

CAR FREE LOW CARBON TRAVEL FOR LONGDENDALE AND GLOSSOPDALE

The Green Travel
Challenge
A Local Conversation

13th October 2021

TRO10034

Unique Reference 20029243

Deadline 2

CONTENTS

Summary	3
The Event	4
Outputs	5
Lorry Weight Restriction	6
Local Car and Bike Schemes	7
Reshaping the Bus Service	8
Cycling	10
Car Journeys	11
Walking to the Shops	12
Other Ideas – What have we missed?	12
Questions	14
A57 Link Roads	16
Small Scale Road/Public Transport Alternative	17
Conclusions	18
Appendix 1 - Summary of package of measures for low carbon sustainable travel measures for Glossopdale and Longdendale and questions for group work	19
Appendix 2 – Keith Buchan’s PowerPoint Presentation	22
Appendix 3 - Padlet	27
Appendix 4 - Small Scale Road/Public Transport Alternative	39

CAR FREE LOW CARBON TRAVEL FOR LONGDENDALE AND GLOSSOPDALE
The Green Travel Challenge – A Local Conversation
Wednesday 13th Oct 2021

SUMMARY

The Green Travel Challenge – A Local Conversation was set up to engage both residents and visitors for travelling car free low carbon in Longdendale and Glossopdale. The event was organized by CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire¹ (CPRE PDSY) and generously funded by CPRE², CPRE North West and CPRE Yorkshire and the Humber regional groups, and Foundation for Integrated Transport³. ICA-UK⁴, an independent charity specialising in facilitation, was appointed to lead the event.

National Highways (previously called Highways England) has for 50 years been discussing designs for a new road to connect the M1 in Sheffield and the M67 in Manchester, and to alleviate the congestion and environmental pollution along the A628 trunk road corridor, especially through Mottram, Hollingworth and Tintwistle. After various proposals which have reached differing stages of preparation, there is now a more limited plan with minor elements on the trunk road, but a major scheme at the Mottram end, the A57 Link Roads.

For the last 20 years, CPRE PDSY has been proposing sustainable alternatives to the through route and subsequently to the Link Roads scheme. There seems to be some agreement that the traffic conditions on the two Trans-Pennine routes, A57 and A628, are unsatisfactory, especially given the special qualities of the National Park through which they pass. The current A57 scheme is designed to relieve one short section of the route at the Greater Manchester end. National Highways assessment shows that it would leave Hollingworth and Tintwistle in the same situation, if not worse, and increase traffic overall in Glossopdale and Longdendale.

To try and address both the local and the wider problems in the context of new Government policies, CPRE PDSY has been listening to the travel experiences of local people and visitors to inform development of sustainable alternatives. These are now being developed by Keith Buchan, an experienced transport planning consultant from the Metropolitan Transport Research Unit (MTRU) who has advised CPRE in this

1
2
3
4

Registered Charity No.1094975 Registered Company No. 449675

area in the past. The purpose of the event was to gain feedback on these proposals from both residents and visitors.

THE EVENT

The event was held on a Zoom link on a Wednesday evening 1830-2000. Fifty people registered to attend through Eventbrite and were sent additional material to prepare for the event, a summary of the proposals and questions to stimulate discussion (Appendix 1). Thirty eight people attended (excluding the two facilitators, the two hosts from CPRE (Andy Tickle and Anne Robinson) and the consultant Keith Buchan), but one had to drop out due to poor Wi-Fi connection, giving a turnout of 74%. The event was organised and facilitated by Megan Evans and Dawn Williams from ICA-UK. Professional facilitation of the public engagement was essential to produce outputs that are understood and supported more widely, particularly as road building is divisive locally and our reputation as anti-road building campaigners creates perceived bias.

At the start attendees were invited to put their location on a map of the area which indicated they came from a broad geography, the majority from within Glossopdale and Longdendale but also from Sheffield, Bakewell, Matlock and Manchester. The majority of the local settlements were represented – Mottram, Gamesley, Tintwistle, Hollingworth, Hadfield, Padfield, Hayfield and Glossop.

After a context setting introduction by Andy Tickle, Head of Campaigns at CPRE, Keith Buchan of MTRU gave a brief PowerPoint presentation of the proposals in easily understandable terms (Appendix 2). Keith took questions of clarification which was followed by 8 breakout groups of 4-5 people, in which attendees were asked to answer the questions previously sent to them. Padlet was used to manage group discussions with columns for the questions, for ideas, things we'd missed, and next steps. The groups were left to discuss among themselves and to post the key elements of the discussion on the padlet (Appendix 3 and on title page). The two hosts and Keith roamed the groups to get an oversight of the discussion but did not participate. After a short break, groups were rearranged for another short period of debate before returning to a brief plenary session and the next steps. The padlet remained open for further contributions for 48 hours and was then closed by the facilitators. Further comments and questions could be sent to Anne Robinson from CPRE up to Friday 22nd October. Four people who were unable to attend the event took advantage of this, bringing the overall engagement up to 82%.

OUTPUTS FROM THE EVENT

In summary the package of measures presented to attendees to discuss was as follows.

- **A weight limit on through-traffic of heavy lorries** across the Peak National Park – this would encourage drivers to use the motorway box M1/M62/M6/M60/A52 around the area, significantly reduce traffic queues and free up road space for active travel.
- **Returning streets to the people** – this would include slower speeds such as 20mph, more space and facilities for cycling and walking with more road crossing points, and creation of a local network for local walking and longer cycling journeys to work, school, shops, leisure, medical centres.
- **Reshaping bus services** to provide integrated affordable reliable and faster services. Modern bus priority doesn't need continuous lanes – smart linked signals and bus gates achieve more for less.
- **Linked traffic signal controls** – Along the trunk route and at M67 J4 introducing linked controls would improve safety, allow for bus priority without disturbing other traffic, break up queues and smooth flow overall.
- **Local affordable EV car and e-bike share/hire schemes** would give people the flexibility of having access to an EV car or bike and allow them to do their bit to reduce climate emissions, without breaking the bank.
- **E-cargo bikes** – one of the key reasons for using the car was for transporting heavy shopping and other goods. People would shop on-line or walk to and from the shops, leaving delivery to the e-bikes.
- **Sustainable travel for employees** to help people plan their journeys and offer advice and support for low carbon alternatives.

Below we have summarised the comments made on the padlet (Appendix 3) and those submitted by email, as stimulated by the questions in Appendix 1. We have also supplied answers to the questions raised. After the event we received a number of emails '*A really good meeting. Some interesting conversations*'. '*A most interesting debate and process tonight. Some of it worked and some did not. I valued being able to both listen and make a strategic comment or two in my first breakout group. The second one was rather sterile frankly*'. '*The event was great, well managed and participated in, real engagement of a number of stake holders... a real evolution of the way this debate has been handled*'.

LORRY WEIGHT RESTRICTION

The lorry ban was popular. It would definitely make journeys on foot more attractive, improve cycling and the quality of the public realm, and hence benefit the residents of Longdendale and the National Park as a whole. It would also improve the environment, reducing pollution and the risk of accidents.

Several people believed that removing the lorries would bring the villages back to life. *'We want to promote local activity for its own sake, visiting neighbours, going to a shop/the shops, stopping and talking in the street! (remember how we could actually hear each other during lockdown) and on side streets why not go further and see children sitting out playing under the trees.'* One person thought it would take more than just removing the lorries - *'Less traffic in general and more linked in activities by Move More Glossop could help'*.

However, four key concerns were raised.

Firstly, the weight restriction must be part of a multi-faceted package, it is not enough on its own. *'It needs other innovative measures, and maybe (!?) a small amount of road widening is a price worth paying to save the Park, the green belt, and Glossopdale'*. The restriction was also seen as punitive. *'A move to establish infrastructure for local communities to be greener/more sustainable would be seen to resourcing the area rather than just banning forms of transport. Cycling/walking infrastructure, better public transport, and car clubs will be resources for the community and an easier sell to what may be a sceptical community.'* *'More attention to behavioural change is required, leading to less car journeys'*.

Secondly, there were concerns about the impacts on the roads to which the lorries would be diverted (the M62 and the A6 were mentioned). *'It's unrealistic at the present time because the alternative routes M1/M62/M60 are so heavily congested there is no spare capacity to take the diverted traffic.'*

More study is required of the impacts of the rerouting, with a suggestion to compare the fuel consumption per mile on the A628 and the M62. *'It might not be that significant due to the difference in driving style (cruising at 70 vs stopping/starting & climbing in low gears. It would be worthwhile doing some research into this. It shouldn't be too hard to do a comparative study by driving both routes in real world conditions and recording the fuel consumption. The actual vehicle used shouldn't matter as we're only interested in the % difference which should be the same on*

average'. Haulage companies are sensitive to journey costs and such research could show that there is little difference in fuel consumption between the longer and shorter trans-Pennine routes.

Overall, more active management of road freight is required not only to coordinate return loads, avoiding empty lorries, but to manage online deliveries, which have greatly increased recently *'with white vans bringing stuff over the Snake from distribution centres in Manchester'*.

Thirdly we were also reminded of the Government's strategic thinking⁵ for a new motorway and high speed rail between Yorkshire and Greater Manchester through Longdendale. *'I am rather surprised that the transport consultant focused on the usual suburban traffic control measures and barely mentioned the wider strategic picture. This wider strategic connectivity is the elephant in the room, which needs to be sorted out before more local suburban traffic control measures ... could have any impact'*. Longdendale's role as part of the Trans-European link between the east and west coast ports was also noted. The outcomes of Brexit are already impacting on this link.

Finally, one attendee warned to *'be careful what you wish for'* as the increased road capacity released by a lorry ban could quickly be taken up by increased car traffic, as journeys become quicker and more convenient than by public transport. This in turn would make Glossop a more attractive location for commuters, thereby encouraging more housing development. Keith agreed and said it was important to ensure that traffic management did not give that impression to car drivers, who could be slowed with speed restrictions and pedestrian crossings.

LOCAL CAR AND BIKE SCHEMES

Local car and bike hire schemes and car clubs were positively supported, with more promotion needed to make people aware of the costs of running a car versus the benefits car/bike sharing.

Two important aspects of such schemes were noted; (1) the space saved by not having all those cars parked for 96% of their lives. If one asks the question, as someone had done in Jersey, the answer is *'absolutely stunning, and of course people*

⁵ 

can then see how much housing, green space, play space you can have if only you take away the cars!!' (2) Also we cannot simply replace all the fossil fuel powered cars with EVs as 'we are trashing the planet just the same. We really have to press for an economic way of providing ... mobility for all, and that means community-led sharing schemes'.

However, although such schemes are a *'nice idea in principle - Who would maintain these? Who would monitor the way that the vehicles are driven? There is an incentive to be careful with one's own vehicle... Without that incentive, we could be in 'white van' territory in terms of driving.'* It was suggested different models need to be explored. Both electric cars and bikes need the borrowing rider/driver to learn the ins/outs. This has to be included in the running of such a scheme.

Others offered reassurance that such schemes have been running on a big scale elsewhere e.g. in Bremen for years, and in Berlin using an app or online booking. *'They work well. There are schemes here in the UK. Hope Valley Climate Action is developing a blueprint for a complete transport system for the valley – a pilot for rural areas throughout the country - which will include one or more car sharing schemes. 'There is some expertise on the latter in our Transport Group' for us to draw on.*

RESHAPING THE BUS SERVICES

Ideas to reshaping the existing bus services comprehensively addressed the specific issues. A full bus service covering evenings and weekends is needed as a bare minimum to encourage change. *'In some parts of Glossopdale there are currently no services in the evenings and on Sundays.'*

In order to tackle unreliable and infrequent services inexpensive, regular small buses for local trips, such as community bus services, or demand responsive transport (DRT) to infill between the core routes for rural areas visitors and residents, were suggested. Taxis were also flagged as an alternative – *'rather than subsidising poorly used bus services, use the money to electrify the taxi fleet which after all is a demand responsive service.'* People recognised it was not easy for the bus operators which *'find themselves with the contradictory need to serve a wide area against the need for speed. A recent trip to Buxton by bus was far more protracted than driving because of its circuitous route. Introducing express, direct buses as well as retaining the 'round-the-houses' ones would probably be uneconomic'.* Similarly, *'a car journey*

that takes 20 minutes from Simmondley to Ashton takes 2 buses and walking and cycling and can be over 90 minutes long’.

Integration with other modes and services, trains and cycles, was frequently mentioned. *‘The routes for buses don't mix with trains and cycling. They're not integrated and buses need to run more often’.* Bikes on buses is a must. *‘It's a massive shame (the X57) can't allow for bikes in some format as mountain bikers and roadys are driving into the Peaks’.* One bus driver had said a child’s bike can’t go on a bus – *‘how to get to BMX without using a car?’*

Greater publicity and easy access to accurate information about bus services, including electronic signing was widely supported, *‘better integration with Google maps or a good app which shows routes via public transport and cycling together (and doesn't show Uber as an option)’*, is essential. *‘I struggled to find accurate information about timetables (for the X57) and stops (in Mottram) and only found out by chance that it goes to Fairholmes⁶’.*

Travelling by bus needs to be made more attractive. *‘Buses still have a bad image. There’s still a feeling among many people that buses are for failures so there’s an image problem (not so much in London or big cities) that needs to be addressed. Making buses and other forms of public transport so attractive you’d be crazy not to use it would be a worthy goal – make them free/very cheap and reliable.’*

One group thought that public ownership or at least public control is required to provide free buses. *‘We need free green buses across High Peak and indeed across the land. For less than £10 billion the current bus service could be made free and doubled in size. For a few tens of billions existing ‘dirty buses’ could be replaced by electric buses and doubled in number.’*

Several key destinations were mentioned including Glossop station and Gamesley station (yet to be built), Ashton, Tameside Hospital, Hayfield, Etihad Stadium, the Peak District, Urmston and Chorlton. Current routes to Greater Manchester are extremely awkward. *‘If I want to go to South Manchester I need to go all the way into Manchester and then take various buses to get to my destination and also walk. Also, to get to the Etihad Stadium you have to go to Manchester first and it's a lot of changes’.*

⁶ Fairholmes is in the Upper Derwent Valley below Howden Dam in the Peak District National Park

Through bus services to both Sheffield and Manchester are also important. *'The Rossendale service is/was called the "Witch Way (after Pendle Hill witches?). It's more a coach than a bus, so can use the motorway sections at good speed, and offer comfortable priority travel into Manchester. If needs be, widen the A57 to accommodate⁷'. The X57 bus service between Sheffield and Manchester 'is fantastic but I am surprised it is still viable as it doesn't seem to be well used'.*

Although a survey of what is needed locally would be good we were advised to *'only do this if you have the funding to actually implement what people have said should happen! Otherwise, there are big issues around credibility and raising people's hopes falsely'*. All but one of the local services running before the pandemic have returned but it was suggested by several participants that post pandemic, it is timely to identify improved routes.

CYCLING

This was widely supported in the groups, as one participant put it, *'We are light years from where we need to be on this due to decades of neglect by Government. However, the budget for the A57 Link Roads scheme (£228m according to the consultation) if it was reallocated to a proper Transport and Place Plan would be enough.'*

Better, joined up, cycle lane provision and clearly marked cycle paths *'would be amazing and I'm sure help me and others to cycle around Glossop more safely.'* Safe and usable cycling routes out of Glossop are also required in every direction e.g. a relatively flat link through from Melandra to Broadbottom.

However more routes alone are not enough. Removing the heavy lorries and slower 20mph speeds would help but the speed limit must be enforced. Perhaps some roads could be made one way so a cycle path can be added? With such measures children are more likely to be allowed to walk or cycle to school, but safer crossings are also needed (see below). There should be penalties for drivers who park in marked bike lanes. E-bikes were noted as a good solution for hilly areas such as Glossopdale.

The Trans-Pennine Trail (TPT) was frequently mentioned as the basis to enhance sustainable transport through the area. *'A more direct route for the TPT and other segregated active travel routes are needed to make walking and cycling easier and*

⁷ Witchway is still going strong [REDACTED]

more pleasant.' The current TPT isn't really a viable route. It is mostly on roads, where *'it's very easy to get lost and end up cycling on busy unsuitable roads. That's because the signposting for cyclists is inconsistent and sometimes quite hard to follow. People need to feel confident they can cycle safely. I think a clearly signposted network of 'quiet lanes' would really help in that respect.'* Even better would be alternative off-road routes which are more direct and could easily be upgraded and completed e.g. Gamesley Woodlands trail to join Glossop Road near Gamesley and the TPT there – or a wholly segregated TPT.

CAR JOURNEYS

Breaking our link with the car – our own personal transporter – came up under several of the questions. Many parts of Glossop are already at maximum capacity. *'I've lived in my road for 25 years and every house was built with a space for 2 vehicles off road. Most residents have converted their carports in to garages or living space, and have at least 2 cars per family, so what was once a safe street for children to play in, is now double parked along its whole length. As long as we have this relationship with our cars this trend will continue'.*

'Car journeys tend to be unavoidable when the alternatives don't exist or are unattractive. There's a gap that needs to be filled – better public transport, taxis, shuttle bus services – and we need to break the link with the car'. Unavoidable car journeys included:

- where cycling and walking are not possible because of distance or steep gradients;
- transporting someone with limited mobility;
- getting to Tameside Hospital;
- when rail services are impracticable (Sundays and very early or late shifts).

Freight by e-bicycle was positively supported, although *'I don't always know what I want from the shops until I get there.'*

There was strong support for 20mph zones and traffic control measures through local villages to combat rat runs. One respondent had reduced car ownership because of working from home and emphasised how the world has changed recently. *'More should be done to promote working from home.'*

One respondent was made uneasy by our questions. *'For me they conjure up the mental image of someone strapped into their car, ready to go. Whereas we want people to think bus/train/walk/cycle.'*

WALKING TO THE SHOPS

The importance of walking was stressed in the groups, especially its underpinning role *'All the issues are linked – It's impossible to talk about any of these issues without bringing in any of the others'*. This is reflected in how the issues related to improving the environment for walking, such as slower speeds and removing the HGVs, have already been part of the comments noted above.

Fewer cars parked on the pavement would make walking more attractive and not force people to walk in the road. In some places *'any sort of pavement would make walking more attractive e.g. walking to from Glossop to Mellor via Charlesworth'*. More crossings would make journeys safer. Particularly dangerous locations, such as the crossing of Turnlee Road that splits Simmondley from Glossop or the crossing on Dinting Road on the walk from Dinting Arches/Viaduct to Glossopdale school, were identified.

OTHER IDEAS – WHAT HAVE WE MISSED?

Importance of spatial planning and integration with transport

'Until we have a traffic solution in place there should be a moratorium on house building in the area. It's outrageous that the council opted for 350dpa (dwellings per acre) when they could have had the 320dpa from Lichfield's OAN. This issue needs confronting because things are going to get very bad in Glossopdale in many ways if this issue isn't faced and seen as integral to the transport issue. Every new house = 2 more cars on a road system in total crisis'. The train service cannot absorb more commuters from new housing, especially if the Godley Green Garden Village adds two thousand more commuters onto the Hadfield-Manchester line.

Transport of stone from quarries

Are there alternative ways to transport stone from High Peak and Glossop to the national rail network (not by HGVs but by new rail, light rail or alternative technologies)? Breedon's quarry in the Hope Valley has a planning agreement limiting the number of lorry trips Breedon is allowed to make. *'Judging from the traffic through our village this agreement must be quite lenient. But it is there and it could be the starting point for applying some pressure to the quarries to change to rail.'*

Make the link to health

Preventative health measures, such as active travel/active neighbourhoods with 20mph speed limits and cycling, would reduce health costs for treating the impacts of poor air quality (e.g. asthma) and lack of physical activity (e.g. diabetes, heart conditions).

Softer measures and Smarter Travel

Any package of alternatives must be supported by 'soft measures' like personalised travel plans, school travel plans, e-bike demonstration days, workplace travel plans.

More carrots and sticks

If the Government is serious about 50% of journeys being sustainable by 2030 they need to immediately offer carrots, not just sticks. A cheap sustainable traffic shopping aisle at all major supermarket chains was suggested. *'We need to move beyond fluffy sustainable transport narrative to hard actions - positive as well as negative'*. Making public transport attractive (either by price or reliability) that people would look at car users as crazy would be a target. Others were not so convinced about the carrots – *'there are too many carrots to encourage motoring, not enough sticks'*.

Cultural change

We need to change the cultural approach towards travel as the Netherlands have done towards cycling.

Engage young people

Young people won't be interested in the planning system or the scheme. Instead, we should focus on the scheme's impact on the climate emergency, using social media and finding some young people to take this forward.

Signage

Think carefully how routes are signed for long distance through traffic. Local journeys are difficult to alter as people follow routes by habit, but long distance journeys are susceptible to alternatives.

Slowing traffic

Phasing traffic signals and slowing traffic would improve traffic flows. *'On A57 through Glossop there are about 8 sets of traffic lights and pedestrians have priority. If traffic lights were phased so that traffic had to travel at 20mph it would reduce*

acceleration and breaking, fuel use and emissions; pedestrians might have to wait a bit longer'. A 50mph speed limit on the A628T was also suggested for traffic restraint.

Trains

'You haven't mentioned the existing train services.'

'Reopen Woodhead Railway' – This should be seriously looked at, taking into account the constraints on the Hope Valley line and the Diggle/Calder line. The cost is likely to be much less than any alternatives.

QUESTIONS

1 Do we know the origin/destination of the HGVs?

Despite repeated requests to National Highways since 2007 we have never received this information.

2 Impact of diverting HGVs onto M62 – M62 is full so how would that work?

We are conducting a survey of journey times but it is clear that, while both routes are congested and slow moving, the M62 average speeds are higher than those on the A628 route at the same time of day. This is being tested to provide a more accurate estimate but off peak is about 50% faster on the M62 (but 60% longer in terms of distance).

3 What will be the impact of HGV diversion on the A6?

Without the model's O&D information from National Highways it is not possible to assess this. The design of the boundary for any through HGV ban would address this problem – quite common for traffic management proposals of this type.

4 Making Longdendale etc places that deserve respect

Our report will give more details on this. In the interim the Chair of Tintwistle Parish Council has supplied us with information about the proposed Village Gateway for Tintwistle. Its purpose is to improve safety for all residents using traffic calming measures. There is a 40mph speed limit between Tintwistle and Hollingworth, and a 60mph speed limit on the approach from the east. Drivers often speed through the village. National Highways is the traffic authority responsible for speed limits and is governed by the same guidance as local authorities (DfT Circular 01/2013).

Supporting measures would consist of traffic calming e.g.

- Entrance to Tintwistle "Village Zone" emphasised with signage/ street furniture/planting

- Road markings at entrances such as dragon's teeth to give drivers the impression the road narrows
- New crossing points

National Highways has trialed the approach through several villages on the A64 near York. A feasibility study of Tintwistle has shown a similar approach could be effective. Funding would be sought through National Highways Designated fund Users and Community.

5 Is it possible to make the climate-related survey that so successfully engaged people available to campaigners in A57 area?

The survey used the online version of free online surveys⁸. A key reason there was such a good completion rate was that the organisers approached most of the local organisations (e.g. sports clubs, music clubs, YHA, WI, religious groups, etc), and asked the contact to cascade the survey out to their members, and include it in any newsletter (the organisers provided some accompanying text).

6 European practice - no mention is made in your questionnaire of other European (are we allowed to mention them?) practice. How does Holland, Denmark and Germany manage and promote sustainable transport?

One attendee provided the example of Berlin which has a petition currently gathering signatures which will force the Council to ban cars throughout the entire centre of Berlin (a huge area). Or the Council could refuse which would trigger a referendum. There are places in France that have free bus services on the ground that not having them costs more. (both examples reported in the Guardian). Keith responded that there are many examples of these practices in Europe, but emerging examples in the UK, for example Waltham Forest "mini-Holland" in London. Not sure city centre examples are particularly helpful for this one.

7 What will be the impact of the Clean Air Zone which I believe is now being extended to Tintwistle?

The Secretary of State for Defra has instructed many local authorities across the UK, including authorities in Greater Manchester (GMCA), to take quick action to reduce harmful nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) levels below the legal limit of 40µgm. The direction under the Environment Act 1995 requires GMCA to undertake feasibility studies to identify measures for reducing NO₂ concentrations to within legal limit values in the 'shortest possible time'. In order to meet these requirements all 10 local authorities

⁸ [REDACTED]

in GM have prepared a Clean Air Plan⁹. The GM CAZ is set to be implemented in May 2022 and end in 2026. Its boundary is the whole of the Greater Manchester area; it applies only to local roads and excludes the trunk and motorway network. However, an exception has been agreed with Government ministers for inclusion of the A57T/A628T from M67 Junction 4 to TMBC-DCC boundary (Millbrook, Hollingworth Brook)¹⁰ – hence Tintwistle is excluded from the charging zone. The charge would not apply to private cars, only to non-compliant lorries, buses, taxis, minibuses. National Highways has excluded the Clean Air Zone from its assessment of the A57 Link Roads, assuming this represents the worst case scenario. However, the impacts of the Zone are likely to be complex but could lead to diversions over a wide area to avoid paying the toll and reach the trunk road and motorway network within Greater Manchester by other routes, creating traffic congestion and air pollution elsewhere. At present we do not know what the impacts of the CAZ on Tintwistle is likely to be but we will be asking for scrutiny of that issue through the examination process.

8 The more northerly railway routes through Diggle and Calder Valley also remain diesel-operated. Did this route figure in some feasibility studies done by Highways England and was then put aside? Where does the line begin and end?

This route did not figure in the 2015 Trans-Pennine Feasibility Study, only the Hope Valley line was included. The line connects central Manchester with Leeds.

A57 LINK ROADS

Inevitably the A57 Link Roads and how to approach the impending Examination of the scheme were raised both through the padlet and through the plenary session. One respondent wanted *‘an alternative vision to be provided. At present the argument is dominated by get the bypass done argument, irrespective of the merits’*.

The impacts on Tintwistle from the Link Roads dominated this part of the discussion.

- *‘A57 Link Roads would increase traffic through Tintwistle’.*
- People who had leafletted Tintwistle about the opportunity to object to the A57 Link Roads had met individual residents, nearly all of whom when spoken to knew the scheme was inadequate and opposed it.
- *‘This is the most heartening thing I have read. Please keep leafletting and talking with people. We should all be doing this. How? And how to make our findings a bit more secure and usable in the EiP?’*

⁹ Clean Air Plan July 2021

¹⁰ Clean Air Plan update July 2021 para 3.4

- *'It seems to me that residents of both Hollingworth and Tintwistle are being urged to support the Mottram bypass/Glossop Spur as the first step towards a promised Hollingworth/Tintwistle bypass. I can't see that will happen (nor do I support it)'*

'Air quality in some areas near the scheme is at the edge of what is legal. There are high rates of pollution related disease in the area. And there are legal duties about air pollution. Surely this is a central campaign plank (along with climate change)?'

'The A38 expansion in Derby was challenged through the courts on climate change grounds and they won'.

SMALL SCALE ROAD/PUBLIC TRANSPORT ALTERNATIVE

Finally, one respondent offered an alternative solution, 'Gyratory flow'. For full details and the benefits of this proposal see Appendix 4. This solution would address the blockage caused by the Mottram lights by implementing a one-way system. A new road from the M67 J4 to Roe Cross Road/Back Moor would allow traffic to circulate in one direction using the new road, Back Moor, Mottram Moor to Mottram and Hyde Road. In addition, the land between Mottram and the new road could serve as the location for a new Mottram Interchange and the creation of a one stop point for accessing towns and cities nearby. There is adequate land between the proposed Interchange and Roe Cross that could be used for bus and coach parking and/or a Park & Ride facility.

Mottram is in a strategic position to serve as a gateway to a number of nearby towns such as Hyde, Stalybridge, Ashton, Stockport, Glossop, Buxton; it is also within commuting distance of two major cities. Shuttles, such as minibuses, would take people to the Interchange, where they could then access one-stop express services to take commuters to their destination straight down the motorway. Commuters from Stalybridge and the Longdendale villages, could park here and access public transport to many different towns both within and outside of Tameside. A shuttle service could also be offered from the Interchange/Park and Ride area to Hattersley railway station as a further added benefit to commuters. This would boost usage of a railway station that has a lot of potential but is currently underused due to its relative isolation on the periphery of the Hattersley estate. The combined effects of an creating an Interchange, Park and Ride facilities and a shuttle to access rail services, would have a major impact on increasing public transport usage in the area,

shifting emphasis away from the private car which is the biggest contributor to the bottling up of local roads.

This option was said by the proposer to have been rejected by the National Highways because of the high HGV flows. This alternative should be reconsidered in light of the proposed HGV control scheme – even if this were limited to articulated HGVs which cause the maneuverability problems.

CONCLUSION

Firstly, a big thank you goes to all those attending and responding to the event who generously shared their thoughts and ideas with us and picked up what we had missed out. All these inputs are invaluable and are being used to inform Keith Buchan's work on the alternative solutions. When this work is complete, we will submit it to the Examination on the A57 Link Roads and ensure that all respondents receive a copy of the report. It was also reassuring to find strong support for the proposed measures as a comprehensive package, although the need to address the impact of heavy lorries on diversionary routes is well made.

We were heartened by the number of positive responses we received about the process after the event. However, we are aware that 40-odd respondents is a very small number in terms of the local population and that we need to do more to reach out to hear from more residents and visitors.

Anne Robinson
November 2021

APPENDIX 1

SUMMARY OF PACKAGE OF MEASURES FOR LOW CARBON SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL MEASURES FOR GLOSSOPDALE AND LONGDENDALE AND QUESTIONS FOR GROUP WORK

What's the problem?

The Longdendale villages of Tintwistle, Hollingworth and Mottram beside the A57/A628 trunk route experience severe environmental pollution from through-traffic of heavy lorries and commuter car traffic from Glossopdale. The A57 Link Roads would offer partial relief to one village but make the situation elsewhere worse. Investing in road building that generates more traffic would undermine national commitments to climate change, air quality, public wellbeing, nature and national parks. The strategic aims for this corridor should be to encourage connectivity by public transport and modal shift of freight to rail but the most pressing issue is to address the situation through the villages.

What's the solution?

Having heard from residents and visitors about their travel experiences and their ideas as to how travel could be improved we are developing a package of measures that would alleviate congestion, improve the environment and decrease carbon emissions throughout the area. All of these ideas are currently in use – but not so far in this locality.

A weight limit on through-traffic of heavy lorries across the Peak National Park – this would encourage drivers to use the motorway box M1/M62/M6/M60/A52 around the area, significantly reduce traffic queues and free up road space for active travel. Reducing the numbers of lorries is extremely popular locally and would require cooperation across a number of local highway authorities, and enforcement of the weight restriction. Local businesses and local deliveries would continue unaffected. Other ideas such as e-cargo bikes can be promoted (see below).

Returning streets to the people – this would include slower speeds such as 20mph, more space and facilities for cycling and walking with more road crossing points, and creation of a local network for local walking and longer cycling journeys to work, school, shops, leisure, medical centres. A local group has already begun the work with a focus on travel to school.

Reshaping bus services, plus smart bus priority – Bus Service Improvement Plans provide the opportunity to do this is now. We know from local people's and visitors' experience of travel to, within and from the area of the difficulties on individual routes and services. These need reshaping to provide integrated affordable reliable and faster services. Modern bus priority doesn't need continuous lanes – smart linked signals and bus gates achieve more for less.

Linked traffic signal controls – Along the trunk route and at M67 J4 modernising and introducing linked controls would improve safety, allow for bus priority without disturbing other traffic, break up queues and smooth flow overall.

Local affordable EV car and e-bike share/hire scheme - Shared EV and e-bike purchase and use schemes would give people the flexibility of having access to an EV car or bike and allow them to do their bit to reduce climate emissions, without breaking the bank.

E-cargo bikes – one of the key reasons for using the car was for transporting heavy shopping and other goods. People would shop on-line or walk to and from the shops and leave delivery to the e-bikes.

Sustainable travel for employees – to help people plan their journeys and offer advice and support for low carbon alternatives. This is a well-established approach across the UK and has been used by National Highways in the past for its ‘Influencing Travel Behaviour’ Programme.

QUESTIONS FOR GROUP WORK

We would like to know from you which car journeys you might be willing and able to avoid. This could be using an alternative means of travel, or getting a delivery instead of driving to the shops. It might be that having more local services would help – are there car journeys you feel you have to make now that you didn’t before?

We would like you to feel free to think of ideas and we could start by thinking of the car journeys you made last week. Which would be the easiest to switch from car? What would help you to make that decision?

Another way of looking at it is that we may need to switch one in ten car journeys over the next 10 years – which ones would you choose and what would be needed to make that possible, or even preferable?

One of the key reasons given for using the car was for transporting heavy shopping and other goods.

If e-cargo bikes or e-vans could deliver the goods would you walk to and from the shops instead of taking the car? If not, what else would be needed to make it attractive?

Would wider well maintained pavements encourage you to walk more for local journeys?

Would more frequent crossing points encourage you to walk more for local journeys?

If not, what else would be needed to make it attractive ?

Many people were deterred from cycling because of perceived danger. In some places segregated routes could be arranged e.g. Glossop to Hayfield but much cycling would still need to be on the highway

Would 20mph speed limits encourage you to cycle? Where should these speed limits apply?

If there were slower speeds and a clearly mapped complete network for cycling would you cycle to work? If not, what else would be needed to make it attractive?

With these measures would you let your children walk or cycle to school? If not, what else would be needed to make it acceptable?

Do you think removing most of the heavy lorries from the area would encourage you to cycle?

Reshaping the bus services - Those who used the buses found them expensive, unreliable, infrequent, with no early morning or evening services, slow due to making tortuous journeys and

not going to key destinations. There are few shelters with nowhere to sit, and no electronic signing to assist.

If you use the buses at the moment what would you choose as the most important improvements that could be made?

What should the key destinations for bus services in Glossopdale and Longdendale be?

What sort of bus or shuttle service would help you leave the car at home?

To serve your needs, which places should it serve?

How could we speed up services which, if they are to serve the entire community, need to 'go round the houses'?

Car clubs and car hire make economic and climate sense as cars are stationary (parked, unused) for 96% of the time.

What would encourage you to join a club to buy/share use of an electric car or an electric bike?

One of our proposals is to stop heavy lorry traffic which has no business in the area using the A628 and A57 through the Park and local roads (access traffic would still be permitted)

Do you think that a lorry control scheme would make local journeys on foot more attractive?

Do you think that removing most of the heavy lorries would be enough to encourage more activities in the village centres?

APPENDIX 2 - KEITH BUCHAN'S POWERPOINT PRESENTATION



A57 Road Scheme? Other ways of managing travel in Glossopdale and Longdendale

Preliminary results

Keith Buchan
Director, MTRU



Three aims:

- 1 Reduce congestion
- 2 Improve environment
- 3 Support sustainable travel

Across all the roads in the area

Four key elements:

- 1 Remove HGV traffic with no business in the area
- 2 Promote alternatives to car use directly: bus, bike and walking
- 3 Improve local environment and “walkability”
- 4 Control traffic through junction improvements and linked traffic signals




1 Remove HGV through traffic

Photo Copyright [michaelely](#) and licensed for reuse under [this Creative Commons Licence](#)

HGV “Access Only”

- Local HGVs unaffected
 - Through HGVs removed from the Park and local area (80-90%) and diverted to motorway routes
 - Despite extra distance on motorways:
 - Fewer serious accidents and fatalities*
 - Congestion costs reduced*
 - Community severance reduced*
 - Local environment improved*
- However:
- Risk of extra carbon*
 - Additional haulier costs*



2 Promote sustainable transport

New Government policies aim to make half all journeys in towns and cities by sustainable means by 2030.

Greater Manchester’s “Right Mix” policy is in line with this, aiming for 2040.

Both achieve this by promoting walking, cycling and public transport.



Meeting Government policy would reduce car traffic locally: about half of the car traffic at Mottram Moor has driven across the National Park.

- Measures would include:
 - “smart bus priority” at signals
 - higher bus service frequencies
 - new safe and convenient cycle routes
 - more pedestrian crossings
- Other local measures would include e-car hire, bike and e-bike hire, and bike delivery schemes.
- Longer distance travel would need commitments to rail improvements.
- Visitor traffic crossing the National Park would need new schemes to encourage sustainable travel to and within the NP



3 Improve local environment and “walkability”

Measures to reduce traffic and encourage sustainable travel improve local environment, especially air quality, noise, severance and visual intrusion/landscape.

All villages along Mottram end A57/A628 routes should be treated as an environmentally sensitive area with:

- A well signed 20 mph speed limit
- Public realm improvements
- Signalised pedestrian crossings at frequent intervals:
 - linked to the 20 mph limit and bus activation

Traffic signals computer controlled to smooth traffic flow, slow it down and break up queues



4 Control traffic through junction improvements and linked traffic signals

- Pedestrian crossings would break up queues; optimising flows for all road users.
- Junction improvements – new layouts and traffic signals – would be part of overall package e.g.
Plans for M67 roundabout already designed and tested for A57 Link Roads. With junction redesign, flow could be improved and “smart” bus gates introduced.



What will people see?

In the local area:

- 80-90% fewer HGVs
- 23% less traffic demand overall
- Fewer road casualties
- Faster, more reliable bus links with easier fares
- Protected crossings to restore access across the A628/A57

In the Park:

- 80-90% fewer HGVs
- 29% less traffic demand

On the M67 into East Manchester:

- 21% less traffic demand
- 70-80% fewer HGVs

APPENDIX 3 – PADLET

The screenshot shows a Padlet page with the following content:

- padlet** logo in the top left and the URL `padlet.com/meganevans5/8igskkofzbt0a` in the top right.
- The Green Travel Challenge** as the main title, with the subtitle "A local conversation".
- Metadata: **MEGANEVANS5** SEP 30, 2021 07:20AM.
- A **Welcome** section header.
- Your zoom link for this evening** with the URL `https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81687428567`.
- New to Zoom or need a refresher?** section containing:
 - Zoom Technical Requirements/Recommendations** with a list:
 1. A personal computer (laptop or desktop) is recommended.
 2. A headset with microphone
 3. Webcam/Video Camera (integrated or external)
 - Text: "Using whatever machine (laptop or desktop), plus headset or earphones, log in to a Zoom test meeting. [redacted]"
 - Text: "Following the link above will invite you to download and run Zoom. It is best that you download and install the application and create a free Zoom account."
 - Text: "*Please do not plan to join on a phone (either on an app, or via dial in). Though it is possible, this will severely diminish the quality of your participation.*"
 - Text: "*Though it is sometimes possible to join via a browser, this reduces functionality.*"
 - Before the Zoom meeting:**
 - Text: "Check that you have the latest version of Zoom. It is good practice to check this weekly, as updates can add features and improve participation."
 - Text: "Here's a link to show how to update it: [redacted]"
 - Text: "Once you have downloaded, installed and set up an account on Zoom, use the test link to enter a trial meeting. You will get a popup - choose 'open zoom.us' which will open your..."
- A **Zoom_Instructions** section at the bottom, labeled "Word document" and "PADLET DRIVE".

How we will work together today

Camera/Microphone

- Please remain on or off camera as you wish/need during presentations and whole group discussions
- If possible, switch your camera on and unmute your mic in small group discussions in breakout rooms
- Please mute your mic when others are presenting
- You can hide your self view if you so wish. People will still see you and vice versa – you won't be able to see your self.

Please be mindful of your airtime

- Please be mindful of your level of participation
- Please give others the time and space to contribute

Respect

- Listen with an open mind
- You can respect another point of view without agreeing with it
- Be open to new ideas or new ways of thinking

Comfort

- Your comfort is our concern. If there is anything we can do to help you further, please send Sidney, Megan or Dawn a Direct Message in the chat

Agenda

- 6.30pm - Introductions & speakers
- 7.20pm - Break
- 7.50pm - Plenary
- 8.00pm - Finish

Padlet closes 5.00pm Friday 15th October 2021

Summary of potential solutions

Package of Low Carbon Sustainable Travel Measures for Glossopdale and Longdendale

What's the problem?

The Longdendale villages of Tintwistle, Hollingworth and Mottram beside the A57/A628 trunk route experience severe environmental pollution from through-traffic of heavy lorries and commuter car traffic from Glossopdale. The A57 Link Roads would offer partial relief to one village but make the situation elsewhere worse. Investing in road building that generates more traffic would undermine national commitments to climate change, air quality, public wellbeing, nature and national parks. The strategic aims for this corridor should be to encourage connectivity by public transport and modal shift of freight to rail but the most pressing issue is to address the situation through the villages.

What's the solution?

Having heard from residents and visitors about their travel experiences and their ideas as to how travel could be improved we are developing a package of measures that would alleviate congestion, improve the environment and decrease carbon emissions throughout the area. All of these ideas are currently in use - but not so far in this locality.

A weight limit on through-traffic of heavy lorries across the Peak National Park - this would encourage drivers to use the motorway box M1/M62/M6/M60/A52 around the area, significantly reduce traffic queues and free up road space for active travel. Reducing the numbers of lorries is extremely popular locally, and would require cooperation across a number of local highway authorities, and enforcement of the weight restriction. Local businesses and local deliveries would continue unaffected. Other ideas such as e-cargo bikes can be promoted (see below).

Returning streets to the people - this would include slower speeds such as 20mph, more space and facilities for cycling and walking with more road crossing points, and creation of a local network for local walking and longer cycling journeys to work, school, shops, leisure, medical centres. A local group has already begun the work with a focus on travel to school.

Reshaping bus services, plus smart bus priority - Bus Service Improvement Plans provide the opportunity to do this is now. We know from local people's and visitors' experience of travel to, within and from the area of the difficulties on individual routes and services. These need reshaping to provide integrated affordable reliable and faster services. Modern bus priority doesn't need continuous lanes - smart linked signals and bus gates achieve more for less.

Linked traffic signal controls - Along the trunk route and at M67 J4 modernising and introducing linked controls would improve safety, allow for bus priority without disturbing other traffic, break up queues and smooth flow overall.


Local affordable EV car and e-bike share/hire scheme - Shared EV and e-bike purchase and use schemes

Summary potential solutions 24 Sep 21

Word document

PADLET DRIVE

Glossop map



Lorry ban

One of our proposals is to stop heavy lorry traffic which has no business in the area using the A628 and A57 through the Park and local roads (access traffic would still be permitted)

Q. Would a lorry control scheme make local journeys on foot more attractive?

Q. Would removing most of the heavy lorries be enough to encourage more activities in the village centres?

An HGV lorry ban would definitely benefit the residents of Longdendale and the National Park as a whole. However I think it is unrealistic at the present time because the alternative routes of M1, M62, M60 are so heavily congested there is no spare capacity to take the diverted traffic. I also fear that Longdendale is part of the Government's strategic thinking for new motorway and high speed rail connections between Yorkshire and Greater Manchester. This wider strategic connectivity is the elephant in the room, which needs to be sorted out before more local / suburban traffic control measures such as cycle lanes, 20mph speed limits, bus gates and more traffic lights could have any impact. For all these reasons I am rather surprised that the transport consultant focused on the usual "suburban" traffic control measures and barely mentioned the wider strategic picture. This video articulates what you are up against, particularly in the context of the Southern Pennines transport corridor. I admit it is very vague, perhaps deliberately so but there is a lot more detail hidden behind the facade.

— ANONYMOUS

Q. What would impact of diverting HGVs on the M62?

One factor that haulage companies are likely to fight against is additional fuel cost of taking a longer route. However it might not be that significant due to the difference in driving style (cruising at 70 vs stopping/starting and climbing in low gears. It would be worthwhile doing some research into this. It shouldn't be too hard to do a comparative study by driving both routes in real world conditions and recording the fuel consumption. The actual vehicle used shouldn't matter as we're only interested in the percentage difference which should be the same on average.

— ANONYMOUS

Yes to both

Lorry ban would definitely make journeys on foot more attractive and bring villages to life. Would also improve cycling.

Yes, due to reduced pollution, better visibility, decreased risk of accident

lorry ban ok, but more behavioural change

we felt that behavioural change is key , less car journeys

More active management of road freight to coordinate return loads - avoiding empty lorries.

Be careful what you wish for

Wouldn't the road capacity released by a lorry ban be quickly taken up by increased car traffic, as journeys become quicker and more convenient than by public transport? This in turn would make Glossopdale a more attractive location for commuters, thereby encouraging more housing development.

I'm not suggesting that banning HGVs is counterproductive, but it can only part of the solution.

We agree: the most effective package of solutions needs to be multi-faceted. A move to establish infrastructure for the local communities to be greener/more sustainable would be seen to be resourcing the area, rather than just banning forms of transport. Cycling/walking infrastructure, better public transport, car clubs etc will be resources for the community, and an easier sell to what may well be a sceptical community. — ANONYMOUS

Have studies been done to assess where the heavy goods vehicles who have been banned have gone and does the road have capacity to take them?

Online deliveries

Look at how much traffic is through online deliveries. We've seen an increase in traffic in West Sheffield which is "white vans" bringing stuff over the Snake from distribution centres in the Manchester area.

Go for it

A weighing facility needs to be installed on the A628; any vehicle exceeding the permitted maximum is automatically stopped.

Question 1: yes. It would make local walking more attractive. And yes it would encourage local activities. But as others have said it needs to be part of a package, not enough on its own, and also comes across as punitive. We want to promote local activity for its own sake - visiting neighbours, going to a shop/the shops, stopping and talking in the street (!) (remember how we could actually hear each other during lockdown!), and on side streets why not go further and see children playing! sitting out! under the trees! — ANONYMOUS

removing lorries making local journeys more attractive?

Yes I think so. Can't put speed bumps on Turnlee road due to all the lorries going down it and it would be noisy for them going over the bumps.

Activities in village centres

Not sure about a direct link to removing heavy goods vehicles. Less traffic in general and more linked in activities by Move More Glossop could help.

Is Longdendale part of a trans-European link?

I believe a lot of the HGV traffic is between ports such as Immingham and Liverpool for onward shipping to Ireland. If this is so should we be funding EU transport costs, if Brexit is to mean anything? Some ferries have already been diverted from Ireland to France, to avoid the additional post-Brexit transport costs in the UK.

Local car and bike schemes

Car clubs and car hire make economic (and climate sense) sense as cars are stationary (parked, unused) for 96% of the time.

What would encourage you to join a club to buy/share use of an electric car or an electric bike?

Great!

Works well in Berlin. Using an app or online.

Local car clubs

Great idea: seem to work well. Worth exploring different models.

Idea - promote scheme more

Make people aware of the costs of running a car vs benefits of car/bike sharing

Freight by bicycle

There is a local e-bike delivery company in Glossop, I hope they're still going. — ANONYMOUS

Nice idea in principle

Who would maintain these? Who would monitor the way that the vehicles are driven? There is an incentive to be careful with one's own vehicle (though you wouldn't think so, the way some folk drive). Without that incentive, we could be in 'white van' territory in terms of driving.

Yes indeed, the mechanics of such a scheme has to be well worked out. However such schemes are already running on a big scale in Bremen for years and, says someone above, in Berlin. Also there are schemes in the UK I believe. Here in the Hope Valley the Climate Action group has funding for a paid project officer working on developing a blueprint for a complete transport system for the valley. This will include one or more car sharing schemes. There is some expertise in our Transport Group on this, I believe. The blueprint will become reality, we hope, with funding in view for a 5-year implementation phase. It is seen as, and being pitched to bodies such as the Department for Transport as, a pilot for rural areas throughout the whole country. — ANONYMOUS

Two important aspects of such schemes are: 1) the space saved by not having all those cars parked everywhere for 96% of their lives is A LOT! I asked a question in the Jersey parliament for a list of ALL the public parking spaces in the island's capital town, their area, and an estimate of their value. The answer was absolutely stunning, and of course people can then see how much housing, green space, play space you can have, if only you take away the cars !! 2) if we go from our present number of fossil fuel powered cars to the same number of EV's we are trashing the planet just the same. We really have to press for an economical way of providing access to mobility for all, and that means community-led vehicle sharing schemes. — ANONYMOUS

Both electric bikes and cars need the borrowing rider/driver to learn the ins and outs! This has to be included in the running of such a scheme. — ANONYMOUS

getting to Tintwistle (from Simmondley)

Tintwistle for car pools/ better bus routes! I have to go to Tintwistle athletic football club sometimes and it has never yet seemed a viable option via bus and walking/cycling

Car sharing - Difficult

I don't want to share a car especially late at night if I'm on my own with my child. Could there be some sort of Facebook group and approval so we know who we are sharing with. Or maybe

there is a list of members you can check their profile or something. But I guess it would have to start small scale anyway before it took off to any large extent so would be close knit anyway.

Reshaping Bus Services

Buses are expensive, unreliable, infrequent, with no early morning or evening services, slow due to making tortuous journeys and not going to key destinations.

Q. If you use the buses at the moment what would be the most important improvements that could be made?

Q. What should the key destinations for bus services in Glossopdale and Longdendale be?

Q. What bus or shuttle service would help you leave the car at home? Which places should it serve?

Q. How could we speed up services which, if they are to serve the entire community, need to 'go round the houses'?

community bus services - eg integrated links with trains

Too unreliable and infrequent at the moment

Need inexpensive, regular small buses for local trips. Should link up with trains. Need public ownership or at least public control.

Routes curtailed due to pandemic need to be reinstated

Need to survey a wider range of people in order to get a better idea of which routes are most important. This is a good opportunity to come up with better solutions that we had before.

All but 1 of the local services running before the pandemic have returned — ANONYMOUS

We need a full bus service

The current bus service isn't usable because the time covered by most buses in High Peak is so limited. It should be possible to travel by bus in the evenings.

Free bus services throughout the country

Though bus services

There is a new bus service across the Snake from Sheffield and I hope it is a success.

Nights and weekends

In some parts of Glossopdale there are currently no services in the evenings and on Sundays - these are needed as a bare minimum to encourage change

Demand responsive bus services to infill main routes for rural areas visitors & residents

community bus service

there should be a priority bus route into Manchester (smart bus gates?). Like the witchline which (used?) to take(s) commuters from Rossendale into MCR. If needs be widen the A57 to accommodate this.

Greater publicity and easy access to accurate information about bus services

The X57 bus service is fantastic but I am surprised it is still viable as it doesn't seem to be well used. There should be much more publicity and awareness of this as a park and ride service for the Peak District. I struggled to find accurate information about timetables and stops (in Mottram) and only found out by chance that it goes to Fairholmes.

Speeding up services

The dilemma which bus companies find themselves in is the contradictory need to serve a wide area against the need for speed. A recent trip to Buxton by bus was far more protracted than driving, not because it drove any more slowly, but because of its circuitous route.

Introducing express, direct buses as well as retaining the 'round-the-houses' ones would probably be uneconomic.

We need Free Green Buses, in High Peak and indeed all across the land. For less than £10 billion the current bus service could be made free and doubled in size. For a few tens of billions existing 'dirty buses' could be replaced by electric buses and doubled in number.

These questions - suitably adapted to refer to everyone, and not just "bus users" - would be good as part of a survey to establish what kind of bus service people would need. But only do this if you have the funding to actually implement what people have said should happen!!! Otherwise there are big issues around credibility and raising people's hopes falsely. See what I wrote under "Local Car and Bike Schemes" about the Hope Valley Climate Action project, which has a clear path to funding. One destination should clearly be the 2 train stations - Glossop and Gamesly (yet to be built

Buses still have a bad image

There's still a feeling among many people that buses are for "failures" (thank you, Margaret Thatcher, allegedly!) so there's an image problem (not so much in London and big cities) that needs to be addressed. Making buses, and other forms of public transport, so attractive you'd be crazy not to use it would be a worthy goal - make them free/very cheap and reliable.

Integration of journeys and information

Electronic signing maybe and buses more often. Also the routes for buses don't mix with trains and cycling it's not integrated so a car journey that takes 20 minutes from Simmondley to Ashton takes 2 buses and walking and cycling and can be over 90 minutes long and also only at certain times.

Also there needs to be a better integration with Google maps or a good app which shows routes via public transport and cycling together (and doesn't show uber as an option).

Key routes for me - dont know about others

Ashton, Hayfield, etihad Stadium, Urmston and chorlton (South Manchester) Also into Peak District from Glossop.The x57 is good although it's a massive shame this can't allow for bikes in some format as mountain bikers and roadys are driving into the peaks. Routes to Greater

Manchester are extremely awkward. If I want to go to South Manchester I need to go all the way into Manchester and then take various buses to get to my destination and also walk. Also to get to the etihad stadium you have to go Manchester first and it's a lot of changes. Also a bus driver in Manchester said a child's bike can't go on a bus - How to get to BMX without using the car?

Buses vs. Taxis

Rather than subsidising poorly-used bus services, perhaps use the money electrifying the taxi fleet which is after all a demind-responsive service.

Fast bus coach lane

Just to amend my comment (above) here slightly, re copying the Rossendale service. Is/was called the "Witch Way (after Pendle Hill witches?). Its more a coach than a bus, so can use the motorway sections at good speed, and offer comfortable priority travel into Manchester. No way the train can continue to absorb more housing, esp if Godley Green pours 2k more commuters onto Hadfield to Manchester, though that should be fought hard anyway. Like others have said on here, we need a combination of things, the lorry ban is a key component, but it needs other innovative measures, and maybe (!?) a small amount of road widening is a price worth paying to save the Park, the green belt, and Glossopdale.

Cycling

Perceived danger deters many people from cycling. In some places segregated routes could be arranged but much cycling would still need to be on the highway

Q. Would 20mph speed limits encourage you to cycle? Where should these speed limits apply?

Q. If there were slower speeds and a mapped complete network for cycling would you cycle to work? If not, what would be needed to make it attractive?

Q. With these measures would you let your children walk or cycle to school? If not, what would be needed to make it acceptable?

Q. Would removing most of the heavy lorries from the area encourage you to cycle?

All the comments are right. We are light years from where we need to be on this due to government neglect for DECADES. However the budget for the A57 links Road scheme, (£228 million according to the consultation), if it was re-allocated to a proper local Transport and Place Plan would be enough!

— ANONYMOUS

Cycling safety

I don't live locally, but I have cycled through it a few times, over the TransPennine Trail and from Glossop to Manchester on the road network. On the latter, it's very easy to get lost and end up cycling on busy, unsuitable roads. That's because the signposting for cyclists is inconsistent and sometimes quite hard to follow. People need to feel confident that they can cycle safely. I think a clearly signposted network of 'quiet roads' would really help in that respect.

Make use of the TPT to enhance sustainable transport through the area.

What is TPT?? — ANONYMOUS

OK gottit! Trans pennine trail! — ANONYMOUS

More usable routes out of Glossopdale

Relatively flat link through from Melandra to Broadbottom?

also connecting Gamesley Woodland route to Glossop Road at old level crossing — ANONYMOUS

Direct routes

A more direct route for TPT and other segregated Active Travel routes are needed to make walking and cycling easier and more pleasant.

Yes, the current course of the TPT isn't really a viable route. It is mostly on roads, where there is an alternative off-road routes which are more direct and could easily be upgraded or completed eg Gamesley Woodlands trail to join Glossop Rd near Gamesley and the TPT there — ANONYMOUS

Need safe cycling routes out of Glossop in every direction

Electric bikes

Very good solution for hilly areas.

Better all round provision for cyclists

Better, joined up, cycle lane provision and penalties for drivers who park in marked bike lanes. Also, thinking ahead, it would be good if one day we were able to get bikes on buses.

Need enforcement of slower speeds

Yes, lower speed limits would make cycling more attractive providing that these limits were enforced

Yes to final question

Removing heavy lorries would indeed help.

clearly marked cycle paths

More cycle paths yes - clearly marked complete cycle path would be amazing and I'm sure help me and other to cycle around Glossop more safely

20mph

would encourage me to cycle but some roads could be made one way so a cycle path can be added?

children walking or cycling to school

Yes with these measures more likely. Big issue with the crossing of Turnlee Road that splits simmondley from Glossop. Its very dangerous. Also an issue with the walk through from Dinting arches to Glossopdale school - as you come to the main road it's very dangerous for the kids to cross and not clear if cars should be waiting there or not - a very badly designed crossing for a school walking route.

removing heavy lorries

would help

Car journeys

Which car journeys might you be willing and able to avoid? This could be using an alternative means of travel, getting a delivery instead of driving to the shops, or having more local services would help.

Q. Are there car journeys you feel you have to make now that you didn't before?

Q. Feel free to think of ideas, start by thinking of the car journeys you made last week. Which would be the easiest to switch from car? What would help you to do that?

Q. If we need to switch one in ten car journeys over the next 10 years - which one would you choose and what would be needed to make that possible, or even preferable?

These questions, assuming they would be used amongst the general public, make me uneasy. For me, they conjure up the mental image of someone strapped into their car, ready to go. Whereas we want people to think: bus/train/walk/cycle. — ANONYMOUS

Avoidable car journeys

Breaking the link with the car

20 mph zone and traffic control measure thorough local village to combat rat runs

20's plenty really works — MEGANEVANS

agree — ANONYMOUS

I use my car a lot less because I am able to work from home

We have reduced from two cars in our household to one. The world has changed since the original study and this needs to be taken into account. More should be done to promote wfh.

unavoidable car journeys

where bicycle and walking not possible because too far or steep gradients;
transporting someone with limited mobility;
getting to Tameside hospital;
when rail services are impracticable (sundays & very early or late shifts)

*Car journeys tend to be unavoidable when the alternatives either don't exist or are unattractive.
There's a gap that needs to be filled - better PT, taxis, shuttle bus services* — ANONYMOUS

Walking to the shops

One of the key reasons given for using the car was for transporting heavy shopping and other goods.

- Q. Would wider well maintained pavements encourage you to walk more for local journeys?
- Q. Would more frequent crossing points encourage you to walk more for local journeys?
- Q. If not, what else would be needed to make it attractive?
- Q. If e-cargo bikes or e-vans could deliver the goods would you walk to and from the shops instead of taking the car?
- If not, what else would be needed to make it attractive?

as I say elsewhere significantly cheaper shopping aisle for non car users. Carrots as well as sticks.
— ANONYMOUS

these are carrots? — ANONYMOUS

All the issues are linked!

Impossible to talk about any of these issues without bringin in at least three of the others!

Fewer cars parked on the pavement would make walking more attractive.

This is all part of the issue of breaking our link with the car, our own personal transporter. Many parts of Glossop are already at maximum capacity. I've lived in my road for over 25 years and every house was built with space for two vehicles off-road. Most residents have converted their carports into garages or living rooms, and have at least 2 cars per family so, what was once a safe street for children to play in, is now double-parked along its whole length. As long as we have this relationship with our cars, the trend will continue. — ANONYMOUS

Need more pavements

Let alone wider pavements, any sort of pavement would make walking more attractive e.g. walking to from Glossop to Mellor via Charlesworth

Car parking

cars parked on pavements actually leaving no space for pedestrians and on some roads and some days you have to even walk in the road.

deliveries

I don't always know what I want from the shops until I get there but yes would be happy to have an ecargo bike or van deliver it. I get a veg box delivered anyway and only top up from the shops. Able and Cole are looking at e-vehicles and do try to deliver in the most economic way in terms of times

More crossings

these would make my journeys safer

Other ideas 1

Q. What have we missed?

HGVs from quarries in High Peak/Glossop - are there alternative ways to transport stone to national rail network (not by HGVs but by new rail, light rail or alterative technologies?)

You as so many Green people have the hard reality we face with an over populated island which needs to be housed, where housing has become a pivotal facet of the economy, not just in itself, but in spin offs like home improvements. Hence all the "Build Back Better" stuff. Not easy to solve these issues in a few words, but its plain as daylight that until we have a traffic solution in place there needs to be a housing moratorium for the area. Its outrageous that the Council opted for 350dpa when they could have had 320dpa from Lichfield's OAN. This issue needs confronting, because things are going to get very bad in Glossopdale in many ways if this issue isnt faced, as seen as integral to the transport issue. Every new house = 2 more cars on a road system in total crisis. — ANONYMOUS

National Park is the Planning Authority. With Breendon's quarry in the Hope valley, as I understand it, there is a planning agreement limiting the number of lorry trips Breendon is allowed to make. Judging from the traffic though our village this agreement must be quite lenient. But it is there and it could be the starting point for applying some pressure to change the quarries to use rail. — ANONYMOUS

Active neighbourhoods - some ideas already here in the research eg 20mph, safe cycling. And make link to health - preventative health measures that would reduce health costs for treating the impacts of poor air quality (eg asthma) and lack of physical activity (eg diabetes, heart conditions).

cultural change

Need to change cultural approach towards e.g. cycling in Netherlands

Engage young people

They wont be interested in the planning system or the scheme so we need to focus on the scheme's impact on the climate emergency.

Agree. And as someone suggested at the meeting, campaign on this using social media. Find some young people who would like to carry this forward? — ANONYMOUS

Signage

Think carefully how routes are signed for long distance through traffic; can't alter local journeys as people follow routes by habit but long distance are susceptible to alternatives

Other ideas 2

Q. What have we missed?

Air Quality - surely this is a massive lever. Some areas near the scheme are at the edge of what is legal. There are high rates of pollution-related disease in the area. And there are legal DUTIES about Air Pollution. Crumbs, surely this is a central campaign plank (along with climate change)
— ANONYMOUS

Smarter Travel - its important that any package of alternatives is supported by 'soft measures' like personalised travel plans, school travel plans, e-bike demonstration days, work based travel plans

if govt serious about 50% journeys "sustainable" by 2030 I think they need to immediately start to offer "carrots" and not just "sticks". I suggest a "cheap sustainable traffic shopping aisle" at all major supermarket chains. Would need funding detail. But we need to move beyond "fluffy" sustainable transport narrative to hard actions, positive as well as negative (imo) (Peter Simon wrote this) I do have other ideas, but this is enough for now perhaps?

Not sure a 'sustainable shopping aisle' stands up as a 'hard action' ?? As i see it the problem is we have too many 'carrots' to encourage motoring and not enough sticks — ANONYMOUS

I agree about the carrot. I'm not sure how cheaper food aisles would work but making public transport so attractive (either by price or reliability) that people would look at car users as crazy would be a target. — ANONYMOUS

Re-open the woodhead railway!

This should be seriously looked at. The cost is likely to be much less than any alternatives.
— ANONYMOUS

Fill in the gaps in the Trans Pennine Trail - make it wholly segregated from road

50mph limit on the A628 as traffic restraint

reopen Woodhead railway

The railway line through Woodhead (the equivalent of the A628) was closed to passengers in 1970 and to freight in 1981. Recently electrified (1950s) and new tunnels bored under the Pennines. What a waste. The Hope Valley alternative is not electrified, still has mechanical signalling in places and is not fast. The more northerly railway routes through Diggle and Calder Valley also remain diesel-operated.

Amazing - thanks for the detail. I have a feeling that this route figured in some feasibility studies done by Highways England and was then put aside. But I am not sure of the detail on this. I expect Anne Robinson knows! - ANONYMOUS

Where does the line begin and end?? - ANONYMOUS

Slowing traffic to improve the flow by phasing the traffic lights

Slowing traffic down would improve the flow. On A57 through Glossop there are about 8 sets of traffic lights and pedestrians have priority. If traffic lights were phased so that traffic had to travel at 20mph it would reduce acceleration and braking, fuel use and emissions; pedestrians might have to wait a bit longer.

Any questions?

Do we know the O & D's of the HGV's?

Origins and destinations . . - ANONYMOUS

"making Longdendale etc places which DESERVE respect - yes1 ExpAND PLEASE"

"you haven't mentioned the existing train services to"

Impact of diverting HGVs onto M62

M62 us full so how will that work?

Is it possible for Laura's experiences to be available to campaigners in A57 area?

Marianne's road users' group sounds an excellent way to find out....

On the Facts - will Tintwistle PC take note that the A57 scheme will INCREASE traffic in Tintwistle!1??

I think Richard has identified the key issue. The argument is dominated by 'get the bypass done' argument, irrespective of the merits of this. An alternative vision has to be provided.

Marianne . I leafleted in Tint against the current proposal and nearly everyone I spoke to knew the proposed scheme was inadequate and opposed it. What is your feel about local opinion ?

This is the most heartening thing I have read. Please please keep leafletting and talking with people. We should all be doing this. how? And how to make our findings a bit more secure and usable in the EiP (Examination in Public) - ANONYMOUS

It seems to me that residents of both Hollingworth and Tintwistle are being urged to support the Mottram Bypass/Glossop Spur as a first step towards a promised Hollingworth/Tintwistle bypass.. I can't see that that will ever happen (nor do I support it)

A38 expansion in Derby was challenged in the courts on climate change grounds and they won

HGV Lorry Ban

What will be the impact on the A6?

European practice

No mention is made in your questionnaire of other European (are we allowed to mention them?) practice. How does Holland, Denmark and Germany manage and promote sustainable transport?

Good point! For example, Berlin has currently a petition gathering signatures which will force the Council to ban cars throughout the entire centre of Berlin (a huge area). Or the Council could refuse, which would trigger a referendum. There are places in France which have free bus services on the grounds that NOT having them costs more! Both these from recent reporting in the Guardian
— ANONYMOUS

What will be the impact of the Clean Air Zone (CAZ) which I believe is now being extended to Tintwistle?

Slides

countrywide charity
in District and
in Yorkshire

A57 Road Scheme? Other ways of managing travel in Glossopdale and Longdendale

Preliminary results

**Keith Buchan
Director, MTRU**

A57 Road Scheme meeting Keith Buchan slides
Powerpoint presentation
PADLET DRIVE

Next steps

Anne Robinson email please send questions to
[REDACTED]@cprepeakandsyorks.org.uk

APPENDIX 4 – SMALL SCALE ROAD/PUBLIC TRANSPORT ALTERNATIVE

My idea essentially is that Mottram currently blocks up the entire traffic system due to the lights at Mottram Moor never having been addressed or identified as the main problem and also of course because it is the terminus of a motorway.

By addressing the blockage caused by the lights via a one-way system (that Highways Agency preferred to name a gyratory flow) both the motorway and the land at the end of the terminus can be used to the advantage of commuters in the area by creating a one stop point for accessing towns and cities nearby - namely the Mottram Interchange.

It is in a very strategic position to be a gateway to so many nearby locations. All that is needed are shuttles, such as minibuses, to take people to this one location, where they can then access one stop express services that can take commuters to their destination straight down the motorway. There is plenty of land between the terminus and the Roe Cross that could be used for bus and coach parking and/or a Park & Ride facility.

Most of the work for this was done for the public inquiry and then for my response to Longdendale Integrated Transport Strategy many moons ago but neither Highways Agency (HA) nor Tameside were ever open to honest discussion and debate of anything other than their own plans, as we all know. Nothing has or ever will change on that front hence my lack of optimism in engaging with these giants.

The one key difference right now is that the one and only reason that HA ever gave for its rejection of the Gyratory Flow is that it did nothing to stop the lorries from going through the villages. **This now puts the idea on a level playing field since their current plans do not do this either.**

I have culled the following from that LITS 'consultation'. There may be one or two bits that are outdated but I think this will be enough to give you an insight as to what I was/am suggesting, albeit it ever falls on deaf ears.

There is of course a far more cost effective solution, which comes in the form of a gyratory flow around Mottram. A workable scheme that is already known to Tameside for it appeared as Alternative 1 at the 2007 Public Inquiry (Appendix 6). Tameside rejected it then, ostensibly because it didn't take the lorries out of the villages. Now we are back on a level playing field as the Mottram only 'bypass' doesn't do this either so Tameside's rejection of the idea is no longer valid.

I therefore formally re-present Alternative 1 as an alternative to the Mottram only 'bypass' and outline its advantages and superiority over Tameside's preferred road option:

- i. It is a whole lot cheaper. No need for an expensive tunnel. It also involves considerably less tarmac since the strip of road required is just a few hundred yards long.
- ii. No need to demolish properties or to compulsory purchase buildings. This saves even more money and enables residents to keep their homes.
- iii. Makes optimum use of the existing road infrastructure.
- iv. No need to destroy Mottram Showground.
- v. Minimal loss of agricultural land and open countryside.
- vi. Enables free flow of traffic 24 hours a day by eliminating the traffic lights at Mottram Junction. This in turn leads to the benefits of...
- vii. Reduction in air pollution, noise, dirt and dust from stationary traffic.
- viii. Massively reduces the incidents of heavily laden lorries breaking down on Mottram Moor due to stopping and starting, which is a major source of snarl-ups.

- ix. Quick and easy implementation of such a short strip of road.
- x. Far less attractive to new traffic than a fully- fledged bypass would be. Yet by de-congesting the area it frees up road space for public transport improvements to be implemented.

As an adjunct for discussion (were Tameside one day to finally decide that they were open to discussion and ideas) and as a complement to the gyratory flow as described above, I would like to suggest that Mottram would be an ideal place for a transport Interchange that could incorporate Park and Ride facilities.

Mottram located as it is at the head of a valley, could provide access to a large menu of nearby towns such as Hyde, Stalybridge, Ashton, Stockport, Glossop, Buxton etc and also has two major cities within commuting distance. Being close to a motorway terminus Mottram Interchange could provide access to express bus/coach services. Commuters from Stalybridge and the Longendale villages, could park up here in order to access public transport to many different towns both within and outside of Tameside.

A shuttle service could also be offered from the Interchange/Park and Ride area to Hattersley railway station as a further added benefit to commuters. This would boost usage of a railway station that has a lot of potential but is currently underused due to its relative isolation on the periphery of the Hattersley estate.

The combined effects of an creating an Interchange, Park and Ride facilities and a shuttle to access rail services, would have a major impact on increasing public transport usage in the area, shifting emphasis away from the private car which is the biggest contributor to the bottling up of local roads.

The nub of the matter is that Highways England are interested only in a trans-Pennine M-way whilst locals just want a traffic solution. Thus, when a genuine transport solution is offered that could be implemented quickly and cheaply they are not interested, as it defeats their *raison d'etre*. This is the impasse. It is virtually impossible to chisel into granite. The gyratory flow achieves everything the current proposal does without wiping out Mottram or threatening the Park by making maximum use of the current road structure.

Some of its advantages are:-

a: Does not seek to upgrade the whole route. Therefore, instead of attracting more traffic to the valley it makes better use of the existing road network, using a one-way system to improve traffic flow and replaces traffic lights with roundabouts at key points.

b: Doesn't seek to flood the whole valley in a sea of concrete and miles of extra road network with the prospect of even more in the future. Instead, it requires just a small strip to link the existing roundabout at Hattersley with Back Moor.

c: Would cost just a fraction of the budget for a tunnel and Spur/Link road to Woolley Bridge, which just isn't required by the Gyratory Flow system. The money saved could be used for more worthwhile projects.

d: Could be implemented in a fraction of the time of the proposed scheme and with very little disruption.

e: Would help unblock the A57 into/out of Glossop by speeding up traffic flow through use of one way system and roundabouts whereas the proposed scheme will have an opposite adverse effect.

f: Will improve air quality by enabling smooth flow of traffic.

g: Very little/almost no loss of agricultural land, wildlife or environmental degradation.

h: None of the visual intrusion that the proposed Link road will have for a very large number of households and which will be seen for miles around.

i: No need to put an expensive tunnel through a quality housing estate.

j: The houses that the HE bought on the estate can be resold and again the money could be re-invested in other more worthwhile projects.

k: No need for the Mottram Showground to be affected in any way. No loss of a cherished local amenity and a valued community event.

m: No future threat to the Peak District National Park Authority of a motorway ripping through the Dark Peak that would effectively destroy the Park. The whole raison d'être of the PDNPA, is to protect the Park for future generations of people who put the love of the countryside over and above highly destructive HE schemes like this one. This is therefore a scheme that you could support.