The Planning Inspectorate

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 Wednesday 2 March 2022

This document sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) second written questions and requests for information.

Responses should be submitted for Deadline 6 on Wednesday 16 March 2022.

The Planning Inspectorate's document references in these questions [in square brackets] can be found on the National Infrastructure Planning website at: [redacted]

Please could all parties answer all questions directed to them or explain why the question is not relevant to them. If questions can be **fully** answered within another submission, then a reference to the relevant paragraph(s) of the submission will be enough.

When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the question number.

If you are answering no more than 3 questions, responses in a letter format will suffice. If you are answering several questions, it will assist the ExA if you could use a table based on that used below. An editable version of this table, in Microsoft Word, is available on request from the Planning Inspectorate. Please email your request to: A57LinkRoads@planninginspectorate.gov.uk.

Abbreviations

AADT	Annual Average Daily Traffic	**NO_2**	Nitrogen Dioxide
dDCO	Draft Development Consent Order	**NPPF**	National Planning Policy Framework
DMRB	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges	**NPSNN**	National Policy Statement for National Networks
DPD	Development Plan Document	**PAS 2080**	Carbon Management in Infrastructure, published by BSI
EMP	Environmental Management Plan	**PDNP**	Peak District National Park
ES	Environmental Statement	**PRoW**	Public rights of way
ExA	Examining Authority	**RIS**	Road Investment Strategy
IAQM	Institute of Air Quality Management	**SPA**	Special Protection Area
IEMA	Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment		

Contents

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
1.	**The draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) and other consents** Reference is made to the dDCO submitted by the Applicant for Deadline 5 [redacted].			
	General matters and other consents			
1.1.	Applicant	Other consents	At Issue Specific Hearing 1 [redacted] the Applicant said it would provide an updated Consents and Agreements Position Statement [redacted] at Deadlines 5, 7 and 9. An update was not provided at Deadline 5. Please could the Applicant provide updates at Deadlines 6, 7 and 9?	N/A
	Parts 1 to 7			
1.2.	Derbyshire County Council	Article 2(1) Interpretation - commence	Derbyshire County Council [redacted] raised concerns about the need to secure pre-commencement archaeological investigations and mitigation works, the need for a	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			Written Scheme of Investigation, and for Derbyshire County Council to be consulted accordingly. The Applicant [redacted] page 9] has suggested the addition of Requirement 10(8). The ExA understands that the suggestion is that this would provide the necessary mitigation when taken together with Requirement 10(1) and the addition of a definition of "*preliminary works*" to Requirement 1. a) Does Derbyshire County Council have any comments on the Applicant's updates to the dDCO [redacted] ? b) Does Derbyshire County Council have any remaining	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			concerns regarding the mitigation of pre-commencement activities?	
1.3.	Applicant Local authorities	Article 7(a) – Limits of deviation	The Applicant [redacted] page 12] advised that the Environmental Statement (ES) has not fully considered the horizontal deviation of 5m that would be permitted by the dDCO [redacted]. It said that noise and air pollution concentration would be higher than considered in the ES if the roads moved towards receptors and lower if it moved away. The Applicant [redacted] Item 2n] said that noise levels could change by between around 1dB and 2dB for receptors closer that 40m to the alignment and considers that there would be unlikely to	N/A - concerns issues with the Rochdale envelope. The main environmental affects in HPBC are from the increase in traffic on the existing roads rather than the new development, therefore deviation of the road is likely to have a very small impact on predictions.

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			be any changes to the significance. Changes to air pollution have not been quantified. Noting the potential magnitude of change in noise and air quality arising from a 5m deviation, particularly in the vicinity of sensitive receptors, the ExA is concerned that the Rochdale Envelope does not appear to have included for the proposed limits of deviation and that a reasonable worst-case scenario does not appear to have been assessed. a) Please could the Applicant advise on the implications of it being secured that the main carriageway would be permitted to deviate horizontally by	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			up to 1m? How practical would it be for the limit of deviation to vary between 1m and 5m depending on the proximity to sensitive receptors? b) Please could the local authorities comment on the Applicant's consideration of a horizontal deviation of 5m and on whether that should be reduced to 1m in the vicinity of sensitive receptors? The Applicant [redacted] also states that landscape impacts in urban areas could have a change to significance of effects as a result of the limits of deviation. It said that this would be subject to a "not environmentally	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			worse than" assessment. c) Please could the Applicant set out when this assessment would be undertaken and/ or how results would be reported?	
1.4.	Applicant Derbyshire County Council	Article 10 – Street Works	The Applicant [redacted page 13] said that Derbyshire County Council's permit scheme would be disapplied. It referred to ongoing discussions and that a Traffic Management Plan would be consulted on with Derbyshire County Council. Derbyshire County Council [redacted] is concerned that there is coordination and liaison to avoid any conflicts and have suggested that 3 months notice be provided of any works.	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			Are the Applicant and Derbyshire County Council able to agree suitable provisions in the first iteration Environmental Management Plan (EMP) [redacted] to set out the measures to be included in the Traffic Management Plan?	
1.5.	Derbyshire County Council	Article 12(5) - Construction and maintenance of new, altered or diverted streets and other structures – responsibility for maintenance	The Applicant [redacted] page 13] said the principles of future maintenance had been agreed with Derbyshire County Council and that the detail would be contained in the second iteration EMP. Derbyshire County Council [redacted] said that responsibilities for maintenance had not been agreed and that any need for commuted sums could be developed through the	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			emerging EMP and the Statements of Common Ground. The ExA notes the potential for measures not being agreed in the Statement of Common Ground, and that the second iteration of the EMP requires consultation rather than agreement with Derbyshire County Council. a) Is Derbyshire County Council content that with Article 12(5)? b) Should the maintenance responsibilities be set out in the first iteration EMP [redacted] ?	
1.6.	Applicant Local authorities	Articles 14(6), 18(11), 19(8), 21(6) – Deemed consent	Please could the Applicant and the local authorities provide an update on discussions regarding the addition of a	No discussions have taken place but the matters predominantly relate to the highways authority.

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			provision for any application for consent to contain a statement drawing the street authority's attention to the guillotine? If agreement is not reached then the ExA is minded to include this provision, for the reasons set out in the first written questions [redacted] Q1.19, Q1.21, Q1.22 and Q1.24].	
1.7.	Applicant	Article 15(2)(b) - Permanent stopping up and restriction of use of highways, streets and private means of access - Temporary alternative routes for private means of access	The Applicant [redacted] page 14] confirmed that private means of access will be maintained. The ExA is considering whether Article 15(2)(b) is sufficiently clear in providing for private means of access to be maintained. Would Article 15(2)(b) be clearer that private means of access would be maintained if the	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			need for alternative routes for streets to be maintained to the reasonable satisfaction of the street authority was set out separately in Article 15(2)(c)?	
	Schedules 1 and 2			
1.8.	Applicant	Further development "… *within the Order limits which does not give rise to …*"	The Applicant [redacted] page 16] has added introductory wording to confirm that further development would not give rise to materially new or different environmental effects to those assessed in the ES. For consistency with similar wording elsewhere, should it be amended to "… *within the Order limits provided that it does not give rise to…*"?	N/A
1.9.	Environment Agency	Requirement 4(1) – second iteration EMP	The Environment Agency [redacted] Q1.32] said that it wished to be	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			consulted on any EMP detail to ensure mitigation for pollution prevention impacts of the construction are considered for the water environment. The Applicant added a provision for the Environment Agency to be consulted on the second iteration EMP, which includes the Pollution Prevention Plan and the Construction Water Management Plan. Does the Environment Agency have any remaining concerns regarding dDCO [redacted] provisions for consultation in relation to mitigation measures for pollution prevention?	
1.10.	Applicant Local authorities	Requirement 4(1) and (2) - second iteration EMP	The ExA [redacted] has raised concerns that key principles established for the	b) Without input from the applicant it is difficult to postulate why the applicant does not appear to be comfortable for the dDCO to require that the measures for the construction stage referred to in the ES are included in the second iteration EMP.

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			first iteration EMP should not be lost or watered down in subsequent versions. The Applicant [redacted] page 17] has explained the process for the development of the second iteration of the EMP and explained that the second iteration would not follow the first iteration "s*lavishly*". The Applicant [redacted] page 17] said that the first iteration EMP [redacted] incorporates the measures for the construction stage referred to in the ES as being incorporated in the EMP. It said that the second iteration would be updated to reflect the finalised design and construction plans and would reflect the mitigation for	Given the further detail in the 2nd iteration , commitment to consultation & to adopt BPM in the REAC (for mitigation) this is not considered to be critical for all the general mitigation proposals highlighted to be included. However, the above noted, where mitigation has been described as embedded and presumed to occur in an associated assessment then there should be a commitment that this mitigation will be included (as impacts have been assessed on this basis)

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			the consented scheme. The Applicant does not appear to be comfortable for the dDCO [redacted] to require that the measures for the construction stage referred to in the ES are included in the second iteration EMP. The second iteration is the version that would be used during construction. a) The ExA is considering whether it can rely on the measures for the construction stage referred to in the ES if their inclusion in the second iteration EMP is not secured in the dDCO [redacted]. Please could the Applicant comment? Can a firmer undertaking be	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			secured regarding the mitigation referred to in the ES? The Applicant [redacted] page 17] said that the second iteration EMP would contain a record of the consents, commitments and permissions resulting from liaison with statutory bodies and be kept up to date with any material changes during construction and for consultation to be required on those changes. However, the Applicant does not appear to be comfortable for the dDCO [redacted] to include those requirements for the second iteration. b) Please could the local authorities comment?	
1.11.	Applicant	Requirement 4(2)(c) - second	The ExA [redacted] Q1.34] is	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
		iteration EMP - Working hours	suggesting additional wording to mitigate the impacts of night-time working by giving the local authorities prior notification to help them to manage communications with local communities: "*Provided that written notification of the extent, timing and duration of each activity is given to relevant local authorities in advance of any works that are to be undertaken outside of the specified hours, except in cases of emergency or for the repair or maintenance of construction equipment, which are to be notified to the relevant local authorities as soon as is practicable.*" The Applicant [redacted] page 18] said that it may not	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			always be possible to give notice for some of the listed works. The ExA would like to understand why some of the works would not be planned in advance. Please could the Applicant explain why it is not possible to give notice for: a) Night-time closures including for road crossings and final surfacing tie ins? b) Any oversize deliveries or deliveries but only where daytime working would be excessively disruptive to normal traffic operation? c) Junction tie-in works? d) Removal of overhead power lines?	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			e) Overnight traffic measures?	
1.12.	Applicant Local authorities	Requirement 4(4) and 4(5) – third iteration EMP	The ExA [redacted] has raised concerns that key principles established for the first iteration EMP [redacted] should not be lost or watered down in subsequent versions. The Applicant [redacted pages 18 to 19] has explained the process and legislative requirements for the development of the third iteration of the EMP and said that the third iteration EMP would be developed from the second iteration EMP, which is the version that would be used for construction. The Applicant does not appear to be comfortable for the dDCO [redacted] to require that the measures for the	a) More appropriate for DCC to comment if requirement 4(4) requires the 3rd EMP to be prepared in accordance with a process contained in the 2nd EMP, where they would have been consulted. As noted in 1.1 above where any operational mitigation has been described as embedded and presumed to occur, in an associated assessment, then there should be a commitment that this mitigation will be included (as impacts have been assessed on this basis) in the third iteration

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			construction stage referred to in the ES are included in the second iteration EMP. The third iteration is the version that would be prepared at handover. a) There are no requirements for approval, or consultation on the third iteration EMP. Please could the local authorities comment? b) Noting that the second iteration EMP is for the construction phase, please could the Applicant advise whether it would reflect measures for the management and operation stage that are included in the first iteration? Is it necessary to ensure that the third	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			iteration reflects measures in the first iteration? c) The ExA is considering whether it can rely on the measures for the management and operation stage referred to in the ES if their inclusion in the third iteration EMP is not secured in the dDCO [redacted]. Please could the Applicant comment? Can a firmer undertaking be secured regarding the mitigation referred to in the ES?	
1.13.	Applicant	Requirement 5 – Landscaping	Derbyshire County Council [redacted] and [redacted] said that the landscape scheme should be approved prior to commencement of the construction	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			works to ensure that works make provision for the approved landscaping. It refers to experience of dealing with large-scale developments where they consider that on too many occasions landscape proposals have had to be significantly amended after the construction phase because the site hasn't been left in an appropriate condition for the required landscaping or on occasions, insufficient land has been left available post construction to accommodate all of the proposed landscaping. Tameside Borough Council [redacted] consider it is reasonable for approval of the landscaping to be required to be	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			approved before any construction works commence. a) The Applicant [redacted] page 20] proposes that landscaping scheme be submitted and approved before the relevant part of the authorised development can come into use. The Applicant explained that it needs to be able to deliver the highway scheme and has suggested that it's construction may need to guide the landscaping scheme. b) Does the Applicant consider that it is not possible for the construction works to be planned to enable the delivery of a	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			landscape scheme that is submitted and approved? If so, please could detailed justification be provided? c) The Applicant's approach suggests the potential for a large degree of flexibility in the landscape mitigation that is delivered. Please could the Applicant summarise how the landscaping mitigation is secured and how it is secured that it will not result in no materially new or more adverse effects materially new or materially worse environmental effects in comparison with those reported in the ES? To	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			what extent would the Illustrative Environmental Masterplan [redacted] Figure 2.4] be followed?	
1.14.	Environment Agency	Requirement 6 – Contaminated land and groundwater	The Environment Agency [redacted] made recommendations regarding model procedures and good practice for contamination. The Applicant [redacted] page 20] noted the recommendations, the approach taken for the land contamination risk assessment, and referred to the adjustment to Requirement 4(1) to require consultation with the Environment Agency. Does the Environment Agency have any remaining concerns regarding	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			dDCO [redacted] provisions in relation to model procedures and good practice for contamination?	
1.15.	Natural England	Requirement 7 – Protected species	Natural England [redacted] Q1.40] suggested additional provisions in relation to the cessation of works in case a protected species is shown to be present or there is a reasonable likelihood of it being present. The Applicant [redacted] pages 20 and 21] set out its approach and suggested a provision that relevant works likely to affect the identified protected species must cease until a scheme of protection and mitigation measures has been approved. a) Does Natural England have any comments	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			on the Applicant's suggestion? b) Does Natural England have any remaining concerns regarding dDCO [redacted] provisions in relation to protected species?	
1.16.	Applicant	Requirement 8 - Surface and foul water drainage	Should the end of Requirement 8(1) be amended to: "… *following consultation with the relevant lead local flood authority and the Environment Agency on matters related to <u>their functions</u>*"?	N/A
1.17.	Environment Agency Lead Local Flood Authorities	Requirement 9(2) – Flood risk assessment	Derbyshire County Council [redacted] said that the Lead Local Flood Authority would welcome consultation on any works that were not in accordance with an approved Flood Risk Assessment for	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			clarity and certainty and for the opportunity to comment on or raise concerns about any works that may result in problems for flood risk in the wider area. The Environment Agency [redacted] recommended that they should be consulted in relation to works proposed in accordance with the flood risk assessment and otherwise in accordance with the flood risk assessment. They also stated that all works should be carried out in accordance with an approved flood risk assessment regardless of whether affected landowners accept any exceedances of flood levels. They said that the flood risk assessment	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			must show that risks would not be increased elsewhere. The Applicant [redacted] pages 21 and 22] responded to the Environment Agency's concerns and updated the dDCO [redacted]. a) Does the Environment Agency have any comments on the Applicant's updates to Requirement 9? b) Do the Environment Agency or the Lead Local Flood Authorities have any remaining concerns regarding dDCO [redacted] provisions in relation to flood risk assessment?	
1.18.	Applicant	Requirement 10 – Archaeological remains	The ExA [redacted] Q1.35] suggested that a requirement be added for any programme of	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			archaeological reporting, post excavation and publication to be consulted on and / or agreed in writing. The Applicant [redacted] page 22] said that the requirement would be added. Please could the Applicant add a requirement for any programme of archaeological reporting, post excavation and publication to be consulted on and / or agreed in writing?	
1.19.	Applicant Local authorities	Requirement 12(1) Details of consultation – minimum period	Please provide an update on discussions regarding the consultation period, for which a period ranging from 14 days to 28 days have been suggested.	No update.
	Schedules 3 to 10			

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
1.20.	Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council	Schedule 3, 4 and 5	Has Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council reviewed the latest versions? Does it have any further comments, please?	N/A
1.21.	Applicant	Schedule 9 – Protective Provisions	Section 127 of the Planning Act 2008 requires the ExA to consider the potential for serious detriment to Statutory Undertakers for the carrying on of their undertakings. As part of that consideration the ExA seeks written confirmation from the Applicant and from the Statutory Undertakers that all necessary matters, including the protective provisions and any relevant side agreements have been agreed. If written confirmation is not received by all relevant parties before the close of	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			the examination, then the ExA will be minded to recommend to the Secretary of State that it does not make a decision until it has satisfied itself that the protective provisions and any relevant side agreements have been agreed between the Applicant and any Statutory Undertakers that are named in Schedule 9 and / or have raised relevant matters requiring agreement during the examination. Please could the Applicant provide an update on: a) The name of each Statutory Undertaker that Parts 1, 2 and 3 of Schedule 9 apply to? b) The identification of	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			all relevant side agreements? c) Whether each relevant Part and side agreement has been agreed with each Statutory Undertaker and with the Environment Agency? d) The provision of written evidence from each party of any agreement? e) Any matters that are still subject to agreement with each party, the steps being taken to resolve them and when any updates will be provided?	
1.22.	Applicant	Schedule 10	a) Should the Register of Environmental Statement Changes be added to Schedule 10 as a	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			document to be certified? b) Please could a copy of the Register of Environmental Statement Changes be submitted to the Examination?	
2.	**General matters**			
	Legislation and policy			
2.1.	Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council	Draft Places for Everyone: Joint Development Plan Document (DPD) for Bolton, Bury, Manchester, Oldham, Rochdale, Salford, Tameside, Trafford and Wigan	Since the submission of the application the draft Places for Everyone: Joint Development Plan Document for Bolton, Bury, Manchester, Oldham, Rochdale, Salford, Tameside, Trafford and Wigan has been published for consultation. a) What weight do you consider should be placed on the policies within the document?	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			b) Please provide justification for why this weight is considered appropriate.	
3.	**Transport networks and traffic, alternatives, access, severance, walkers, cyclists, and horse riders**			
	Traffic modelling			
3.1.	Applicant	Level of confidence in traffic modelling / traffic growth assumptions	There is uncertainty at this time resulting from the introduction of electric (or other alternative power trains) for vehicles, possible levels of autonomy for vehicles, the future introduction of policies intended to restrain the use of the private car and encourage transference to more sustainable modes, volatility in fuel prices, changes to working practices and other factors. These have potential to affect	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			forecast traffic growth. a) What level of confidence can now be placed on the traffic modelling? b) What impact would this have for the case for the scheme?	
3.2.	Local highway authorities	Godley Green Development	Reference has been made to a development at Godley Green for which it is understood that an application has now been made and registered. The Applicant has provided a response outlining their approach in dealing with this matter with regard to modelling [redacted]. a) Are the local highway authorities satisfied with this approach? b) If not, what approach should	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			be taken to the development in the modelling?	
3.3.	Applicant	Modal transference.	There are aspirations, both at local and national level, to transfer journeys to more sustainable transport modes. a) Is this reflected within the model? b) If so, what assumptions and allowances have been made to reflect this? c) If not, should it be?	N/A
3.4.	Applicant Local highway authorities	Modal use assumptions. CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire Branch Deadline 5 Submission - Responses to Deadline 4 submissions and comments on Issue Specific Hearing 2 [redacted]	There are concerns, expressed by CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire Branch in [redacted] paragraphs 160 and 170] and elsewhere, that public transport and active travel modes have been under-represented in the model.	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			a) Please provide comments on the issues raised. b) If these modes have been under-represented, what effect would this have on the case for the scheme? c) Do the local highway authorities have any comments in regard to this issue?	
3.5.	Applicant Local authorities Peak District National Park Authority Natural England	Screening thresholds	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.	HPBC has accepts that the recommended DMRB screening criteria for national highways road schemes, indicates that both the Glossop and Tintwistle AQMAs would be screened out, based on the traffic figures presented The key concern remains that HPBC would like to have seen the AQMAs, although HPBC appreciate that DMRB has been followed they believe there should be a lower criteria set for AQMA, inline with the principles of the IAQM guidance HPBC considers there to be a good argument for inclusion of both AQMA based on uncertainty in the traffic modelling: - Change in AADT on the A628 in Tintwistle is only fractionally below the DMRB criteria - Concerns over the likelihood of extra (approx. 4K AADT) from the new A57 traffic diverting onto Shaw

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			a) Please provide, for each relevant environmental topic, the screening threshold set out in the DMRB, providing the relevant paragraph reference in each case. 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. c) Where there is a choice of DMRB or other screening	Lane/Dinting Road rather than only 300 remaining on A57 within Glossop AQMA

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			criteria, please identify the criteria selected and the reasoning for that choice. d) Do the local authorities, Peak District National Park Authority and Natural England have any comments that they wish to make about this matter?	
3.6.	Applicant	Trips diverting within the Local Study Area	Various routes have been identified onto which trips may divert to avoid delays and minimise journey times or costs as perceived by drivers. These trips pass through Tintwistle, Hollingsworth and Glossop, as well as other settlements, and may have adverse impact on relevant environmental topics.	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			Please confirm whether, or not, the worst-case scenario for diverted trips, with maximum estimated flow, has been considered when assessing the impact of such diversions.	
3.7.	Peak District National Park Authority	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 [redacted]	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 [redacted] .	N/A
	Alternatives			
3.8.	Applicant	Gyratory Stephen Bagshaw's Written	In his written representation Mr Bagshaw has proposed an	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
		Representation submitted at Deadline 2 [redacted]	alternative scheme to the proposal. a) Has this alternative been considered previously? b) If so, what were your conclusions? c) Please provide a response to the issues raised. d) Do you consider that the proposal provides an alternative solution which would satisfy the same aims of the scheme, provide the same, or improved, benefits and is deliverable?	
3.9.	Applicant	Measures to promote carbon-free / low carbon travel CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire	In their written submission, including, amongst others, [redacted] CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire Branch propose an alternative scheme to the proposal for	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
		Branch Written Representation at Deadline 4 [redacted]	car-free low carbon travel for Longdendale and Glossop. a) Has this alternative, or any of the various constituent measures, been considered previously? b) If so, what were your conclusions? c) Please provide a response to the issues raised. d) Do you consider that the proposal provides an alternative solution which would satisfy the same aims of the scheme, provide the same, or improved, benefits and is deliverable?	
	Traffic effects outside the Order Limits			

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
3.10.	Applicant Derbyshire County Council	Junction of A57 Brookfield / Shaw Lane / Dinting Vale North Derbyshire County Council Deadline 2 Submission - Local Impact Report from Derbyshire County Council [redacted]	In their Local Impact Report [redacted], Derbyshire County Council identify concerns regarding future capacity at the junction of A57 Brookfield / Shaw Lane / Dinting Vale North and that this will result in local delays. a) Has any specific analysis of the operation of this junction been undertaken? b) Should the specific mitigation be provided to address any resultant additional? c) Has any potential mitigation been considered? d) If so, how would this be secured? e) Would an increase in junction capacity it this junction	More detailed analysis is required of the impacts of the increase in traffic using Shaw Lane and Dinting Road. The screening out of the consideration of the AQMA at Dinting is predicated on alternative routes across Glossop being readily utilised by vehicles. Our LIR questioned the suitability of the Shaw Lane and Dinting Road diversion *"given this route has a higher number of roadside residential receptors"* (paragraph 8.46). Even if feasible, such a diversion is likely to lead to negative impacts which have not been properly considered or mitigated. Alternatively, if the junction and alternative route are not used as predicted, it is likely that the traffic passing through the AQMA at Dinting will be higher than forecast with consequential implications for air quality. In this scenario, severance and safety issues will also potentially be more prevalent on the A57.

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			affect any driver-perceived attractiveness of the Shaw Lane / Dinting Road route for drivers? f) If so, what would be the resulting effect? g) Would any additional diversion of traffic require additional mitigation?	
3.11.	Peak District National Park Authority	Traffic management measures on A57 Snake Pass	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.	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			a) Do you 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? c) Do you have any suggestions for acceptable physical measures on the A57 Snake Pass to address highway safety?	
3.12.	Peak District National Park Authority	Traffic management measures on A628 Woodhead Pass.	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	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			average speed cameras. a) Do you consider such a solution would provide a practicable and effective solution to vehicle speed management on the A628 Woodhead Pass? b) If not, why not? c) Do you have any suggestions for acceptable physical measures on the A628 Woodhead Pass to address highway safety?	
3.13.	Peak District National Park Authority High Peak Borough Council Derbyshire County Council	Car parking within the National Park.	Improving road access to the National Park may encourage people to access the National Park by private motor car. During site inspections, it was observed that much of the parking along the A57 Snake Pass took the form of informal roadside parking, particularly	High Peak Borough Council is not the local highway authority or local planning authority within the Peak District National Park and so will not comment on highway safety or visual amenity. However, the Borough Council is keen to support improved access to the National Park for visitors, particularly via sustainable means. To this end, we support efforts made by both Derbyshire County Council and the Peak District National Park Authority to improve public transport, walking and cycling links between the National Park and settlements on its fringe such as Glossop and Hadfield. Such locations provide railway connectivity for visitors from Greater Manchester although onward connections

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			around locations where Public Rights of Way (PRoW) cross or join the road. a) What effects would increased parking demand have on: - • Highway safety, and • Visual amenity? b) Should formal provision be made to manage these effects? c) If not, why not? d) If so, how could such provision be secured? e) Could increased demand for travel for visitors be addressed in other ways? f) If so, how would this be delivered?	into the National Park via public transport are currently limited. Derbyshire County Council's plans for an Enhanced Bus Partnership could potentially help to address this issue in the future.
3.14.	Applicant	Traffic passing through Bamford and	Concerns have been raised regarding increases to traffic flows through Bamford and the	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
		the Peak District National Park Representation received at Deadline 2 [redacted] Representation received at Deadline 5 [redacted]	National Park [redacted] and [redacted]. a) Please respond to the issues raised, including: - • Changes to link flows; and • Highway safety. b) Should any mitigation measures be provided to address the issues raised? c) If so, how would these be secured?	
	Connectivity within the Order Limits			
3.15.	Applicant	Access on Carrhouse Lane [redacted]	In their response at Deadline 4, JJ and WE Bower [redacted], raised concerns regarding the alignment of the approach to, and the internal height clearance of, the proposed underpass at Carrhouse Lane.	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			Please summarise the approach taken to the design of the underpass, including the parameters of vehicles which it is designed to accommodate.	
3.16.	Applicant	Access on Carrhouse Lane [redacted]	In their response at Deadline 4, JJ and WE Bower [redacted], raised concerns that vehicles turning right into Carrhouse Lane may experience difficulties, and engender delays on the network. It has been suggested that a yellow box junction to safeguard access may be appropriate. a) Has the Applicant considered such provision? b) What benefits and / or disbenefits does the Applicant consider would	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			result from such provision? c) If considered to be of benefit how would such provision be secured?	
	Public transport			
3.17.	Applicant	Bus journey times	It is likely that buses will remain on routes using the existing road network, rather than using the links provided by the proposal. The information provided on bus travel times within the application is limited. Please provide, preferably in diagrammatic form, a breakdown of link journey times for local bus routes, showing, for each link, predicted journey times for the Do-Minimum and Do-Something scenarios, in opening and design	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			years for journeys within the Local Study Area.	
3.18.	Local authorities and local highway authorities	Modal Transference	There are aspirations, both at local and national level, to transfer journeys to more sustainable transport modes. a) Do you consider that sufficient consideration been given during the assessment of the effects of the scheme to Public Transport networks? b) Is the design flexible enough to provide for any future increase in public transport usage and associated infrastructure?	a) As highlighted in our Local Impact Report, the increased local journey times would likely affect the timing and reliability of public transport services within Glossopdale. This may lead to a decreased desirability to use these services. However, the impact of the scheme on this is not currently clear. b) Please refer to comments from Derbyshire County Council in relation to the suitability of the scheme to support public transport in design terms.
	Walkers, cyclists, and horse riders			
3.19.	Applicant	Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council Response to the	In their response to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
		Examining Authority's First Written Questions [redacted]	[redacted] Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council identify an aspiration for a minimum overhead clearance of 2.5 metres on the public pedestrian route that passes under the western end of the River Etherow Bridge. a) Could this be provided? b) If not, why not?	
3.20.	Applicant	Scheme Layout Plans [redacted] Sheet 4 of 10	On the A57(T) north-eastern (Mottram Moor) arm, the layout indicates a single north-eastbound traffic lane running alongside a new length of footway, or footway cycleway. This, however, appears to terminate, decanting footway users onto carriageway. Further, there is no connectivity	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			indicated between the proposed footway or footway / cycleway and the existing footway serving 123-133 Mottram Moor. a) Would the Applicant clarify what is intended in terms of footway or footway / cycleway provision connection to the footway of Mottram Moor to the north-east? b) Please provide updated plans showing the intended layout, with all footway connections.	
3.21.	Applicant	Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council Deadline 5 Submission - Post-hearing submission requested by the Examining Authority - Comments on	Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council identified benefits for active travel and connectivity resultant from the provision of direct linkage of the routes provided alongside	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
		Issue Specific Hearing 2 Items [redacted]	the dual carriageway to Roe Cross Lane. Further benefits would accrue by the provision of connectivity through the proposed public open space on the roof of the underpass. a) Would the Applicant comment on the feasibility and benefits and / or disbenefits of such provision? b) If such connectivity were to be provided, how would it be secured?	
	Public Rights of Way			
3.22.	Applicant	Stub ends of existing PRoW	There is concern that, following construction, some PRoW will be left with residual lengths that no longer connect to the wider network and that leaving residual lengths	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			may lead to problems of trespass and damage. Particular concern has been raised regarding footpaths in the vicinity of Tara Brook Farm. a) Would it be beneficial to stop cul-de-sac lengths up at the same time as they are severed? b) If so, how would such stopping-up be secured?	
	Design – transport networks, traffic, walkers, cyclists, and horse riders			
3.23.	Applicant Local authorities Local highway authorities	First Written Questions [redacted] Q3.23]	Please provide an update regarding discussions seeking to secure future maintenance of the relevant works.	Please refer to comments from Derbyshire County Council.
	Remaining concerns			
3.24.	Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			could Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of transport networks, traffic, alternatives, access, severance, walkers, cyclists, or horse riders?	
3.25.	Derbyshire County Council	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could Derbyshire County Council summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of transport networks, traffic, alternatives, access, severance, walkers, cyclists, or horse riders?	N/A
3.26.	High Peak Borough Council	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please	None beyond those highlighted in this submission (incl. 3.5) and our Local Impact Report. In relation to severance in particular, our LIR (para. 15.21) stated that:

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			could High Peak Borough Council summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of transport networks, traffic, alternatives, access, severance, walkers, cyclists, or horse riders?	*"The increased capacity for east – west trips between Manchester and Sheffield along the A57 through Glossop will lead to greater traffic flows through Glossop, and may increase congestion issues within Glossop and surrounding local areas. Related issues such as severance are not examined for this area. This is something that should be considered by the Applicant to understand if Glossopdale residents could experience an impact from severance. This should consider key locations that rely on safe road crossing such as the secondary school in Hadfield, Dinting Railway Station and Glossop High Street where shops rely on safe pedestrian road crossing points. Severance has the potential to affect local shopping habits and therefore the local economy."* It is noted that the applicant, in their response to the LIR, are of the opinion that *"consideration of the DMRB LA112 Population and Human Health shows that this increase in traffic can be anticipated to have non-significant negative effects"* We are still of the opinion that further consideration should be given to these matters.
3.27.	Peak District National Park Authority	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could the Peak District National Park Authority summarise any remaining concerns	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			that it has about the Applicant's consideration of transport networks, traffic, alternatives, access, severance, walkers, cyclists, or horse riders?	
4.	**Peak District National Park**			
4.1.	Applicant	ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Effects [redacted]	The Applicant [redacted] Item 4o] refers to Paragraphs 7.3.45 and 7.5.9 [redacted] not being agreed with Peak District National Park Authority. Is Paragraph 7.3.45 complete?	N/A
4.2.	Applicant Natural England	Regard to the statutory purposes of Peak District National Park Section 62 of the Environment Act 1195	Peak District National Park Authority [redacted] said that the assessment methodology does not allow for an adequate judgement to be made regarding potential effects of the Proposed Development on the	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			statutory purposes of the Peak District National Park - to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the National Parks'.) as defined by the Environment Act 1995. Do the Applicant and Natural England consider that sufficient regard has been given to the statutory purposes of Peak District National Park, consistent with s62 of the Environment Act 1995? Please provide reasoning.	
4.3.	Applicant	National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN) Paragraphs 5.150, 5.152 and 5.154	Please could the Applicant signpost the consideration given to NPSNN Paragraphs 5.150, 5.152 and 5.154in its application and summarise its reasoning and conclusions regarding:	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			a) The "*great weight*" to be given to conserving landscape, scenic beauty? How is the "*great weight*" considered in the assessment of indirect effects and their significance? b) The need to plan the Strategic Road Network to encourage routes that avoid National Parks? c) The duty to have regard to the purposes of Peak District National Park, with the aim of avoiding compromising the purposes of designation and the need for the Proposed Development to be designed sensitively given the various siting, operational, and	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			other relevant constraints.	
4.4.	Applicant	National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraphs 176 and 185	Please could the Applicant signpost the consideration given to NPPF Paragraphs 176 and 185 in its application and summarise its reasoning and conclusions regarding: a) The "*great weight*" to be given to conserving and enhancing landscape, scenic beauty, wildlife, and cultural heritage in National Parks? How is the "*great weight*" considered in the assessment of indirect effects and their significance? What enhancement measures have been identified and how are	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			they secured by the dDCO or other means? b) How the Proposed Development has been sensitively located to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the National Park? c) How the Proposed Development has been designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the National Park? d) The need to limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes, and nature conservation? What consideration has been given	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			to the indirect effects from increases in traffic and the potential for increases in car parking?	
4.5.	Peak District National Park Authority	Effects in the vicinity of routes through the National Park	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.	N/A
4.6.	Natural England Derbyshire County Council High Peak Borough Council	Slight effects and material considerations	Peak District National Park Authority [redacted] considers that slight effects could be material to the decision-making process. The Applicant [redacted]Item 4o] said that is not in alignment with DMRB LA104 Table 3.7, which is the	HPBC is not the highways authority and therefore is not familiar with the detail of DMRB. As such, the extent to which DMRB reflects the wider statutory obligations and policy requirements associated with the need to consider impacts on National Parks is not known. However, in general terms, it is more likely that "slight effects" on a National Park are material to a decision than for other areas given the fragile nature of the environment and degree of protection they are given in the NPPF and local policy.

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			methodology for the assessment. Please could Natural England, Derbyshire County Council and High Peak Borough Council comment? Has enough consideration been given to all relevant guidance, policy, and legislation, apart from the DMRB?	
4.7.	Applicant Natural England Derbyshire County Council High Peak Borough Council	Effects	Peak District National Park Authority [REP4-012] said that the effects arising from an increase in traffic should not be described as "*no change*". It questioned the consideration given to the impact on tranquillity and on the perceptions of tranquillity from increases in traffic. The Applicant [REP4-008 Item 4t] has described the process by which the indirect effects	*a)* Yes. Given the great weight afforded to impacts on national Parks in national planning policy, it is proportionate for the applicant to provide a more detailed analysis of impacts. Whilst it is recognised that the scheme does not include any development within the National Park itself, the impacts of the scheme do extend into the National Park. It is noted that in relation to developments in the proximity of National Parks paragraph 176 of the NPPF states that *"development within their setting should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated areas."* Clearly, there is an expectation that the impacts of developments in the setting of National Parks are fully understood. b) N/A c) N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			of traffic were assessed, which involved the assessor applying the % change difference in traffic data and numbers to the receptor experience on site. a) Given the "*great weight*" and protection afforded by the NPSNN and NPPF, would it be proportionate for the assessment to provide more quantification for the assessment, including hourly increases in traffic, increases in noise and any potential increases in car parking? Please provide reasoning. b) Please could the Applicant quantify hourly increases in traffic, increases in noise and any	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			potential increases in car parking? Could that quantification then be used to update the assessment in terms of the perception of changes in noise, landscape and visual impact, tranquillity, dark skies, and other relevant considerations? Peak District National Park Authority [REP4-012] has raised concerns regarding the consideration of tranquillity, including in relation to light from windscreens/ bodywork, litter, exhaust fumes and noise channelling through valley? c) Please could the Applicant and Natural England comment?	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
4.8.	Applicant Peak District National Park Authority	Any other comments on submissions for Deadline 4	a) Does the Applicant have any other comments on the Peak District National Park Authority's responses under the heading of "*Peak District National Park (PDNP)*" in its Deadline 4 submission [redacted]? b) 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 [redacted]?	N/A
4.9.	Peak District National Park Authority Applicant	Study area, baseline conditions, overall methodology, and mitigation Statements of Common Ground	Peak District National Park Authority [redacted] and [redacted] is questioning the Applicant's assessment in relation to the	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			consideration of Peak District National Park. 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 [redacted] ? 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?	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
4.10.	Natural England Applicant	Study area, baseline conditions, overall methodology, and mitigation Statements of Common Ground Deference to advice provided by Peak District National Park Authority	Natural England [redacted] Item 4] have deferred to advice provided by the Peak District National Park Authority in relation to matters raised by the ExA in Issue Specific Hearing 2 [redacted] Item 4r]. Natural England have been invited to respond to related matters in these second written questions. The ExA notes that Natural England is the government's statutory advisor in relation to areas which are subject to national landscape designations, such as Peak District National Park. a) Please could Natural England comment on the implications of Peak District National Park Authority's concerns for the matters noted as	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			"*Agreed*" in their draft Statement of Common Ground with the Applicant [redacted] ? b) Please could the Applicant and Natural England ensure that matters that are either agreed or not agreed are set out in the final signed copy of their Statement Ground and submit this before the end of the Examination? c) For the avoidance of doubt, please could Natural England clarify that when it defers to Peak District National Park Authority, should the ExA interpret that as Natural England agreeing with Peak District	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			National Park Authority? d) Please could Natural England clearly set out when it defers to any responses provided by Peak District National Park Authority in its responses to these second written questions?	
	Outstanding concerns			
4.11.	Natural England	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could Natural England summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of the Peak District National Park?	N/A
4.12.	Peak District National	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
	Park Authority		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?	
4.13.	Derbyshire County Council	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could Derbyshire County Council summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of the Peak District National Park?	N/A
4.14.	High Peak Borough Council	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could High Peak Borough Council summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the	No further issues to raise.

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			Applicant's consideration of the Peak District National Park?	
5.	**Other landscape and visual, design, Green Belt**			
	Landscape and visual			
5.1.	Applicant	LUC Landscape Character and Sensitivity Assessment (part of evidence base for Places for Everyone Joint DPD) GM Urban Historic Landscape Characterisation Project (GMUHLC)	Please could the Applicant provide an explanation of the differences between the documents used to establish the baseline and the more recent Landscape Character Assessment prepared for Places for Everyone Joint DPD, and confirm any implications for the conclusions of the Landscape and Visual Impact assessment and update ES Chapter 7 [redacted] accordingly?	N/A
5.2.	Peak District National	National Planning Policy	The Applicant [redacted] Q5.1] set out its	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
	Park Authority	Framework and local policy	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?	
5.3.	Applicant	Views from the B6015 north of junction with Padfield Road adjacent to public access land	During its second Unaccompanied Site Inspection [redacted] the ExA noted the views of the area of the Proposed Development from the B6015 north of junction with Padfield Road adjacent to public access land. The Applicant [redacted] Item 4f] said that a night-time photomontage in this location can be discounted within the assessment due to the distance. Derbyshire County Council [redacted] Item 4f] said that a night-time photomontage	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			might be of value in demonstrating how the proposed mitigation could be effective e.g. the absence or choice of street lighting, planting, etc. Peak District National Park Authority [redacted] Item 4f] said an assessment of visual impacts from this view-point would be valuable. It said that the location is on the edge of the National Park boundary and looks across to the scheme location and the view represents the transition of the landscape from the National Park and its rural fringe towards the urban landscape of the scheme's location. It added that a night-time photomontage would be helpful to consider potential	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			effects on dark skies. Please could the Applicant respond and comment on whether an assessment or photomontage has been produced for any viewpoints within the Peak District National Park that have comparable visibility of the Proposed Development? The visibility of the Proposed Development from this location appears to be less shielded by topography and vegetation that the other considered within the National Park.	
5.4.	Applicant Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council Derbyshire County Council	Modelled levels and limits of deviation	The Applicant [redacted] Q5.5] said that the assessment was based on alignment overlain on existing ground levels plus 4.5m to simulate HGV and	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
	Peak District National Park Authority		subsequently [redacted] Item 4h] added that the assessment acknowledged the presence of embankments, false cutting and landform generally. The Applicant [redacted] Item 4h] set out the level differences from existing ground level, which included carriageways at the following approximate heights above existing ground level: • Section 3: 3-5m • Section 4: 6-10m • Section 8: 3-4m • Section 11: 3m • Section 12: 2-3m • Section 13: 5m	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			• Section 14: 4-5m • Section 15: 2-2.5m False cutting or bunds were noted at the following approximate heights above existing ground level: • Section 4: 5m higher than proposed carriageway levels • Section 10: 1-4m • Section 11: up to 6m Sections are provided in the Engineering Drawings and Sections drawing [redacted]. These indicate that some embankments, including Section 4, would be topped by 2.5m high environmental barriers. The Applicant [redacted]Item 4h] said that vertical	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			limits of deviation were not considered likely to result in changes in levels of significance for landscape or visual receptors. a) Please could the Applicant provide more detailed clarification about how these departures from existing ground level were considered in the assessment? Given the scale of the height differences, how did it consider the potential for the Proposed Development to be visible from locations where existing ground levels would not be visible? b) Please could the Applicant clarify whether the photomontages [APP-099 to APP-107] and	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			the drawings of the Zone of Theoretical Visibility [APP-095 and APP-096] are consistent with the levels identified [redacted] Item 4h]? c) How has the Applicant considered the height of the construction plant and equipment relative to existing ground level, for example when plant is operating at the top of a new embankment? d) Please could Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council, Derbyshire County Council and Peak District National Park Authority comment?	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			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?	
5.5.	Applicant Derbyshire County Council	Environmental Masterplan [redacted] Figure 2.4] Outline Landscape and Ecological Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan [redacted]	Derbyshire County Council [redacted] Item 4j] commented on the Environmental Masterplan [redacted] Figure 2.4]. Please could the Applicant respond? Should the landscape proposals respond more to the character of the immediate and wider landscape and not just simply attempt to hide the road. Is it possible to do both?	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			Derbyshire County Council [redacted] Item 4n] commented on a previous version of the outline Landscape and Ecological Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan [redacted] . a) Please could the Applicant and Derbyshire County Council discuss the comments in the context of the latest update, seek to agree any further updates to the outline Landscape and Ecological Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan [redacted], and confirm which matters have been agreed or not agreed? Should the	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			planting mix be revisited? b) Please could the Applicant comment on whether the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments [redacted] GEM1.1] should be updated to reflect that the Landscape and Ecological Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan has been submitted, and information in second iteration EMP would be based on this document?	
5.6.	Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council High Peak Borough Council	Outline Landscape and Ecological Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan [redacted]	Please could Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council and High Peak Borough Council comment on the outline Landscape and Ecological Environmental	Yes, we would support DCCs comments. In addition, to Derbyshire County Council's suggestion that the applicant reviews the Landscape Character of Derbyshire publication, reference should also be made to the High Peak Landscape Character SPD [redacted]

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			Management and Monitoring Plan [redacted] ? Does they share any of Derbyshire County Council's concerns [redacted] Item 4n]?	This document provides additional guidance in relation to planting and biodiversity for all character areas, including the "Riverside Meadows" character type that the scheme within High Peak appears to be within.
5.7.	Applicant Local authorities	Management of new structures and the potential for vandalism	CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire Branch [redacted] raised concerns about the management of new structures and the potential for vandalism. a) Please could the Applicant respond? b) Please could the local authorities comment?	High Peak Borough Council would not be responsible for the management of such structures.
5.8.	CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire Branch Applicant	Proposed eastern portal and carriageway Landscape and visual impact assessment and potential site inspection	CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire Branch [redacted] suggested a site inspection of private land in the pastures south of Mottram Old Hall to understand the impacts of the Proposed Development,	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			including the proposed eastern portal and carriageway. Future views are noted from a bridleway and by drivers. The Applicant is quoted as saying that there would be no views from sensitive receptors. The ExA is requesting more information on the matters raised by CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire Branch before deciding if a site inspection should be carried out. a) Please could CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire Branch clarify the bridleway locations with potential views of the proposed eastern portal and dual carriageway that it is concerned about?	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			b) Please could the Applicant comment on the matters raised by CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire? How visible would the proposed eastern portal and dual carriageway be from bridleways, other public rights of way, or other sensitive receptors and how have these been considered in the assessment? What consideration has been given to views by users of the proposed carriageway?	
	Design			
5.9.	Applicant Local authorities	Mitigation	The ExA is considering whether mitigation is firmly secured and therefore the extent	The contents of the Design Approach document cover the main matters for consideration.

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			to which it can be relied on. It is considering if it is necessary to add a Requirement to the dDCO [redacted]. The Applicant [redacted] Item 4v] said that the aesthetic appearance of the Proposed Development is extremely important in the context of its visibility. Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council [redacted] Item 4v] said that aesthetics are very important for the landscape and it is particularly important that mitigations are fully discussed with and agreed with Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council during detailed design.	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			The Applicant [redacted] Item 4y] said that: • It agreed to prepare a Design Approach Document, and provided a contents list for that [redacted] Annex 1]. • A Design Champion could be appointed to take on the responsibility of achieving sustainable design across the project in an integrated manner, to take on the lead author responsibility of a design approach document that would identify approaches for all engineering	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			and environmental design and ensure that delivery and objectives identified in the design approach document during the Detailed Design and Construction stages. • It agreed to a further Design Review by the Design Council to receive constructive comments on the Scheme design as it evolves into the Detailed Design stage prior to construction. • Close collaboration would proceed with external	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			parties, in the Detailed Design and construction phases, working closely with Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council and Derbyshire County Council, for example, to agree Scheme proposals on the single carriageway section and junctions, and also with Transport for Greater Manchester in terms of the new junction design. • The mitigation measures would be secured through the LEMP, EMP	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			and REAC, through Requirement 4 of the draft DCO Schedule of Requirements . a) Please could the local authorities comment on the contents of the Design Approach Document [redacted] Annex 1]? b) Please could the Applicant discuss the Design Approach Document with the local authorities and submit an Outline Design Approach Document to the Examination? c) Please could the Applicant clarify whether the Outline Design Approach Document will be appended to the first iteration	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			EMP [redacted]? If not, how will it be certified by the dDCO? d) Please could the Applicant suggest how the secured mitigation could be made firmer and more precise, and suggest wording for the dDCO?	
5.10.	Applicant Local authorities Peak District National Park Authority	Lighting	a) Please could the Applicant set out the consideration given to design options for street lighting, including the height and spacing, whether it can be omitted, and how light pollution and glare could be mitigated. b) Please could the local authorities and Peak District National Park	No comment.

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			Authority comment?	
	Green Belt			
5.11.	Applicant Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council	Openness NPSNN paragraphs 5.170, 5.171 and 5.178 NPPF paragraph 150(c)	Paragraphs 5.170, 5.171 and 5.178 of the NPSNN deal with proposals in the Green Belt. There is a general presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Such development should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Applicants should determine whether any development within the Green Belt may be considered inappropriate development within the meaning of Green Belt policy in the NPPF. Paragraph 150(c) of the NPPF states that local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			Green Belt location is not inappropriate development if it preserves openness. The Applicant [redacted] paragraphs 7.5.36 to 7.5.40] has set out its consideration of openness, noting the uses of cuttings, false cuttings and embankments. It said that the Proposed Development had been designed to sit at a low level in the landscape. The Applicant [redacted] Item 4h and [redacted] has provided Engineering Drawings and Sections drawings and set out the level differences from existing ground level, which included carriageways at up to 10m above existing ground level, bunds at up to 6m above	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			carriageway levels, and environmental barriers up to 2.5m high. a) Please could the Applicant clarify in greater detail, having regard to the spatial and visual components of openness, why the elevated sections of carriageway, cuttings, false cuttings, embankments, bunds, structures, and signage would not affect openness? • Which consideration has been given to receptors near those receptors? • Have any of the viewpoints have been prepared to show visual	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			links between the wider green belt and how the Proposed Development would affect visual openness? • What are the spatial and visual effects on the Green Belt? • Would there be an effect on the openness of the Green Belt? • Would there be material harm to openness? b) Please could Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council comment?	
	Remaining concerns			
5.12.	Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			questions, please could Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of landscape, visual, design, or the Green Belt?	
5.13.	Derbyshire County Council	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could Derbyshire County Council summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of landscape, visual, design, or the Green Belt?	N/A
5.14.	High Peak Borough Council	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could High Peak Borough Council summarise any	No further comments.

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of landscape, visual, design, or the Green Belt?	
5.15.	Peak District National Park Authority	Remaining concerns	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?	N/A
6.	**Other noise, vibration, and nuisance**			
	Study area, baseline conditions and overall assessment methodology			
6.1.	Local authorities	Public rights of way	The Applicant [redacted]Item 2a] provided an assessment of noise impacts on public rights of way. The	HPBC is not responsible for rights of way.

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			assessment suggests that some perceptible differences, including some exceedances of significant observed adverse effect level. The Applicant concludes that the effects are not significant due to transient nature of users and therefore the duration of the interaction with the Proposed Development. Do the local authorities have any comments on the assessment and the conclusion that there would be no significant effects?	
6.2.	Applicant	Baseline noise levels	High Peak Borough Council [redacted] Item 2c] said that the first iteration EMP [redacted] lacks detail on the noise monitoring to be undertaken in the area of 18 and 54 Wooley Bridge e.g.	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			Annex B2: Noise and Vibration Management Plan 2.6.3 notes "*Woolley Bridge*". a) Please could the Applicant respond? Can more detail be provided and agreed with High Peak Borough Council? The Applicant [redacted]Item 2b] suggested that there may be a lower baseline in the area of 18 and 50 Woolley Bridge than considered in the assessment. b) Please could the Applicant comment on the potential for a lower baseline to result in an assessment of significant adverse effects?	
	Construction phase			

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
6.3.	Local authorities	Noise sources with distinctive characteristics	The Applicant [redacted] Item 2f] said that the assessment methodology does not require any special treatment or consideration for noise sources with distinctive tonal, impulsive or low frequency characteristics, although variation in spectral characteristics of specific construction plant has been considered. Are the local authorities content that the Applicant given enough consideration to distinctive tonal, impulsive, or low frequency characteristics including, but not limited to, percussive piling?	Yes, it would appear to have undertaken the assessment in accordance with appropriate guidance. It would be anticipated that any known "noise characteristics" of the associated kit listed in Appendix 11.2 (APP-175), such as pilling, would be addressed within the (2nd EMP) noise management plan and the adoption of BPM
6.4.	Applicant	Section 61 consents	High Peak Borough Council [redacted] Item 2g] said that the s61 process	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			does not mean that there would be no additional impacts or indeed that noise impacts would not be significant, only that the applicant will control these impacts in accordance with Best Practicable Means. It said that, typically, if an activity is infrequent or unexpected then it would not anticipate that it would be included in the assessment, but that if some of the activities listed were likely to become embedded, for example, nightly routine equipment maintenance then this should be included. There is also possibly some unknown element to this, as the application of s61 is appears to be at the discretion of the Principal Contractor.	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			a) Please could the Applicant comment? Which activities would be likely to be infrequent or unexpected and which would be likely to become embedded? How certain is that? The Applicant [redacted] Items 2g and 2h] said that the Section 61 application process would "*ensure that construction works including night working would not give rise to any materially new or worse effects*". b) How is that secured? c) If it is not, how can the ExA be satisfied that the flexibility provided using the Section 61 process is consistent with the assessment	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			representing a reasonable worst-case scenario?	
6.5.	Applicant	Night works	Paragraph 11.12.1 of ES Chapter 11 [redacted] states that "*no night works are anticipated with the exception of traffic management*"? At Issue Specific Hearing 2 [redacted] the Applicant confirmed that was the basis of the assessment. Requirement 4 of the dDCO [redacted] lists activities permitted outside normal working hours, which would include night works. a) What hours are considered for night works in the assessment? b) Does it need to be ensured that only traffic management will be permitted during the hours	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			considered for night works? c) If not, how can the ExA be satisfied that the assessment represents a reasonable worst-case scenario?	
6.6.	Applicant Local authorities	Percussive piling	The Applicant [redacted]Item 2i] said the intention is that percussive piling would only be used where rotary bored piling is not feasible. ES Chapter 11 [redacted] refers to significant adverse effects for piling and suggests that percussive piling would be likely to result in more adverse impacts than rotary bored piling. The ExA would like to ensure that appropriate mitigation is secured.	Agreed.

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			a) Should restricting the use of percussive piling to when rotary bored piling is not feasible be secured as necessary mitigation? The Applicant [redacted]Item 2k] has listed other mitigation measures for percussive piling. b) Should those measures be added to the Outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan [redacted] Annex B2]?	
6.7.	Applicant Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council High Peak Borough Council	Mitigation	Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council [redacted]Item 2l] said that details of the proposed complaints process should be provided together with how this will be managed. It also	Discussions ongoing

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			said that the scope and extent of monitoring to be implemented before works commence should be detailed. High Peak Borough Council [redacted] Item 2l] said that some of the commitments, notably monitoring, lack any real clarity or commitment and should be more focussed. It said that all environmental commitments made when undertaking the environmental assessments should be secured, for example a statement that Best Practicable Means will be adopted for all activities would be expected. a) Please could the Applicant comment? b) Please could the Applicant, Tameside Metropolitan	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			Borough Council and High Peak Borough Council discuss the comments, seek to agree any further updates to the first iteration EMP [redacted], and confirm which matters have been agreed or not agreed?	
6.8.	Applicant Local authorities	Noise insulation and temporary housing	The Applicant [redacted] Q9.13] said that the process and triggers for noise insulation or temporary housing set out in in Section E.4 of BS 5228:2009 Part 1 would be followed. The Applicant [redacted] Item 2m] said that threshold noise levels would be secured in the Noise and Vibration Management Plan. Should the process, triggers and example threshold	Agreed.

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			noise levels for noise insulation and temporary housing set out in Section E.4 of BS 5228:2009 be secured?	
	Operational phase			
6.9.	Applicant Local authorities	Speed control measures	The Applicant [redacted] Item 2q] said that there are no assessment methods within DMRB to consider the specific noise and vibration impacts from speed cushions or other similar traffic calming measures. a) Are assessment methods available elsewhere? b) What is the potential for significant noise or vibration impacts from speed cushions or other similar traffic calming measures?	Response is still being considered

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
6.10.	High Peak Borough Council	Operation phase	In their Local Impact Report [redacted] Paragraphs 14.27, 14.28 and 14.29] High Peak Borough Council raised concerns about the method used to select the façade point used in the assessment, the number of properties experiencing significant adverse effects, and the location of receptors receiving perceptible increases in road traffic noise and whether those are significant. The Applicant responded at Deadline 3 [redacted] . Please could High Peak Borough Council summarise any remaining concerns that it has about these issues?	Response is still being considered
	Remaining concerns			

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
6.11.	Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of noise, vibration, common law nuisance or statutory nuisance?	N/A
6.12.	Derbyshire County Council	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could Derbyshire County Council summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of noise, vibration, common law nuisance or statutory nuisance?	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
6.13.	High Peak Borough Council	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could High Peak Borough Council summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of noise, vibration, common law nuisance or statutory nuisance?	Response is still being considered
6.14.	Peak District National Park Authority	Remaining concerns	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 noise, vibration, common law nuisance or statutory nuisance?	N/A
6.15.	Environment Agency	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			elsewhere in these second written questions, please could the Environment Agency summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of common law nuisance or statutory nuisance?	
7.	**Air quality**			
7.1.	Applicant High Peak Borough Council	Matters raised in High Peak Borough Council's Local Impact Report [redacted]	Item 8.37. The Applicant has not definitively committed to construction dust monitoring at high-risk sites and said [redacted] that it would be considered if necessary to monitor effectiveness of standard mitigation in line with DMRB LA 105 Table 2.108.1. a) Please could the Applicant explain the parameters used to identify	Meetings on AQ are ongoing with the applicant, with the next meeting scheduled for 18/3/2022. It would be appropriate to defer the responses on AQ until after this meeting

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			whether monitoring would be required? Some high-level information about monitoring is set out in Appendix B7 Nuisance Management Plan to the first iteration EMP [redacted]. b) Does High Peak Borough Council have any comments on this/ is it sufficient to address their concern about high-risk sites? Item 8.38. High Peak Borough Council asked for the A57 Brookfield qualifying features used in the NO2 compliance assessment to be labelled on ES Figure 5.4 [redacted]. c) Is the Applicant able to do this, please?	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			Item 8.39. High Peak Borough Council raised concerns about the non-application of adjustment to modelled NO_2 and PM_{10} concentrations where the modelled values are within 30% of monitored. High Peak Borough Council [redacted] suggest they are concerned about over representation of beneficial effects. d) Please could the Applicant to comment on this, and any implications for the conclusions on effect significance?	
7.2.	Applicant	Road gradient	The ExA understands that DEFRA guidance (DEFRA LAQM TAG16 paragraph 7.449) suggests identification of all roads with a gradient of more than 2.5% for the	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			modelling of gradient effects. a) Please could the Applicant clarify where the criteria that it has used for roads of more than 6% gradient is derived? b) Please could the Applicant confirm which roads within the study have a gradient of more than 2.5% and how the potential increase in emissions, especially from HDV exhaust, has been considered in the assessment? Can they confirm that there is no risk that excluding these gradient effects has resulted in an under reporting of effects.	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
7.3.	Applicant High Peak Borough Council	Air quality modelling	High Peak Borough Council [redacted] Items 7t to 7v] has raised a number of concerns, including in relation to road gradient effects, data, model verification and improvement, and modelling. It requested examples of results obtained for receptor locations in High Peak between the different data sources to demonstrate that they are all similar to predictions. Clarification was requested regarding the splitting up of the localised model validation zones, was the model set up checked / altered in each of the localised zones or is the only difference between the initial model run and the model zones being the splitting up of the model based on	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			location and application of 6% emission factor gradient. The Applicant [redacted] paragraph 3.1.1] said that a meeting between the Applicant and High Peak Borough Council to discuss the matters raised by High Peak Borough Council is scheduled to take place in early March. The ExA notes the number of issues that appear to be unresolved and that the issues are potentially key to the air quality assessment. There is that there is little time remaining in the Examination for these matters to be addressed. c) Please could the Applicant and High Peak Borough Council discuss the	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			issues further and seek to reach agreement? d) Please could the parties set out their respective positions by Deadline 6, and no later than Deadline 7, in advance of the Hearings scheduled for April 2022?	
7.4.	Applicant	Vehicles diverting to Shaw Lane and Dinting Road from A57 Glossop High Street	High Peak Borough Council [redacted] Item 8.41] has questioned the rationale for showing vehicles diverting to Shaw Lane and Dinting Road from A57 Glossop High Street and whether this undermines the assessment of receptors on the A57. Peter Simon [redacted] suggested this would potentially affect flows through the Glossop Air Quality Management	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			Area, which was screened out. Please could the Applicant respond and set out the implications for flows through the Glossop Air Quality Management Area if the diversion isn't taken? Are there any implications for the assessment of effects?	
7.5.	Applicant Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council High Peak Borough Council Peak District National Park Authority	Screening	The Applicant [redacted] 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	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			thresholds to be used. a) Please could the Applicant provide the IAQM screening criteria, compare it with the DMRB LA 105 and provide reasoning why it considers that IAQM screening criteria are not appropriate? Is the Applicant suggesting that if the modelled increases in traffic levels are the same then the type of project that led to the increase in traffic would make a difference to the receptors? b) Would a variation of the screening threshold be appropriate for links within the Air Quality	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			Management Areas? c) Please could Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council, High Peak Borough Council and Peak District National Park Authority comment? The ExA [redacted] Item 7ee] asked the Applicant to comment on how the screening is consistent with the potential for a very small increase in Nitrogen Dioxide (NO_2) to result in non-compliance with the Air Quality Directive / Air Quality Standards Regulations 2010? The Applicant responded [redacted] Item 7ee]. The Applicant is predicting increases in traffic, which the ExA understands is likely to result in	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			increases in NO_2 emissions. The ExA is concerned whether enough consideration has been given for those increases to result in a non-compliance, even if the increases in traffic are below 1,000 AADT. It is also concerned about the consideration given to receptors within Air Quality Management Areas designated for NO_2 that are just outside the study area. d) Please could the Applicant comment? e) Please could Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council, High Peak Borough Council and Peak District National Park Authority comment?	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
7.6.	Applicant	Construction traffic	High Peak Borough Council [redacted] Items 8.35 and 8.36] request information on the level of construction traffic and duration for the eastern end of the link road where it connects at Woolley Bridge due to air quality receptors being within 200m. They further request clarification on whether construction traffic and management are likely to result in an adverse effect on congestion in High Peak. Please could the Applicant respond?	N/A
7.7.	High Peak Borough Council	Air Quality Management Areas NPSNN paragraph 5.11	The Applicant [redacted] Q7.15 to 7.18 and [redacted] Items 7dd to 7jj] responded to questions regarding its assessment of effects on Air Quality Management Areas.	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			a) Please could High Peak Borough Council comment? b) Does High Peak Borough Council have any remaining concerns about the consideration given to air quality • Within or adjacent to Air Quality Management Areas? • Where changes are sufficient to bring about the need for a new Air Quality Management Area or change the size of an existing Air Quality Management Area; or bring about changes to exceedances	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			of the Limit Values?	
7.8.	High Peak Borough Council	Air Quality Directive / Air Quality Standards Regulations 2010 NPSNN paragraph 5.13	The Applicant [redacted] Items 7ee and 7hh] said that there would not be a non-compliance with the Air Quality Directive in the vicinity of Tintwistle or Dinting Vale / Glossop. a) Please could High Peak Borough Council comment? b) Does High Peak Borough Council have any remaining concerns about: • Whether the Proposed Development would result in any area which is currently reported as being compliant with the Air Quality Directive becoming	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			non-compliant? • Whether the Proposed Development would affect the ability of any non-compliant area to achieve compliance within the most recent reported timescales?	
	Remaining concerns			
7.9.	Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of air quality?	N/A
7.10.	High Peak Borough Council	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			second written questions, please could High Peak Borough Council summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of air quality?	
7.11.	Peak District National Park Authority	Remaining concerns	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?	N/A
8.	**Climate change**			
	Overall assessment methodology			
8.1.	Applicant	Indirect effects	Please could the Applicant comment on the relevance of the following recent judgement to the consideration of indirect effects from	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			the Proposed Development: • R (on the application of Sarah Finch on behalf of Weald Action Group) v Surrey County Council, Horse Hill Developments Ltd, SoS LUHC v Friends of the Earth Ltd [2022] EWCA 187?	
8.2.	Local authorities	Cumulative effects	In Issue Specific Hearing 2 [redacted] Item 6c] the ExA requested that the Applicant provide its assessment of the cumulative effects of Greenhouse Gas emissions from the Proposed Development with other existing and / or approved projects on a local, regional and national level on a consistent	The assessment does not appear to provide any specific reference to local policies or carbon budgets.

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			geographical scale (for example an assessment of the cumulative effects of the Road Investment Strategy (RIS) 1 and RIS 2 at a national level). The Applicant [redacted] responded at Deadline 5. Please could the local authorities comment on the Applicant's response? Has appropriate consideration been given to local policies and local or regional carbon budgets?	
8.3.	Applicant	Significant effects - threshold	The Applicant [redacted] Item 6e] said that NPSNN does not set out the criteria for what should be considered significant, but instead it sets out the criteria for when carbon emissions should be a reason for refusal. It also	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			said that "*Section 3 of DMRB LA 114, paragraphs 3.18 to 3.20 define the reporting requirements for comparison against the relevant carbon budgets and the evaluation criteria for significance, which is consistent with the decision-making requirements set out in paragraphs 5.17 and 5.18 of the NPSNN.*" a) Given that the Applicant considers that the NPSNN does not set out the criteria for what should be considered significant, please could it explain why it considers that the DMRB LA 114 evaluation criteria for significance is consistent with the NPSNN?	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			b) Please could the Applicant comment on whether it is appropriate for the threshold for refusal established in national policy to be adopted for the assessment of significant effects? Is there any other precedent in national policy for the criteria for refusal and significance to be the same? Is it reasonable to expect the threshold for the assessment of significant effects to be lower than that used for refusal? The IEMA[1] has published updated guidance on the assessment of greenhouse gas	

[1] IEMA, Assessing Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Evaluating their Significance, 2nd edition (February 2022)

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			emissions, which includes some further guidance about how to establish significance. c) Please could the Applicant comment on how significance is defined in that context?	
8.4.	Derbyshire County Council Applicant	Significant effects - benchmarking	Derbyshire County Council [redacted] Item 6f] suggested that benchmarking should be undertaken in accordance with DMRB LA 114 to help establish level of significance. The Applicant [redacted] Item 6f] referred to the benchmarking of the operational stage provided in paragraph 14.3.14 of ES Chapter 14 Climate [redacted]. a) Does Derbyshire County Council have any comments on the Applicant's	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			response? Is it satisfied that paragraph 3.21 of DMRB LA 114 has been followed? b) Please could the Applicant set out whether it has carried out any benchmarking of carbon emissions for the construction phase, including from materials. If it has, how was the data normalised? Did the projects benchmarked against include any use of carbon reduction methods, such as the use of any low carbon construction methods or materials?	
8.5.	Local authorities Interested Parties	Significant effects - de minimis	The Applicant [redacted] Q8.1d and [redacted] Item 6g] refers to the case of R (Transport Action Network	No comment.

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			Limited) v Secretary of State for Transport and Highways England Company Limited (2021) EWHC 2095 (Admin). The Applicant suggests that the carbon emissions from the Proposed Development should not be considered significant if the assessment is to be consistent with that judgement. Please could the local authorities and Interested Parties comment?	
	Construction materials, transport, and construction processes			
8.6.	Local authorities Applicant	Mitigation measures	The ExA is considering whether mitigation is firmly secured and therefore the extent to which it can be relied on. It is considering if it is necessary to add a Requirement to the dDCO [redacted].	No comment.

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			The Applicant has updated the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments [redacted] C1.8] and provided an Outline Carbon Management Plan [redacted] which sets out the proposed use of Carbon Management in Infrastructure, published by BSI (PAS 2080). Derbyshire County Council [redacted] Items 6l and 6m] said that PAS 2080 should be included as a mitigation measure and independent verification of its use assured. It noted that PAS 2080 helps to guide mitigation measures but does not specifically identify them and so a detailed assessment of the	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			impacts and measures to mitigate them is still needed, with PAS 2080 used as the overarching framework. It suggested that an outline strategy for the use of PAS 2080 should be developed and agreed during the Examination, in order to ensure the appropriate approach, language and framework is being applied. a) Please could the local authorities comment on the updated Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments [redacted]C1.8] and on the Outline Carbon Management Plan [redacted]? b) Please could the Applicant respond to Derbyshire	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			County Council's comments? c) Please could the Applicant clarify whether the Outline Carbon Management Plan will be appended to the first iteration EMP [redacted]? If not, how will it be certified for the dDCO? d) Should firm mitigation measures, such as the use of specific low carbon construction methods or materials, be identified? Should targets for reduction be set against the emissions which assume the use of conventional construction methods and materials in the ES Chapter 14 Climate [redacted]	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			[redacted]? Should measures be added to require independent review of the use of the process and the mitigation that is identified? Should there be independent verification that the mitigation is delivered? What role should the local authorities have?	
8.7.	Applicant	Use of PAS 2080: 2016	The Applicant [redacted] Item 6m] said that it did not propose to mandate PAS 2080 across all parties. The ExA's understanding is that wide participation is required for PAS 2080 to be effective. Please could the Applicant clarify which parties should be required to use PAS 2080? How	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			should that be secured?	
	Operational phase			
8.8.	Applicant Derbyshire County Council	Mitigation measures	Derbyshire County Council [redacted] Q8.14 and [redacted] Item 6o] has suggested carbon-reduction measures for the operational phase. The Applicant [redacted] page 16] responded to the initial suggestions. Please could the Applicant and Derbyshire County Council discuss the measures, seek to agree the mitigation, and confirm which matters have been agreed or not agreed?	N/A
	Remaining concerns			
8.9.	Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could Tameside	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			Metropolitan Borough Council summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of climate change?	
8.10.	Derbyshire County Council	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could Derbyshire County Council summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of climate change?	N/A
8.11.	High Peak Borough Council	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could High Peak Borough Council summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of climate change?	No further comments.

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
8.12.	Peak District National Park Authority	Remaining concerns	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?	N/A
9.	**The historic environment**			
	Policy and methodology			
9.1.	Applicant Local authorities	Non-designated heritage assets for which the Applicant is unable to identify the significance of effect	The Applicant [redacted]Q6.3] said that it was confident that the assets would be characterised at a future stage and that the residual effects would be unlikely to exceed slight adverse and would therefore not be significant. a) Is the Applicant able to secure a firm undertaking that the assets	The five non-designated assets in question appear to be located within Tameside. No further comment.

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			would be characterised at a future stage? b) Do the local authorities have any comments on the Applicant's approach or on the Applicant's advice that the significant effects would be unlikely to be significant?	
9.2.	Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council High Peak Borough Council Applicant	Limited harm and the NPPF tests	Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council [redacted] Q6.4] and High Peak Borough Council [redacted] Q6.4] raised concerns about the Applicant's use of the term "*limited harm*" and the whether the NPPF tests have been addressed correctly. The Applicant [redacted] Q6.3 and [redacted] pages 15, 28 and 59] said that "*limited harm*"	It is agreed that "limited harm" is likely to be at the lower end of less than substantial harm. Actual harm needs to be considered individually for assets. The ExA's request that the applicant updates the ES to clarify this and to address the tests in the NPPF is welcomed.

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			[redacted] Table 6-3] is considered to fall at the lower end of the spectrum of less than substantial harm. a) Do Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council or High Peak Borough Council have any remaining concerns about the definition of "*limited harm*" or whether the NPPF tests have been addressed correctly? b) Please could the Applicant update the ES to include the explanation and clarify how the NPPF tests have been addressed?	
9.3.	Local authorities Peak District National Park Authority	Magnitude of adverse effects equivalence to level of harm and the NPPF tests	The Applicant [redacted] Q6.5] said that "*major adverse magnitude of impact*" [redacted] Table 6-3] equates to	It is noted that the applicant's response to Q6.5 states: *Whether harm is substantial or less than substantial is considered on an individual asset basis and is not a blanket measure reflected in the significance effect*.

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
	Applicant		substantial harm, while lesser magnitudes of impact equate to less than substantial harm. 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) Please could the Applicant update the ES to include the explanation and clarify how the NPPF tests have been addressed?	This appears to contradict the approach set out in Table 6 -3 which equates substantial harm to "major adverse" impacts and less than substantial harm to "moderate adverse".
	Designated heritage assets			
9.4.	Local authorities	Melandra Castle Roman Fort	The Applicant [redacted] pages 26 and 27] responded to concerns raised by Derbyshire	Please refer to further comments from Derbyshire County Council.

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			County Council [redacted] Paragraphs 9.19 to 9.22] about the consideration given to the setting of Melandra Castle Roman Fort, how much harm would be done to it, and the mitigation of long term impacts. a) Does Derbyshire County Council have any remaining concerns about the assessment, the level of harm, or about the secured mitigation measures? b) Have the local authorities identified other mitigation measures that they consider should be provided and, if so, what is the justification them to be secured?	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
9.5.	Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council	Mottram Old Hall Contribution of parklands to significance of asset	The Applicant [redacted] page 60] responded to Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council's request [redacted] Q6.7] for clarification of the extent of "former grounds" and "parkland" considered in the assessment. Does Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council have any remaining concerns about the assessment or about the Applicant's conclusion that there would be less than substantial harm on Mottram Old Hall?	N/A
9.6.	Peak District National Park Authority	Tintwistle Conservation Area Ladybower Reservoir The scheduled monuments Hordron Edge,	The Applicant [redacted] Q6.8] has set out its consideration of impacts on Tintwistle Conservation area and the listed	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
		Bamford Edge, Crook Hill, and Bridgend Pasture	buildings and scheduled monuments identified by Peak District National Park Authority in their Local Impact Report [redacted] paragraphs 8.4.5 and 8.4.7]. Does Peak District National Park Authority have any remaining concerns about the Applicant's conclusions?	
9.7.	Applicant	Opportunities to deliver enhancement of the historic environment NPSNN Paragraph 5.137	Paragraph 5.137 of the NPSNN notes that Applicants should look for opportunities within Conservation Areas and within the settings of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance. Peak District National Park Authority [redacted] Paragraph 8.4.10 and [redacted] Q6.8] have commented on the lack of	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			enhancement. The Applicant [redacted] page 51] said that it was pursuing opportunities to deliver enhancement through the National Highways Designated Funds programme. Please could the Applicant provide evidence that enhancement opportunities are being considered for the Conservation Areas and heritage assets identified in ES Chapter 6 [redacted] ?	
	Remaining concerns			
9.8.	Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			consideration of the historic environment?	
9.9.	Derbyshire County Council	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could Derbyshire County Council summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of the historic environment?	N/A
9.10.	High Peak Borough Council	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could High Peak Borough Council summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of the historic environment?	No further comments.
9.11.	Peak District National	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
	Park Authority		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?	
10.	**Soils, ground conditions, material assets and waste**			
	Earthworks			
10.1.	Applicant	Supplementary ground investigation	The Applicant has indicated that further ground investigation would be carried out in February 2021. Please can the Applicant provide an update on the future availability of the results of the 2021 supplementary ground investigation, and any consequent updates to the ES?	N/A
	Remaining concerns			

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
10.2.	Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of soils, ground conditions, material assets or waste?	N/A
10.3.	Derbyshire County Council	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could Derbyshire County Council summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of soils, ground conditions, material assets or waste?	N/A
10.4.	High Peak Borough Council	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written	No further comments.

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			questions, please could High Peak Borough Council summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of soils, ground conditions, material assets or waste?	
10.5.	Peak District National Park Authority	Remaining Concerns	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?	N/A
10.6.	Environment Agency	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could the Environment Agency summarise any remaining concerns	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			that it has about the Applicant's consideration of soils, ground conditions, material assets or waste?	
11.	**The water environment, drainage, flood risk assessment, Water Frameworks Directive**			
	Baseline information			
11.1.	Applicant	National Highways Deadline 5 Submission - Flood Risk Assessment (Tracked) [redacted]	The Applicant has submitted a Flood Risk Assessment document at Deadline 5 [redacted] which is identified as a "tracked" document. No alterations appear to be identified in the document and it appears identical to the Flood Risk Assessment submitted at Deadline 5 [redacted]. Has the document marked as being a "tracked" document	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			been submitted in error?	
11.2.	Applicant	Environment Agency's representation at Deadline 4 [redacted] National Highways Response to Representations made at Deadline 4 [redacted] River Etherow modelling	It is noted that the modelling of the River Etherow has not yet been agreed with the Environment Agency. The Applicant has responded to the concerns of the Environment Agency [redacted] stating the intention to address this matter at Detailed Design Stage. a) How can the ExA be satisfied that a reasonable worst case scenario has been assessed and that appropriate mitigation is secured without this information? b) Has a timeframe been identified to resolve any outstanding matters of disagreement	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			prior to detailed design?	
11.3.	Environment Agency Lead Local Flood Authorities	Environment Agency's representation at Deadline 4 [redacted] National Highways Response to Representations made at Deadline 4 [redacted] River Etherow modelling	As above, it is noted that the modelling of the River Etherow has not yet been agreed with the Environment Agency. The Applicant has responded to the concerns of the Environment Agency [redacted] stating the intention to address this matter at Detailed Design Stage. a) Do the Environment Agency or the Lead Local Flood Authorities have any comments on the Applicant's response? b) What issues remain outstanding? c) Is this approach acceptable to the Environment Agency and the	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			Lead Local Flood Authorities?	
11.4.	Applicant Environment Agency	Risk to abstraction boreholes, etc. Environment Agency's representation at Deadline 4 [redacted] National Highways Deadline 5 Submission - Environmental Statement - Chapter 13: Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Tracked) [redacted] National Highways Deadline 5 Submission - Applicants comments on Deadline 4 submissions [redacted]	The Environment Agency has identified concerns that dewatering of the below ground structures within the scheme may artificially dewater natural aquifer bodies. These groundwater bodies are known to provide sole supplies of water (from an abstraction borehole) to several private dwellings. Dewatering of the aquifer would therefore deprive the owners and abstractors of these boreholes of water. a) What survey information has been gathered of water features to date which would inform discussions with the Environment Agency?	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			b) What additional information is required? c) How could this information be gathered, and within what timeframe? d) How can the ExA be satisfied that a reasonable worst case scenario has been assessed and that appropriate mitigation is secured without this information?	
	Flood risk and drainage			
11.5.	Applicant	Environment Agency's Representation at Deadline 4 [redacted] National Highways Response to Representations made at Deadline 4 [redacted]	There are concerns that the Flood Risk assessment has not been updated to reflect the latest fluvial climate change allowances that were introduced in 2021. The Applicant has responded to the concerns of the Environment Agency [redacted] stating	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			the intention to address this matter at Detailed Design Stage. a) How can the ExA be satisfied that a reasonable worst case scenario has been assessed and that appropriate mitigation is secured without this information? b) Has a timeframe been identified to resolve any outstanding matters of disagreement prior to detailed design?	
11.6.	Environment Agency Lead Local Flood Authorities	Environment Agency's Representation at Deadline 4 [redacted] National Highways Response to Representations made at Deadline 4 [redacted]	As above, there are concerns that the Flood Risk assessment has not been updated to reflect the latest fluvial climate change allowances that were introduced in 2021. The Applicant has responded to the	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			concerns of the Environment Agency [redacted] stating the intention to address this matter at Detailed Design Stage. a) Does the Environment Agency or the Lead Local Flood Authorities have any comments on the Applicant's response? b) What issues remain outstanding? c) Is this approach acceptable to the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authorities?	
11.7.	Environment Agency Lead Local Flood Authorities	Environment Agency's Representation at Deadline 4 [redacted]	The Environment Agency is concerned that it has not yet seen a proposed surface water drainage strategy. The Applicant has provided a Drainage Design Strategy Report [redacted].	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			a) Is this sufficient for the Environment Agency to comment on? b) If not, what further information is needed? c) Are the Lead Local Flood Authorities satisfied with the information supplied? d) If not do they have any comments?	
11.8.	Applicant	Access on Carrhouse Lane [redacted]	Concerns have been raised regarding surface water drainage in the vicinity of the Carrhouse Lane underpass. a) What investigation has been carried out in the suitability of existing drainage infrastructure to cope following development?	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			b) Is the existing infrastructure, combined with the proposed infrastructure satisfactory?	
11.9.	Applicant Local authorities Local highway authorities	First Written Questions [redacted] Q11.13]	Please provide an update regarding discussions seeking to secure future maintenance of the relevant works.	Not applicable.
	Water habitat			
11.10.	Applicant Environment Agency	Contaminated runoff Environment Agency Deadline 2 Submission - Response to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions (WQ1) [redacted] Q11.16] National Highways Deadline 2 Submission - Applicant's response to Examining	In their response to First Written Questions Q11.16 [redacted] The Environment Agency identified a need to address the matter of water contaminated by road salting and gritting within the Environmental Statement - Chapter 13: Road Drainage and the Water Environment. Particulate matter from brake and tyre wear may also be generated.	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
		Authority's First Written Questions [redacted] National Highways Deadline 5 Submission - Environmental Statement - Chapter 13: Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Tracked) [redacted] Drainage Design Strategy Report [redacted]	The applicant responded to the same question in its responses to First Written Questions [redacted] and amended Environmental Statement - Chapter 13: Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Tracked) [redacted] . a) Does the Applicant's response and amendment of Environmental Statement - Chapter 13: Road Drainage and the Water Environment satisfactorily address the Environment Agency's concerns in regard to road salt and gritting? b) If not, what concerns remain and how might these be addressed?	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			c) Does the Environment Agency or the Applicant have any comments in regard to particulates in runoff? d) Should the Environmental Statement - Chapter 13: Road Drainage and the Water Environment be amended to address particulate contamination in runoff? e) Are amendments also needed to the Drainage Design Strategy Report [redacted] to address these issues?	
	Remaining concerns			
11.11.	Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could Tameside	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			Metropolitan Borough Council summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of the water environment, drainage, flood risk assessment, or the Water Frameworks Directive?	
11.12.	Derbyshire County Council	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could Derbyshire County Council summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of the water environment, drainage, flood risk assessment, or the Water Frameworks Directive?	N/A
11.13.	High Peak Borough Council	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could High Peak	No further comments.

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			Borough Council summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of the water environment, drainage, flood risk assessment, or the Water Frameworks Directive?	
11.14.	Environment Agency	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could the Environment Agency summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of the water environment, drainage, flood risk assessment, or the Water Frameworks Directive?	N/A
12.	**Biodiversity, ecological and geological conservation, Habitat Regulation Assessment**			
	Biodiversity			

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
12.1.	Applicant Environment Agency	Invasive non-native species National Highways Deadline 2 Submission - Draft Statement of Common Ground with Environment Agency [redacted] National Highways Deadline 5 Submission - Outline Landscape and Ecological Management and Monitoring Plan [redacted]	The Draft Statement of Common Ground with Environment Agency [redacted] refers, at 10.1.3.3, to the presence of a number of invasive / non-native species within red line area and potential opportunity to improve ecological quality of some priority habitats currently identified as having these non-native species. The Applicant has submitted an Outline Landscape and Ecological Management and Monitoring Plan [redacted]. a) Should the Applicant's documents refer to the use of best practice measures, as referred to by the Environment Agency? b) Would the Environment Agency provide	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			comments on the suitability of the measures to control invasive non-native species contained within the above document?	
12.2.	Environment Agency Natural England	Approach to mammal crossings, otter fencing and other measures within water environment assessment. First Written Questions [PD-009 Q12.10] National Highways Deadline 2 Submission - Applicant's response to Examining Authority's First Written Questions [redacted]	The applicant responded to Q12.10 in its responses to First Written Questions [redacted] that other mitigation measures located in the vicinity of watercourses (e.g. mammal crossings, otter fencing) have not been explicitly assessed at the current stage of design, but will be considered further during the detailed design phase. a) Do the Environment Agency or Natural England have any comments on	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			the Applicant's response? b) Is this approach acceptable to the Environment Agency and the Natural England?	
12.3.	Applicant	Peat degradation within the National Park.	Air quality and particulate contamination in runoff has potential to affect the peat deposits within the National Park. a) What consideration has been made of the impact of such contamination specifically on the peat deposits and future health of the moss which contributes to the deposits and ensures their future? b) Is mitigation required? c) If so, what mitigation could be provided?	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			d) How would this be secured? e) If not, please provide comments to justify this conclusion.	
12.4.	Applicant	Disturbance to qualifying features of the Dark Peak SSSI Peak District National Park Authority representation at Deadline 4 [redacted].	Would the Applicant please respond to the specific concerns raised in Peak District National Park's response at Deadline 4 [redacted] in regard to displacement of birds from noise disturbance and potential reduction in populations of 30-100% of populations in a 1km zone from road, and disturbance effects increasing with traffic volume.	N/A
12.5.	Applicant	Effect on the mountain hare population. Peak District National Park Authority Deadline 4	In their response at Deadline 4 [redacted] Peak District National Park Authority have raised concerns regarding the	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
		Submission - Post-hearing submissions requested by the Examining Authority [redacted] CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire Branch Deadline 5 Submission - Response to National Highways comments on CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire Branch's Written Representation [redacted] .	potential for visual disturbance to mountain hare and the basis for excluding significant effects on the species. CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire Branch have provided comments about current mountain hare numbers and an estimate of the proportion lost to roadkill from a report prepared in Spring 2004 [redacted] . f) Please comment on potential for visual disturbance to result in significant effects to mountain hare. g) Please respond to PDNPA specific concerns about evidence used as the basis for excluding significant effects to	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			mountain hare, as raised in [redacted]. h) Please comment on the evidence submitted by CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire Branch about current mountain hare numbers and the proportion estimated to be lost as roadkill.	
12.6.	Natural England	Peak District National Park Authority representation at Deadline 4 [redacted]. Environmental Statement - Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [redacted]. National Highways Deadline 4 Submission - 9.51 Written summary of Applicant's case	In their response at Deadline 4 [redacted] Peak District National Park Authority have raised concerns regarding the potential for visual disturbance to mountain hare and the basis for excluding significant effects on the species. CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire Branch have provided comments about current mountain hare numbers and	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
		at Issue Specific Hearing 2 [redacted]	an estimate of the proportion lost to roadkill from a report prepared in Spring 2004 [redacted] . a) Does Natural England have any comment to make on the issues raised in the previous question? b) Please confirm whether, or not, you are satisfied with the Applicant's explanation for discounting visual disturbance as an impact pathway (see [redacted]) to mountain hare. c) Please comment on the evidence submitted by CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire Branch about current mountain hare numbers and the	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			proportion estimated to be lost as roadkill.	
12.7.	Peak District National Park Authority	Effect on the mountain hare population. Natural England Deadline 4 Submission - Post-hearing submissions requested by the Examining Authority in lieu of attendance [redacted]. National Highways Deadline 4 Submission - Written summary of Applicant's case at Issue Specific Hearing 2 [redacted]	In their response [redacted] 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 [redacted]. Please provide any further comment that you wish to make regarding the conclusions of Natural England or the information supplied by the Applicant.	N/A
12.8.	CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire Branch	Effect on the mountain hare population. CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire Branch Deadline	In your submission at Deadline 5 [redacted], reference is made to the current number of mountain hare numbers located in	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
		5 Submission - Response to National Highways comments on CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire Branch's Written Representation [redacted] .	the Peak District being in the low thousands and a report from Spring 2004 indicating that traffic on the A57 probably claims 20% of adult hares living adjacent to the road. Please can you explain the basis for the information presented about current numbers and whether there is any more recent data or evidence in respect of the proportion of mountain hares killed by traffic on the A57 and / or data or evidence relating to other relevant roads.	
	Habitat Regulation Assessment			
12.9.	Peak District National Park Authority	Scope of concern National Highways Deadline 2 Submission - Habitats	The Applicant has set out in [redacted] the justification for why there would be no likely significant	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
		Regulations Assessment Screening Report - Appendix B PINS Screening Matrices	effects during construction. a) Please confirm whether, or not, your Authority's concerns only relate to operational effects of the proposal. b) If your Authority's concerns extend to the construction phase, please provide reasoning for this conclusion.	
12.10.	National Trust	Potential for increased recreational pressure on qualifying features of the Special Protection Area (SPA). National Highways Deadline 2 Submission - Habitats Regulations Assessment	The Applicant provided an explanation as to why the proposal is unlikely to result in an increase in recreational pressure (see Table 5.1 of [redacted] from improving road access to the National Park and encouraging more people to visit by car. Natural England [redacted] has not	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
		Screening Report [redacted] Natural England Deadline 2 Submission - Response to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions (WQ1) [redacted] National Trust Deadline 2 Submission - Written Representation [redacted]	raised any issues with the approach. Please confirm whether, or not, you are satisfied with Applicant's response at [redacted].	
12.11.	Applicant	Disturbance to qualifying features of the SPA. Peak District National Park Authority representation at Deadline 4 [redacted]. National Highways Deadline 2 Submission - Habitats Regulations	The Peak District National Park Authority [redacted] state that an appropriate assessment should have been undertaken in respect of the bird qualifying features of the SPA from noise and visual disturbance. Please could the Applicant respond to the following matters raised by the Peak District National	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
		Assessment Screening Report - Appendix B PINS Screening Matrices [ ]. National Highways Deadline 3 Submission - Environmental Statement - Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration .	Park Authority in : a) The habitats used by the bird features of the SPA are described broadly in the text of , but please could the Applicant submit any further evidence in this regard, for example plans to illustrate where the habitats are located relative to the road and the distances. b) Please explain what habitats are used for foraging by the Qualifying Features, if different to those habitats used for breeding. c) ES Chapter 11 does not appear to quantify baseline	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			and predicted noise levels during operation at relevant locations on the A57 and A628 for use in the HRA. Please explain how these have been established in order to reach the conclusion that there will be minor noise increase associated with the A57 and negligible increase associated with the A628. d) Please confirm whether, or not, consideration has been given to both the A57 and A628 with regard to the noise and visual impact pathways . e) Please respond to points raised about displacement of	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			birds from noise disturbance, with potential reduction of 30-100% in populations in a 1km zone from road, and disturbance effects increasing with traffic volume.	
12.12.	Natural England	Peak District National Park Authority representation at Deadline 4 [redacted]. National Highways Deadline 2 Submission - Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report - Appendix B PINS Screening Matrices [redacted]. National Highways	The Peak District National Park Authority [REP4-012] state that an appropriate assessment should have been undertaken in respect of the bird qualifying features of the SPA from noise and visual disturbance. d) Does Natural England have any comment to make on the issues raised in the previous question? e) Please confirm whether, or not, you are satisfied	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
		Deadline 3 Submission - Environmental Statement - Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [redacted]. National Highways Deadline 4 Submission - 9.51 Written summary of Applicant's case at Issue Specific Hearing 2 [redacted]	with the Applicant's explanation for discounting visual disturbance as an impact pathway (see [redacted]) to SPA birds	
12.13.	Peak District National Park Authority	Wildfire risk National Highways Deadline 3 Submission - Comments on Local Impact Report submitted by Peak District National Park Authority [redacted]	Please confirm whether, or not, your Authority is satisfied with the Applicant's explanation regarding wildfire risk in their response at [redacted].	N/A
12.14.	Peak District National	Remaining concerns National Highways	In their response at [redacted] the Applicant confirms the A628 does not	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
	Park Authority	Deadline 3 Submission - Applicants comments on Written Representations . Natural England Deadline 4 Submission - Post-hearing submissions requested by the Examining Authority in lieu of attendance [redacted] . National Highways Deadline 4 Submission - Written summary of Applicant's case at Issue Specific Hearing 2 [redacted] .	meet the DMRB LA 105 traffic scoping criteria for traffic increases. In their response [redacted] 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 [redacted] . 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.	
	Remaining concerns			
12.15.	Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could Tameside Metropolitan	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			Borough Council summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of biodiversity, ecological and geological conservation, or the Habitat Regulation Assessment?	
12.16.	Derbyshire County Council	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could Derbyshire County Council summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of biodiversity, ecological and geological conservation, or the Habitat Regulation Assessment?	N/A
12.17.	High Peak Borough Council	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please	No further comments.

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			could High Peak Borough Council summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of biodiversity, ecological and geological conservation, or the Habitat Regulation Assessment?	
12.18.	Peak District National Park Authority	Remaining concerns	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?	N/A
12.19.	Natural England	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			questions, please could Natural England summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of biodiversity, ecological and geological conservation, or the Habitat Regulation Assessment?	
12.20.	Environment Agency	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could the Environment Agency England summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of biodiversity, ecological and geological conservation, or the Habitat Regulation Assessment?	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
13.	**Land use, social and economic, human health**			
	Local social and economic impacts			
13.1.	Christopher Hill	Effect on business at 15 Old Hall Lane.	Your Additional Submission [redacted] refers to effects on a local business resulting from acquisition of the property from which the business is run. a) Please provide details of how the business is likely to be affected, including, but not restricted to: - • The turnover of the business. • The number of people that the business employs. • Whether, or not, it is possible to relocate the business.	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			• The likely effects of relocation should this prove to be possible.	
13.2.	NTELC (National Thermal Engineering Limited) Steeple Building and Preservation Owen Mark Pugh	Effects on businesses at Roe Cross Lane Industrial Estates Units H, J, K and L.	a) Please provide details of how the business is likely to be affected, including, but not restricted to: - • The turnover of the business. • The number of people that the business employs. • Whether, or not, it is possible to relocate the business. • The likely effects of relocation should this prove to be possible.	N/A
	Remaining concerns			

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
13.3.	Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of land use, social and economic, or human health?	N/A
13.4.	Derbyshire County Council	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could Derbyshire County Council summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of land use, social and economic, or human health?	N/A
13.5.	High Peak Borough Council	Remaining concerns	Apart the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions,	See comments above at Q3.26 regarding severance and associated implications for the local economy and safety.

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			please could High Peak Borough Council summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of land use, social and economic, or human health?	
13.6.	Peak District National Park Authority	Remaining concerns	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 land use, social and economic, or human health?	N/A
14.	**Other environmental topics**			
14.1.	Derbyshire County Council	Maintenance of A57 Snake Pass and A628 Woodhead Pass	There are concerns that the increase in traffic on these roads identified in the "Do-Something"	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			scenario will increase the amount of time that these roads are closed for maintenance works. a) Is there evidence to demonstrate that the structural failures of the road are resultant from the total number of axle loads, or are they primarily associated with geology / climatic issues associated with the route?	
	Remaining concerns			
14.2.	Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			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?	
14.3.	Derbyshire County Council	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could Derbyshire County Council 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	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			other important and relevant considerations?	
14.4.	High Peak Borough Council	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could High Peak Borough Council 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?	No further comments.
14.5.	Peak District National Park Authority	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could the Peak District National	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			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?	
14.6.	Environment Agency	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could the Environment Agency summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of transboundary effects, cumulative and combined effects, or other important and	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			relevant considerations?	
14.7.	Natural England	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could Natural England summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of transboundary effects, cumulative and combined effects, or other important and relevant considerations?	N/A
14.8.	Statutory Undertakers	Remaining concerns	Apart from the issues covered elsewhere in these second written questions, please could the Statutory Undertakers summarise any remaining concerns that it has about the Applicant's consideration of the utility infrastructure?	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
15.	**Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession, Statutory Undertakers, and funding**			
15.1.	Applicant John Joseph Bower Warner Eric Bower	Carr House Farm / plots 4/13a, 4/13b, 4/13c, 4/13d, 4/13e, 4/13f, 4/13g, 4/13h, 4/13i, 4/13j, 4/13k, 4/16, 4/17, 4/19, 4/20, 4/21, 5/1a, 5/1b, 5/1c, 5/1d, 5/1e, 5/1f, 5/1g, 5/1h, 5/1i, 5/1j, 5/1k, 5/2, 5/3, 5/4, 5/5, 5/7a, 5/7b, 5/7c, 5/7d, 5/7e, 5/7f, 5/7g, 5/7h, 5/8, 5/9a, 5/9b, 5/9c, 5/9d, 5/9e, 5/9f, 5/9g, 6/1a, 6/1b, 6/1c, 6/1d, 6/1e, 6/1f, 8/8a, 8/8b, 8/8c, 8/8d, 9/3, 9/7a, 9/7b, 9/7c,	Warner Bower [redacted] set out concerns regarding the Proposed Development and the compulsory acquisition and temporary possession powers sought by the Applicant. The submission noted that it was a jointly with John Bower. a) For completeness, please could John Bower confirm that he is content for Warner Brower to represent him to the Examination? The Applicant responded [redacted] Section 9]. b) Please could Warner Bower comment on the	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
		9/7d, 9/7e, 9/16	Applicant's responses and provide an update on any subsequent discussions with the Applicant? c) Please could the Applicant provide an update on the discussions and advise on the outstanding matters, the next steps to be taken and the progress anticipated by the close of the Examination? Does it anticipate that any side agreements will be required?	
15.2.	Applicant Hayley Simpson Valerie Bromley	Craig Dean, 21a Old Road / plot 3/6	Hayley Simpson [redacted] has set out concerns regarding the compulsory acquisition powers sought by the Applicant, the effects on the family and the nature and	N/A

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			frequency of the Applicant's communications with them. The submission is also on behalf of Valerie Bromley and Michaela Bromley. a) For completeness, please could Valerie Bromley and Michaela Bromley confirm that they are content for Hayley Simpson to represent them to the Examination? b) Please could the Applicant respond to the concerns raised by Hayley Simpson? The ExA [redacted] Items 5b and 5c] is exploring the potential of residents being able to retain ownership, and the issues involved with that. This was discussed at Compulsory	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			Acquisition Hearing 1 [redacted]. The Applicant has responded in writing [redacted]Items 5b and 5c] and has provided a drawing [redacted] that sets out some of the technical issues. The Applicant [redacted]Items 5c] said that it needs to do a structural survey of Craig Dean to inform its assessment of whether the building could remain if the Proposed Development progresses. The ExA expects that information would then help it to consider the issues and options for Craig Dean. c) Please could Hayley Simpson comment on the Applicant's responses and provide an update on any	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			subsequent discussions with the Applicant? Can access be provided for the structural surveys? If they can't, please could the reasons for that be explained? d) Please could the Applicant provide an update on the discussions and advise on the outstanding matters, the next steps to be taken and the progress anticipated by the close of the Examination? Does it anticipate that any side agreements will be required? How does the Applicant propose to progress if a structural survey cannot be	

No	Question to	Reference	Question	HPBC's response
			carried out before the end of the Examination?	
	Other matters			
15.3.	Applicant Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council	L.S. Lowry statue / Plot 8/2	The Book of Reference [redacted] includes for the compulsory acquisition of the L.S. Lowry statue in plot 8/2. Please could the Applicant and Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council comment on the importance of this statue and whether it would or should be relocated?	N/A