatives it became clear that the bus information is seriously out of date leading to increases: the 237 runs every 20 minutes, and decreases: the X57 ceased operation in January 2022. The most frequent bus routes are in the South West corner of the study area, elsewhere there are obvious deficiencies.

3.14 One area of interest for CPRE has been the impact on public transport and how the forecasts for public transport use seem to be pessimistic. CPRE has sought clarification on this (including at the meeting on 15th December) but await further material.