

## A57 Link Roads

### Agenda and arrangements for Issue Specific Hearing 3

Item	Questions	Tameside Response
<p><b>Item 2</b></p>	<p><b>TRANSPORT NETWORKS AND TRAFFIC</b></p> <p><u>Policy</u></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>l) Please would the <b>Applicant</b> 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?</p> <p>m) Do the <b>local authorities</b> or <b>local highway authorities</b> have any comment in this regard?</p>	<p>m) The scheme supports the aims of the Greater Manchester Transport Strategy 2040 (GMTS 2040).</p> <p>The GMTS 2040 sets out Greater Manchester's approach to the vision for Greater Manchester to have <b><i>'World class connections that support long-term, sustainable economic growth and access to opportunity for all'</i></b>.</p> <p>The four key elements of the vision are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supporting Sustainable Economic Growth</li> <li>• Improving the Quality of Life, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Improving access to jobs and training, education, healthcare, shopping and recreation</li> <li>○ Improving Health</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Protecting the Environment</li> <li>• Developing an Innovative City Region</li> </ul> <p>Greater Manchester ambition is to improve our transport system so that - by 2040 - 50% of all journeys in Greater Manchester are made by public transport or active travel, supporting a reduction in car use to no more than 50% of daily trips. This will mean one million more sustainable journeys every day in Greater Manchester by 2040, enabling us to deliver a healthier, greener and more productive city-region. This is referred to as the transport 'Right Mix'. Achieving the Right Mix is expected to lead to zero net growth in motor vehicle traffic in Greater Manchester between 2017 and 2040.</p>

		<p>This will help to enable Greater Manchester to meet the Government's Transport Decarbonisation Plan, which seeks to deliver carbon reduction in transport.</p> <p>The 'Right Mix' target of 50% of all journeys in Greater Manchester are made by public transport or active travel, supporting a reduction in car use to no more than 50% of daily trips is an overall Greater Manchester target and this will vary dependent upon the types and length of trips being made.</p> <p>The area with the biggest potential for change is local neighbourhood trips (of 2km or less) where there are large numbers of short car journeys which could reasonably be switched to walking or cycling. These types of trips will be made from some of the local settlements within Tameside in the area around the scheme such as Hattersley, where there is also potential for increased public transport use by both bus and rail for journeys longer than 2km into Manchester and the major town centres in Tameside. In addition, there will be greater potential for both cycling and walking, as well as public transport journeys to be made from Mottram once the A57 through the village has been detrunked and traffic is reduced.</p> <p>The scheme will also support the shorter journeys from the Glossop area into Tameside as the scheme will provide segregated cycle and walking facilities along the A57 Link Road from Mottram Moor to Woolley Bridge which will link to existing and proposed cycle and walking routes in Mottram and the wider area of Tameside. The detrunking of the A57 through Mottram will also allow the provision of improved bus services to Glossop.</p> <p>For the 'Right Mix' for longer City – to - City trips, such as Manchester to Sheffield, Greater Manchester is targeting a 5%</p>
--	--	--

		<p>reduction in car mode-share, which will be achieved through improvements to inter-urban public transport, such as the proposed improvements to the Manchester to Sheffield line which will allow the increase in the number of fast long distance rail services. Many City - to - City trips include journeys that neither start nor end in a city centre, and there is little potential for these to be made by public transport. However, we expect the major proposed improvements to inter-urban public transport to substantially reduce car use for trips that do involve travel to and from a major city centre.</p> <p>The proposed steps to achieve the overall 'Right Mix' targets set out in the GMTS 2040 are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Step 1: 10% population growth leads to 10% growth in trips (and trip-kilometrage) by all modes.</li><li>• Step 2: Land-use and transport policies (plus changes in individual preferences) lead to a redistribution of 5% of trips from Wider City Region to Neighbourhood.</li><li>• Step 3: Land-use and transport policies (plus changes in individual preferences) lead to a redistribution of 10% of Wider City Region trips to Regional Centre.</li><li>• Step 4: Land use change and transport interventions lead to a higher mode share for walking for Regional Centre and Neighbourhood trips.</li><li>• Step 5: Transformational cycling policies lead to a switch to cycle from other modes – reaching a 10% mode share for Regional Centre and Neighbourhood trips and a 5% mode share for Wider City Region trips by 2040.</li><li>• Step 6: Improved metro, suburban rail, and bus rapid transit services, plus complementary policies, cause these rapid transit modes to increase their mode-share, taking 8% of Wider City Region trips.</li></ul>
--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Step 7: Transport policies (including travel demand management) lead to a 5% reduction in trip-length of Wider City Region car-trips.</li> <li>• Step 8: Improved inter-urban public transport leads to a 5% reduction in car mode-share for city-to-city trips.</li> </ul>
<b>Item 2</b>	<p><b>Traffic outside the Order Limit</b></p> <p><b><u>Glossopdale and Longdendale</u></b></p> <p>The Applicant, in the Transport Assessment Report [APP-185 <a href="#">None PW Integrated Template (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</a> ], 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.</p> <p>bb) Has the <b>Applicant</b> 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?</p> <p>cc) Do the <b>local authorities</b> or <b>local highway authorities</b> have any comments on the merits, or otherwise, of such measures?</p>	<p>cc)</p> <p>With the increasing use of ‘SatNav’ devices for route planning, TMBC feels that it is important for the commercial software to be updated to suggest the strategic routes. This would be preferable to additional signage. In our experience, drivers tend now to follow routes suggested by these devices rather than being reliant upon signed routes</p>
<b>Item 4</b>	<p><b>WATER ENVIRONMENT, DRAINAGE AND FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT</b></p> <p><b>Baseline Modelling</b></p> <p><b><u>River Etherow</u></b></p>	<p>A number of issues remain to be resolved and meetings are being arranged with the Applicant to discuss these. Any remaining issues can be dealt with as part of the detailed design process.</p>

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 [None PW Integrated Template \(planninginspectorate.gov.uk\)](#)], the Environment Agency identified outstanding concerns regarding the Hydrogeology Risk Assessment [REP3-025 [TR010034-000949-TR010034 9.43 ES Appendix 13.2 Hydrogeology Risk Assessment D3 260122.pdf \(planninginspectorate.gov.uk\)](#)], the Flood Risk Assessment [REP5-010 [TR010034 5.5 Flood Risk Assessment \(4\) D5 230222 \(planninginspectorate.gov.uk\)](#)] and how risks could be identified, addressed and mitigation secured within the dDCO. Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council identify, in their response to the ExA's Second Written Questions [REP6-037 Q11.11 [Table 2: Examining authority's general questions arising from the draft Development Consent Order \(DCO\) \(planninginspectorate.gov.uk\)](#)], that they still have outstanding concerns about flood risk and hydraulic design.

- a) Please would the **Applicant, the Environment Agency and Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council** please provide any update on their positions?
- b) What progress has been made towards agreement between the **Applicant, the Environment Agency, and Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council**?
- c) Have the **Applicant, the Environment Agency and Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council** scheduled any future discussions to finalise the model and / or reach agreement? What is the likelihood of agreement being reached before the end of the Examination?
- d) If no agreement is reached on the model and its suitability for assessing the effects of the proposal on the water environment,

	<p>drainage and flood risk at that point, what approach do the <b>Applicant and the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authorities</b> consider the Examining Authority should take with regard to the effects of the proposal?</p>	
<p><b>Item 4</b></p>	<p><b>Flood Risk Assessment</b></p> <p>The Environment Agency [REP4-019 <a href="#">TR010034-001027-Environment Agency.pdf (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</a>] 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.</p> <p>In their response to the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions [REP6-039 Q11.5 <a href="#">TR010034-001190-Environment Agency Response - Deadline 6 - A57 NSIP WQ2 - Issued 16.03.22 Redacted.pdf (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</a>] 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.</p> <p>Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council advise in their response to the same question [REP6-037 Q11.5 <a href="#">Table 2: Examining authority's general questions arising from the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</a>] that they are awaiting updated information from the Applicant.</p>	<p>A number of issues remain to be resolved and meetings are being arranged with the Applicant to discuss these. Any remaining issues can be dealt with as part of the detailed design process.</p> <p>k) TMBC consider a conditional approach, in the form suggested by the Environment Agency is appropriate way to move forward.</p>

	<p>f) Please would the <b>Applicant, the Environment Agency and the Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council</b> provide any update on their positions?</p> <p>g) What progress towards agreement between the <b>Applicant, the Environment Agency and Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council</b> in regard to flood risk has been made?</p> <p>h) <b>Have the Applicant, the Environment Agency and Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council</b> scheduled any future discussions to finalise their positions? What is the likelihood of the Flood Risk Assessment being updated to reflect the latest fluvial climate change allowances prior to the end of the examination period within a timescale that would allow agreement with the Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authorities?</p> <p>k) Do the <b>Applicant, and the Lead Local Flood Authorities</b> consider a conditional approach, in the form suggested by the Environment Agency appropriate?</p>	
<p><b>Item 4</b></p>	<p><b>Hydrogeology Risk Assessment [REP3-025 <a href="#">TR010034-000949-TR010034_9.43_ES_Appendix_13.2_Hydrogeology_Risk_Assessment_D3_260122.pdf (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</a>]</b></p> <p>The Environment Agency, in their representation at Deadline 4 [REP4-019 <a href="#">TR010034-001027-Environment Agency.pdf (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</a>] and response to the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions [REP6-039 Q11.4 and Q12.1 <a href="#">TR010034-001190-Environment Agency Response - Deadline 6 - A57 NSIP WQ2 - Issued 16.03.22 Redacted.pdf (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</a>] 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.</p> <p>These groundwater bodies are known to provide sole supplies of water (from an abstraction borehole) to several private dwellings.</p>	<p>n) TMBC have no comments in respect to the wording of Requirements 4(1) and 4(2).</p> <p>o) TMBC have no comments on the Applicant's approach in dealing with the Environment Agency's concerns in respect of the Applicant's Hydrogeology Risk Assessment.</p>

	<p>Dewatering of the aquifer would therefore deprive the owners and abstractors of these boreholes of water.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>m) Please would the <b>Applicant</b> comment on how these concerns are addressed within the Environmental Statement? If they are not, would the <b>Applicant</b> explain whether they should be, or provide an explanation why not? If the <b>Applicant</b> considers that they should be addressed, how will this be done?</p> <p>n) Please would the <b>Applicant, Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authorities</b> 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?</p> <p>o) Do the <b>Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authorities</b> 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?</p>	
<p><b>Item 4</b></p>	<p><b>Maintenance of Drainage Structures</b></p> <p>It is of great importance that drainage systems are maintained so that they fulfil their intended function effectively.</p> <p>v) Please would the <b>Applicant and the relevant local authorities</b> provide an update on the discussions regarding adoption and maintenance of drainage structures associated with the scheme?</p>	<p>v) Discussions have been held with the applicant/their design consultants to agree the split of highway drainage responsibility and future maintenance. These discussions have been positive. To date no major issues have been identified and TMBC believe a satisfactory outcome is achievable.</p>
<p><b>Item 6</b></p>	<p><b>CLIMATE CHANGE</b></p>	<p>b) No remaining concerns</p>



	<p><b>Cumulative effects</b></p> <p>Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council [REP6-037 <a href="#">Table 2: Examining authority’s general questions arising from the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</a>] and High Peak Borough Council [REP6-027 <a href="#">Table 2: Examining authority’s general questions arising from the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</a>] have raised concerns about the consideration given to local policies and budgets. In general terms, the ExA is minded to consider local policies as “important and relevant” matters.</p> <p>a) Please could the Applicant comment?  b) Do <b>Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council and High Peak Borough Council</b> have any remaining concerns?</p>	
<p><b>Item 6</b></p>	<p><b>Mitigation – construction phase</b></p> <p>Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council [REP6-037 <a href="#">Table 2: Examining authority’s general questions arising from the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</a>] 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.</p> <p>Derbyshire County Council [REP6-026 <a href="#">TR010034-001142- Derbyshire County Council - responses to the ExA’s Second Written Questions.pdf (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</a>] 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.</p>	<p>q) TMBC agree with the ExA, 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.</p> <p>r) As long as the ExA’s views are incorporated in the DCO, TMBC consider no further mitigation measures are required for the construction phase.</p>

The Applicant [REP6-017 [HE551473-BBA-GEN-A57\\_AL\\_SCHEME-RP-ZM-000062 \(planninginspectorate.gov.uk\)](#)] 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 [TR010034-000887-TR010034\\_9.7\\_Comments\\_on\\_ExA\\_Written\\_Questions\\_D2\\_140122.pdf \(planninginspectorate.gov.uk\)](#)] 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.

m) Please could the **Applicant** explain whether and / or how the use of those materials, or similar, would cause it difficulty?

n) Please could the **Applicant** suggest a form of words for a requirement that would provide some firmness for mitigation using low carbon construction methods or materials?

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.

	<p>o) Please could the <b>Applicant</b> advise whether the addition of such a requirement to the DCO would cause it any difficulty?</p> <p>p) Please could the <b>Applicant</b> suggest a form of words for a requirement?</p> <p>q) Please could the <b>local authorities</b> comment?</p> <p>Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council [REP6-037 <a href="#">Table 2: Examining authority's general questions arising from the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</a>] said that observance of PAS2080 alone does not guarantee success in delivering a genuinely low-carbon scheme.</p> <p>r) Does <b>Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council</b> consider that other mitigation measures are required for the construction phase?</p>	
<p><b>Item 7</b></p>	<p><b>OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL MATTERS</b></p> <p><b>General</b>  <u><b>Outstanding responses to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions</b></u></p> <p>The Examining Authority is awaiting <b>Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council's</b> responses to some of their First Written Questions [PD-009 <a href="#">Table 2: Examining authority's general questions arising from the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</a>] regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Legislation and Policy Q2.1a)</li> <li>b) Soils, ground conditions, material assets and waste Q10.4, Q10.5 and Q10.6</li> <li>c) The water environment, drainage, flood risk assessment, Water Frameworks Directive Q11.12, Q11.15 and Q11.17</li> <li>d) Land use, social and economic, human health Q13.7 and 13.13</li> </ul>	<p>TMBC's written responses to the outstanding questions are set out in Appendix 1 at the end of this document.</p>

	<p>e) For clarity, if not answered elsewhere within another representation, would <b>Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council</b> respond to the questions? If a response has been provided, please identify the location of the response within a document.</p>	
<p><b>Item 7</b></p>	<p><b><u>Statement of Common Ground with Greater Manchester Combined Authority</u></b></p> <p>At the Preliminary Meeting on Tuesday 16 November 2021, it was suggested that Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council provide input to the Statement of Common Ground requested with Transport for Greater Manchester in Annex E of the ExA's letter of 19 October 2022 [PD-006 <a href="#">TR010034-000608-TR010034 Final Rule 6 Letter.pdf (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</a>].</p> <p>f) Please could <b>Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council and the Applicant</b> comment?</p>	<p>a) Transport for Greater Manchester's Statement of Common Ground includes details of the strategic planning issues relating to the GMCA's Places for Everyone Greater Manchester Spatial Strategy, including the PfE proposals within Tameside.</p>
<p><b>Item 7</b></p>	<p><b><u>Mitigation</u></b></p> <p>In their answer to Q 12.1 of the Examination Authority's Second Written Questions [REP6-039 <a href="#">TR010034-001190-Environment Agency Response - Deadline 6 - A57 NSIP WQ2 - Issued 16.03.22 Redacted.pdf (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</a>], the Environment Agency has advised that the best practice measures and guidance which has been used to inform / instruct the management approach presented, should be referred to and that in the instance of the Landscape and Ecological Management and Monitoring Plan (LEMMP), it would be advisable to refer to all schedule 9 (Wildlife &amp; Countryside Act 1981) Invasive Non-Native Species (INNS) identified within the development site area.</p>	<p>m) In terms of the mitigation measures for bats and badgers, given the stage of the scheme and that the measures will require licences from Natural England, the outline given of the mitigation measures is sufficient at this stage. However in terms of reporting, as outlined in Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments, all biodiversity measures listed (BD1.1-BD1.16) should be reported to LPA(s).</p>

	<p>In the same response the Environment Agency advises that they would only provide comments on the suitability of the measures proposed to control INNS detailed within scheduled 9 associated with the water environment and / or correct disposal of 'waste materials' arising from control / treatment in their role as an environmental regulator for waste management and that wider review / commentary on the control of any wider schedule 9 INNS identified within the development site area would need to be sought from the relevant additional competent authorities.</p> <p>m) Is <b>Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council</b> satisfied that the level of detail supplied of mitigating measures, including structures for species such as bats and badgers is sufficient to demonstrate that the proposed measures will be effective?</p>	
<p><b>Item 7</b></p>	<p><b>Other landscape and visual</b></p> <p><b><u>Carriageway levels, bunds and barriers</u></b>  The Applicant [REP4-008 <a href="#">TR010034-001054-TR010034 9.51 Written Summary of Applicants case at ISH2 D4 160222.pdf (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</a> and REP6-017 <a href="#">HE551473-BBA-GEN-A57 AL SCHEME-RP-ZM-000062 (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</a>] 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 <a href="#">TR010034-000887-TR010034 9.7 Comments on ExA Written Questions D2 140122.pdf (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</a>] initially said that the assessment did not take changes in existing ground levels into account and later [REP4-008 <a href="#">TR010034-001054-TR010034 9.51 Written Summary of Applicants case at ISH2 D4 160222.pdf (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</a> and REP6-017</p>	<p>o and p) A design review meeting is to be arranged with the Applicant's consultants. Access to the 3D model will be made available at this meeting. This will allow a greater understanding of levels, bunds and barriers.</p> <p>p) Greater Manchester Ecology Unit - As previous stated the grassland seed mixtures in the LEMP are not appropriate for Tameside and need to be changed. A meeting has been arranged to discuss and agree any updates to the mitigation, including to the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management and Monitoring Plan.</p> <p>r) A response to the updated LEMMP will be provided at Deadline 9.</p>

[HE551473-BBA-GEN-A57 AL SCHEME-RP-ZM-000062 \(planninginspectorate.gov.uk\)](#) 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 [Table 2: Examining authority's general questions arising from the draft Development Consent Order \(DCO\) \(planninginspectorate.gov.uk\)](#)] and Derbyshire County Council [REP6-026 [TR010034-001142- Derbyshire County Council - responses to the ExA's Second Written Questions.pdf \(planninginspectorate.gov.uk\)](#)] 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?

**Mitigation**

Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council [REP6-037 [Table 2: Examining authority's general questions arising from the draft Development Consent Order \(DCO\) \(planninginspectorate.gov.uk\)](#)] and Derbyshire County Council [REP6-026 [TR010034-001142- Derbyshire County Council - responses to the ExA's Second Written Questions.pdf \(planninginspectorate.gov.uk\)](#)], High Peak Borough Council [REP6-027 [Table 2: Examining authority's general questions arising from the draft Development Consent Order \(DCO\) \(planninginspectorate.gov.uk\)](#)] and Warner Bower [REP4-028 [TR010034-001022-Warner E Bower.pdf \(planninginspectorate.gov.uk\)](#)] 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 [TR010034-001208- TR010034 9.70 Comments on Deadline 6 responses \(1\) D7 230322.pdf \(planninginspectorate.gov.uk\)](#)] 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 [TR010034-001169- TR010034 9.40 Outline landscape and ecological management and monitoring plan \(3\) D6 160322.pdf \(planninginspectorate.gov.uk\)](#)]?

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)?	
<b>Item 7</b>	<p><b>Design</b></p> <p><b>Lighting</b></p> <p>The Applicant [REP6-017 Q5.10 <a href="#">HE551473-BBA-GEN-A57_AL_SCHEME-RP-ZM-000062 (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</a>] set out the consideration given to design options for street lighting.</p> <p>Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council [REP6-037 Q5.10 <a href="#">Table 2: Examining authority's general questions arising from the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</a>] 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.</p> <p>Derbyshire County Council [REP6-026 Q5.10 <a href="#">TR010034-001142- Derbyshire County Council - responses to the ExA's Second Written Questions.pdf (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</a>] 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.</p> <p>Peak District National Park Authority [REP6-038 Q5.10 <a href="#">TR010034-001136- Peak District National Park Authority - responses to the ExA's Second Written Questions.pdf (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</a>] referred to the need to protect dark skies, mitigate effects to wildlife and protect night-time views.</p> <p>t) Please could the <b>local authorities, Peak District National Park Authority and the Applicant</b> provide an update on discussions? Are the necessary mitigation measures in place to ensure that an appropriate balance between operational and safety requirements</p>	<p>t) TMBC require that the section of new highway to be adopted by TMBC (Woolley Bridge to Mottram Moor) be lit to appropriate lighting standards. The roads to which the new carriageway links are illuminated. The new highway will cater for cyclists, pedestrians and equestrian users.</p> <p>u) and v) TMBC acknowledges that there has already been a review of the scheme by the Design Council at an earlier stage. It would perhaps make sense to continue their involvement going forward.</p> <p>TMBC acknowledges that there is a commitment to consult on the EMP (second iteration) to which the design approach document will be appended. How the applicant will then work with the authority is not explicit, but the commitment is stated such that we are satisfied with the approach.</p> <p>The approach to landscape character is set out in the document. This along with the involvement of the Design Council and consultation with the relevant local planning authorities is sufficient to ensure that the scheme responds appropriately to landscape/townscape character in our view.</p> <p>There is detailed information and proposals for junctions/identified areas of the scheme in terms of signage, and lighting in particular, but little information in respect of the other issues such as hard landscaping, materials or barriers. There is, though, reference to meeting certain principles here and it is acknowledged that setting out specific design standards may not be appropriate at this time. Subject to meeting the consultation requirements above, TMBC is satisfied with the approach.</p>



	<p>and the desire to minimise visual impacts would be achieved? What lighting levels should be provided?</p> <p><b>Design Approach Document</b> The Applicant has submitted a Design Approach Document [REP7-029 <a href="#">TR010034-001211-TR010034 9.73 Annex C.1 Design Approach Document (1) D7 230322.pdf (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</a>].</p> <p>u) Please could the <b>local authorities and Peak District National Park Authority</b> provide any initial comments?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should the document set out proposals for the provision of a Design Champion and a Design Review by the Design Council?</li> <li>• Are there appropriate provisions for how the Applicant would work with the local authorities and other stakeholders?</li> <li>• Has it given enough regard to how the detailed design would respond to Landscape / Townscape Character?</li> <li>• Is enough detail provided on signage, street furniture, lighting, environmental barrier, structures and hard landscaping design and materials?</li> <li>• Are there any other measures that should be included?</li> </ul> <p>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</p>	
<p><b>Item 7</b></p>	<p><b>Green Belt</b></p> <p>The Applicant [REP4-008 <a href="#">TR010034-001054-TR010034 9.51 Written Summary of Applicants case at ISH2 D4 160222.pdf (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</a> and REP6-017 <a href="#">HE551473-BBA-GEN-A57 AL SCHEME-RP-ZM-000062 (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</a>] set out level differences of the</p>	<p>y) and z) Given the complexity of the Green Belt issues, TMBC would request that we provide more detailed comments for Deadline 9.</p> <p>bb) TMBC will respond in writing to this question at Deadline 9</p>

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 [HE551473-BBA-GEN-A57 AL SCHEME-RP-ZM-000062 \(planninginspectorate.gov.uk\)](#)] 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 [HE551473-BBA-GEN-A57 AL SCHEME-RP-ZM-000062 \(planninginspectorate.gov.uk\)](#)] 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.

Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council [REP6-037 [Table 2: Examining authority's general questions arising from the draft Development Consent Order \(DCO\) \(planninginspectorate.gov.uk\)](#)] reserved the opportunity to comment once it had sight of the Applicant's response.

y) Please, providing reasoning, could **Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council** now provide initial comments on:

- The spatial and visual effects on the Green Belt?
- If there would be an effect on the openness of the Green Belt?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If there would be material harm to openness in the context of local Landscape Character?</li> </ul> <p>z) Please could <b>Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council</b> provide detailed comments for Deadline 8 (Wednesday 13 April 2022)?</p> <p>The ExA is considering whether the Proposed Development preserves openness and whether it should be considered as inappropriate development in the Green Belt.</p> <p>aa) In case the ExA does conclude that it would be inappropriate development, please would the <b>Applicant</b> 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)?</p> <p>bb) Please could the <b>local authorities and Peak District National Park Authority</b> provide comments on the Applicant’s case by Deadline 9 (Wednesday 27 April 2022)?</p>	
<p><b>Item 7</b></p>	<p><b><u>Historic Environment</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Enhancement</u></b></p> <p>The Applicant [REP6-017 Q9.7 <a href="#">HE551473-BBA-GEN-A57_AL_SCHEME-RP-ZM-000062 (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</a>] set out proposals for enhancement to Mottram-in-Longdendale Conservation Area and Melandra Castle Scheduled Monument through its’ Environment and Wellbeing Designated Fund.</p> <p>ii) Do the <b>local authorities and Peak District National Park Authority</b> 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?</p> <p><b><u>Mottram Old Hall</u></b></p>	<p>ii) TMBC has reviewed and is satisfied with the Applicant’s response regarding Enhancement relating to Mottram-in-Longdendale Conservation Area [REP06-017 Q9.7] and subject to a feasibility study being agreed with TMBC has no further concerns.</p> <p>kk) TMBC has no further concerns.</p>

	<p>Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council [REP6-037 Q9.5 <a href="#">Table 2: Examining authority's general questions arising from the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</a>] raised concerns regarding the harm to Mottram Old Hall.</p> <p>jj) Please could the Applicant comment?  kk) Do <b>Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council</b> have any remaining concerns about the consideration of harm to Mottram Old Hall?</p>	
<p><b>Item 7</b></p>	<p><b>Land use, social and economic, human health</b></p> <p><b><u>Sterilisation of development land</u></b>  In their response to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions [PD-009 Q13.3 <a href="#">Table 2: Examining authority's general questions arising from the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</a>], Savilles response [REP2-084 <a href="#">Planning Appraisal Report (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</a>] suggests the potential of the proposal to stifle developable land</p> <p><b>mm) Does Tameside</b> Metropolitan Borough Council have any comment to make on the development potential of the land in question?</p>	<p>mm) The Land at Holme Valley, Wooley Bridge, Hollingworth has been promoted through the development of the GMSF/PfE document. The land has been considered through the omission sites schedule of Places for Everyone at Row 3 of (<a href="https://www.greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk/media/5668/110451-tameside-omission-sites.pdf">https://www.greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk/media/5668/110451-tameside-omission-sites.pdf</a>)</p> <p>The land is currently designated as Green Belt and there is not the intention by TMBC to amend this.</p>

## Appendix 1

### Item 7 - OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL MATTERS

#### General

#### Outstanding responses to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions

The Outstanding Responses required as set out in ITEM 7 – Other Environmental Matters, Outstanding Responses in the list of questions for Issues Hearing 3 are set out below.

2.	General matters			
	Legislation and policy			
2.1	Local planning authorities  Local highway authorities	ES Chapters 1-4 <a href="#">[REP1-014]</a>	ES paragraph 1.3.10 sets out the Applicant's list of relevant adopted plans.  a) Does this constitute the full list of development plans and policies relevant to the Proposed Development? Please explain their relevance.	a)  It is considered that those identified within the ES at paragraph 1.3.10 in relation to Planning matters in Tameside are of most relevance. Although it is noted that policies which are identified principally relate to transport matters. Policies relating to Green Belt, landscape and the historic environment would also appear to be particularly pertinent and a management appraisal exists for the Conservation area of Mottram. <a href="https://www.tameside.gov.uk/Planning/Conservation-Area-Appraisals-and-Management-Propos">https://www.tameside.gov.uk/Planning/Conservation-Area-Appraisals-and-Management-Propos</a>  It is also noted that the matter of Places for Everyone and weight to be attributed to it is considered elsewhere within the ES and does not appear within the table and 1.3.10. Which would appear logical. As has consideration of the updated NPPF, given the table references 2019.

				<p>The Council’s Carbon and Environment Strategy 2021-26 can found at: <a href="https://www.tameside.gov.uk/our-strategy">Our Strategy (tameside.gov.uk)</a></p> <p>Our Carbon and Environment Strategy 2021-26 aims to create a collective responsibility for our borough’s environment. It is important residents and business find the support they need from us to cut their carbon, which will help them offer support to their communities.</p> <p>The climate strategy, which takes its lead from Greater Manchester’s five-year environment plan, breaks down the challenge facing Tameside into five main areas: greenspace and biodiversity; homes, buildings and workplaces; influencing other to cut emissions; reducing waste and procuring sustainably; travel and transport.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

<b>Soils, ground conditions, material assets and waste</b>				
<b>Earthworks</b>				
<b>Material Assets</b>				
<b>10.4</b>	Applicant Local Authorities	ES Chapter 10 <a href="#">[APP-066]</a> Table 10.4 and Paragraph 10.9.1	<p>Table 10.4 identifies a target for use of recycled aggregates of 30%.</p> <p>a) Have potential sources of recycled aggregates been identified?</p> <p>b) If not, what degree of certainty is there that this proportion of aggregate</p>	c) The chapter has been reviewed and is satisfied subject to conditions as per the standard set out in paragraphs 10.12.3 and 10.12.4

			supply for the scheme can be secured?  c) Would the local authorities comment on availability of suitable recycled aggregates?	
<b>Waste Management</b>				
<b>10.5</b>	Local authorities  EA	Waste management  ES Chapter 10 <a href="#">[APP-066]</a>  NPSNN paragraph 5.43	Please comment on:  a) The ability of the local waste infrastructure to satisfactorily deal with waste from the Proposed Development?  b) Whether any adverse effect is anticipated on the capacity of existing waste management facilities to deal with other waste arisings in the area?	a) TMBC anticipate that the local waste infrastructure will be satisfactorily deal with the waste from the proposed development, especially as majority of the excavated materials will be reused on the site.  b) No adverse effect is anticipated on the capacity of the existing waste management facilities to deal with other waste arising in the area.
<b>10.6</b>	Applicant  EA  NE  Local authorities	Pollution control permits and licenses  REAC <a href="#">[REP1-037]</a>  ES Chapter 10 <a href="#">[APP-066]</a>	a) With reference to the NPSNN, are the relevant pollution control authorities satisfied that potential releases can be adequately regulated under the pollution control framework?	a) TMBC are satisfied that potential releases can be adequately regulated under the pollution control framework.  b) TMBC do not consider that the cumulative effects of pollution when the Proposed Development is added would make the development unacceptable.

			<p>b) Is it considered that the effects of existing sources of pollution in and around the project are not such that the cumulative effects of pollution when the Proposed Development is added would make that development unacceptable?</p> <p>c) Is there any good reason to believe that any relevant necessary operational pollution control permits, or licences or other consents will not subsequently be granted?</p>	<p>c) It is not anticipated that there any good reason to believe that any relevant necessary operational pollution control permits, or licences or other consents will not subsequently be granted.</p>
<b>10.8</b>	Local authorities EA NE	Other policy and factual issues	Are there any other comments with respect to waste management?	There are no further comments in relation to waste management.

<b>11</b>	<b>The water environment, drainage, flood risk assessment, Water Frameworks Directive</b>
-----------	---



11.12	Local highway authorities  Lead Local Flood Authorities	REAC <a href="#">[REP1-037]</a> Table 2.1 Section 10  ES Chapter 13 <a href="#">[APP-069]</a>  NPSNN paragraphs 4.48 and 4.55-6	<p>The REAC identifies a number of permits required, amongst other things, but not limited to, the control the discharge, or extraction of water and control pollution.</p> <p>a) With reference to the NPSNN, are the relevant pollution control authorities satisfied that potential releases can be adequately regulated under the pollution control framework?</p> <p>b) Is it considered that the effects of existing sources of pollution in and around the project are not such that the cumulative effects of pollution when the Proposed Development is added would make that development unacceptable?</p> <p>c) Is there any good reason to believe that any relevant necessary operational pollution control permits, or licences or other consents</p>	<p>a) The LHA/LLFA believes that potential releases can be adequately controlled under the pollution control framework.</p> <p>b) It is not felt that cumulative effects of known existing pollution would make the development unacceptable.</p> <p>c) There is no reason to believe that the necessary permits or licences will not be granted.</p>
-------	---	---	---	---

			will not subsequently be granted?	
<b>Water habitat</b>				
<b>11.15</b>	Local Highway Authority Lead Local Flood Authorities Ecology	Drainage Design Strategy Report <a href="#">[APP-188]</a>	To what degree will the proposed culvert structures be designed to provide connectivity of water habitat and for which species?	The proposed drainage structures should be designed to provide connectivity of water habitat for any identified species. Culverts should be designed to allow safe passage of badgers, otters, water voles and amphibians.
<b>Opportunities for enhancement</b>				
<b>11.17</b>	Local Highway Authority Lead Local Flood Authorities	Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) ES Chapter 13 <a href="#">[APP-069]</a> (Road Drainage and the Water Environment)	NPSNN paragraph 5.115 states that <i>“Applicants should seek opportunities to use open space for multiple purposes such as amenity, wildlife habitat and flood storage uses. Opportunities can be taken to lower flood risk by improving flow routes, flood storage capacity and using SuDS.”</i>  Does the Proposed Development take the opportunities identified in the NPSNN? Is there anything else that could be reasonably achieved?	TMBC is not aware of anything else that could be reasonably achieved.

13.0	Land use, social and economic, human health			
	Human health			
13.7	Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council	ES Chapter 12 <a href="#">[REP1-018]</a> Paragraphs 12.6.29-12.6.31	<p>a) Is there any evidence of environmental factors that are likely to be affected by the Proposed Development contributing to lower life expectancy due to Cardiovascular Disease, CHD, stroke, diabetes, asthma, Heart Failure, Atrial Fibrillation and Peripheral Arterial Disease in Longdendale ward?</p> <p>b) Please could the Applicant advise how has this been considered in the assessment?</p>	<p>a) There is no evidence of environmental factors that are likely to be affected by the Proposed Development contributing to lower life expectancy due to Cardiovascular Disease, CHD, stroke, diabetes, asthma, Heart Failure, Atrial Fibrillation and Peripheral Arterial Disease in Longdendale ward.</p> <p>The proposed development removes the majority of the traffic which currently uses the A57 through the centre of Mottram and the A57 Woolley Lane in Hollingworth. Consequently, the air pollution, both particulates and NOx will be reduced for the majority of the ward. This will help to reduce the environmental factors, which contribute to lower life expectancy from these medical conditions.</p>
13.13	Local authorities	Other policy and factual issues	Do the local authorities have any comment with regard to the effects of the Proposed Development on human health?	No further comments.



## A57 Link Roads

### Agenda for Issue Specific Hearing 4

Item	Questions	Tameside Response
Item 3	<p><b>PARTS 1 TO 7</b></p> <p><b><u>Article 11 - Application of the 1991 Act and the 2004 Act</u></b></p> <p>The Applicant [REP6-017 <a href="#">HE551473-BBA-GEN-A57 AL SCHEME-RP-ZM-000062 (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</a>] said that Derbyshire County Council and Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council's permit schemes would no longer be disappiled and has updated the dDCO [REP7-003 <a href="#">TR010034-001214-TR010034 3.1 draft DCO (5) D7 230322.pdf (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</a>], removing Article 11(8).</p> <p>c) Do <b>Derbyshire County Council or Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council</b> have any comments on the updates? Are there any remaining concerns about their permit schemes?</p>	<p>c) TMBC welcome the fact that 'detrunked' sections of road will now fall under the remit of GMRAPS. The new section of highway from Mottram Moor to Woolley Bridge should also be covered by the GMRAPS. TMBC would expect to be notified in any event of any works being planned/undertaken to the new and existing sections of the A57. This arrangement currently exists.</p>
Item 3	<p><b><u>Articles 14(6), 18(11), 19(8), 21(6) – Deemed consent</u></b></p> <p>The Applicant has updated the dDCO [REP7-003 <a href="#">TR010034-001214-TR010034 3.1 draft DCO (5) D7 230322.pdf (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</a>] to require authorities to be notified of the provisions for deemed consent when it makes an application for consent.</p> <p>e) Do <b>Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council, Derbyshire County Council or High Peak Borough Council</b> have any comments on the updates? Are there any remaining concerns about deemed consent?</p>	<p>e) TMBC does not have any remaining concerns.</p> <p>19(8) should be 19 (9) and/or 19(10)</p>
Item 3	<p><b><u>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 dDCO reference</u></b></p>	<p>f) TMBC have no remaining concerns about the maintenance of access.</p>

	<p>The Applicant has updated the dDCO [REP7-003 <a href="#">TR010034-001214-TR010034 3.1 draft DCO (5) D7 230322.pdf</a> (<a href="#">planninginspectorate.gov.uk</a>)] to reword the provisions regarding the maintenance of access.</p> <p>f) Do <b>Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council, Derbyshire County Council or High Peak Borough Council</b> have any comments on the updates? Are there any remaining concerns about the maintenance of access?</p>	
<p><b>Item 4</b></p>	<p><b>SCHEDULES 1 AND 2</b></p> <p><b><u>Requirement 4(2)(c) - second iteration EMP - Working hours</u></b></p> <p>The Applicant has added Requirement 4(2)(c)(x) to the dDCO [REP7-003 <a href="#">TR010034-001214-TR010034 3.1 draft DCO (5) D7 230322.pdf</a> (<a href="#">planninginspectorate.gov.uk</a>)] to require notification of activities outside normal working hours.</p> <p>c) Do <b>Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council, Derbyshire County Council or High Peak Borough Council</b> have any comments on the update? Are there any remaining concerns about dDCO provisions for working hours?</p>	<p>c) Out of hours working will need the approval of a TMBC EHO.</p> <p>There are a significant number of works that can be carried out with the stated working hours that could be disruptive, including deliveries. Notwithstanding the constraints identified at 4 (2)(iii) in particular, it would be preferable that ‘normal’ deliveries take place within or as close to the stated working hours, as this activity can be disruptive in terms of noise.</p> <p>The wording could be amended as follows:</p> <p>(c) require adherence to working hours of 07:30–18:00 Mondays to Fridays and 07:30–16:00 on Saturday, <b>including deliveries</b> other than those identified at (c)(iii) below, except for—</p> <p>(i) <b>deliveries</b>, movements to work, maintenance and general preparation works but not including running plant and machinery for a period of one hour either side of the above times;</p> <p>4 (2) (vi) refers to the removal of overhead power lines and where there are no new/unforeseen material impacts. It is not</p>

		<p>clear how is this to be assessed and who is to determine the position should this situation arise. This should be clarified.</p> <p>Meeting arranged to resolve this and any other planning related issues.</p>
Item 4	<p><b>Requirement 5 – Landscaping</b></p> <p>The Applicant has updated the dDCO [REP7-003 <a href="#">TR010034-001214-TR010034 3.1 draft DCO (5) D7 230322.pdf</a> (<a href="#">planninginspectorate.gov.uk</a>)] to require that no part of the authorised development can commence unless a written landscaping scheme for that part has been consulted on and approved.</p> <p>f) Do <b>Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council, Derbyshire County Council or High Peak Borough Council</b> have any comments on the update? Are there any remaining concerns about Requirement 5?</p>	f) No further comments.
Item 4  Local Planning Authority	<p><b>Requirement 10 – Archaeological remains</b></p> <p>The Applicant has updated the dDCO [REP7-003 <a href="#">TR010034-001214-TR010034 3.1 draft DCO (5) D7 230322.pdf</a> (<a href="#">planninginspectorate.gov.uk</a>)] to add a requirement for any programme of archaeological reporting, post excavation and publication to be consulted on and / or agreed in writing.</p> <p>g) Do <b>Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council, Derbyshire County Council or High Peak Borough Council</b> have any comments on the update? Are there any remaining concerns about Requirement 10?</p>	g) No further comments.
Item 4	<p><b>Requirement 12(1) Details of consultation – minimum period</b> <a href="#">TR010034-001214-TR010034 3.1 draft DCO (5) D7 230322.pdf</a> (<a href="#">planninginspectorate.gov.uk</a>)</p> <p>h) Please could <b>Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council, Derbyshire County Council or High Peak Borough Council, Tameside Metropolitan</b></p>	h) A 21 day consultation period is acceptable

	<p><b>Borough Council, Derbyshire County Council and High Peak Borough Council</b> provide an update on discussions regarding the consultation period, for which periods ranging from 14 days to 28 days have been suggested?</p>	
Item 5	<p><b>SCHEDULES 3 TO 10</b></p> <p><b>Schedule 3, 4 and 5</b> [REP7-003 <a href="#">TR010034-001214-TR010034 3.1 draft DCO (5) D7 230322.pdf (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</a>]</p> <p>a) Has <b>Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council</b> reviewed the latest versions? Does it have any further comments, please?</p>	a) No further comments
Item 6	<p><b>ANY OTHER DRAFT DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER MATTERS</b></p> <p>a) Please could the <b>Applicant</b> provide a written summary of its responses for Deadline 8, on Wednesday 13 April 2022?</p> <p>b) Please could the <b>Applicant</b> provide any updates to its final dDCO, Explanatory Memorandum and tracked versions for Deadline 8, on Wednesday 13 April 2022?</p> <p>The ExA will publish a schedule of changes to the dDCO no later than Wednesday 20 April 2022. <b>Comments on that are required for Deadline 9, on Wednesday 27 April 2022.</b></p>	TMBC will respond in writing to this question at Deadline 9