

**A57 LINK ROADS
TRO10034**

DEADLINE 9 - 27th APRIL 2022

Post-ISH3 7f submission - Email correspondence between TfGM and NH

**CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire Branch
Unique Reference: 20029243**

Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between NH and TfGM REP2-019

TfGM is not a party at the Examination preferring to use a SoCG with NH as its means of communicating. The SoCG between National Highways and TfGM indicates intermittent engagement since July 2016, the majority of which were emails concerned with local junction and bus stop arrangements. The final engagement in row 10.15 of the SoCG is a 12 Jan 2022 *'email detailing additional strategic points that TfGM would like to discuss as part of the ongoing discussions.'* An email about strategic points appears important, in the context of the failure of the traffic modelling to accurately reflect the impact on Greater Manchester and the failure of the scheme to support the goals of the Greater Manchester Transport Strategy Right Mix policy.

At the Preliminary Meeting of the Examination on 16 November 2021, it was suggested that TMBC provide input to the SoCG requested with Transport for Greater Manchester in Annex E of the ExA's letter of 19 October 2022 [PD-006]. This request was dealt with at the ISH3 Item 7f) [REP8-027] when TMBC responded that *'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.'* At ISH3 we requested that this email be made available to the Examination. We received the email (dated 11th not 12th Jan) from NH on 25 April 2022. As supplied its formatting makes it difficult to read so we have reproduced the email below.

Since the author has been redacted and it has an informal tone, the status of this email is not clear, but it is all we have so far. It does, however, raise significant issues such as the relevance of Right Mix and carbon targets, the need to 'reclaim the road' and fund a package, the need to be compatible with a future bypass of Hollingworth/Tintwistle, the A57 as 'Streets for All'. The latter would need to deal with the significant traffic increases envisaged.

Overall we are concerned that this statement raises issues not before the DCO and seems to have been written without sight of the CPRE detailed analysis on the way in which the scheme impacts adversely on the Right Mix package.

The email from TfGM to NH

Dated 11 Jan 2022

Hi Andrew

As I said, we'd be following up more formally, but just to give you the best advanced notice the sorts of things I think we should be highlighting are as follows:

- GM supports the bypass (one of the few road schemes that we favour)
- We need to mention Rightmix targets.
- Need to mention carbon targets.
- Need to mention clean air.
- The above three imply some degree of caution about the extent to which we allow an increase in car traffic.
- The benefit it brings are not just travel time savings for motorists: we also get an improvement in the urban environment in Mottram, with benefits for walkers and cyclists and also helps bus users. Important in particular to be able to get the bus through junctions at either end of the bypass.
- In general when we are supportive of road schemes we do so in expectation that we can reclaim the road that has been relieved for other purposes – so we would like the scheme to also pay for pedestrian/cycling/bus facilities in Mottram (I'm sure we can find a way of putting this better!)
- We note that this is just Mottram - the question of Hollingworth/Tintwistle is still open. GM doesn't yet have a firm commitment to this (though informally it falls into the limited category of road schemes we are not necessarily averse to) – but either way Mottram needs to be done in a way that it is future proofed ie allows for a future which includes the H-T bypass.
- Importance of considering GMSF growth, particularly Godley Green.
- A57 as a future Streets for all corridor.

Thanks (author redacted)


Copy of email as sent to us by NH on 25th April 2022



Fri 07/01/2022 12:01

FW: A57 Link Roads - SoCG

To:  Dawson, Andrew

 You replied to this message on 11/01/2022 12:32.

Hi Andrew,

As I said, we'll be following up more formally, but just to give you the best advanced notice, the sorts of things I think we should be highlighting are as follows:

- GM supports the Mottram bypass (one of the few road schemes that we favour)
- We need to mention Rightmix targets.
- Need to mention carbon targets.
- Need to mention clean air.
- The above three imply some degree of caution about the extent to which we allow an increase in car traffic.
- The benefits it brings are not just travel time savings for motorists: we also get an improvement to the urban environment in Mottram, with benefits for walkers and cyclists, and also helps bus users. Important in particular to be able to get the bus through junctions at either end of the bypass.
- In general, when we are supportive of road schemes we do so in expectation that we can reclaim the road that has been relieved for other purposes – so we would like the scheme to also pay for pedestrian/cycling/bus facilities in Mottram (I'm sure we can find a way of putting this better!)
- We note that this is just Mottram – the question of Hollingworth/Tintwistle is still open. GM doesn't yet have a firm commitment to this (though informally it falls into the limited category of road schemes we are not necessarily averse to) – but either way, Mottram needs to be done in a way that it is future proofed i.e. allows for a future which includes the H-T bypass.
- Importance of considering GMSF growth, particularly Godley Green.
- A57 as a future Streets for All corridor.

Thanks,



