

A57 Link Roads

Issue Specific Hearing 2

Item 2	Construction phase Pre-commencement Pre-commencement activities are those that are excluded from the definition of “commence” in Article 2 of the dDCO. The Applicant [REP2-021 Q9.11] said that there were unlikely to be significant effects during pre-commencement. It also appears to suggest that mitigation measures including a noise and vibration plan, Best Practicable Means and a noise and vibration complaints process during precommencement would not be required. d) Please could the local authorities comment?	d) It was understood that the mitigation measures mentioned would include pre-commencement works. This was covered in the REAC [REP1-037] Table 2.1 Rows GEM 1.1 & 1.2 – “Principal contractor must prepare an EMP (2nd iteration) for the works prior to commencement of the works and which details the measures that should be undertaken prior to, and during construction of, the Scheme. If there were to be any significant effects from operations during precommencement then Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council would need to be consulted to discuss appropriate traffic management, traffic diversions, signage etc as appropriate.
Item 2	Night works and Section 61 consent Paragraph 11.21 of ES Chapter 11 states that “no night works are anticipated with the exception of traffic management”? Please clarify what has been considered in the assessment. Requirement 4 of the dDCO lists potential activities outside normal working hours. The Applicant [REP2-021 Q9.7] said that Section 61 works would encompass all construction activities, including night time works in addition to those report in the ES. The ExA needs to be satisfied that the assessment considers a reasonable worst-case scenario. The REAC [REP1-037] mentions the potential for Section 61 consent.	g) If all measures detailed in ES Chapter 11, the EMP and the Noise & Vibration Management Plan, and any additional measures as appropriate, are undertaken then this should reduce the potential for any significant effects. This would need to be confirmed in writing to Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council. Where works comprise ‘out of normal working hours’, night-time and weekend working this will necessitate Section 61 consent.

	<p>g) Please could the Applicant and local authorities comment on the potential for Section 61 works to result in significant effects?</p>	
Item 2	<p>Mitigation</p> <p>The Applicant [REP2-021 Q9.12] referred to mitigation measures included in the REAC [REP1-037].</p> <p>l) Please could the local authorities comment on whether enough detail been provided of the mitigation measures at this stage, to ensure that the assessed mitigation would all be delivered? Should more detail be provided of the need for the extent of monitoring to be consulted on and agreed and on any follow-up actions that might be necessary? Should more detail be set out on the complaints process and interfaces with the local authority?</p>	<p>l) Sufficient detail of the proposed Scheme has been provided in REAC [REP1-037] Table 2.2 Sections 1 – General Environmental Management & Section 8 – Noise & Vibration.</p> <p>Details of the proposed complaints process should be provided together with how this will be managed. The scope and extent of monitoring to be implemented before works commence should be detailed.</p>
Item 2	<p>Noise barriers</p> <p>The Applicant [REP2-021 Q9.19] has advised that absorbent noise barriers have some potential to reduce noise levels at Mottram Moor Junction and to the west of the underpass.</p> <p>p) Please could the Applicant and the local authorities comment on whether absorbent noise barriers should be secured at one or both of those locations? Should criteria be secured for when the use of absorbent noise barriers would be required?</p>	<p>p) The Applicants noise monitoring and modelling will determine, based on the relevant standards, whether absorbent noise barriers should be secured at one or both of those locations specified.</p>
Item 3	<p>TRANSPORT NETWORKS AND TRAFFIC, ALTERNATIVES, ACCESS, SEVERANCE, WALKERS, CYCLISTS, AND HORSE RIDERS</p> <p>Traffic modelling</p> <p>a) To what degree are the Applicant, local highway authorities and interested parties in agreement regarding the scope and detailing of the traffic model and what are the remaining areas of dispute?</p>	<p>a) Tameside does not have any remaining areas of dispute concerning the scope and detailing of the traffic model. We will continue to discuss these issues with National Highways if any changes modifications are made to the traffic model to understand how these may affect the transport network within Tameside.</p>

	<p>b) What level of detailed modelling is appropriate for Manchester and Sheffield?</p> <p>c) Would more detailed modelling of Manchester and Sheffield be appropriate. If so, why and if not, why not?</p> <p>d) To what extent has the Applicant considered policies aimed at traffic restraint (including encouraging routes that avoid the National Park), reducing reliance on motor vehicles and encouraging active travel within the traffic model, and any effects of the introduction of the Greater Manchester Clear Air Zone? Are these reflected in the model?</p> <p>e) Has the Applicant considered the effects of autonomous vehicles on congestion within the traffic modelling?</p> <p>f) What further implications, if any, would a change to the use of autonomous vehicles have for air quality and noise?</p> <p>g) Would a change to autonomous vehicles have any effects on the Case for the Scheme?</p> <p>h) Do the above parties have any comment on those matters above?</p>	<p>b) The level of detailed modelling provided for both Manchester and Sheffield is appropriate.</p> <p>c) We do not consider that more detailed modelling would be appropriate for Manchester and Sheffield. We agree with National Highways response to the ExA written questions Q3.1 and Q3.2 as set out within [REP2-21] that the forecast effects the proposed scheme will have on journey times over the wider road network outside the limits of the DCO, including Manchester and Sheffield, have already been accounted for in the assessment of the benefits of the Scheme.</p>
<p>Item 3</p>	<p>Traffic effects outside of the Order Limit</p> <p>Effects within Glossop</p> <p>Traffic flows within Glossop are predicted to increase as a result of the Do-Something scheme when compared to those under the Do-Minimum.</p> <p>l) Do the local authorities have any comments?</p>	<p>l) Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council have no further comments on this matter.</p>
<p>Item 3</p>	<p>Effects in Tintwistle, Hollingworth/Hadfield</p>	<p>o) Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council have held initial discussions with the applicant in relation to the proposals on</p>

Derbyshire County Council [REP2-051 Q3.21, Q3.22 and Q14.4] raise concerns that traffic may divert off the A628 through the residential areas, or that traffic levels will increase on Woolley Lane if vehicles turn left at the Gunn Inn Junction, rather than carry on to the Mottram Moor Junction.

o) Do the local authorities have any comments?

the A57 Woolley Lane, but proposals will be finalised and agreed as part of the detailed design process. Derbyshire County Council will be consulted on any proposals at this stage.

The aims of the proposed works on Woolley Lane are to:

- To discourage through traffic so that such traffic is encouraged to use the new link road.
- To reduce traffic speeds.
- To improve road safety.
- To improve the environment for non-motorised users.
- To make the reduced speed limit self-enforcing.
- To reduce the dominance of vehicular traffic.
- To reduce severance for non-motorised users and thus improve connectivity.
- To encourage local trips to be made on foot or by bicycle, rather than by car.

There are currently traffic management/traffic calming measures in place in the residential area between the A628 Market Street/A57 Woolley Bridge in Hollingworth to reduce the amount of traffic cutting through this area.

The provision of a left turn ban on Woolley Lane to ensure that traffic heading towards Manchester does not turn left from the A628 onto it before it gets new link road, may well encourage traffic to Glossop to use the roads linking though to Glossop in the Tintwistle area. In addition, the provision of a prohibition of the use of Wooley Lane from the A628 would be detrimental to:

- The future introduction of public transport services on Woolley Lane to/from Glossop to serve the residents near Woolley Lane.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This would cause significant problems for the residents of the residential area adjacent to Woolley Lane. Earnshaw St, Lord St and Cross St are one way from Woolley Lane and residents would face the possibility of a long diversion via the A57 Link Road, Woolley Bridge and Woolley Lane to reach them. <p>The provision of the proposed measures on Woolley Lane and the A57 Link Road will significantly reduce the use of Woolley Lane</p> <p>The proposals at the Woolley Lane junction will provide pedestrian crossing facilities at this junction in order to improve pedestrian access at this junction and connectivity where currently none exist at present.</p>
<p>Item 3</p>	<p>Effects within the National Park</p> <p>p) What consideration has the Applicant given to the effects of increases in traffic identified within the traffic modelling for the Do-Something scheme, when compared to those of the Do-Minimum scheme with reference to highway safety and severance?</p> <p>q) If necessary, how could these be addressed?</p> <p>r) Do the local authorities have any comments?</p>	<p>r) Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council have no further comments on this issue.</p>
<p>Item 3</p>	<p>Connectivity within the Order area</p> <p>Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council [REP2-056 Q3.15] mention the possible provision of a link for walkers, cyclists and horse riders between the link road and Roe Road.</p> <p>s) What benefits/disbenefits would, in the view of the Applicant and the Local Highway Authorities, result from such provision, and would there be a connectivity to the bridleway provision from Old Hall Lane?</p>	<p>s) Local Highway Authority –</p> <p><u>Benefits</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As a newly constructed road, it would be beneficial to have consistent facilities for active travel users along the whole length of the route rather than a sporadic offer of different status routes. There is desire for walkers, cyclists and horse riders to make the journey from Hattersley and Mottram to Stalybridge and vice versa by active travel means.

- The existence of the M67 and Hyde Road presents a significant severance to these users when the desire is to travel in a north/south direction. There is currently only a limited number of options for this movement without mixing with motor traffic. Whilst walkers have several options, equestrians and cyclists only have one public bridleway route. The creation of another route will give people more options thereby encouraging an increase in active travel users.
- A direct route to Roe Cross Road will also reduce the distance for active travel users when travelling from the west.
- The route should be constructed to a high standard meaning that it would be superior in condition to the other route options in the vicinity. The existing bridleway route suffers from regular flooding and water erosion and so providing another option will benefit users and present cyclists with a viable choice to make this journey with less on-road cycling.

Disbenefits

- Dependant on the route chosen, the route may have to make use of existing public footpaths thereby introducing a shared use element that doesn't currently exist.
- The gradient of the natural topography of the land might present a problem to some users.

Whilst there is potential for the route to connect to Old Hall Lane, this would be a within the gift of the applicant rather than the LHA.

Additionally, there are developed proposals for segregated cycling lanes on Roe Cross Road under an Active Travel Fund scheme.

<p>Item 4</p>	<p>LANDSCAPE, VISUAL AND GREEN BELT</p> <p>Study area, baseline conditions; overall methodology and mitigation</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework and local policy</p> <p>The Applicant [REP2-021 Q5.1] has set out its consideration of the July 2021 update to the National Planning Policy Statement.</p> <p>a) Are the local authorities satisfied with the Applicant’s explanation?</p> <p>Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council [REP2-056 Q5.7 and Q5.15] identified documents that the Applicant should consider in its assessment. The Applicant [REP3-021 pages 54 to 57] responded at Deadline 3.</p> <p>b) Is Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council satisfied that the Applicant has identified relevant local policy?</p>	<p>a) Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council are satisfied with the Applicant’s explanation</p> <p>b) Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council are satisfied the Applicant’s has identified the relevant local policy.</p>
<p>Item 4</p>	<p>Baseline</p> <p>Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council [REP2-056 Q5.7 and Q5.15] considers that the “dense urban” description in paragraph 7.5.2 of the ES [REP2-007] is not appropriate and considers that existing landscape and townscape characteristics have not been described accurately. The Applicant [REP3-021 pages 54 to 57] responded at Deadline 3.</p> <p>c) Does Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council have any outstanding concerns about the Applicant description of the study area?</p>	<p>c) Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council has no further concerns about the applicants description of the study area.</p>
<p>Item 4</p>	<p>Landscape and townscape characteristics</p> <p>Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council [REP2-056 Q5.15] raised concerns about the descriptions of SLLCA 3, SLTCA 5 and SLTCA 7. The Applicant [REP3-021 pages 56 to 57] responded at Deadline 3.</p>	<p>d) Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council has no further concerns about the descriptions.</p>

	d) Does Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council have any outstanding concerns about the descriptions?	
Item 4	<p>Viewpoints</p> <p>Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council [REP2-056 Q5.4 and Q5.15] raised concerns about the viewpoints selected for the night-time assessment and considers that the 2km study area for visual impact omits some key theoretical viewing points. The Applicant [REP3-021 page 54] responded at Deadline 3.</p> <p>e) Does Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council have any outstanding concerns about the selection of viewpoints?</p>	e) Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council has no further concerns regarding this matter.
Item 4	<p>Mitigation – planting</p> <p>The Applicant [REP2-021 Q5.5 and Q5.18] has said that the height and maturity of planting, screening during winter months and details of replacement trees to fill voids will be identified during detailed design.</p> <p>j) Please could the local authorities comment?</p>	j) This remains under review by Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
Item 4	<p>The Applicant submitted an outline Landscape and Environmental Management Plan [REP3-022] at Deadline 3.</p> <p>m) Do the local authorities have any initial comments on the plan, including in relation to the consideration and explanation of boundary treatments, the maintenance regime, monitoring, and remedial actions during operation? Does it provide enough detail at this stage to ensure that the assessed mitigation and benefits would all be delivered?</p> <p>n) Please could the local authorities provide written comments on the plan for Deadline 5, on Wednesday 23 February 2022?</p>	<p>m) This remains under review by Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.</p> <p>n) This remains under review by Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.</p>
Item 4	<p>Design</p> <p>Key elements</p>	v) Aesthetics are very important for the landscape, especially in the greenbelt and it is particularly important that

	<p>The Applicant [REP2-021 Q5.20 and Q6.2] has set out the principles of its approach for the design of key elements. In simplified terms the secured mitigation is for the detailed design to be consulted on with the local authorities.</p> <p>v) Please could the Applicant and the local authorities comment on the importance of the aesthetic appearance of the Proposed Development in the context of its visibility, including from residential and other receptors that currently overlook the Green Belt?</p> <p>w) Please could the local authorities comment on the secured mitigation? In principle, has enough detail been provided of the mitigation measures at this stage, to ensure that the assessed mitigation would all be delivered? Has enough consideration been given to opportunities for enhancement?</p>	<p>mitigations are fully discussed and agreed with Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council as part of the detailed design.</p> <p>w) Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council are satisfied with the Applicant's explanation at present. As set out in the Applicant's responses the elements listed are currently at the preliminary design stage and will be further developed in the detailed design stage and will seek to follow the good design principles outlined in the Design Principles for National Infrastructure and National Design Guide documents by responding to setting, place and people. It is therefore very important that the local authorities are involved in the final design in order to make sure the best possible mitigations are provided.</p>
<p>Item 4</p>	<p>Aspects to be adopted</p> <p>The Applicant [REP2-021 Q5.22] said that the measures needed to secure the design of details of finishes to the scheme, street furniture and other hard landscaping would be finalised during detailed design and are secured by Article 12 of the dDCO.</p> <p>x) Are the local authorities satisfied with the Applicant's approach?</p>	<p>x) Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council is satisfied with the applicant's current approach of engaging with us during the detailed design phase to secure agreement on those elements of the scheme that are to be adopted.</p>
<p>Item 4</p>	<p>Mitigation</p> <p>The Applicant [REP2-021 Q5.23] has set out the process that led to the development of the current design, including the involvement of a Chartered Landscape Architect, the Design Council, National Highway's Design Panel and consultation with stakeholders.</p> <p>Derbyshire County Council [REP2-051 Q5.23] have said that implementation of any or all of the measures would assist in determining</p>	<p>aa) Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council consider that an outline "design code" or "design approach document developed and agreed during the Examination would be useful.</p>

	<p>post-consent approvals (including the discharge of requirements) in relation to achieving good design. Thameside Metropolitan Borough Council [REP2-056 Q5.23] said that the measures would be useful.</p> <p>aa) Do the local authorities consider that an outline “design code” or “design approach document” should be developed and agreed during the Examination? Please could the Applicant comment?</p>	
Item 4	<p>Green Belt</p> <p>Inappropriate development</p> <p>The Applicant [REP2-021 Q4.1] has set out its consideration of whether the temporary works could be considered inappropriate. With reference to Planning Policy Guidance, it has also set out its consideration of the impact of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt.</p> <p>cc) Do the local authorities have any comments on the Applicant’s consideration of temporary works, openness, or whether the Proposed Development would constitute inappropriate development?</p>	<p>cc) Thameside Metropolitan Borough Council agree with the applicants approach.</p>
Item 6	<p>CLIMATE CHANGE</p> <p>Significant effects</p> <p>The Applicant [REP2-021 Q8.3] said that it has complied with DMRB LA 114 for the assessment of significant effects. This states that “the assessment of projects on climate shall only report significant effects where increases in GHG emissions will have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets”. The Applicant also said that there are no recognised thresholds for assessing level of significance in EIA. Paragraph 5.18 of the NPSNN states that “any increase in carbon emissions is not a reason to refuse development consent, unless the increase in carbon emissions resulting from the proposed scheme are so significant that it would have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet</p>	<p>f) Thameside Metropolitan Borough Council refer to the declaration of climate emergency made by the LA and recommend all best endeavours be made not only to maintain carbon emissions at or near current levels but to seek to reduce carbon emissions, both direct and indirect, as appropriate.</p>

	<p>its carbon reduction targets”.</p> <p>The ExA notes that the DMRB provides guidance, while the NPSNN is national policy.</p> <p>f) Are the local authorities aware of any recognised thresholds for assessing level of significance?</p>	
	<p>Chapter 14 of the ES [REP1-019] states that the Proposed Development would release an additional 38,970 tCO₂e into the atmosphere during construction, and 401,026 tCO₂e over 60 years of operation.</p> <p>h) In the context of net zero by 2050, please could the Applicant and the local authorities comment on whether, in EIA terms, it appears reasonable for the releases to be considered “not significant”? Is it reasonable for the planning balance? Should requirements for mitigation be on the basis that there are significant effects?</p>	<p>h) Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council considers the 39ktonnes CO₂ emissions proposed during construction and the 401ktonnes CO₂ emitted during use to be significant. Requirements for mitigation should be considered on that basis.</p>
<p>Item 6</p>	<p>Construction materials, transport and construction processes</p> <p>Mitigation measures and PAS 2080: 2016</p> <p>The Applicant [REP2-021 Q8.10 and Q8.11] provided an overview of PAS 2080: 2016. It described a comprehensive process involving the pro-active participation of all stakeholders to a strategy defined by the asset owner. The process would require carbon to be quantified, reduced by applying a carbon reduction hierarchy, and managed by a Carbon Management Plan.</p> <p>l) Please could the local authorities comment on the suitability of PAS: 2080: 2016 for mitigating carbon releases from the Proposed Development during the construction phase? Should its use be secured as necessary mitigation?</p> <p>n) Do the local authorities consider that an outline of the Applicant’s strategy for the use of PAS 2080: 2016 and outline Carbon Management</p>	<p>l) PAS 2080:2016 is an appropriate systematic mechanism to manage the carbon emissions of an infrastructure project.</p> <p>n) Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council is committed to seeking reduced carbon emissions year on year – following the Tyndall Curve to net zero by 2038 – a collaborative approach to maximising carbon reduction, using PAS2080:2016 is welcome.</p>

	Plan should be developed and agreed during the Examination? What role should the local authorities have? Please could the Applicant comment?	
Item 6	<p>Operational phase</p> <p>Mitigation measures</p> <p>Derbyshire County Council [REP2-051 Q8.14] and Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council [REP2-056 Q8.14] suggested that there were further opportunities to mitigate carbon during construction, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • creating a network of cycleways and footways that would encourage active travel and reduce the reliance on vehicle use • potential for renewable energy installations and generation • opportunities for habitat creation and protection in relation to offsetting and resilience • behavioural change and cooperation between local authorities, residents and businesses to reduce carbon emissions <p>The Applicant [REP3-021 page 16] responded to Derbyshire County Council at Deadline 3.</p> <p>o) Are the local authorities satisfied that appropriate carbon-reduction measures been secured for the operational phase? If not, what other measures should be secured? Could it be helpful for the Applicant to engage with a local behaviour change group during the Examination?</p>	<p>o) The applicant has evidently addressed additional carbon reduction measures however the project is still presented as emitting an additional 39ktonnesCO2 through construction phase and 401ktonnesCO2 in use. In this context tangible mitigations of carbon emissions both in use and in construction phases need careful consideration.</p>
Item 7	<p>AIR QUALITY</p> <p>Study area, baseline conditions and overall methodology</p> <p>Climate change implications for air quality</p> <p>The Applicant [REP2-021 Q7.2] considers that adverse changes would be outweighed by a beneficial shift to electric vehicles.</p>	<p>r) Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council consider that the approach taken is satisfactory. It is noted that the consideration of the Applicant that adverse changes would be outweighed by a beneficial shift to electric vehicles will dependent upon the future take-up of electric vehicles.</p>

	r) Are the local authorities satisfied that is a reasonable approach?	
Item 7	<p>Terrain</p> <p>The Applicant [REP2-021 Q7.3] has said that adjustments for terrain have been made in accordance with DEFRA guidance. It noted that adjustments were applied when the difference between modelling and monitoring was greater than 25%.</p> <p>t) Are the local authorities satisfied with the consideration of terrain, including for heavy duty vehicles travelling uphill?</p>	t) Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council consider that the explanation of how the model was adjusted to take into account terrain is acceptable.
Item 7	<p>Pre-commencement</p> <p>Pre-commencement activities are those that are excluded from the definition of “commence” in Article 2 of the dDCO.</p> <p>The Applicant [REP2-021 Q7.10] said that there were unlikely to be significant effects during pre-commencement and that complaint response procedures and Community Engagement Plan would be prepared and implemented prior to construction.</p> <p>x) Please could the local authorities comment?</p>	x) Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council consider that the proposed approach is acceptable.
Item 7	<p>Dust mitigation and monitoring</p> <p>The Applicant submitted an outline Nuisance Mitigation Plan [REP3-010 Annex B7] at Deadline 3.</p> <p>y) The Applicant [REP2-021 Q7.11] has noted that DMRB LA105 does not follow Institute of Air Quality Management guidance. Do the local authorities have a view on whether DMRB LA105 dust mitigation measures are appropriate or whether the mitigation should be in accordance with Institute of Air Quality Management guidance? Should any other recognised guidance be included in the plan?</p>	<p>y) Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council consider that DMRB dust mitigation measures are appropriate.</p> <p>z) Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council consider that the level of detail provided in the plan is sufficient given that further detail will be consulted on in the EMP (second iteration).</p>

	<p>z) Do the local authorities have any general comments on provisions for dust mitigation and monitoring in the plan? Does it provide enough detail at this stage?</p> <p>aa) Please could the local authorities provide written comments on the plan for Deadline 5, on Wednesday 23 February 2022?</p>	
Item 7	<p>Operational phase</p> <p>Assessment for the design year of 2040</p> <p>The Applicant [REP2-021 Q7.13] said that the opening year of 2025 is expected to be the worst case rather than 2040, because increases in traffic between 2025 and 2040 would be more than offset by a shift to electric vehicles.</p> <p>cc) Are the local authorities satisfied that is a reasonable approach?</p>	<p>cc) Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council are satisfied that this is a reasonable approach.</p>
Item 8	<p>OTHER SPECIFIC ISSUES</p> <p>Soils, ground conditions, material assets and waste</p> <p>Availability of comments from Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council</p> <p>a) It is noted that comments are awaited from Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council with regard to the contents of ES Chapter 10 [APP20 066]. When will Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council make these be available to be published?</p>	<p>a) This remains under review by Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council. The comments will be made as soon as possible.</p>
Item 8	<p>Baseline Information</p> <p>The Applicant submitted a Hydrogeological Risk Assessment [REP3-025].</p> <p>b) Please could the Environment Agency, local authorities and other Interested Parties provide comments on this document for Deadline 4, on Wednesday 16 February 2022?</p>	<p>b) This remains under review by Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council. The comments will be made as soon as possible.</p>

<p>Item 8</p>	<p>Land use, social and economic, human health</p> <p>Local social and economic impacts</p> <p>Derbyshire County Council [REP2-045] identify potential added benefits for the scheme were it to deliver active travel routes for school routes through industrial estates (Paragraph 15.15).</p> <p>h) Would the local authorities and the Environment Agency please provide comments on each of these by Deadline 4?</p>	<p>h) Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council consider the scheme needs to ensure that the requirements of all active travel modes of transport are reflected in detailed design both along the new routes and along those roads to be de-trunked. These active travel facilities should be to the highest possible standards in order to encourage increased active travel use and to provide safe routes to and from schools in the area. The Council will continue to work closely with the Applicant in the detailed design processes, especially on the de-trunked section of the A57 through Mottram in order to take advantage of the significant reduction in traffic by providing active travel facilities. The provision of active travel facilities in the scheme will allow the extension of the existing and proposed active travel routes within Tameside to be extended to Derbyshire.</p>
<p>Item 8</p>	<p>Other environmental topics</p> <p>The Applicant [REP3-029 Annexes B1 to B7] has submitted the following outline management plans: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline Soil Resource Plan • Outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan • Outline Construction Water Management Plan • Outline Site Waste Management Plan • Outline Materials Management Plan • Outline Community Engagement Plan • Outline Nuisance Management Plan <p>l) Would the local authorities and the Environment Agency please provide comments on each of these outline management plans for Deadline 5, on Wednesday 23 February 2022?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline Soil Resource Plan • Outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council are satisfied that the Outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan has covered the relevant areas expected and that more specific information will be forthcoming in future iterations once more detailed designs are available. • Outline Construction Water Management Plan • Outline Site Waste Management Plan • Outline Materials Management Plan • Outline Community Engagement Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council consider that the Outline Community Engagement Plan is eminently sensible and practical and we have no areas of concern. • Outline Nuisance Management Plan

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council are satisfied that the Outline Nuisance Management Plan has covered the relevant areas expected and that more specific information will be forthcoming in future iterations once more detailed designs are available.
--	--	---