

From: Kevin Ludden [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 June 2021 15:49
To: Neil.Rodgers@[REDACTED]Tameside-Gilmore, Nigel
<nigel.gilmore@[REDACTED] A57 Link Roads
<A57LinkRoads@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: A57 Link Road at Mottram - re public consultation

Dear Mr. Rodgers, Mr Gilmore and the Planning Inspectorate, I understand that you will be writing a report on the adequacy of the 2020 public consultation by Highways England over the A57 Mottram mini-bypass Link Road.

Because I live about 300 yards from the location and have resided here for 36 years, may I let you know why I felt the consultation was both poor and presumptuous?

01)It was given to the public as a fait accompli with little explanation over changes to the route other than they were cheaper and (supposedly) to the benefit of residents. Its tone was that it was a done deal and HE were not going to bust a gut in explaining and defending awkward aspects or indeed, attending properly to questions which were inconvenient to their immediate agenda leading upto a planning application.

02)I felt cheated when the consultation made no reference to residents' fears about the dangers of subsidence raised in the 32-page detailed 'Geotechnical Report on the Assessment of Potential Settlement due to Tunnel Construction' of the bypass commissioned by the Highways Agency in 2007 for the same site as now.

HE promised, time and again, at various meetings, that they would carry out tests and keep us informed. But in the 2020 public consultation's 23-page booklet, there was not one word about subsidence and our concerns. No detail from drilling sites, nothing.

03)The 2020 public consultation document showed no intuition or foresight over the Pandemic. There was not one mention in the document about how the mini-bypass could be affected by the Covid-19 virus - with the vast numbers of people working from home either due to Lockdown or employer choice and how that could become a permanent employment feature and with a consequent reduction in commuting and other work traffic on our roads. I thought it had the potential to turn the mini-bypass into a white elephant - unused. I asked HE about this and a senior official just responded that there had been no data (to consider it). The response was flat and there was nothing in the consultation document.

04)HE did not address the basic question of whether residents wanted the new road in its amended and diminished form, covering only the village of Mottram, as opposed to the original design for Mottram, Hollingworth and Tintwistle. We were asked in the consultation's response form's booklet whether we agreed or disagreed with HE's 'overall proposals for the scheme,' ie taking it for granted that the (Mottram) road was a done deal and we were only being consulted about the detail of it - not whether we wanted this now-truncated project without Hollingworth and Tintwistle.

HE project manager [REDACTED] claimed in the Tameside Reporter on June 12, 2021, that: 'Two thirds were in favour of the scheme' while making no apology for it being a one-village, butchered bypass. He made it sound like a success story when I, as a local resident, have only heard local opinion as 'it's a waste of time and money just covering Mottram.' Local newspapers have

headlined people's dismay as 'Road rage over bypass' and 'We don't want half a bypass, villagers say.' But, if you believe Highways England and how it worded its opinion poll question in its public consultation document, we all think it's great. We don't and it's not.

Regards,

Kevin Ludden, [REDACTED]

--

This email has been checked for viruses by AVG.

<https://gbr01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.avg.com%2F&data=04%7C01%7CA57LinkRoads%40planninginspectorate.gov.uk%7C2ca6381880a84cd4e28a08d9371f3f89%7C5878df986f8848ab9322998ce557088d%7C0%7C0%7C637601429610769141%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Iik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=zvEkAfujI4RSmWI2Fp8XeDjoMu%2F5tC0rcy15SMrSN6o%3D&reserved=0>