

From: Johanne Dagustun [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 June 2021 02:19
To: NI Enquiries <NIEnquiries@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Proposed A57 Link Roads previously Trans Pennine Upgrade Programme (TPUP) TR010034

As a local resident, I am keen to offer you my views on the adequacy of the consultation on this proposal, as I understand that this is a key issue that you will be examining in the near future.

In that context, I wish to flag up to you:

- an extract of my response to the Highways England consultation directly focused on this issue: please see my response to q21 in the document attached
- a letter I previously wrote to the local paper on this issue, which you can find here: <https://online.flippingbook.com/view/971924/18/>.

In addition, I have read the note of your meeting with the Highways England, dated February 26th [TR010034-Advice-00008-1-262021- A57 Link Road Project Update Meeting Note.pdf \(planninginspectorate.gov.uk\)](#), and I am strongly of the view that much of the confusion noted in some of the responses to the consultation may stem from the inadequacy of the consultation, as highlighted in the two documents above.

I would also highlight that the consultation analysis prepared by Highways England has not yet been published, despite some analysis being shared with you back in February. For the local community, this delay in publication further works to undermine trust in the process being followed by Highways England; for example, as I write I am unable to draw on my own scrutiny of the consultation analysis to form a view on what elements should be highlighted to you as I offer my comments on the adequacy of the consultation.

I trust that these documents and comments will be helpful to you as you prepare your decision on this issue, and I look forward to seeing that decision in due course.

Kind regards

Jo Dagustun
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]



Please note that the contents of this email and any attachments are privileged and/or confidential and intended solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this email and its attachments, you must take no action based upon them, nor must you copy or show them to anyone. Please contact the sender if you believe you have received this email in error and then delete this email from your system.

Recipients should note that e-mail traffic on Planning Inspectorate systems is subject to monitoring, recording and auditing to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The Planning Inspectorate has taken steps to keep this e-mail and any attachments free from viruses. It accepts no liability for any loss or damage caused as a result of any virus being passed on. It is the responsibility of the recipient to perform all necessary checks.

The statements expressed in this e-mail are personal and do not necessarily reflect the opinions or policies of the Inspectorate.

DPC:76616c646f72



Please consider the environment before printing this email

Response ID ANON-C9Q5-UV5F-8

Submitted to **A57 Link Roads - November to December 2020**

Submitted on **2020-12-17 19:14:15**

Introduction

A57 Link Roads - Consultation Response Form

Please provide us with your name and address. If you'd prefer for your comments to be anonymous, please provide us with your postcode so we know where you live in relation to the scheme.

Name:

Jo Dagustun

██████████
██████████████████
██████████████
██████

Postcode:

██████████

1 What do you currently use the road for?(Tick all that apply)

Business, Residential, Leisure

2 How do you normally travel on the route? (Tick all that apply)

Car, Walk

Other::

3 What is your view on our overall proposals for the scheme?

Disagree

4a What is your view on our proposal to remove the Roe Cross road link, junction and roundabout from the scheme?

Disagree

4b Is there anything we should consider or any comments you'd like to make?

Comments:

The removal of this element of the scheme:

- significantly reduces the potential benefits of the scheme for all those wishing to access the motorway network from south Stalybridge. It is important to assess this proposal in the context of an assessment of the benefits that were previously intended to accrue to this stakeholder group.
- significantly reduces the potential benefits of the scheme for residents of Matley Lane, who would no longer be likely to see an anticipated reduction of 'rat run' traffic. It is important to assess this proposal in the context of an assessment of the benefits that were previously intended to accrue to this local area.
- significantly reduces the potential benefits of the scheme in terms of traffic calming at three of Mottram's main junctions (at either end of Back Moor and at Mottram Junction), and is likely to increase traffic flow over time along Back Moor. Where is the assessment of this impact?
- significantly increases the chance of traffic from the Stalybridge direction using Mottram Junction to reach the motorway network, a junction which is otherwise the focus for reducing traffic. What impact will this have on the local vision for Mottram Junction, in terms of traffic flow and road safety?

As a local resident, I am keen to understand the local authority's assessment of this proposal.

5a What is your view on our new location and design for the Mottram Underpass?

Disagree

5b Is there anything we should consider or any comments you'd like to make?

Comments:

It seems quite astounding and unlikely that we are able to build underground lines in London and other major cities without demolishing first everything that sits on the ground above the lines, but that this building methodology is the best that we can offer to this village in the North West of England.

At its eastern end, the tunnel seems to come to an end very close to a dense residential area. What is the scope for extending the tunnel at that end, to reduce the impact on local residents?

As a local resident, I am keen to understand the local authority's assessment of this proposal.

6a What is your view on our proposal to replace the proposed roundabout at Mottram Moor, with a signal-controlled junction?

Disagree

6b Is there anything we should consider or any comments you'd like to make?

Comments:

I strongly believe that putting a new junction in this location, taking into account the heavy traffic flows expected, poses a significant risk to road safety, so long as the catchment for the high school in Hollingworth extends to the west of this junction. Mottram Moor is currently an important route to school for many local children: the new road layout will introduce a major hazard and most likely reduce the extent to which parents feel willing to support their children's active travel to school, contrary to policy in this area, with a consequential negative impact on the health and well-being of young people. Ironically, there is simply no need to have any new junction in this area: with the bypass extended to encompass Hollingworth, this link road from Glossop could instead be routed under Mottram Moor, with a long tunnel to minimise the air pollution effects of the traffic flowing underneath.

I would like to see the work that has been done with local schools to assess the impact of a junction in this location, on the basis of their existing school travel information. Also, the views of national road safety charities should be sought on this issue, and is disappointing that this has not been done to date.

As a local resident, I am keen to understand the local authority's assessment of this proposal.

7a What is your view on our proposal to reduce the length of our River Etherow crossing?

Disagree

7b Is there anything we should consider or any comments you'd like to make?

Comments:

Before taking a positive view on this element of the scheme, I would need to know more about how this impacts future possible improvements to local walking, cycling and bridleway infrastructure. In order to meet local sustainable travel goals, we urgently need to establish the opportunities for, and make decisions about, such new infrastructure development before final decisions are made about new road layouts.

As a local resident, I am keen to understand the local authority's assessment of this proposal.

8a What is your view on our new design for the Woolley Bridge junction and location of the link road?

Disagree

8b Is there anything we should consider or any comments you'd like to make?

Comments:

Before taking a positive view on this element of the scheme, I would need to know more about how this impacts future possible improvements to local walking, cycling and bridleway infrastructure. In order to meet local sustainable travel goals, we urgently need to establish the opportunities for, and make decisions about, such new infrastructure development before final decisions are made about new road layouts.

As a local resident, I am keen to understand the local authority's assessment of this proposal.

9a What is your view on the new provisions for cyclists and pedestrians, including additional crossings at the proposed Mottram Moor junction and connections to the former route?

Disagree

9b Is there anything we should consider or any comments you'd like to make?

Comments:

Without a comprehensive assessment and agreed plan for what improvements can be made to encourage active travel in the local area more generally, it is difficult to offer a view on this partial and piecemeal provision. At first glance, however, this provision looks to be insufficient, falling short of best practice in terms of offering reassuring well-segregated cycle lanes and walkways.

The underpass proposed at the end of the M67 seems particularly problematic: this is a local area where previous underpasses have had to be closed due to personal safety issues (on Stockport Road). Personally, I have come closest to being attacked by strangers in a lonely underpass, and would not wish this on anyone. Busy underpasses, lined with well-frequented cafes and shops are one thing: creating an underpass, likely to be used infrequently, in an area where personal attacks are not uncommon is quite another. Has this provision been subject to a gender impact assessment? Have the views of the local policy force been sought?

It is also the case that the current provision for pedestrians and cyclists in the local area is wholly inadequate, for example along the A57(T) Hyde Road between Mottram and the M67, where the pavement on the westbound side is managed very poorly for the safety of pedestrians. This raises key issues of trust with regard to plans for future provision. There has been scope for a segregated footpath and cycle way for some time in this area, and this remains a priority for the local community: every day is important for local health and safety, and it is unacceptable that any improvements should be put on hold until a new road layout can be delivered.

10a What is your view on our new locations for the Carrhouse Lane underpass?

Disagree

10b Is there anything we should consider or any comments you'd like to make?

Comments:

Before taking a positive view on this element of the scheme, I need to know more about how this impacts future possible improvements to local walking, cycling and bridleway infrastructure. For example, it is possible that this proposed road layout would constrain options for a new off-road link between Broadbottom

Railway Station and Hollingworth, which could be achieved by the upgrading of local footpaths in this area. In order to meet local sustainable travel goals, we urgently need to establish the opportunities for, and make decisions about, such new infrastructure development before final decisions are made about new road layouts.

As a local resident, I am keen to understand the local authority's assessment of these proposals.

11a What is your view on our environmental assessment and the measures we proposed to minimise the impact in relation to air quality?

Disagree

11b Is there anything we should consider or any comments you'd like to make?

Comments:

For a project of this size and scope, it is totally unacceptable on public health grounds that this project does not have an objective bringing air quality, across the footprint of the whole scheme, within legal limits. Have health experts been consulted on this matter, or do we need to await court judgements to underline the criminality of both the current air quality situation and the highly limited proposals in this regard?

As a local resident, I am keen to understand the local authority's assessment of these proposals.

12a What is your view on our environmental assessment and the measures we proposed to minimise the impact in relation to noise?

Disagree

12b Is there anything we should consider or any comments you'd like to make?

Comments:

Without some site-specific demonstrations, shared with local residents and land users, it is not possible to agree that the noise impact of this scheme will be acceptable. This might have been achieved via the production of a more realistic and productive project video, to include projected traffic flows and changes in noise levels resulting from the proposals, from multiple vantage points in the local area.

Aside from human impact, we know much about how increases in road traffic noise impact on local wildlife. It will be important to see the likely impact of new sources of noise on local biodiversity, and it is a matter of regret that this information has not been offered in the current documentation.

As a local resident, I am keen to understand the local authority's assessment of these proposals.

13a Would you describe the landscape surrounding the scheme as particularly important to you?

Yes

13b If yes, what are the three most important natural, or man-made features of this landscape to you?

Comments:

1. Hobson Moor, as a venue for peaceful leisure activities and as a first link in the chain of undisturbed moorland stretching towards the Peak District National Park.

2. Local deer. It is remarkable that the local population of deer have not been provided for in the environmental impact assessments to date. This population is widespread in the local area, and a much loved aspect of our local wildlife: the consideration of this important species needs to go well beyond a simple analysis of how we would prevent road accidents in this context.

3. The wonderful views and the peaceful and accessible green spaces and trails provided across the whole watershed area.

14 Please use this space to provide any further comments or suggestions:

Comments:

It is hugely disappointing to see such little detail on the environmental impact of this scheme at this stage and how this fits with local, regional and national policy. The local area is bound by Climate Emergency commitments at the national, regional and local level, and yet this issue is not highlighted in the current documentation. This is a major oversight.

My sense is that there is no good fit, and that this scheme thus contradicts local commitments to reduce carbon emissions. It is thus impossible to endorse this scheme without some further transparency and discussion on this issue - for which the local authority would have to adopt a positive engagement strategy - and I suspect that a proper examination of the data on this point would work to point up the dubious legality of this scheme (although the data provided so far on this point is very difficult to interpret). What is absolutely clear, however, is that the argument that "the [cumulative] impact of the Scheme should be considered in the context of overall emissions from the UK and globally" - as stated in the project documentation - is both wrong and highly misleading. If everyone took that approach, on every local scheme, then our rising carbon output would soon underline the logical fallacy inherent in that approach.

A57 Link Roads - Consultation Response Form

15 Your age:

45-54

16 Your gender:

Female

17 Do you consider yourself to have a disability?

No

18 Did you participate in one of our telephone events or join one of our webinars?

Yes

19 By completing this questionnaire, you have identified that you have an interest in this project. It would help us if you could identify the nature of your interest (you may tick more than one box).

Residential

Other::

20 How did you find out about the consultation? (please provide details in comments box below)

Comments::

Local MPs supporting the scheme sought to raise awareness of the need to support the scheme amongst their local supporters, and it was probably this that alerted me to the forthcoming consultation. I was also alerted to the forthcoming consultation via press releases suggesting that construction contractors had been engaged on the scheme.

21 Considering the current situation around COVID-19, do you think we've delivered an effective consultation?

No

If 'No', is there anything you think we could improve?:

I am extremely concerned that this consultation is taking place now (Autumn 2020) and consider it very poor practice that the decision was made to go ahead with it at this time. Especially given the preliminary nature of some of the information presented, and the further work still to be done, regarding the environmental impact of the scheme and associated traffic flow estimates, it seems simply bizarre that a decision wasn't taken to proceed with that background work until national and local conditions allowed for a more effective - post-vaccine - consultation. I am highly disappointed that the pre-consultation engagement discussions with local stakeholders didn't work to flag up this option in an effective way.

Given local rules and guidance, in addition to the baseline strain that the coronavirus pandemic is having on individual families, it has simply been impossible for many local residents to fully engage in this consultation: the opportunities for ad-hoc conversations with local friends and neighbours (under 'no mingling restrictions') are simply very low indeed, and yet it is these conversations that give people the support and confidence to engage and speak up.

I have been shocked to find that some people locally - especially in Hollingworth - are unaware that this proposal does not encompass a full bypass around Mottram, Hollingworth and Tintwistle.

I have personally made a huge effort to engage people locally, whatever their views, as I believed that there was otherwise a risk that many important local perspectives would otherwise simply go unheard. This included helping to organise a webinar, at which we arranged for someone speaking for and someone speaking against the scheme, so that we could support isolated people to engage in the discussion and draw their own conclusions about the impact of the scheme. But we had to admit failure when we noted that this webinar did not achieve the hoped for local reach. (That said, it is possible that this session reached more people than the Highways England webinars.)

I know of people who would have wanted to attend the session arranged locally, and the HE webinars too, but it was simply not feasible to set them up technologically given the local pandemic restrictions.

Many local people I have talked to feel sidelined by this consultation. It is hard to over-estimate the impact of this, and the likely disquiet if the scheme goes ahead in a way that does not seem to solve the problem as local communities understand it, but indeed makes their personal situation worse. I will come back to this below.

I have listened to many people telling me that they are frankly baffled and upset by the consultation process. In some cases, this is because the information they have received does not give them sufficient information to understand the likely impact of the proposals, and they yearn for the traditional public meetings at which they can ask questions, express their views, listen to others and see large maps and models; in other cases, people in key areas (such as south Stalybridge) have not received any information through their doors (and nor had been targeted by any specific social media efforts). This is despite a key change (the removal of the planned infrastructure at Roe Cross) affecting them in particular.

As part of this consultation, it is important to note that there was no effective way for ordinary members of the public to safely study the printed project documentation (which ran to hundreds of pages and was not easily accessible, due to idiosyncracies of formatting, to even proficient IT users), unless they were willing to pay more than one hundred pounds for their own set. The local documentation access points, for example in small village shops and post offices, were simply unsuitable locations for browsing given the ongoing pandemic, and in any case the deposited documentation did not include the sort of large scale maps that people wanted to examine.

Of those who watched the video, some people I spoke to were appalled at the 'marketing aspect' of this element of the consultation materials. Whilst fairly effective at communicating the planned route, it seemed highly disingenuous that the video didn't also communicate projected traffic flows. Instead, it offered a highly stylised vision of largely traffic-free new roads, in an emotive way which I would argue was designed (whether consciously or not) to garner support for the scheme rather than to offer an objective overview fit for consultation purposes.

I was contacted by one woman, highly interested in the scheme and with many constructive views, and asked her if she had attended the HE webinars: I was

taken aback to hear her ask me how webinar was spelt. Given the conversation that followed, I strongly believe that we have severely overestimated the likely effectiveness of the webinar offer to many in the community, for whom this is simply an alien concept: one can't sign up for a webinar if one has no understanding of what this is. To address this issue, working with an objective to maximise local engagement, a pre-consultation stage of offering technology skill development amongst the local community might have been worthwhile (and would have delivered wider and lasting benefits).

Given the constraints of consulting during a pandemic, I strongly believe that the two stages of the statutory consultation should have been decoupled and sequenced to encourage engagement. This could have allowed people to scrutinise the responses from statutory consultees, such as the local authorities and other bodies, before they made their own response: I believe that this would have been somewhat effective in promoting wider engagement, as people would have had a chance to consider the extent to which they felt that their paid representatives and other organisations were accurately representing their own views.

On the other hand, I have found that key local organisations, such as local schools and possibly also the local authority in Tameside, have simply been unable to devote any significant resource to this consultation. Whilst I hope that this is very much not the case, I have been given to understand that Tameside Council do not even intend to respond to this consultation, in a way that can be put on record and scrutinised by local residents, despite their role as a statutory consultee and despite the fact that their participation at this stage - as underpinned by statute - is highly relevant and conducive to an effective consultation, helping Highways England prepare effectively for the next stage of the project development process.

This is a particularly sensitive consultation about a highly controversial scheme. The debate about how to resolve local problems has been ongoing for decades. I have spoken to people who want to engage on behalf of long-deceased relatives, but simply aren't finding it straightforward to do so. At this key stage, it is really important to get maximum engagement, and it's important to understand that this was always going to be difficult: on the one hand, there are people who simply don't believe that anything is going to happen, after living through many decades of promises made and broken, so why bother to engage; on the other hand, there are people who are keen for just something - anything - to be done, and so they turn a blind eye to the details - this latter approach is exactly what we don't want, of course, for the final scheme to deliver successfully.

I think it's important to be very clear indeed on one key issue: one projected impact of the scheme will be to significantly worsen the day to day lives of many local residents, especially in Hollingworth, as the traffic speeds up and road safety is further compromised (assuming that no action is taken to impose weight limits on the Woodhead Pass). There seems to be no debate about that. The scheme will also fail to address the key health and safety issue of illegal levels of air pollution in some areas. On those grounds alone, I believe that this consultation should have been undertaken following the highest possible standards with regard to effective consultation. I do not believe that this has been achieved, and indeed do not believe that it could have been at the current time. This will surely be a matter of regret for all those who favour this scheme proceeding as quickly as possible, for it is surely the case that the adequacy of this consultation will be tested fervently as the project progresses.

Meanwhile, local residents, young and old, suffer the consequences of intolerable local road conditions, which put their health and wellbeing at risk every single day. It is high time for a more joined up approach on this issue, an approach which places the voices of the local community at its heart - as they grapple with balancing their own wellbeing with the needs of those who traverse through their community - to reach a consensus on the way forward. This will require a sophisticated programme of work, and I fear that the current consultation does little to contribute to that.