

**A57 Link Roads
TR010034**

**8.4 Draft Statement of Common Ground
with Transport for Greater Manchester**

APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)

Planning Act 2008 Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed
Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

January 2022

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Rules 2010

A57 Link Roads

Development Consent Order 202[x]

8.4 Draft Statement of Common Ground with Transport for Greater Manchester

| | |
|---|---|
| Regulation Number: | Regulation 5(2)(q) |
| Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference | TR010034 |
| Application Document Reference | TR010034/APP/8.4 |
| Author: | A57 Link Roads Project Team, National Highways and Atkins |

| Version | Date | Status of Version |
|----------------|--------------|--------------------------|
| Rev 2.0 | January 2022 | Deadline 2 |
| Rev 1.0 | June 2021 | DCO Application |
| | | |

DRAFT STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

**This Draft Statement of Common Ground has been prepared and agreed by (1)
National Highways Limited and (2) Transport for Greater Manchester**

Signed..... To be signed prior to examination
Name
Project Manager
On behalf of National Highways
Date:

Signed [REDACTED]
Glyn Boucher
Infrastructure Design Manager
On behalf of XXXXX
(Highways / Urban Traffic Control)
Date: 10/01/22

Signed
Name
Development Manager
On behalf of XXX
(Strategy and Planning)
Date:

Table of contents

| | |
|---|----------|
| 1. Introduction | 5 |
| 1.1. Purpose of this document | 5 |
| 1.2. Parties to this Statement of Common Ground | 5 |
| 1.3. Terminology | 5 |
| 1.4. Addressing Rule Six requirements | 6 |
| 2. Record of Engagement | 7 |
| 3. Table of issues and matters related to Rule Six Letter Annex E to be agreed | 9 |

1. Introduction

1.1. Purpose of this document

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

1.2. Parties to this Statement of Common Ground

- 1.2.1. This SoCG has been prepared by (1) National Highways as the Applicant and (2) Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM).
- 1.2.2. National Highways (formerly Highways England) became the Government-owned Strategic Highways Company on 1 April 2015. It is the highway authority in England for the strategic road network and has the necessary powers and duties to operate, manage, maintain, and enhance the network. Regulatory powers remain with the Secretary of State. The legislation establishing the then Highways England made provision for all legal rights and obligations of the Highways Agency, including in respect of the Application, to be conferred upon or assumed by Highways England (now National Highways) .

TfGM is the local government body responsible for delivering Greater Manchester's transport strategy and commitments.

1.3. Terminology

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

1.4. Addressing Rule Six requirements

1.4.1. The document evidences the meeting of conditions set out within Annex E of the Rule Six letter from the Examining Authority, dated 19th October 21. TfGM is a Category E interested party. The SoCG will address the following requirements within Annex E through the associated sections outlined in tables 1.1 below.

Table 1.1: Section Six Letter Annex E Requirement for category E interested parties - statutory undertakers.

| Annex E Requirement | Statutory Undertaker Issues |
|---|--|
| Impacts on rights/apparatus and on the transmission/distribution systems that could be interfered with and their mitigation | 1. Impacts on rights/apparatus and on the transmission/distribution systems that could be interfered with and their mitigation |
| The acquisition of any statutory undertakers' land or rights over such land and the detriment that may be caused to the carrying on of the undertaking in question. The adequacy and agreement of protective provisions in the draft Development Consent Order; any necessary side agreements; and compliance with s127 and s136 of the Planning Act 2008 | 2. The acquisition of any statutory undertakers' land or rights over such land and the detriment that may be caused to the carrying on of the undertaking in question. The adequacy and agreement of protective provisions in the draft Development Consent Order; any necessary side agreements; and compliance with s127 and s136 of the Planning Act 2008 |
| The protection of the Mottram Longdendale Aqueduct. | 3. The protection of the Mottram Longdendale Aqueduct. |
| The adequacy of the Protective Provisions set out in the draft Development Consent Order to safeguard relevant interests | 4. The adequacy of the Protective Provisions set out in the draft Development Consent Order to safeguard relevant interests |
| The Outline Environmental Management Plan | 5. The Outline Environmental Management Plan |
| Any other relevant matters included in the ExA's Initial Assessment of Principal Issues | 6. Any other relevant matters included in the ExA's Initial Assessment of Principal Issues |
| Any other matters on which agreement might aid the smooth running of the Examination and assist the ExA's recommendation to the Secretary of State | 7. Any other matters on which agreement might aid the smooth running of the Examination and assist the ExA's recommendation to the Secretary of State |

2. Record of Engagement

2.1.1. A summary of the meetings and correspondence that has taken place between National Highways and Transport for Greater Manchester between 2016 and March 2021 in relation to the Application, is outlined in Table 2-1.

Table 2.1: Record of Engagement between National Highways and Transport for Greater Manchester

| Date | Form of correspondence | Key topics discussed and key outcomes (the topics should align with the Issues tables) |
|------------------|---------------------------------|---|
| 11 July 2016 | Stakeholder Engagement Workshop | An early engagement workshop with all relevant stakeholders to discuss the challenges and objectives of the A57 Link Roads development, a review of the elements of programme and issues, the delivery process, potential for early delivery of package elements, Hollingworth and Tintwistle. |
| 1 May 2018 | Steering Group Meeting | A scheme update was provided, with queries on traffic figures and the format of consultation on the traffic figures. Stakeholders requested to receive the traffic data prior to the release of the information to the public. There were discussions around the Local Impact Report and an update was provided on air quality and noise. |
| 4 November 2020 | HE Email | S42 consultation letter |
| 23 November 2020 | Meeting | A meeting with TfGM to discuss urban traffic control and traffic modelling specifically at Mottram Moor junction, Woolley Bridge junction and Gun Inn junction. Discussions around M67 J4 to be undertaken at a later date. |
| 30 November 2020 | TfGM Email | Land Interest Questionnaire completed |
| 30 November 2020 | Meeting | A meeting with TfGM to discuss urban traffic control and traffic modelling at M67 junction 4 roundabout. An alternative junction design is proposed, to include a cut-through to accommodate the dominant flow of traffic from east to west onto the motorway. |
| 17 December 2020 | TfGM Email | Email to HE providing UTC's proposed concept layout for the A57 Mottram Bypass/Mottram Moor junction for HE's consideration. |
| 16 December 2020 | HE Email | Requested that land interest information was resent due to a problem with the privacy settings. |
| 13 January 2021 | HE Email | Email providing a sketch proposal for the Pegasus crossing to the west of Mottram Moor, and a request for comments from TfGM. |
| 21 January 2021 | HE Email | Screenshot of bus stop relocations on Mottram Moor to be discussed, and proposed junction. |
| 26 January 2021 | Meeting | A meeting with TfGM to discuss the relocation of bus stops, including consideration of an additional bus stop, and potential improvement of bus stops at Carrhouse Lane/Mottram Moor. |
| 1 February 2021 | TfGM Email | Requested a drawing showing the latest proposal for Mottram Moor, to be included in TfGM's consultation with the bus operators regarding the two bus stops on Mottram Moor. |

| Date | Form of correspondence | Key topics discussed and key outcomes (the topics should align with the Issues tables) |
|-----------------|------------------------|---|
| 2 February 2021 | HE Email | Drawing showing the proposals for Mottram Moor. |
| 8 March 2021 | TfGM Email | Email stating that a response from Stagecoach has been provided and they have no objections to the removal of the two bus stops on Mottram Moor. Also noting that Stagecoach asked about the potential impacts on the Roe Cross Road/Old Road stops as they are used as a service timing point |
| 8 March 2021 | HE Email | Response regarding the bus stops on Roe Cross Road stating that they will be impacted by the works and temporary relocation will be required during construction. Also noting that in the permanent scenario the intention is that they are returned to the same layout as existing and that this will be discussed further during detailed design. |
| 8 March 2021 | TfGM Email | Acknowledgement of above email and confirmation that HE response will be passed on to Stagecoach. |
| 15 March 2021 | Meeting | A meeting with TfGM to discuss the location of TfGM assets and associated issues |
| 30 March 2021 | HE Email | Email requesting that TfGM replies to previous HE email of 13 January 2021 to confirm it is happy with the proposed Pegasus crossing to the west of Mottram Moor. |
| 30 March 2021 | TfGM Email | Email confirming the preliminary layout for the Pegasus crossing is acceptable to UTC and suggesting some potential amendments. TfGM noted that the proposal can be refined at the detailed design stage. |
| 23 November 21 | GMCA email | Email to confirm that Whilst the GMCA does not want to be a Rule 6 party it is considered prudent to sign a Statement of Common Ground alongside TfGM. |
| 15 December 21 | Meeting | A meeting with TfGM to clarify the high level points that need to be addressed as the scheme progress |
| 11 January 22 | TfGM Email | Email from TfGM confirming the status of the SoCG relating to the operational and technical aspects |
| 12 January 22 | TfGM Email | Email detailing additional strategic points that TfGM would like to discuss as part of the ongoing discussions. |

Note: Meeting invites are not included in the table above

- 2.1.2. It is agreed that this is an accurate record of the key meetings and consultation undertaken between (1) National Highways and (2) Transport for Greater Manchester in relation to the issues addressed in this SoCG.

3. Table of issues and matters related to Rule Six Letter Annex E to be agreed

Table 3.2: Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) Between National Highways and Transport for Greater Manchester Transport for Greater Manchester (TFGM) Table of Issues/Matters - Final Version dated TBC

| SoCG Ref. Number | Relevant examination document | Relevant Issue | TFGM comment | National Highways response | Status |
|--|-------------------------------|----------------|--------------|----------------------------|--------|
| 1. Legislation and Policy | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 2. Assessment and Proposed Mitigation | | | | | |
| 2.1 Environmental Assessment and Mitigation | | | | | |
| 2.1.1 Adequacy of assessment for each environmental topic | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 2.1.2 Adequacy of mitigation for each environmental topic | | | | | |

| SoCG Ref. Number | Relevant examination document | Relevant Issue | TFGM comment | National Highways response | Status |
|--|-------------------------------|----------------|--------------|----------------------------|--------|
| 2.1.3 Methodology | | | | | |
| 2.1.4 Baseline conditions and coronavirus | | | | | |
| 2.2 Flexibility and worst case scenario | | | | | |
| 2.3 Construction and operational effects | | | | | |

| SoCG Ref. Number | Relevant examination document | Relevant Issue | TFGM comment | National Highways response | Status |
|---|-------------------------------|----------------|--------------|----------------------------|--------|
| 2.4 Scoping out of detailed assessment and National Policy Statement for National Networks | | | | | |
| 2.5 Assessment of methodology and best practice | | | | | |
| 2.6 Application of professional judgements and assumptions | | | | | |
| 2.7 Mitigation and outline environment management plan | | | | | |

| SoCG Ref. Number | Relevant examination document | Relevant Issue | TFGM comment | National Highways response | Status |
|---|-------------------------------|----------------|--------------|----------------------------|--------|
| 2.8 Residual impacts and securing of mitigation measures | | | | | |
| 2.9 Cumulative impacts | | | | | |
| 2.10 The significance of each residual impact | | | | | |

| SoCG Ref. Number | Relevant examination document | Relevant Issue | TfGM Comment | National Highways response | Status |
|--|-------------------------------|----------------|--------------|----------------------------|--------|
| 3. Environmental Statement and DCO Requirements | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 4. DCO Requirements and associated provisions and documents | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 5. Matters for detailed approval | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 6. Other consents and permits | | | | | |

| SoCG Ref. Number | Relevant examination document | Relevant Issue | TfGM Comment | National Highways response | Status |
|--|-------------------------------|----------------|--------------|----------------------------|--------|
| 7. Opportunities for enhancement and environmental benefits | | | | | |
| 8. Human rights and equalities duties | | | | | |
| 9. Any other relevant and important considerations | | | | | |

| SoCG Ref. Number | Relevant examination document | Relevant Issue | TFGM comment | National Highways response | Status |
|--|-------------------------------|----------------|--------------|----------------------------|--------|
| 10. LPA Issues | | | | | |
| 10.1 Compliance with local policy and development plan | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 10.2 Achievement of sustainable development | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 10.3 Matters listed under assessment of principles | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 10.4. Whether potential releases can be adequately regulated under the pollution control framework, consistent with the National Policy Statement for National Networks | | | | | |

| SoCG Ref. Number | Relevant examination document | Relevant Issue | TFGM comment | National Highways response | Status |
|--|-------------------------------|---|---|---|--------|
| 10.5 Any other relevant matters included in the ExA's Initial Assessment of Principal Issues | | | | | |
| 10.6 Any other matters on which agreement might aid the smooth running of the Examination and assist the ExA's recommendation to the Secretary of State | | | | | |
| 10.1 | | Highway design M67 Junction 4 Roundabout | The Consultees developed a traffic model (LinSig) for the roundabout. The main concern is storage on Arm 17, particularly during peak times. An area was identified that could provide additional space and changes need to be made to the stop line. The Consultee agrees that this would suffice in terms of queue capacity, with a total of 50m. | The Applicant has redesigned the roundabout with regard to this advice. | Agreed |
| 10.2 | | Highway design M67 Junction 4 Roundabout | The Consultee proposes an alternative design, similar to a T-Junction, where a cut through to the motorway is proposed. The Consultee is to run this model and share with the Applicant. The Consultee | The Applicant has altered the design to a cut through arrangement in agreement with TfGM. | Agreed |

| SoCG Ref. Number | Relevant examination document | Relevant Issue | TFGM comment | National Highways response | Status |
|------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|---|--------|
| | | | highlights that this would change the Scheme identified at public consultation. | | |
| 10.3 | | Highway design Mottram Moor Junction | The Consultee is including a right turn as a worst-case scenario in traffic modelling. TfGM states fundamental layout works well, however minor amendments are required (i.e., stop lines) – further feedback to be provided middle of December. | The Applicant has amended the layout of the Junction with regard to the consultation. | Agreed |
| 10.4 | | Highway design Woolley Bridge Junction | The Consultee would expect separate triangle island, advises a refuge would be sufficient at minimum 2m width. Tying this into farm property is to be reviewed. TfGM anticipates this would be beneficial for traffic carrying on to the estate. The consultee has advised on the junction as part of the overall assessment, but ultimate acceptance will remain with DCC. | Following this discussion, the Applicant has amended the traffic island design in this location. | Agreed |
| 10.5 | | Highway design Network along A57 Link Road | The Consultee enquires about whether there is any intention of installing a fibre network along the A57 Link Road. | The Applicant confirms that there will be no fibre network installation. Only copper network on M67 and 4G/ GSM comms network will be used for the new HE equipment | Agreed |

| SoCG Ref. Number | Relevant examination document | Relevant Issue | TFGM comment | National Highways response | Status |
|------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|--------|
| | | | | associated with the Scheme. | |
| 10.6 | | Highway design HE access to TFGM CCTV data | The Consultee stated that a separate project is being completed regarding the sharing of technology and CCTV between HE and TfGM | The Applicant will consider further as part of the Detailed Design development. | Agreed |
| 10.7 | | Highway design Location of TfGM equipment | TfGM set out its technological asset requirements with regards to observation of the Scheme. | The Applicant requested a detailed schematic later in the design process but agrees in principle. | Agreed |
| 10.8 | | Highway design Procurement of equipment | The Consultee confirmed that it would be responsible for the supply and installation of the technology assets listed. | The Applicant confirmed that it would install the bases for the equipment as required. | Agreed |
| 10.9 | | Highway design Layout of Pegasus crossing on Mottram Moor | The Consultee confirmed that the preliminary layout for the Pegasus crossing is acceptable to UTC. The preference would be to move the crossing as far west as possible to achieve 100m between the east bound stop line and the stop line at the junction, whilst maintaining the 20m distance to the car park exit. In addition, the lead up to the holding area on the southern side could be more | The Applicant will discuss with the Consultee further during the detailed design process. | Agreed |

| SoCG Ref. Number | Relevant examination document | Relevant Issue | TFGM comment | National Highways response | Status |
|------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|--------|
| | | | gradual removing the hair pin turn. The Consultee noted that the details can be refined at the detailed design stage. | | |
| 10.10 | | Highway design Layout of A57 Mottram Bypass / Mottram Moor Junction | The Consultee provided a proposed concept layout for the A57 Mottram Bypass / Mottram Moor junction for the Applicant's consideration. | The Applicant has updated the design to match these proposals. | Agreed |
| 10.11 | | Highway design Location of bus stops | The Consultee confirmed that Stagecoach have no objection to the removal of the two bus stops on Mottram Moor, however they queried the potential impacts on the Roe Cross Road/Old Road bus stops as they are used as a service timing point. The Applicant confirmed that the two bus stops on Roe Cross Road will be temporarily impacted by the works and will be temporarily relocated during construction, but in the permanent scenario the intention is that they are returned to the same layout as existing. This will be discussed further during detailed design. | The Applicant also confirmed that the bus stop on Stalybridge Road will not be affected by the Scheme, but that further communication will be provided as works are developed to improve the detrunked highway through Mottram. | Agreed |
| 10.12 | | Highways Design Stage 1 Geometry – TfGM UTC Central Design Board | TfGM have taken the following junction to the internal design panel reviews, in which the geometry, layouts and facilities at each junctions are assessed for safety, | Noted | Agreed |

| SoCG Ref. Number | Relevant examination document | Relevant Issue | TFGM comment | National Highways response | Status |
|------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|----------------------------|--------|
| | | | <p>adequacy and compliance with design standards.</p> <p>M67 Junction 4 Roundabout</p> <p>A57 Mottram Bypass / Mottram Moor Junction</p> <p>Woolley Bridge Junction the consultee has advised on the junction as part of the overall assessment, but ultimate acceptance will remain with DCC.</p> <p>All junctions have passed stage 1 reviews</p> | | |
| 10.13 | | <p>Highways Design</p> <p>Stage 2 Traffic Signal Design - TfGM UTC Central Design Board</p> | <p>TfGM have taken the following junction to the internal design panel review, in which junction's area assessed for compliance in operation, operational efficacies and junction timings also ensuring the needs of all users area accommodated correctly</p> <p>M67 Junction 4 Roundabout</p> <p>A57 Mottram Bypass / Mottram Moor Junction</p> <p>Woolley Bridge Junction the consultee has advised on the junction as part of the</p> | Noted | Agreed |

| SoCG Ref. Number | Relevant examination document | Relevant Issue | TFGM comment | National Highways response | Status |
|------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|------------------|
| | | | <p>overall assessment, but ultimate acceptance will remain with DCC.</p> <p>All junctions have passed stage 2 reviews</p> | | |
| 10.14 | | <p>Highway design</p> <p>Gun Inn Junction</p> | <p>The Consultee agrees improvements needed to Gun Inn Junction due to the demand for pedestrian facilities in the area and suggested it would link into surrounding residential areas to schools/other housing estates. The Consultee expressed potential concerns with accommodating pedestrian facilities. Also concerns with junction capacity with the introduction of a full pedestrian stage. No formal instruction / work undertaken to date.</p> | <p>The Applicant is to work with the consultee to look at options available at the junction to accommodate improvements</p> | Under Discussion |
| 10.15 | | <p>Additional points relating to strategic issues.</p> | <p>Email received from TfGM 12 January 22, highlighting several additional comments that are to be discussed relating to the scheme at a strategic level</p> | <p>The Applicant will work with the consultee to resolve the new issues raised throughout the planning process.</p> | Under Discussion |

© Crown copyright (2022).

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

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

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

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