

# **A57 Link Roads Scheme DCO Application**

**Representation and response on behalf  
of the Peak District National Park  
Authority to The Examining Authority's  
second written questions and requests  
for information (issued 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2022)**

**Produced by the Peak District National Park  
Authority (March 2022)**

Application by Highways England for an Order Granting Development Consent for A57 Link Roads

The Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information – Issued on 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2022

Response on behalf of the Peak District National Park Authority.

3.0	<b>Transport networks and traffic, alternatives, access, severance, walkers, cyclists, and horse riders</b>		
	<b>Traffic modelling</b>		
3.5	<p>Applicant Local authorities <b>Peak District National Park Authority</b> Natural England</p>	<p>Screening thresholds</p>	<p>The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) provides screening criteria for traffic flows which are used to decide whether a detailed assessment is required with particular reference to biodiversity, noise, air quality, and in relation to the effects on the Peak District National Park.</p> <p>a) Please provide, for each relevant environmental topic, the screening threshold set out in the DMRB, providing the relevant paragraph reference in each case.</p> <p>b) Please identify any other recognised screening criteria (Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA), Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM), etc) that have been used or considered, providing the relevant paragraph reference in each case.</p> <p>c) Where there is a choice of DMRB or other screening criteria, please identify the criteria selected and the reasoning for that choice.</p> <p><b>d) Do the local authorities, Peak District National Park Authority and Natural England have any comments that they wish to make about this matter?</b></p> <p>We recognise the guidance from DMRB for the setting of the Assessed Road Network. We also appreciate the advice offered to the Issue Specific Hearing 2 by the applicant thus far on the limitations for robust modelling where changes are less than 1,000 vehicles.</p> <p>However, given the small difference between the predicted AADT for the A628 in 2025 under the 'Do Something' scenario of 40 vehicles (4%), we would have preferred Highways England / National Highways and their agents to have adopted a precautionary approach. Assessing the route on the basis of a 1,000-vehicle increase would have allowed for a detailed consideration of the effects of the scheme on biodiversity, noise, air quality, and in relation to the effects on the Peak District National Park.</p>

			<p>We appreciate that on the basis of the predicted 960 vehicle increase (AADT 2025 Do Something) an assessment of 1,000 vehicles would probably have shown the worst-case scenario, but this could have been caveated with regard to the modelled figures and the minimum increase in flow requirements for accurate modelling.</p> <p>Given the apparent small difference between existing recorded flows and the predicted traffic flows for 2025 (both of which are based on the pre-Covid situation), it has been suggested within the Examination by some parties that the modelled figures are lower than would be expected with the scheme. Therefore, a precautionary approach would again appear to have been the best way to take; particularly given the high level of protection ascribed both to the National Park and its internationally designated sites along the A628 corridor.</p>
3.7	<b>Peak District National Park Authority</b>	Confidence limits for traffic flows on links within the National Park. National Highways Deadline 3 Submission - Comments on Local Impact Report submitted by Peak District National Park Authority [REP3-028]	<p><b>Please confirm whether, or not, the Authority is satisfied with the Applicant's explanation regarding confidence in traffic increase figures / screening out of effects on the A628 [REP3- 028].</b></p> <p>The applicant's Rep [REP3-028] does not appear to obviously explain their confidence in traffic increase figures / screening out of effects; although there is reference to their assessment of noise issues including a table of predicted traffic flows during the time period 06:00 to midnight in response to the Local Impact Report submitted by Peak District National Park Authority.</p> <p>Nonetheless, the applicant has set out at the Issue Specific Hearing 2 the limitations for robust modelling where changes are less than 1,000 vehicles. Whilst we are confident that the applicant is confident in the modelled figures, we are still concerned at the screening criteria used, given the high level of protection ascribed both to the National Park and its internationally designated sites along the A628 corridor.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that the modelling is based on pre-Covid levels of travel and prior to a national declaration of the Climate Emergency. At the current time it is unclear how reflective of the 'new normal' the modelled figures are.</p>
<b>Traffic effects outside the Order Limits</b>			
3.11	<b>Peak District National Park Authority</b>	Traffic management measures on A57 Snake Pass	<p><b>There are concerns that traffic flow over the Snake Pass will be increased by route transference and will result in additional accidents. Derbyshire County Council have identified a possible solution to control vehicle speeds on this route to address this issue. This would involve the introduction of average speed cameras.</b></p>

**a) Do you consider such a solution would provide a practicable and effective solution to vehicle speed management on the A57 Snake Pass?**

Average speed cameras have proved effective in controlling speed on a number of roads nationally. However, notwithstanding our concerns in relation to road safety (expressed within our previous representations), we do not believe this to be an appropriate solution to address the issues. We are concerned that the proposed response to address the *indirect* road safety concerns of induced traffic flow (resulting in a range of negative impacts on the special qualities of the National Park); is to seek to deliver a scheme that leads to even greater physical impact on the National Park, it's landscape and its setting.

This is one of the issues with the information submitted as part of the assessment; the 'knock on' effects of increased traffic flow are not considered. In this case, addressing the indirect effects, (increased traffic flows and worsening road safety as a result of the scheme) may result in **direct and substantial effects** on the National Park landscape – in this particular case, average speed cameras and all of the associated signage and other infrastructure.

We believe that it is for the applicant to (a) consider these aspects in their assessment and (b) look to reduce potential effects or include mitigation/offset/compensation measures.

Overall, we do not consider such a solution would provide a practicable and effective solution to vehicle speed management on the A57 Snake Pass.

**b) If not, why not?**

There is an existing average speed camera scheme within the Peak District National Park. The scheme covers the A54 and A537 roads within the South West Peak area of the National Park. The scheme was introduced with the agreement of the National Park Authority due to the ongoing and severe road safety issues associated with the route during the early years of this century. Predominantly, the issues were related to the use of the route by leisure motorcyclists and had resulted in the 'Cat and Fiddle' route being described and consistently rated as the most dangerous road in the country (EuroRAP).

The scheme has been in place for 10 years and there is now a requirement to update the infrastructure including the provision of additional cabinets at each camera location to ensure passive safety for road users in the event of any collision with the cameras.

The scheme itself is visually intrusive within the landscape and along with the associated signage has an urbanising effect on what is an open moorland landscape. Photos provided at Appendix 1 show the existing scheme at various locations within the National Park across the

A537 and A54 corridors. It should be noted that for the new scheme, additional cabinets will be provided, the cameras will be pole rather than gantry mounted and an infra-red array will be attached to each pole.

The Peak District National Park Authority adopted a Transport Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document in 2019. This document includes a section on Enforcement Cameras. Paragraph 14.16 states: -

*“Whilst recognising the traffic calming effects of average speed camera schemes, the Authority is also concerned about the visual intrusion of such schemes. Given the visual impact that average speed cameras (and their associated infrastructure) have on the setting of the National Park; the Authority’s preferred approach would be to utilise other measures as discussed above, to address the enforcement of speeding vehicles. The delivery of further average speed camera schemes should only be considered in extremis, and may be opposed by the Authority without sufficient evidence to support their introduction.”*

**c) Do you have any suggestions for acceptable physical measures on the A57 Snake Pass to address highway safety?**

The nature of the Snake Pass means that whilst it might be seen as a strategic link between Sheffield and Manchester, in reality its topography means that it is a challenging route for HGV traffic. Where HGV traffic slows other vehicles, it can lead to accidents caused by frustration experienced by other motor vehicle users. These are effectively caused by motorists trying to overtake HGVs and other slower moving vehicles on a road consisting of numerous bends with short straighter sections. The introduction of a 7.5 tonne weight limit might help to address this issue.

However, it is worth noting that the recent closure of the A57 Snake Pass due to landslips has again demonstrated the overall instability of the route. Whilst this instability is a function of the geology of the area and not necessarily related to the number of vehicles, it would appear inadvisable to rely on it as a strategic route. Anecdotally the road has undergone a number of landslip related closures or traffic management schemes over recent years, often related to severe weather events (freeze / thaw and dry summers followed by very wet winters).

It has also been apparent that owing to the recent closures the route has become a considerable attraction to walkers and cyclists taking advantage of the lack of other vehicles. This could present an opportunity to close the summit of the Snake Pass to through traffic, allowing access from both sides but not for through journeys. It would also lessen the demand on Derbyshire County Council to maintain the route beyond that required for local and visitor traffic.

3.12	Peak District National Park Authority	Traffic management measures on A628 Woodhead Pass.	<p><b>Similarly, there are concerns that traffic flow over the Woodhead Pass will be increased by route transference and result in additional accidents. Derbyshire County Council have identified a possible solution to control vehicle speeds on this route to address this issue. This would involve the introduction of average speed cameras.</b></p> <p><b>a) Do you consider such a solution would provide a practicable and effective solution to vehicle speed management on the A628 Woodhead Pass?</b></p> <p>Notwithstanding our concerns in relation to road safety (expressed within our previous representations), we do not believe this to be an appropriate solution to address the issues. We are concerned that the proposed response to address the <i>indirect</i> road safety concerns of induced traffic flow (resulting in a range of negative impacts on the special qualities of the National Park); is to seek to deliver a scheme that leads to even greater physical impact on the National Park, it's landscape and its setting.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement coupled with information provided as part of the hearings indicates that the applicant does not believe that the predicted increase in traffic is sufficient to require an assessment of impacts on the special qualities of the National Park. We believe that any assessment of the need for an average speed camera scheme to offset the impact of induced traffic flows on the applicant's network should form part of the scheme as a whole, rather than as an afterthought. It should be noted that any such proposals would need to be rigorously assessed in relation to their impact on the National Park landscape.</p> <p><b>b) If not, why not?</b></p> <p>There is an existing average speed camera scheme within the Peak District National Park. The scheme covers the A54 and A537 roads within the South West Peak area of the National Park. The scheme was introduced with the agreement of the National Park Authority due to the ongoing and severe road safety issues associated with the route during the early years of this century. Predominantly, the issues were related to the use of the route by leisure motorcyclists and had resulted in the 'Cat and Fiddle' route being described consistently rated as the most dangerous road in the country (EuroRAP).</p> <p>The scheme has been in place for 10 years and there is now a requirement to update the infrastructure including the provision of additional cabinets at each camera location to ensure passive safety for road users in the event of any collision with the cameras.</p> <p>The scheme itself is visually intrusive within the landscape and along with the associated signage has an urbanising effect on what is an open moorland landscape. Photos provided at</p>
------	---------------------------------------	--	---

			<p>Appendix 1 show the existing scheme at various locations within the National Park across the A537 and A54 corridors. It should be noted that for the new scheme, additional cabinets will be provided, the cameras will be pole rather than gantry mounted and an infra-red array will be attached to each pole.</p> <p>The Peak District National Park Authority adopted a Transport Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document in 2019. This document includes a section on Enforcement Cameras. Paragraph 14.16 states: -</p> <p><i>“Whilst recognising the traffic calming effects of average speed camera schemes, the Authority is also concerned about the visual intrusion of such schemes. Given the visual impact that average speed cameras (and their associated infrastructure) have on the setting of the National Park; the Authority’s preferred approach would be to utilise other measures as discussed above, to address the enforcement of speeding vehicles. The delivery of further average speed camera schemes should only be considered in extremis, and may be opposed by the Authority without sufficient evidence to support their introduction.”</i></p> <p><b>c) Do you have any suggestions for acceptable physical measures on the A628 Woodhead Pass to address highway safety?</b></p> <p>Our preference would be for softer measures aimed at making the route less attractive for users of other routes. This is particularly the case in relation to the M62 which is an eminently more suitable route for strategic journeys compared with the A628.</p> <p>Such measures could include a lowering of the speed limit to 50mph, bringing it in line with the majority of the surrounding rural ‘A’ road network. Such a measure was identified within the previous Highways Agency Mottram-Hollingworth-Tintwistle bypass scheme along with a range of other traffic restraint measures. A reassessment of these measures might prove useful in reducing the indirect effects of the scheme on the A628(T).</p>
3.13	<p><b>Peak District National Park Authority</b></p> <p>High Peak Borough Council</p> <p>Derbyshire County Council</p>	Car parking within the National Park.	<p><b>Improving road access to the National Park may encourage people to access the National Park by private motor car.</b></p> <p><b>During site inspections, it was observed that much of the parking along the A57 Snake Pass took the form of informal roadside parking, particularly around locations where Public Rights of Way (PRoW) cross or join the road.</b></p> <p><b>a) What effects would increased parking demand have on: -</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highway safety, and</li> <li>• Visual amenity?</li> </ul>

The modelling provided by the applicant suggests that the increase in traffic flows over the A57 Snake Pass is based on the re-routing of existing journeys rather than wholly new journeys. However, it is likely that this re-routing will also increase awareness of the location for those making such journeys and result in an increase in leisure visits to the area.

Increased informal parking has caused safety problems particularly around the Snake Summit area due to encroachment of parked cars onto the highway because of a lack of adequate spaces to park off the road. In poor weather this poses a particular risk when visibility is reduced. In visual amenity terms, the long lines of parked cars around the summit detract from the wild nature of the landscape. Derbyshire County Council have sought to address this issue at this particular location through the introduction of double yellow lines. Whilst these are at odds with the wildness of the location, they are not easily visible within the wider landscape and are an effective deterrent when coupled with appropriate levels of enforcement.

**b) Should formal provision be made to manage these effects?**

Most of the parking along the A57 Snake Pass consists of small unmarked lay-bys. In many cases these appear to have been created where remedial road straightening works have occurred, creating lay-bys; or where informal use has driven the creation of a more formal provision.

There may be opportunities to either increase or better manage parking provision in some locations. However, it is unlikely that such provision could or should be delivered at the scale required. Any increase in parking should also take account of the need to restrict parking in problematic areas.

**c) If not, why not?**

The Peak District National Park Authority has two statutory purposes; these are “the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the National Park” and “the promotion of opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the National Park.” Both purposes carry equal weight under law unless they are in conflict. In such cases ‘*conservation and enhancement*’ takes priority over ‘*understanding and enjoyment*’ (the Sandford principle). The delivery of car parks to provide access to the open countryside falls under the ‘*understanding and enjoyment*’ purpose.

The submitted Peak District National Park Local Impact Report includes a map at page 14 (Figure 3.4 – The A628 Trunk Road and A57 in the context of the SAC / SPA



/ SSSI designations). This shows the relationship of the A57 Snake Pass to the SAC / SPA / SSSI designations. In addition to the constraints brought about by these designations, there is also a presumption against development in the 'Open Countryside' of the National Park.

The Peak District National Park Development Management Policies (2019) document sets out the planning policy for the provision of visitor parking facilities within the National Park. The policy states: -

**A. New or enlarged car parks will not be permitted unless a clear, demonstrable need, delivering local benefit, can be shown.**

**B. Where new or additional off-street visitor parking is permitted, an equivalent removal of on-street parking will usually be required. This will be delivered through Traffic Regulation Orders to restrict on-street parking.**

**C. In considering proposals for new or enlarged car parks in the Natural Zone and in Conservation Areas, the developer is expected to have assessed alternative sites located in a less environmentally sensitive location, capable of being linked to the original visitor destination either by a Park & Ride system or right of way.**

Whilst the policy does not prevent the additional provision of car parks along the Snake Pass, the ecological designations mean that it is more likely to be permitted within the valley landscape east of Snake Summit. Even within the valley setting, slope stability and land ownership might preclude its delivery. Most importantly, there would need to be a demonstrable need that could be met by such provision.

**d) If so, how could such provision be secured?**

As stated above, a suitable site would need to be identified, where a demonstrable demand could be met. The willingness of a landowner to provide a site would also be a prerequisite.

**e) Could increased demand for travel for visitors be addressed in other ways?**

It is in some ways ironic that this question is being raised, within a few weeks of the withdrawal of the X57 regular daily bus service between Sheffield and Manchester along the Snake Pass. The reason for its withdrawal being a lack of patronage.

			<p>The Peak District National Park Authority is keen to improve sustainable visitor access to the National Park, with a prioritisation of active travel and public transport over car-borne journeys. Whilst not a transport authority, the National Park Authority has operated a Visitor Experience bus into the Hope Valley and the Upper Derwent as part of a 3-year pilot since 2019. We are keen to see the improvement of public transport links into the National Park from surrounding urban areas. We are however, dependent on the support of our six constituent transport authorities to deliver sustainable transport access for their residents to the National Park.</p> <p><b>f) If so, how would this be delivered?</b> The Bus Service Improvement Plans offer an opportunity to deliver better public transport connections to, from and within the Peak District National Park. However, this will require a firm commitment from our constituent transport authorities to deliver such services.</p> <p>It should be noted that Proposal 19 from the report of the Glover Review into Protected Landscapes advocated “<i>new, more sustainable ways of accessing national Landscapes</i>”. This proposal was acknowledged in direct reference to the Peak District in the Government’s recent response to the report.</p>
<b>Remaining concerns</b>			
3.27	<b>Peak District National Park Authority</b>	Remaining concerns	<p><b>Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could the Peak District National Park Authority summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant’s consideration of transport networks, traffic, alternatives, access, severance, walkers, cyclists, or horse riders?</b></p> <p>We have remaining concerns as highlighted within our previous representations regarding the impact of the scheme on crossing points for walkers, cyclists and horse riders caused by increased traffic flows on the A57 Snake Pass and A628(T) in particular. We are also concerned of the effects of increased traffic flow on both the actual and perceived safety of vulnerable road users. At a time when the government is seeking to encourage cycling as a form of transport, the public propensity to cycle can be seriously affected by both perceptions of safety and the volume of traffic.</p> <p>We are also concerned that the applicant does not appear to have undertaken a thorough assessment of alternatives to the scheme, that are not based around increasing road capacity.</p>

4.	<b>Peak District National Park</b>		
4.5	<b>Peak District National Park Authority</b>	Effects in the vicinity of routes through the National Park	<p><b>Does Peak District National Park Authority have any concerns about indirect effects in the vicinity of routes through the Peak District National Park apart from the A57 Snake Pass? Please provide reasoning.</b></p> <p>Our principle concerns relate to the effects of induced traffic flows on the A57 Snake Pass and A628 (T). We have demonstrated these concerns within our previous representation, Local Impact Report, and in answers to Examining Authority's first questions and to those raised at Issue Specific Hearing 2. As stated previously, we also believe that the screening out of impacts on the A628(T) because the predicted increase in AADT in 2025 (Do something) is 40 vehicles below the DMRB threshold is regrettable, as it means that such impacts have not been robustly assessed.</p> <p>We are also concerned about the effects of rerouted traffic on Monks Road. Whilst the predicted increase in traffic is not as high as for either the A628(T) or the A57 Snake Pass, it is a minor road with an undulating topography. The road is crossed by a number of footpaths that can only be linked by sections of road walking. Any increase in traffic represents a risk to those users and uses.</p> <p>The A6024 has a lower increase in AADT, however, its junction with the A628(T) is challenging, so this may have a knock-on effect on road safety.</p> <p>The indirect effects of increased traffic flow have not been adequately considered by the applicant's assessment. By their own methodology (LA107 Landscape &amp; Visual effects), landscape and visual receptor sensitivity is classed as 'very high'.</p> <p>Given the 'very high' sensitivity of the receptors, even minor or negligible magnitudes of adverse effect have the potential to result in significant effects. This has not been addressed or acknowledged by the assessment.</p> <p>Further to our answer re. 3.11 / 3.12 above, additional scheme elements with direct effects (average speed cameras) are now being considered within the park landscape. It is very important that all potential effects of the scheme are considered within the decision-making process, so this is potentially a significant omission.</p>
4.8	Applicant	Any other comments on	<p><b>g) Does the Peak District National Park Authority have any other comments on the Applicant's responses under Items 4p and 4t in its Deadline 4 submission [REP4-008]?</b></p>

	<b>Peak District National Park Authority</b>	submissions for Deadline 4	<p>We believe that the applicant is merely re-stating their position and misunderstands ours.</p> <p>We do not request for ‘all levels of significance to be material considerations’ (potentially significant effects should be material considerations), but we consider that the assessment process either under estimates or fails to adequately consider potential effects within a National Park landscape.</p> <p>We re-state that a low magnitude of effect has the potential to result in significant effects on ‘very high’ sensitivity receptors. This is not considered by the assessment process.</p> <p>It is also possible that direct effects on the Park will take place (3.11 and 3.12) – consideration of wider effects is again a significant omission in the assessment.</p>
4.9	<b>Peak District National Park Authority</b>  Applicant	Study area, baseline conditions, overall methodology, and mitigation  Statements of Common Ground	<p><b>Peak District National Park Authority [REP2-048, REP2-055 and REP4-012] is questioning the Applicant’s assessment in relation to the consideration of Peak District National Park.</b></p> <p><b>a) Please could the Peak District National Park Authority comment on the implications of their concerns for the matters noted as “Agreed” in their draft Statement of Common Ground with the Applicant [REP2-024]?</b></p> <p>The Peak District National Park Authority apologises to the Examining Authority and to the applicant for any confusion in this matter. Owing to the tight timescales involved, the Local Impact Report and the Statement of Common Ground were being produced consecutively and this resulted in the concerns raised within the Authority’s representations not being reflected within the Statement of Common Ground. We recognise that this means that the Applicant’s assessment regarding the consideration of impact on the Peak District Peak District National Park was erroneously stated as agreed.</p> <p><b>b) Please could the Applicant and Peak District National Park Authority ensure that matters that are either agreed or not agreed are set out in the final signed copy of their Statement of Common Ground and submit this before the end of the Examination?</b></p> <p>The Peak District National Park Authority will work with the applicant to ensure that the final signed copy of the Statement of Common Ground fully reflects the areas that both parties agree or disagree on.</p>
<b>Outstanding concerns</b>			

4.1.2	Peak District National Park Authority	Remaining concerns	<p><b>Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could the Peak District National Park Authority summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of the Peak District National Park?</b></p> <p>The Authority's main concerns are highlighted elsewhere within these written questions or within our previously submitted documents and verbal statements at Issue Specific Hearing 2.</p> <p>Principally they stem from the weight that should be accorded to any indirect impacts on the Peak District National Park as a result of the scheme. Longstanding national policy puts great weight of the protection of National Parks from development either within the National Park or affecting land within it.</p>
<b>5. Other landscape and visual, design, Green Belt</b>			
5.2	Peak District National Park Authority	National Planning Policy Framework and local policy	<p><b>The Applicant [REP2-021 Q5.1] set out its consideration of the July 2021 update to the National Planning Policy Framework. Is the Peak District National Park Authority satisfied with the Applicant's explanation?</b></p> <p>No, the Peak District National Park Authority is not satisfied with the applicant's explanation, which does not address our comments raised in our previous response. Our response is not related to the limited changes in the July 2021 update, but the fact that the assessment does not comply with the 'material' issues put forward within the NPPF. It also does not give adequate weight to National Park purposes as defined in either paragraphs 176 and 177 of the NPPF or within Section 62 of the Environment Act (1995).</p> <p>We are unsure why the applicant considers that the NPPF is not applicable to this scheme as no highway exemptions are outlined in the NPPF? We were referencing the point that the NPPF and DMRB are not aligned (which was explicitly acknowledged by the applicant).</p> <p>We repeat our query from our previous response below:</p> <p><i>8.2.5 With reference to the NPPF and the DMRB, the applicant's response that 'it is possible that the two documents may conflict', it would appear that the applicant acknowledges the misalignment between the documents. It would appear to be the case from the applicant's assessment methodology that the DMRB 'outweighs' the NPPF?</i></p> <p>Please note that this has not been addressed – the applicant states that the NPPF is not applicable and that 'the scheme has been designed in accordance with the DMRB', which</p>

			<p>again would appear to indicate that the applicant believes the DMRB is either in accordance with the NPPF or 'outweighs' it.</p> <p>There appears to be some misunderstanding from the applicant about the role of the NPPF? 'The Applicant has also checked the assessments that have been undertaken as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment to ascertain whether methodologies from the NPPF have been relied upon'. The NPPF sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these policies should be applied, it does not define methodologies (as DMRB / GLVIA3 do).</p>
5.4	<p>Applicant</p> <p>Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council</p> <p>Derbyshire County Council</p> <p><b>Peak District National Park Authority</b></p>	<p>Modelled levels and limits of deviation</p>	<p><b>The Applicant [REP2-021 Q5.5] said that the assessment was based on alignment overlain on existing ground levels plus 4.5m to simulate HGV and subsequently [REP4-008 Item 4h] added that the assessment acknowledged the presence of embankments, false cutting and landform generally. The Applicant [REP4-008 Item 4h] set out the level differences from existing ground level, which included carriageways at the following approximate heights above existing ground level:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 3: 3-5m</li> <li>• Section 4: 6-10m</li> <li>• Section 8: 3-4m</li> <li>• Section 11: 3m</li> <li>• Section 12: 2-3m</li> <li>• Section 13: 5m</li> <li>• Section 14: 4-5m</li> <li>• Section 15: 2-2.5m</li> </ul> <p><b>False cutting or bunds were noted at the following approximate heights above existing ground level:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 4: 5m higher than proposed carriageway levels</li> <li>• Section 10: 1-4m</li> <li>• Section 11: up to 6m</li> </ul> <p><b>Sections are provided in the Engineering Drawings and Sections drawing [REP5-005]. These indicate that some embankments, including Section 4, would be topped by 2.5m high environmental barriers. The Applicant [REP4-008 Item 4h] said that vertical limits of deviation were not considered likely to result in changes in levels of significance for landscape or visual receptors.</b></p> <p><b>d) Please could Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council, Derbyshire County Council and Peak District National Park Authority comment?</b></p>

			<p>The Peak District National Park Authority has no comment to make in relation to this question.</p> <p><b>e) Are the authorities content that the height differences and the environmental barriers have been appropriately considered in the assessment of effects for landscape or visual receptors?</b></p> <p>The Peak District National Park Authority has no comment to make in relation to this question.</p>
	<b>Design</b>		
5.10	<p>Applicant</p> <p>Local authorities</p> <p><b>Peak District National Park Authority</b></p>	Lighting	<p><b>b) Please could the local authorities and Peak District National Park Authority comment?</b></p> <p>Generally speaking, the area of the National Park immediately to the east / south-east of the scheme (including the A628(T) and A57 Snake Pass) has the darkest night skies. Dark skies are important for nocturnal wildlife and offer people the chance to experience the beauty of the night sky without the glare of artificial light.</p> <p>Whilst the scheme is located within an area that is already well-lit, it is important that light disturbance associated with the scheme is managed / mitigated for the benefit of wildlife on the National Park fringe and for the protection of night-time views from the National Park.</p>
	<b>Remaining concerns</b>		
5.15	<b>Peak District National Park Authority</b>	Remaining concerns	<p><b>Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could the Peak District National Park Authority summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of landscape, visual, design, or the Green Belt?</b></p> <p>Apart from the matters discussed elsewhere within this document and our earlier submissions and verbal comments, the Peak District National Park Authority has no remaining concerns.</p>
<b>6.</b>	<b>Other noise, vibration, and nuisance</b>		
	<b>Remaining concerns</b>		
6.1.4	<b>Peak District National Park Authority</b>	Remaining concerns	<b>Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could the Peak District National Park Authority summarise any remaining concerns</b>

			<p><b>that it has about the Applicant's consideration of noise, vibration, common law nuisance or statutory nuisance?</b></p> <p>Apart from the matters discussed elsewhere within this document and our earlier submissions and verbal comments in relation to noise disturbance of wildlife, and effects on the quiet enjoyment of the National Park, the Peak District National Park Authority has no remaining concerns.</p>
<b>7.</b>	<b>Air quality</b>		
7.5	<p>Applicant</p> <p>Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council</p> <p>High Peak Borough Council</p> <p><b>Peak District National Park Authority</b></p>	Screening	<p>The Applicant [REP4-008 Item 7dd and 7ee] has set out its approach to screening, the use of DMRB LA 105 guidance. It noted that lower thresholds are set out in Institute of Air Quality Management guidance, but that is specifically intended for residential and mixed used developments and highways schemes have their own set of criteria and thresholds to be used.</p> <p><b>c) Please could Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council, High Peak Borough Council and Peak District National Park Authority comment?</b></p> <p>The Peak District National Park Authority is concerned that an assessment of the air quality impacts of the scheme on Tintwistle AQMA have not been undertaken. Given the very small difference between meeting the threshold and not doing so (40 vehicles or 4%) then a precautionary approach would appear to have been reasonable; especially given the government impetus behind improving air quality within non-compliant areas.</p> <p><b>e) Please could Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council, High Peak Borough Council and Peak District National Park Authority comment?</b></p> <p>The Peak District National Park Authority would support a reassessment of the impacts on air quality as a result of traffic increases through the High Peak Borough AQMAs. The best case would be that the assessment indicates no impact on compliance. However, if the scheme is likely to affect compliance then there is an opportunity to identify measures to mitigate a worsening of air quality accordingly. It is important that due consideration is given to this matter.</p> <p>The issue overall raises concerns about how the screening in or out of indirect impacts is undertaken as part of the scheme development process.</p>



	<b>Remaining concerns</b>		
7.11	<b>Peak District National Park Authority</b>	Remaining concerns	<p><b>Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could the Peak District National Park Authority summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of air quality?</b></p> <p>As detailed within our earlier submissions, we have remaining concerns that figures for nitrogen deposition, whilst they are below the AADT threshold, are only marginally so. If the margin of error falls above a 95% significance level then further consideration of the potential impacts of nitrogen deposition should be undertaken and form part of an appropriate assessment. This is on the basis that a significant impact on SAC qualifying habitats cannot be ruled out.</p>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Climate change</b>		
	<b>Remaining concerns</b>		
8.1.2	<b>Peak District National Park Authority</b>	Remaining concerns	<p><b>Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could the Peak District National Park Authority summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of climate change?</b></p> <p>Regarding 9.59 Applicant's response to Issue Specific Hearing 2 Item 6 c) and d) Cumulative Carbon Assessment. Specifically, 2.2.13 which states that "<i>there is no sectoral target for transport, or any other sector, and that emissions in one sector, or in part of one sector, may be balanced against better performance in others.</i>" It would strengthen the applicant's case to demonstrate exactly which areas of better performance are being used to counter balance the additional emissions generated by the scheme. The Climate Change Committee's recommendations for surface transport require a 63% reduction in carbon emissions from 2019 levels to live within the Government's Targets associated with its sixth carbon budget. This would suggest that varying rates of improvement are inevitable but an expansion of emissions cannot be disregarded as it will place additional pressures elsewhere that maybe difficult to manage.</p> <p>In 2.2.14, the applicant states that they believe there is no legal requirement to assess the impact of an individual scheme against the total carbon emissions from RIS1 and RIS 2. However, for an impact assessment to be robust it must consider the context within which the development is occurring and therefore the total additional emissions due to RIS1 and RIS2 are relevant context and should be included in the assessment.</p>

			<p>In 2.2.23, the applicant states <i>‘for road projects applicants should provide evidence of the carbon impact of the project and an assessment against the Government’s carbon budgets.’</i> The release of carbon due to the construction and operation of the project is an output and not an impact. The impact is global warming. Therefore, the applicant should attempt to assess full the impact of the scheme and consider how those impacts can be mitigated. If there is no alternative then perhaps through sequestration elsewhere. The cost of which should be identified.</p> <p>The response generally presents the position that the impacts are difficult to assess and therefore it is unreasonable for them to have to consider them as part of the proposal. However, the Government provides supplementary guidance to the HM Treasury Green Book on the appraisal and evaluation of energy use and greenhouse gas which is intended to aid decision making in these complex areas. It would be reassuring to see that National Highways had used this or an equivalent cost benefit analysis when determining the suitability of their proposals.</p>
<b>9.</b>	<b>The historic environment</b>		
	<b>Policy and methodology</b>		
9.3	<p>Local authorities</p> <p><b>Peak District National Park Authority</b></p> <p>Applicant</p>	<p>Magnitude of adverse effects equivalence to level of harm and the NPPF tests</p>	<p><b>The Applicant [REP2-021 Q6.5] said that “major adverse magnitude of impact” [REP1-015 Table 6-3] equates to substantial harm, while lesser magnitudes of impact equate to less than substantial harm.</b></p> <p><b>a) Do the local authorities or Peak District National Park Authority have any concerns about the equivalence of magnitude of adverse effect to level of harm or whether the NPPF tests have been addressed correctly?</b></p> <p>In our previous comments we said <i>“The levels of harm should be consistent with the wording of the NPPF (i.e. ‘substantial,’ or ‘less than substantial’)”</i>. Nuance within the ‘less than substantial’ category can help define lower levels of harm. Therefore, ‘minor harm’ should still be ‘less than substantial’, but at the lower end of this scale’. Table 6.3 REP1-015 has not been altered to address this, it is still referring to ‘limited harm’ within the ‘minor adverse’ section – I think Moderate, Minor and negligible Harm should equate to varying levels of ‘less than substantial’ harm.</p> <p><b>b) Please could the Applicant update the ES to include the explanation and clarify how the NPPF tests have been addressed?</b></p>

			<p>Have the NPPF test been addressed correctly? We think this is quite a challenging question, given the different languages of the DMRB and the NPPF; the methodology is a reasonable attempt to bring the two together but I feel that the level of harm is lost in the extra step of the DMRB assessment of significance of effects, and the space for the balanced decision-making which weighs up the benefit(s) of the scheme with the harm caused is lost. I think this is a criticism of the different policies/processes (NPPF, DMRB) rather than this report per se.</p> <p>It would be beneficial to have the level of harm in NPPF language, i.e. 'substantial' or 'less than substantial' (including a range within this latter category) stated in Table 6.5.</p>
	<b>Designated heritage assets</b>		
9.6	<b>Peak District National Park Authority</b>	<p>Tintwistle Conservation Area</p> <p>Ladybower Reservoir</p> <p>The scheduled monuments Hordron Edge, Bamford Edge, Crook Hill, and Bridgend Pasture</p>	<p><b>The Applicant [REP2-021 Q6.8] has set out its consideration of impacts on Tintwistle Conservation area and the listed buildings and scheduled monuments identified by Peak District National Park Authority in their Local Impact Report [REP2-048 paragraphs 8.4.5 and 8.4.7].</b></p> <p><b>Does Peak District National Park Authority have any remaining concerns about the Applicant's conclusions?</b></p> <p>We agree that the impact on the setting or the ability to appreciate the scheduled monuments is likely to be negligible. With regard to Tintwistle Conservation Area however, we consider it to be an asset of High value. The increased traffic will have an impact on it, and the planning process will need to give 'great weight' to its conservation.</p>
	<b>Remaining concerns</b>		
9.11	<b>Peak District National Park Authority</b>	Remaining concerns	<p><b>Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could the Peak District National Park Authority summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of the historic environment?</b></p> <p>In our previous comments we said that we consider Grade II Listed Buildings and Grade II Registered Parks and Gardens to be of High Value; they are of national importance. This also applies to Conservation Area and non-designated assets of national importance. This is not reflected in Table 6.2.</p>
<b>10</b>	<b>Soils, ground conditions, material assets and waste</b>		
	<b>Remaining concerns</b>		

10.5	<b>Peak District National Park Authority</b>	Remaining concerns	<p><b>Apart the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could Peak District National Park Authority summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of soils, ground conditions, material assets or waste?</b></p> <p>Other than any concerns expressed as part of our previous submissions, the Peak District National Park Authority has no concerns in relation to soils, ground conditions, material assets or waste.</p>
<b>12 Biodiversity, ecological and geological conservation, Habitat Regulation Assessment</b>			
<b>Biodiversity</b>			
12.7	<b>Peak District National Park Authority</b>	<p>Effect on the mountain hare population.</p> <p>Natural England Deadline 4 Submission - Post-hearing submissions requested by the Examining Authority in lieu of attendance [REP4-025].</p> <p>National Highways Deadline 4 Submission - Written summary of Applicant's case at Issue Specific Hearing 2 [REP4-008]</p>	<p>In their response [REP4-025] Natural England state that they are satisfied with evidence presented by the Applicant. The Applicant has provided further information in their Response submitted at Deadline 4 [REP4-008].</p> <p><b>Please provide any further comment that you wish to make regarding the conclusions of Natural England or the information supplied by the Applicant.</b></p> <p>The Peak District National Park Authority has nothing further to add to the comments previously submitted in relation to this matter as part of our Representations, Answers to Examining Authority questions and verbal comments at Issue Specific Hearing 2.</p>
<b>Habitat Regulation Assessment</b>			

12.9	<b>Peak District National Park Authority</b>	<p>Scope of concern</p> <p>National Highways Deadline 2 Submission - Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report - Appendix B PINS Screening Matrices</p>	<p><b>The Applicant has set out in [REP2-044] the justification for why there would be no likely significant effects during construction.</b></p> <p><b>a) Please confirm whether, or not, your Authority's concerns only relate to operational effects of the proposal.</b></p> <p>The Peak District National Park Authority can confirm that our concerns only relate to the operational phase of the scheme.</p> <p><b>b) If your Authority's concerns extend to the construction phase, please provide reasoning for this conclusion.</b></p> <p>The Peak District National Park Authority can confirm that our concerns do not relate to the construction phase of the scheme.</p>
12.13	<b>Peak District National Park Authority</b>	<p>Wildfire risk National Highways</p> <p>Deadline 3 Submission - Comments on Local Impact Report submitted by Peak District National Park Authority [REP3- 028]</p>	<p><b>Please confirm whether, or not, your Authority is satisfied with the Applicant's explanation regarding wildfire risk in their response at [REP3-028].</b></p> <p>The Peak District National Park Authority can confirm that we are satisfied with the response. We accept that, whilst they may not have "<i>no effect</i>", the proposals are unlikely to result in a significant increase in wildfire risk.</p>
12.14	<b>Peak District National Park Authority</b>	<p>Remaining concerns</p> <p>National Highways Deadline 3 Submission - Applicants comments on Written Representations.</p>	<p><b>In their response at [REP3-020] the Applicant confirms the A628 does not meet the DMRB LA 105 traffic scoping criteria for traffic increases.</b></p> <p><b>In their response [REP4-025] Natural England state that they are satisfied with evidence presented by Applicant. The Applicant has provided further information in their response submitted at Deadline 4 [REP4-008].</b></p> <p><b>Please provide any further comment that you wish to make in regard to the conclusions of Natural England or the information supplied by the Applicant.</b></p>

		<p>Natural England Deadline 4 Submission - Post-hearing submissions requested by the Examining Authority in lieu of attendance [REP4-025].</p> <p>National Highways Deadline 4 Submission - Written summary of Applicant's case at Issue Specific Hearing 2 [REP4-008].</p>	<p>As detailed within our earlier submissions, we have remaining concerns that figures for nitrogen deposition, whilst they are below the AADT threshold, are only marginally so. If the margin of error falls above a 95% significance level then further consideration of the potential impacts of nitrogen deposition should be undertaken and form part of an appropriate assessment. This is on the basis that a significant impact on SAC qualifying habitats cannot be ruled out.</p>
	<b>Remaining concerns</b>		
12.18	<b>Peak District National Park Authority</b>	Remaining concerns	<p><b>Apart the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could Peak District National Park Authority summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of biodiversity, ecological and geological conservation, or the Habitat Regulation Assessment?</b></p> <p>The Peak District National Park Authority has no additional concerns that have not been addressed elsewhere within this document or as part of previously submitted comments within our Representations, answers to Examining Authority written questions or as part of our verbal submission to the Issue Specific Hearing 2.</p>
<b>13</b>	<b>Land use, social and economic, human health</b>		
	<b>Remaining concerns</b>		
13.6	<b>Peak District National Park Authority</b>	Remaining concerns	<p><b>Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could the Peak District National Park Authority summarise any remaining concerns that it has about</b></p>

			<p><b>the Applicant's consideration of land use, social and economic, or human health?</b></p> <p>The Peak District National Park Authority has no additional concerns that have not been addressed elsewhere within this document or as part of previously submitted comments within our Representations, answers to Examining Authority written questions or as part of our verbal submission to Issue Specific Hearing 2.</p>
<b>14</b>	<b>Other environmental topics</b>		
	<b>Remaining concerns</b>		
14.5	<b>Peak District National Park Authority</b>	Remaining concerns	<p><b>Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could the Peak District National Park Authority summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of the utility infrastructure, transboundary effects, security, major accidents and disasters, civil and military aviation and defence, decommissioning, cumulative and combined effects, or other important and relevant considerations?</b></p> <p>As indicated previously within our written and verbal responses, our major concern in this matter is in relation to the combined impacts of the various negative effects on the National Park. These are principally impacts on the special qualities of the Peak District National Park (including its wildlife) and the enjoyment (quiet or otherwise) of those qualities. These effects include effects on air quality, noise and disturbance and severance.</p>

**Appendix 1 – Photos of the A54 / A537 ‘Cat & Fiddle’ Average Speed Camera Scheme**



**Figure 1 – Average Speed Camera at the junction of the A54 and A537**



**Figure 2 – Average Speed Camera at the junction of the A54 and A537**





**Figure 3 – Average Speed Camera and cabinets east of Cat & Fiddle pub**



**Figure 4 – Average Speed Camera and cabinets east of Cat & Fiddle pub**



**Figure 5 – View eastwards from Cat & Fiddle viewpoint**



**Figure 6 – Camera and signage on the A54**