

Tameside MBC Responses for Deadline 9

<p>Item 7</p> <p>Ecology</p>	<p>Other landscape and visual</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council [REP6-037] [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>and Derbyshire County Council [REP6-026]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] High Peak Borough Council [REP6-027]</p> <p>[REDACTED] and Warner Bower [REP4-028]</p> <p>[REDACTED] 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.</p> <p>The Applicant [REP7-026] [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>appears to suggest that these matters be resolved during detailed design.</p> <p>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)?</p>	<p>r) While the planting mixtures in the updated Outline LEMMP are still not perfect they now include many more appropriate species. As it is stated that they are indicative only and that the final mixtures will be agreed later, provided this happens, the LEMMP is acceptable at this stage.</p>
--	---	--

<p>Item 7</p>	<p>Green Belt</p> <p>The Applicant [REP4-008] [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>y) The Council has reviewed the Engineering and Section Drawings provided and conclude that, despite the design solutions to minimise</p>
----------------------	---	--

[REDACTED] 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] [REDACTED] 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] [REDACTED] 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] [REDACTED] 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:

impact on the openness of the Green Belt; the Council still considers that the Proposed Development will impact on the openness of the Green Belt for the following reasons:

- The nature of the Green Belt is currently largely open countryside - the Proposed Development will affect the spatial openness as the area covered by the link will be permanently 'lost' and no longer countryside;

The harm to the Green Belt visually includes:

- in the sections where the carriageway is proposed to run along raised embankments up to 10m above ground level (including Section 4 which the Applicant describes to be raised approximately 6-10 m above existing, screened either side with embankments (approx. 5m higher than carriageway level)). A HGV driving at this height above ground level will be visible from many viewpoints.
- the use of landform features such as 6m bunds (such as at Section 11) will impact spatially and visually on the Green Belt
- Proposed landscaping treatment is likely to reduce the visual impact to some degree as the current character is open

The Council has reviewed the Proposed Development in the context of the openness of the local landscape character; which is predominantly rural; pastoral farmland and grazing meadows enclosed by hedgerows; which are open in nature (as defined in GM Landscape Character and Sensitivity Report 2018). The Proposed Development includes screening of the route with trees and planting and environmental bunds; which will cause material harm to the openness in the context of Local Landscape Character.

bb) Tameside Council have no further comments on the case for Very Special Circumstances.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The spatial and visual effects on the Green Belt? – The National Highways response to the green belt is set out below. • If there would be an effect on the openness of the Green Belt? • If there would be material harm to openness in the context of local Landscape Character? <p>zThe ExA is considering whether the Proposed Development preserves openness and whether it should be considered as inappropriate development in the Green Belt.</p> <p>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)?</p>	
--	--	--

<p>Item 7</p>	<p><u>Historic Environment</u></p> <p><u>Enhancement</u></p> <p>The Applicant [REP6-017 Q9.7 [REDACTED]] 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 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?</p> <p><u>Mottram Old Hall</u></p> <p>Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council [REP6-037 Q9.5 [REDACTED]]</p>	<p>kk) The Council has no remaining concerns regarding the harm to Mottram Old Hall [REP6-037 Q9.5]</p>
----------------------	--	---

	<p>[REDACTED] raised concerns regarding the harm to Mottram Old Hall.</p> <p>kk) Do Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council have any remaining concerns about the consideration of harm to Mottram Old Hall?</p>	
--	---	--