

A57 Link Roads

TR010034

**9.9 Applicant's comments on Deadline 1
Submissions First Written Questions**

Rule 8 (1)(c)

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

Volume 9

January 2022

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

A57 Link Roads Development Consent Order 202[x]

9.9 Applicant's comments on Deadline 1 Submissions

Rule Number:	Rule 8(1)(c)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010034
Application Document Reference	TR010034/EXAM/9.9
Author:	A57 Link Roads Project Team, National Highways and Atkins

Version	Date	Status of Version
1	14 January 2022	Deadline 2

Table of contents

1.	Introduction	4
2.	Gareth Simpson's Comments on the Proposed Development (REP1-047)	5
3.	John J. Bower's comments on the Proposed Development (REP1-050)	6
4.	Sharon Jones's Post-hearing submission (REP1-052)	9
5.	Daniel Wimberley's Post-hearing submission (REP1-045)	14

1. Introduction

- 1.1.1. This document provides the comments of the applicant, National Highways, in response to the Submissions made at Deadline 1 as requested by the Examining Authority at Deadline 2 in its Rule 8 letter dated 19 November 2021. Comments have been provided on the following documents:
- Gareth Simpson's Comments on the Proposed Development (REP1-047)
 - John J. Bower's comments on the Proposed Development (REP1-050)
 - Sharon Jones's Post-hearing submission (REP1-052)
 - Daniel Wimberley's Post-hearing submission (REP1-045)
- 1.1.2. National Highways has sought to provide comments where it is helpful to the Examination to do so. National Highways has not responded to every submission for instance, because the submission was very short, or because it contained expressions of opinion without supporting evidence. where National Highways has chosen not to comment this is not an indication National Highways agrees with the point or comment raised or opinion expressed.

2. Gareth Simpson's Comments on the Proposed Development (REP1-047)

Response reference:	Representation Issue	National Highways Response
REP1-047-1	<p>Just a short letter about the A57 link road. In my view as a taxi driver I think it's a complete waste of time. I use the M67/A57 on a daily bases and I know it's a problem with the traffic but most of it is the HGV's.</p> <p>I can't see what difference a mile long bypass is going to do with the traffic congestion, it's still going to build up again when it get's to Tintwistle/Glossop. It's not just mottram/tintwistle and glossop it's everywhere there's just to many vehicle's.</p>	<p>The Scheme improves journey times and reduces both traffic congestion and delay on the A57 between Glossop and Hattersley. Consequently, it will make routes, including the A57, the A628 through Tintwistle and some other roads, more attractive for drivers that are currently using alternative routes to avoid traffic congestion and delay on this section of the A57. Inevitably, therefore, the Scheme is forecast to result in some re-routing of traffic from alternative routes, including onto the A57, A628 and some other roads, which means that with the Scheme traffic flows on some roads are forecast to increase. However, the Scheme overall is forecast to deliver journey time savings across the appraised road network compared to without it.</p> <p>Total vehicle kilometres across the appraised road network are also effectively the same with the Scheme as without it. This indicates that the Scheme is not forecast to induce additional traffic on to the road network and that increases in traffic flows on some roads due to the Scheme are balanced out by reductions on other roads because of rerouting or redistribution of some journeys. The Scheme is not anticipated to result in any significant increases in HGVs.</p>

3. John J. Bower's comments on the Proposed Development (REP1-050)

Response reference:	Representation Issue	National Highways Response
REP1-050-1	<p>This proposed road is going to achieve nothing, it is a matter of building for buildings sake. I have lived at Carr House Farm, all my life, and at Meadow View since I married in 1983. The road authority at the time, were at Carr House Farm in 1961 taking measurements, in every decade since then, except the 70's, plans have come and gone, across all areas of our Farm. Every time changing and being told the previous design would not improve matters. So how is this going to work, when it is a shadow of previous designs. The idea was always to build a by-pass around the three villages of Mottram Hollingworth and Tintwistle, with the spur road taking traffic to and from Glossop. It is the latter which affects my family greatly, from both a business and sentimental reasons. I have to say that I would rather not have a road crossing our ground, but I also understand that the traffic situation is not good in this area, and improvements need to be made. What is proposed will do nothing to improve. Mottram will have a by-pass around it, Hollingworth and Tintwistle will still have traffic through the centre of the villages, so how that is a betterment for the people living there is beyond me. The spur road crossing our ground, is now one lane uphill, and one lane down. thirty years ago it was a dual carriageway, in the early 2000's it was two lanes uphill and one lane</p>	<p>Please see response references RR-0434 (page 43), RR-0173 (page 41) and RR-0174 (page 42) in National Highways comments on Relevant Representations (REP1-042).</p>

Response reference:	Representation Issue	National Highways Response
	<p>down, so how can that be an improvement?.in the meantime the land take has increased. so what is proposed is simply moving the existing Wooley lane (A57) 200 metres across our fields to achieve nothing, apart from wasting 200 plus millions of pounds.</p>	
<p>REP1-050-2</p>	<p>Their is no joined up planning, new houses are continuously being built in Glossop, which is more gridlocked all hours of the day seven days a week.</p>	<p>High Peak Borough Council is responsible for ensuring that local road infrastructure and housing allocations are aligned through their Local Development Plan.</p> <p>Planning applications for proposed developments are required to be supported by Transport Assessments that will identify any traffic or transport related adverse impacts that they cause. The developers of these schemes are responsible for proposing and funding highway improvements to accommodate additional development generated traffic and mitigate any identified adverse impacts. It is not National Highways' responsibility to provide the additional road capacity to enable delivery of individual developments.</p> <p>Response Reference RR-0796-8 (page 114 of REP1-042) explains how National Highways has now commenced its next round of route strategies. These route strategies will inform the investment plans for RIS 3 (2025 to 2030) and beyond.</p>
<p>REP1-050-3</p>	<p>We have been told at meetings with the highways agency that they had to develop a scheme around a plan handed to them from a central point, well this is quiet apparent, a</p>	<p>National Highways is a Government company charged with maintaining and improving the Strategic Road Network (SRN). National Highways is a delivery company for Department for</p>

Response reference:	Representation Issue	National Highways Response
	<p>disaster is all I can say, they need to listen and take on board what local people say, not pretend they are listening when they are not. So I hope the chairperson will see the folly of this present proposal, and send it back to be redesigned</p>	<p>Transport (DfT). National Highways does not determine which projects are to be delivered within the Government's Roads Investment Strategy (RIS) or have responsibility for setting transport policy.</p> <p>Consultation on the Scheme has been extensive at each stage of development. Application document 5.1 - Consultation Report (APP-026) and associated appendices (APP-027 to APP-052) provide details of this consultation.</p> <p>Part 8 of REP-0142 demonstrates that a significant number of Relevant Representations have been received in support of the Scheme.</p>

4. Sharon Jones's Post-hearing submission (REP1-052)

Response reference:	Representation Issue	National Highways Response
REP1-052-1	Regarding the above I did not receive a follow up email regarding the open forum, so I have emailed what I wanted to say instead:	National Highways has no comment to make.
REP1-052-2	It will cause more congestion as it's just moving traffic from one place to another. Too many traffic lights and roundabouts.	The Scheme improves journey times and reduces both traffic congestion and delay on the A57 between Glossop and Hattersley. National Highways have made a full response to the relevant representation on congestion please refer to relevant representation response RR-0170-2 – for full details.
REP1-052-3	I am confused as to what area of Mottram will benefit from this.	The Scheme improves journey times and reduces both traffic congestion and delay on the A57 between Glossop and Hattersley. The Scheme will also provide new and improved facilities for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders throughout the route. Please refer to REP1-042 (Response Reference RR-0170-2) for a more detailed explanation of the expected benefits of the Scheme.
REP1-052-4	Peoples houses are also in the firing line this should not be affecting anyone.	The Scheme seeks to minimise compulsory purchases and impacts as far as possible. Where it is considered homes may unavoidably be required to be purchased to facilitate the Scheme, National Highways is continuing dialogue with the affected homeowners to seek to come to a mutually-agreed position .

Response reference:	Representation Issue	National Highways Response
REP1-052-5	The proposed route cuts through where the badgers foxes and deer live.	Several features have been incorporated into the design to benefit wildlife. These include 5 mammal passes (purpose-built piped crossings) that would be installed along the road network in strategic locations to increase the permeability of the Scheme for badgers and other mammals (including brown hare and hedgehogs). Furthermore, the 3 underpasses, 6 culverts and the River Etherow Bridge will reduce the barrier effect. All these are designed to be used by a range of species, and appropriate planting would be included to encourage wildlife to use these crossing points. Fencing will be used to prevent road mortalities and to guide wildlife to use the crossing points. For full details please refer to Chapter 8: Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement (ES) (APP-064). National Highways has responded to this issue through the relevant representation response, please refer to REP1-042, Response Reference RR-0324 for full details.
REP1-052-6	We should be thinking of taking the HGVs away from the village not through them	The route is part of the Strategic Road Network (SRN) and is therefore identified as being suitable for HGVs and NH response (REP1-042, Response Reference RR- 0170-1) sets out why it is not appropriate to restrict use for HGVs along the route..
REP1-052-7	We have so much pollution from unnecessary traffic which should be using the m62. It is becoming dangerous as speed of traffic is horrendous and, there seems to be no consideration when pulling on drive.	Please refer to REP1-042, Response Reference RR-0170-4 for a detailed response on the air quality assessment and greenhouse gases assessment. Also refer to the DCO documents See Chapter 5: Air quality of the Environmental Statement (APP-061) and Chapter 14: Climate of the ES (APP-070).

Response reference:	Representation Issue	National Highways Response
		<p>The removal of traffic congestion and delay on the de-trunked section of the A57 due to the Scheme should improve access to those living along the route. This stretch of road will be friendlier and attractive to cyclists and pedestrians (across all groups) through the provision of improved facilities and crossings, public realm improvements and a reduction in traffic speed.</p>
<p>REP1-052-8</p>	<p>Link Road doing nothing for local people</p>	<p>Section 10 of the Transport Assessment Report [APP-185] sets out the performance of the Scheme against the Scheme objectives including connectivity and concludes the Scheme would provide time saving benefits and relieve congestion through Mottram, Hattersley and Woolley Bridge, improving journey times for trips on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) between Manchester and Sheffield, as well as for trips using the local road network in this area.</p> <p>The Scheme would also relieve congestion on the de-trunked section of the A57, improving connectivity for local traffic.</p> <p>Furthermore, all new and improved junctions (M67 Junction 4, Mottram Moor, Gun Inn Junction and Woolley Bridge) will be provided with upgraded Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders (WCH) facilities, making crossing easier and improving safety.</p>
<p>REP1-052-9</p>	<p>Glossop traffic will still be at a standstill going in and Hollingworth and tintwistle will have to put up with more and more vehicles using the area.</p>	<p>Please refer to REP1-042, Response Reference RR-0170-2 for a full response on traffic impacts on Glossop.</p>

Response reference:	Representation Issue	National Highways Response
REP1-052-10	It is a very sensitive area with lots of natural springs, I know this as Our field is often waterlogged and more roads causes more flooding. Our field is next to the proposed area	<p>A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (APP-056) was submitted as part of the DCO. It draws on a range of disciplines and designs, including, drainage, earthworks, culverts, and previous hydrological and hydraulic modelling to ensure all sources of flood risk are assessed as part of the FRA. The FRA describes the existing flood risks from all flood risk sources, followed by an assessment of flood risks both to the Scheme and as a result of the Scheme, identifies required mitigation measures and lastly describes the residual flood risk. Alongside the FRA please also see Chapter 13: Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the ES (APP-069), which assesses the impacts to flood risk predominantly associated with the creation of surface water runoff and works within areas identified to be at risk of flooding.</p> <p>A Drainage Design Strategy Report (APP-188) has also been prepared and submitted in support of the Scheme. The report documents several field studies and states that there are a substantial number of mapped springs which suggest that the groundwater level is high in many areas. NH is therefore aware of the location and level of natural springs in the area and has taken them into consideration as part of the overall design, detailed in the design section of the Drainage Design Strategy Report.</p>
REP1-052-11	To save all this upheaval in the area it may be good to look at different ways of improving what's there now. The small roundabout at Woolley lane could be made better by purchasing the derelict building at the side, hence making	Chapter 3 Assessment of alternatives of the ES (APP-060) includes a description of the reasonable alternatives studied by NH, which are relevant to the Scheme and its specific

Response reference:	Representation Issue	National Highways Response
	<p>the bridge wider, I am no expert. but I am sure something could be done. And also the lights at mottram, maybe if broadbottom traffic was diverted down through Hattersley past Tesco to the round about and Mottram traffic taken a different route.</p>	<p>characteristics, and the reasons for the option chosen, taking into account the effects of the development on the environment.</p> <p>NH has responded to relevant representations on possible alternatives please refer to REP1-042, Response Reference RR-0282-5 for further details.</p> <p>The Scheme proposed by NH provides a holistic solution, which improves air quality and noise impacts along Woolley Lane, and it is not considered that the suggestion by the interested party would provide the same range of benefits.</p>
<p>REP1-052-12</p>	<p>We have too many HGVs in the area.</p>	<p>Please refer to Response Reference RR- 0170-1 in national Highways' comments on the Relevant Representations (REP1-042).</p>
<p>REP1-052-13</p>	<p>Please leave our area alone.</p>	

5. Daniel Wimberley's Post-hearing submission (REP1-045)

- 5.1.1. Mr Wimberley's representations made to the examination for Deadline 1 amounts to a claim that the pre-application consultation undertaken in relation to the A57 Link Roads Scheme was deficient. The adequacy of consultation is a matter for pre-examination and the Secretary of State's decision on whether to accept the application for Examination. The Secretary of State accepted the application for examination on 26 July 2021, having reached the conclusion that the Applicant had complied with the pre-application consultation requirements. Given that the ExA has no remit to review that decision, our responses to the Deadline 1 submissions does not include a response to Mr Wimberley's representations.

© 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