

A57 Link Roads Development Consent Order Hearing Sessions

Hearing Session 3: Issue Specific Hearings

Tuesday 5th and Wednesday 6th April 2022

Derbyshire County Council's written summary of oral submissions at hearing sessions and post-hearing written submissions requested by the ExA

ITEM 2: TRANSPORT NETWORKS AND TRAFFIC

Policy:

Both locally and nationally there is an aspiration to change travel habits in favour of more sustainable travel and policy reflects this. For instance Transport For Greater Manchester sets out an aim in the Greater Manchester Transport Strategy 2040 for 50% of all journeys in Greater Manchester to be made by walking, cycling and public transport by 2040. The Government's Transport Decarbonisation Plan seeks to deliver carbon reduction in transport. The scheme lies within Greater Manchester and many of the trips within the area modelled are trips originating or arriving in Greater Manchester, travelling to local settlements.

l) Please would the Applicant explain whether the scheme supports the aims of the Greater Manchester Transport Strategy 2040 and / or the Government's Transport Decarbonisation Plan? If so, how? If not, why not?

m) Do the local authorities or local highway authorities have any comment in this regard?

DCC Oral Submission

Derbyshire County Council offered no further comments on this issue.

Traffic Outside the Order Limit

Glossopdale and Longdendale

The Applicant, in the Transport Assessment Report [APP-185], has identified that traffic is likely to increase on roads through residential areas that provide existing routes through Glossop and surrounding areas. Capacity issues have been identified

at the junction of Shaw Lane with Brookfield and Dinting Vale (the Shaw Lane Junction). In the case of the Shaw Lane Junction Derbyshire County Council have identified an aspiration to address this with junction works.

t) Is Derbyshire County Council satisfied with the Applicant's modelling of the alternative routes?

u) Does Derbyshire County Council consider that the predicted flows on these routes are reasonable / likely? If so, are the effects arising from the increased flows acceptable?

v) Does Derbyshire County Council consider that the increased flows are likely to require additional traffic management measures to limit the traffic on these routes, either in terms of driver behaviour, vehicle numbers or to address issues of pedestrian/cycle connectivity / safety?

x) At present any works at Shaw Lane Junction or within the residential areas through which alternative routes pass lie outside of the dDCO scheme 6 proposal. What importance does Derbyshire County Council place on their provision?

y) The traffic modelling has assumed optimisation of the traffic signals at the Shaw Lane Junction. Does Derbyshire County Council envisage works being required beyond optimisation to address this issue?

Z) Please would the Applicant clarify why, if there is an effect on the junctions or residential areas, these are not addressed within the dDCO?

aa) Do Derbyshire County Council and High Peak Borough Council consider this a reasonable approach? If not, please explain why.

bb) Has the Applicant considered whether, or not, there would be benefits in reinforcing the message to drivers travelling between the M1/Sheffield and Manchester to use the Strategic Road Network for their journey in preference to the A57 through Glossop and Snake Pass using an enhanced signing strategy?

cc) Do the local authorities or local highway authorities have any comments on the merits, or otherwise, of such measures?

dd) Please could the Applicant clarify whether the primary purpose of the A57 Link is to take traffic off the Strategic Route Network onto the local road network? How would that be supported by policy, the aims of RIS2, or good practice? Please could Derbyshire County Council comment?

DCC Oral Submissions on Questions t) to dd)

Question u) Predicted Flows

Essentially the traffic model seeks to replicate the travel behavioural activities of people residing in the area of the model's coverage including residents of Glossop what these are typically doing and how these relate to travel patterns.

Glossop and its surrounding environs fall within two electoral divisions (EDs) Etherow and Glossop and Charlesworth. These between them have a combined population of just over 33,000 people living in about 14,000 households.

At Table 2.1 of the transportation assessment, we see the locations of Glossop Hatfield Padfield and Gamesley. This is split up into 9 zones or roughly assuming even coverage, 1600 households or just over three and half thousand people. All of those people going about their legitimate business.

They will travel by a variety of modes, ideally walking, cycling and public transport however we need to be realistic to the fact that some of whom will travel by car. All journeys begin and end at a specific point depending upon where they live. The model, however, assumes all 14,000 households residing in both of the above EDs, will load on to the network depending upon where the zone centroid in which they reside has been allocated a loading point. Therefore, modelled flows on the side roads in Glossop or indeed anywhere else in the model are aggregated and loaded onto a number of specific points.

The traffic model does not fully replicate all the nuances, travel behaviour of each individual Glossop resident. Consequently flows on a particular link will be subjected to possibly significant variation depending upon the pointing questions relative to the zone in question and its loading points onto the highway network and therefore traffic flows along a link can change significantly simply in response to whether a measurement is taken upstream or downstream of a particular junction, or in the case of the traffic model, where and how an agglomeration of households is assumed to make a connection onto the road network.

The County Council believes that there is a significant demand for travel between Glossop, the Glossop area, and Greater Manchester. The route by which most of these movements is made is via the A57 and the congestion and consequent environmental impacts have been clearly well documented. Consequently, and particularly at peak times, anecdotal evidence suggests that traffic will seek to meet this demand by a number of alternative routes particularly through Charlesworth, Broadbottom and through Gamesley, for example. These are along routes that are not particularly suitable.

The primary effects of the scheme are to reduce or eliminate a significant bottleneck through Mottram. Consequently, traffic will be attracted onto A57 corridor through Glossop as demonstrated by the traffic modelling. There will, however, be some increases in traffic on local roads, Dinting Road for example which provides a parallel route to the A57 as a result of the secondary effects of traffic reassignment. However, the County Council does not believe that this is necessarily induced traffic, largely a case of local traffic using alternative routes for the reasons discussed.

Take as an example a resident or cluster of residents residing on Dinting Road. The current journey in to say Greater Manchester takes them along Hadfield Road in order to get onto Woolley Lane. By virtue of the fact that the proposals effectively replicate Woolley Lane 100 metres or so south, people making this journey will probably reassign onto Shaw Lane purely and simply by the fact that this is now their shortest route.

Derbyshire County Council does not believe that the changes in traffic flow on the local roads in Glossop arise from people from elsewhere deciding to descend on Glossop purely and simply as a consequence of the scheme but changes in the travel behaviour of local people who currently reside in the town.

We see that on the roads in Glossop away from the A57 changes in flow of typically around 1000 movements daily. Over, say a 16-hour day, this equates to 60 an hour or one a minute, consequently, the County Council believes that changes in flows arising from the scheme are largely imperceptible.

Public Transport

Current congestion and capacity issues experienced on the route results in a significant challenge in terms of delivering sustainable transport improvements, particularly for improvements relating to bus services.

The scheme would enable the provision of complementary public transport measures the County Council believes are predicated on successful delivery of the actual scheme.

The scheme does not undermine sustainable alternatives. The scheme provides comprehensive improvements for non-motorised users, does not overall disadvantage bus services and does not preclude future improvements to public transport.

Question u) Impacts on Shaw Lane at its Junction with the A57

The applicant has provided the County Council with capacity assessments of the A57 at its junction with Shaw Lane. Potential for additional queuing and future congestion at the junction is acknowledged.

Derbyshire County Council considers it appropriate, as the design for the scheme emerges to review the traffic flow forecast through the junction, and in consultation with the applicant explore the scope for a system of linked signalling arrangements with the proposed new junction on Woolley Lane in order to manage the traffic entering Glossop on the A57.

Questions v) x) and y): Impacts on Shaw Lane and Dinting Road

The ExA referred to an uncontrolled school crossing along Dinting Road, suggesting that there are a large number of school pupils using it. Whilst the Inspector acknowledged that this is perhaps outside the scope of the scheme in some ways, he is correct in that this is a relevant question in so much as to whether an increase in traffic due to the scheme although slight, would potentially add to safety concerns for school children. The Inspector noted also that it is in the vicinity of Dinting station, on a section of highway that is of poor horizontal and vertical alignment.

Derbyshire County Council indicated that the hearing session that the Council are pro-active in identifying safe places for pedestrians to cross the road and locations

for traffic signals to improve traffic management. The Council receive many requests each year for new crossings. These sites are surveyed, and the results compared with national criteria including, where relevant, numerical consideration to identify the locations which would benefit most from the installation of signals or a crossing.

Not all sites are suitable, however. The factors measured are the number of people crossing the road, the amount of traffic, the safety record on the road near to the site and local features such as hospitals, schools, and shops. The County Council acknowledge that the applicant has provided some indication of potential changes in traffic flow on both Shaw Lane and Dinting Road together with a number of local roads in the area although the County Council does not consider on the basis of the information provided that there is likely to be numerical justification for the introduction of a controlled crossing at this stage necessitated by the scheme.

Further Written Update

Since the ExA raised this issue at the hearing session, the County Council's Network Management Officer has held further discussions with the applicant about the need for a more formalised crossing on Dinting Road in the vicinity of Glossopdale School. Further investigations have also taken place by the County Council's Developer Contributions Officer on this issue.

These discussions and further investigations have identified that the County Council has secured developer contributions funding for a controlled crossing on Dinting Road, which is to the left of Station Approach. This funding relates to a planning application by Derbyshire County Council's Director of Property (application Code No CD1/0420/5) that was received by the County Council, as Minerals and Waste Planning Authority, on the 30 April 2020 for permission for the erection of a Two-Storey Teaching Building with Associated Connecting Canopy and the Provision of Three Multi User Games Area Courts at Glossopdale School, Newshaw Lane, Hadfield SK13 2DA. The application was granted by the County Council on 18th December 2020 subject to conditions.

However, in terms of developer contributions, a Unilateral Undertaking was also signed as part of the approval of the scheme between Derbyshire County Council and High Peak Borough Council, which included a clause (2.5) that required that a sum of £50,000 should be payable to the County Council (as Enforcing Authority) for safety improvements to the Highway Network in the vicinity of the site.

The planning application Highways Authority consultation response however stated:

'The Highway Authority has received several complaints about the crossing point on Dinting Road, including from the MP and a Glossopdale School Governor. The Transport Statement dismisses this road as not being "heavily trafficked" despite describing it as a key link between Glossop and Hadfield, an access to the rail station and being a main bus route. It is a well-known and well used rat run in the town to by-pass the regularly congested A57 corridor. Bearing the latter and aforementioned complaints in mind, it's considered that any approval for expansion of the school should secure funding for investigation in to, and any subsequent installation of, a zebra crossing at this location.'

dd) The County Council understands that the A57 Link Roads scheme will be included in National Highways Post Opening Project Evaluation (POPE) programme. This considers early scheme performance, providing the opportunity for National Highways to make improvements, if required, in a timely manner to support the delivery of the future performance of the scheme. The County Council considers that in view of the Inspectors concerns, the scope of the POPE ought to include local roads in Glossop.

Highway Layout

Derbyshire County Council, in their Local Impact Report [REP2-046 paragraph 7.35] expressed reservations regarding the design of the southbound merge exiting the Wooley Bridge junction. In previous responses it has been indicated that discussions have been taking place between the Applicant and the Council to address these concerns.

ii) Would the Applicant and Derbyshire County Council provide an update on these discussions?

mm) Does Derbyshire County Council have any remaining concerns regarding the design of the junction?

DCC Oral Submission

ii) The County Council can confirm that the detailed design of the junction has been subject to ongoing discussions between the County Council's network management officers and the applicant's consultants since the Council completed its Local Impact Report and can confirm that the detailed design proposed by the applicant, that includes the two lane south-bound merge exiting the new Wooley Bridge Junction, is now acceptable to the County Council.

The applicant has made the case that the two-lane merge solution is required for capacity reasons based on the transport modelling outputs for that part of the scheme and the County Council now agrees that as an acceptable design solution, particularly as the applicant has amended the design to provide for an extended length of the two-lane merge southbound on the A57.

mm) On the basis of the above, the County Council has no remaining concerns regarding the junction design.

ITEM 3: PEAK DISTRICT NATIONAL PARK

Peak District National Park Authority [REP6-038] state that the assessment process either under-estimates or fails to adequately consider potential effects within a National Park landscape and that it fails to consider that a low magnitude of effect has the potential to result in significant effects on “very high” sensitivity receptors.

k) Please could Derbyshire County Council comment on the potential for increases in traffic flow to result in any corresponding growth in car parking within the Peak District National Park?

DCC Written Submission

k) This issue was addressed in the County Council’s response to the Second Round of Written Questions at Question 3.3.

Derbyshire County Council is aware that much of the parking along the A57 Snake Pass takes the form of informal roadside parking and clearly increased parking demand would be undesirable both from a highway safety and visual amenity perspective.

However, whilst the County Council is aware that the proposals will result in a small incremental increase in traffic across the National Park, the Council considers that this is largely a consequence of secondary reassignment effects arising from the scheme. It does not necessarily follow that the scheme would make the National Park a more attractive destination in itself.

ITEM 4: WATER ENVIRONMENT, DRAINAGE AND FLOOD RISK

Baseline Modelling

River Etherow

The model for the River Etherow has not been agreed between the Environment Agency and the Applicant. Further, in their response to the ExA's Second Written Questions [REP6-039], the Environment Agency identified outstanding concerns regarding the Hydrogeology Risk Assessment [REP3-025], the Flood Risk Assessment [REP5-010] and how risks could be identified, addressed and mitigation secured within the dDCO.

d) If no agreement is reached on the model and its suitability for assessing the effects of the proposal on the water environment, drainage and flood risk at that point, what approach do the Applicant and the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authorities consider the Examining Authority should take with regard to the effects of the proposal?

e) Does Derbyshire County Council have any comment?

DCC Written Submission

This issue was covered by the County Council in its response to the Second Round of Written Questions.

From Derbyshire County Council's point of view, the Lead Local Flood Authority has not raised any concerns regarding the modelling of the River Etherow and has indicated that the LLFA is satisfied with the applicant's position that this matter can be dealt with at the detailed design stage and secured through the DCO.

Flood Risk Assessment

The Environment Agency [REP4-019] has identified concerns that the Flood Risk Assessment has not been updated to reflect the latest fluvial climate change allowances that were introduced in 2021.

In their response to the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions [REP6-039 Q11.5] the Environment Agency suggests that, if it is the Applicant's intention to address issues of the flood modelling, and thus consequent implications within the Flood Risk Assessment, during the detailed design stage, assurance is needed during the examination that the development design provided is feasible and that there is confidence that it would remain feasible once the latest climate change guidance is factored in. Such an approach, the Environment Agency has suggested, may allow a conditional approach for the remaining issues to be addressed as part of an updated FRA.

K) Do the Applicant, and the Lead Local Flood Authorities consider a conditional approach, in the form suggested by the Environment Agency appropriate?

DCC Written Submission

This issue was covered by the County Council in its response to the Second Round of Written Questions.

From Derbyshire County Council's point of view, the LLFA has not raised any concerns regarding the Flood Risk Assessment and has indicated that the Council is satisfied with the applicant's position that this matter can be dealt with at the detailed design stage and secured through the DCO and conditioned as such that this will be addressed in an updated Flood Risk Assessment, which appears to be addressed in Requirement 9 (1) of the applicant's updated Draft DCO.

Hydrological Risk Assessment

The Environment Agency, in their representation at Deadline 4 [REP4-019] and response to the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions [REP6-039 Q11.4 and Q12.1] has identified concerns that dewatering of the below ground structures within the scheme may artificially dewater natural aquifer bodies or cause temporary or localised flooding. 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. The Environment Agency has voiced concerns that the impact from the link road scheme could extend wider than just the redline boundary as defined on site maps (0.5 Km for surface water features and 1 Km for groundwater) and that the shape of the zone of influence, rather than being idealised, may vary due to the complex geology and faulting defined for the study area.

n) Please would the Applicant, Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authorities comment on how Requirements 4(1) and 4(2) seek to address the outstanding risks / challenges? Is the wording appropriate? If not, how could the Requirements be amended to secure the necessary actions / mitigation to address the Environment Agency's concerns?

DCC Oral Submission

The County Council has reviewed requirements 4 (1) and 4 (2) in the applicant's updated Draft DCO that was submitted on 23rd March which relate to the second iteration of the EMP.

There appears to be nothing specific in requirements 4 (1) and 4 (2) that deals with this issue specifically. However, the County Council notes that Requirement 4 (2) (d) makes reference to the submission of a Dewatering Management Plan that is required to be submitted as part of the Second iteration of the EMP but does not provide any details.

The County Council considers therefore that there appears to be some opportunity through Requirement 4 (2) and the reference to the Dewatering Management Plan to specifically include wording that addresses this issue raised by the Environment Agency.

o) Do the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authorities have any comments regarding the Applicant's approach in dealing with the Environment Agency's concerns in respect of the Applicant's Hydrogeology Risk Assessment.

DCC Written Submission

No. This is not an issue which has been raised by the County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority through the Examination so far, so the County Council has no further comments to make.

Drainage Design Strategy Report

In their response to the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions [REP6-026 Q11.7] Derbyshire County Council indicated that further consideration of the Drainage Design Strategy Report [APP-188] would be needed by the Lead Local Flood Authority prior to comment.

u) Are Derbyshire County Council's comments now available, and, if not, when will they be available?

DCC Written Submission

Derbyshire County Council would confirm that, as Lead Local Flood Authority, it has now had the opportunity to review the Drainage Design Strategy Document.

Having reviewed the document, the LLFA confirms that they agree with the general principles of what the applicant are proposing and are pleased to see an emphasis on sustainable drainage and keeping the drainage system as natural and sustainable as possible.

The only measure that the LLFA would like to see improved is the proposed culverted new sections of the ordinary watercourse. The LLFA considers that it would be good to see as much of the newly diverted ordinary watercourses as open channels and not culverts,

Derbyshire County Council has a policy that only allows for the culverting of ordinary watercourses in exceptional circumstances. Therefore, the County Council would expect to see open channels as much as possible and if not, the LLFA would prefer to see very large-oversized culverts with daylighting where possible, to encourage ecology to behave naturally and create a natural habitat.

Maintenance of Drainage Structures

It is of great importance that drainage systems are maintained so that they fulfil their intended function effectively.

v) Please would the Applicant and the relevant local authorities provide an update on the discussions regarding adoption and maintenance of drainage structures associated with the scheme?

DCC Written Submission

Derbyshire County Council is currently seeking to arrange a meeting between its Lead Local Flood Authority Officers and the applicant's Flood Risk Consultants to seek to agree maintenance liabilities for the drainage structures associated with the scheme.

The LLFA would make the point that this is not seen as a fundamental concern as long as it is made clear by the applicant which drainage features it expects the County Council to assume maintenance responsibilities for either through the DCO itself or through the Environment Management Plan.

ITEM 6: CLIMATE CHANGE

Mitigation – construction phase

Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council [REP6-037] said that it would be valuable to have periodic report on whether mitigation has been delivered and that this information should be agreed to be made public and shared regularly to reassure stakeholders.

Derbyshire County Council [REP6-026] said that firm mitigation measures such as the use of specific low carbon construction methods or materials, should be identified at this stage, as well as provisional targets for emissions reduction. It would be able to broadly review measures and their implementation.

The Applicant [REP6-017] said that:

- Firm measures such as use of specific low carbon construction methods or materials should not be identified as this is considered to presuppose and restrict options*
- A reduction target would be set in accordance with the latest National Highways Net Zero Plan • Review of the process and mitigation used would (as the ExA understands) be carried out internally*
- Independent verification would have to be as part of a wider construction verification.*

The Applicant [REP2-021] referred to the potential for significant reductions due to the extensive use of relevant materials, i.e., recycled sub-base, warm asphalt, lower carbon concrete through alternative ingredients, and lower carbon steel from energy efficient production.

The ExA is minded to conclude that the local authorities should be consulted on the setting of targets, the development of proposals for the mitigation of construction emissions, the use of PAS 2080; and that progress in delivering the mitigation should be reported to the local authorities.

q) Please could the local authorities comment?

DCC Oral Submission

Derbyshire County Council would support the approach being proposed by the Examining Authority and that the County Council would welcome consultation on the carbon reduction mitigation measures being suggested.

Mitigation – operational phase

Derbyshire County Council [REP6-026] expressed concerns about the mitigation secured for the operational phase. The Applicant [REP6-017] has summarised its proposals.

s) Have the Applicant and Derbyshire County Council discussed the mitigation measures? Are they able to seek to agree the mitigation, and confirm which matters have been agreed or not agreed?

DCC Oral Submission

The County Council can confirm that it has discussed this matter with the applicant briefly as part of a much wider discussion.

The applicant has indicated that there is no scope within the scheme to include any electric vehicle charging points and that the private sector will ultimately deliver electric vehicle charging points across the network, such as at existing petrol filling stations.

The County Council would accept that position.

However, the County Council and applicant have yet to be able to agree whether there is scope for any other measures such as opportunities for use of solar or wind power to illuminate signage for example, which can often be seen in other locations across the country now.

ITEM 7: OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL MATTERS

Other landscape and visual Carriageway levels, bunds and barriers

The Applicant [REP4-008 and REP6-017] set out level differences of the proposed carriageway from existing ground level (up to 8m), the heights of bunds above proposed carriageway level (up to 5m) and that some embankments would be topped by 2.5m high environmental barriers.

The Applicant [REP2-021] initially said that the assessment did not take changes in existing ground levels into account and later [REP4-008 and REP6-017] clarified that full consideration was given to Engineering Drawings and Sections and that section drawings were used by the assessor on site and, these, along with professional judgement were used to determine the magnitude of change and significance levels.

n) Please could the Applicant provide a copy of the Engineering Drawings and Sections that were used at the time of the assessment of effects on landscape or visual receptors? Were the level differences of the proposed carriageway from existing ground level, the heights of bunds above proposed carriageway level and the environmental barriers considered as set out by the Applicant during the Examination?

Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council [REP6-037] and Derbyshire County Council [REP6-026] awaited further clarification from the Applicant.

o) Please could Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council and Derbyshire County Council now comment on the implications of the level differences of the proposed carriageway from existing ground level, the heights of bunds above proposed carriageway level and the environmental barriers for the assessment of effects on landscape or visual receptors? Are they satisfied that assessment reflects the size and nature of the features clarified by the Applicant during the Examination?

DCC Written Submission

Derbyshire County Council has reviewed the applicant's response to this question in its response to the Second Round of Written Questions and noted that they consider that vertical limits of deviation of 0.5m and 1.0 m for structures used in the assessment were not considered likely to result in changes in levels of significance for landscape and visual receptors as these changes are relatively small.

From the County Council's point of view, Section 15 is the only section falling within Derbyshire with the assessment noting that immediately to the west of Woolley Bridge Junction, the proposed Scheme carriageway is approximately 2-2.5m higher than the existing ground level, where it is carried on an embankment.

In that context, from the County Council's point of view, the issue of ground levels and limits of deviation and impact on landscape and visual receptors is not a particularly significant issue for the County Council and it does not have significant concerns about this matter and accepts the applicant's position on this issue.

Mitigation

Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council [REP6-037] and Derbyshire County Council [REP6-026], High Peak Borough Council [REP6-027] and Warner Bower [REP4-028] have expressed concerns about the proposed mitigation planting. Concerns have included the planting and seed mixes and the consideration given to native species and Landscape Character. The Applicant [REP7-026] appears to suggest that these matters be resolved during detailed design.

p) Please could the Applicant, Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council, Derbyshire County Council and, if appropriate, High Peak Borough Council, discuss the concerns and seek to agree any updates to the mitigation, including to the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management and Monitoring Plan [REP6-013]?

DCC Oral and Further Written Submission

At the hearing session the County Council indicated that its officers had had discussions about this issue with the applicant as part of a wider discussion about the scheme and it had been agreed that a meeting between the applicant's Landscape Consultant and the County Council's Landscape Architect should be arranged to seek to resolve the outstanding differences of opinion on the proposed mitigation planting.

Following the hearing session, a meeting took place on 8th April 2022 between the County Council's Landscape Architect and the applicant's Landscape Consultants to discuss the landscape elements of the Outline Landscape Management Plan (OLEMP) and the Design Approach Document. A summary note of the matters discussed and key points agreed is set out below:

General

The aim of the meeting was to discuss the matters raised by DCC in order to agree a process; the OLEMP is indicative and further consultation and updates are still to be undertaken.

OLEMP

1. Landscape Management Objectives
 - a. Agreed that Section 5.1 will include/strengthen existing objectives relating to planting for visual screening and also integrating the Scheme into the landscape fabric. This will ensure a stronger landscape focus to better balance the ecological objectives.
2. Woodland Planting Mixes
 - a. Agreed that Table 6.6 on woodland mixes should be revisited to consider the Landscape Character of Derbyshire document which includes detail of planting mixes for trees and hedgerows. Noted that ash is no longer an option.
3. Individual Trees/Species Selection/Ornamentals
 - a. Table 6.18: Agreed that, while only a relatively small area of the Scheme/study area lies within DCC and that the DCC area may be considered more rural/less urban than areas closer to settlement, it is important to ensure it is clear there is a balance between the benefits

of species diversity/ornamentals and the locally native species (the inclusion of more ornamental species may indeed be appropriate in certain locations, but the more rural character is reflected in the planting of locally native species). Species diversity/ornamentals versus native trees is not necessarily an issue provided that schemes are appropriately designed, i.e. might be more appropriate for more visible trees to be generally consistent with the wider landscape character to allow for better scheme integration.

4. Monitoring

- a. Agreed that clarification is required on who will review the reports and undertake the annual inspections.

Design Approach Document

- The design approach should reference the Landscape Character of Derbyshire, which includes detail of planting mixes and aligns with the Peak District National Park Landscape Strategy.

q) Please could the Applicant update the mitigation and submit it to the Examination for Deadline 8 (Wednesday 13 April 2022)?

r) Please could Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council, Derbyshire County Council and High Peak Borough Council comment on the updates for Deadline 9 (Wednesday 27 April 2022)?

DCC Oral / Written Submission

Yes. On the basis that a meeting has now taken place between both parties, the County Council confirms that it would be happy to comment on the updated mitigation by Deadline 9.

Design Lighting

The Applicant [REP6-017 Q5.10] set out the consideration given to design options for street lighting. Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council [REP6-037 Q5.10] said that the link road to be adopted by it should incorporate street lighting with lighting levels lower than in more built up urban areas.

Derbyshire County Council [REP6-026 Q5.10] said that principles had been agreed and that detailed discussions were ongoing. It referred to a need to find a balance between operational and safety requirements and the desire to minimise visual impacts.

Peak District National Park Authority [REP6-038 Q5.10] referred to the need to protect dark skies, mitigate effects to wildlife and protect night-time views.

t) Please could the local authorities, Peak District National Park Authority and the Applicant provide an update on discussions?

Are the necessary mitigation measures in place to ensure that an appropriate balance between operational and safety requirements and the desire to minimise visual impacts would be achieved?

What lighting levels should be provided?

DCC Oral and Additional Written Submission

Detailed discussions and exchanges of correspondence were carried out between the applicant's Lighting Consultants and the County Council's Street Lighting Officers in 2021.

In correspondence sent by the County Council's Street Lighting Officers to the applicant's consultants on 21st July 2021, the principles that would inform a design solution to the street lighting of the scheme were agreed between the County Council and the applicant's consultants.

The basis for those principles was the County Council's Adopted Street Lighting Specification Document that was adopted and published in January 2021. The Specification Document sets out very detailed design specifications for street lighting schemes depending on:

- The classification of the highway concerned;
- Traffic flows:
- Its environmental zone – whether it urban, suburban, rural, natural dark skies or protected dark skies which apply to the National Park.
- Speed limits that apply to that highway;

Then based on those factors the highway has a defined lighting class for which a number of detailed standard specifications are set out that include;

- Column heights
- Maximum wattage of lighting
- Lumens range i.e. Illumination range of the lighting

In its correspondence with the applicant's Lighting Consultants referred to above, the County Council classed the A57 Link Roads scheme as an NH1 scheme - a major traffic route being a link road or distributor road; and classified the area of the A57 Link Roads Under Environment Zone 3: Suburban District Medium Brightness Area. Accordingly, the County Council identified required column heights, maximum wattage and a lumens range for the scheme.

The key point from the County Council's point of view is that the County Council has quite stringent adopted specifications for street lighting on grounds on highway and public safety. However, particularly in terms of illumination, a range is set out in those specifications that takes into consideration any important environmental factors or designations such important / protected ecology sites.

The illumination for the A57 Link Roads street lighting that has been recommended by the County Council to the applicant, takes into account the need for mitigation on sensitive ecology of the location and wider area of the highway scheme, so

illumination has been recommended by the County Council at the lower end of the illumination range at 2700K.

In conclusion, the County Council considers that an appropriate balance has been recommended for the street lighting that takes account of the County Council's detailed operational specifications for street lighting but also the need to mitigate environmental impacts of the street lighting scheme.

Design Approach Document

The Applicant has submitted a Design Approach Document [REP7-029].

u) Please could the local authorities and Peak District National Park Authority provide any initial comments?

- Should the document set out proposals for the provision of a Design Champion and a Design Review by the Design Council?*
- Are there appropriate provisions for how the Applicant would work with the local authorities and other stakeholders?*
- Has it given enough regard to how the detailed design would respond to Landscape / Townscape Character?*
- Is enough detail provided on signage, street furniture, lighting, environmental barrier, structures and hard landscaping design and materials?*
- Are there any other measures that should be included?*

DCC Oral and Written Submission

Derbyshire County Council's Landscape Architect has reviewed the Design Approach Document (DAD) and considers there is nothing particularly objectionable about any of it and it refers to a suite of current guidance that should inform good design.

The main issue raised by the Landscape Architect is the lack of cross referencing of these national design guides with local documents such as the 'Landscape Character of Derbyshire' publication that provides design guidance at a more local level of detail and appropriate to each identified landscape character type (LCT).

For example, there is advice in the Landscape Character of Derbyshire publication on the appropriate tree and shrub species for both woodland and hedgerow creation but the County Council's Landscape Architect remains of the opinion that the species selected in the landscape design of the new route has not been informed by this local guidance. For example, the Riverside Meadows LCT within Derbyshire is characterised by simple hawthorn hedgerows (reflecting their relatively late enclosure from wasteland) whereas the DAD refers to species rich hedgerows throughout the scheme. It might also be expected to see gritstone walls in this landscape such as those found along the A6018, Roe Cross Road particularly in association with the more built-up areas.

With regard to the particular questions posed by the ExA the County Council would comment as follows:

- 1) Yes it should set out proposals for a Design Champion and a Design Review by the Design Council;
- 2) It is not clear from the DAD whether there remains the opportunity for local authorities to further influence the ongoing design of the scheme and how this might be achieved;
- 3) There is insufficient detail to set out how the scheme is aiming to respond to specific landscape/townscape character – for example, could boundaries change as the road extends across the landscape showing the change in character between different landscape types and more urban areas?
- 4) There are no details on signage, lighting, street furniture, etc other than setting out the broad aims for these features such as avoiding light pollution or creating a unified character. It is likely these will be dictated by other highway design guidance and pay less regard to aesthetics.

v) Please could the local authorities and Peak District National Park Authority provide detailed comments on the Design Approach Document for Deadline 8 on Wednesday 13 April 2022?

DCC Oral Submission

Yes it was indicated at the hearing that Derbyshire County Council will provide detailed comments by the deadline of 13th April 2022 (as now set out above).

Green Belt

The Applicant [REP4-008 and REP6-017] set out level differences of the proposed carriageway from existing ground level (up to 8m), the heights of bunds above proposed carriageway level (up to 5m) and that some embankments would be topped by 2.5m high environmental barriers. The Applicant [REP6-017] has summarised its consideration of openness. Reference is made to adverse impacts at receptors which specifically mention views / openness. The Applicant concluded that the Proposed Development would preserve openness. The Applicant [REP6-017] said that the proposals would align with localised landscape character and balances the locations where screening using mitigation planting is appropriate. It said that the landscape design would be aligned to local landscape character in reflecting local planting patterns and vegetation types as well as creating a variety of open and enclosed views both towards the new highway as well as within it, to appreciate the local landscape character

The ExA is considering whether the Proposed Development preserves openness and whether it should be considered as inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

aa) In case the ExA does conclude that it would be inappropriate development, please would the Applicant set out its case for the very special circumstances that would be needed for the Proposed Development to proceed? Please could that be provided for Deadline 8 (Wednesday 13 April 2022)?

bb) Please could the local authorities and Peak District National Park Authority provide comments on the Applicant's case by Deadline 9 (Wednesday 27 April 2022)?

DCC Oral Submission

Yes it was confirmed at the hearing that Derbyshire County Council will be able to provide comments on this matter by Deadline 9.

Enhancement

The Applicant [REP6-017 Q9.7] set out proposals for enhancement to Mottram-Longdendale Conservation Area and Melandra Castle Scheduled Monument through its' Environment and Wellbeing Designated Fund.

ii) Do the local authorities and Peak District National Park Authority consider that the Applicant's proposals would be likely to "... preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset ...", consistent with NPSNN Paragraph 5.137?

DCC Written Submission

The County Council has reviewed the applicant's response to this matter in their response to the EXA Second Written Questions.

The County Council notes that Highways England has secured funding through its Environment and Designated Funds Scheme for two feasibility studies to be prepared that will consider enhancement opportunities in Mottram in Longdendale Conservation Area and Melandra Castle.

For Melandra Castle, it is noted that, as part of the feasibility study, a Conservation Management Plan will be updated for the asset that will comprise:

- Setting up a working group for Melandra castle comprising officers from Historic England, Derbyshire County Council, High Peak Borough Council, Glossop and Longdendale Archaeological Society and the applicant's consultants.
- Undertaking an audit of the archaeological archives of the Castle.
- Organising as site visit with the working group and specialists;
- Preparing and Interpretation Options Strategy.

- Further works to consolidate and preserve the fabric of the castle will be identified as part of the Conservation management Plan.

In conclusion, the County Council considers that the applicant's proposals as set out above are a welcome step in the right direction to preserve the setting of that asset and its significance and welcomes the indication of the County Council's engagement in the process.

Severance

Mention has been made of enhancing routes for sustainable modes as part of the "green arc" of the Glossop gateway masterplan.

nn) Please would the Applicant, Derbyshire County Council and High Peak Borough Council provide details of what steps, if any, have been taken to secure such proposals, including funding, in association with the proposal?

DCC Written Submission

The County Council would like to defer comment on this matter to colleagues at High Peak Borough Council who have been leading on the Glossop Gateway Masterplan.