



Planning Inspectorate

Application by National Highways for an Order Granting Development Consent for the M60/M62/M66 Simister Island Interchange Project

Action Points arising from Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) on environmental matters held on Wednesday 27 and Thursday 28 November 2024

Action	Description	Action by	When
1	Provide in writing the evidence supplied orally during the hearing detailing the benefits beyond the those included within the Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR) and confirm whether there are any other indirect benefits from the Scheme aside from supporting the allocations within Places for Everyone (PfE) Joint Development Plan.	Applicant	Deadline (D) 4
2	Provide detail of the BCR and describe the benefits for the inner links option in comparison to Northern Loop.	Applicant	D4
3	Provide an update to the cumulative assessment following submission of a scoping opinion in PfE JPA.1.1 site allocation and any other known developments.	Applicant	D5
4	Consider if sensitivity tests should be revisited in respect of PfE Northern Gateway site allocations.	Applicant	D4
5	Submit a copy of the National Highways 'The Road to Good Design'.	Applicant	D4
6	Provide details how the design of the Scheme meets the 'Design Principles for National Infrastructure', published by the National Infrastructure Commission (February 2020).	Applicant	D4
7	Explain why not all comments received during the statutory consultation in respect of design were taken into account.	Applicant	D4
8	BMBC to provide further evidence to support response to ExQ1 question DES1.1. to explain why it is satisfied with the design in general. BMBC and Applicant to provide further details on the advice provided by BMBC on the design during pre-application stage and how the design incorporated their comments.	Bury Metropolitan Borough Council (BMBC) and the Applicant	D4
9	Explain why, when the design review panel "strongly encouraged the design team to introduce more trees across the Scheme", this was not included within the proposed design	Applicant	D4

Action	Description	Action by	When
	and was not considered feasible, notwithstanding your comments in Table 4-2 row 8 in the Scheme Design Report [APP-151].		
10	Provide more details on the aspirations for the finished quality appearance of the Pike Fold Viaduct and Pike Fold Bridge.	Applicant	D4
11	Explain whether a document setting out the design principles can be produced to define the design principles that are to be incorporated into the detailed design, bringing together the different design objectives and mitigation measures set out across the application documents of the Scheme.	Applicant	D4
12	Supply a written submission of the further detail supplied in the hearing which explained how Table 12.28 in Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 12 was created and why the ratings within it are considered appropriate.	Applicant	D4
13	Provide further details on the measures proposed to ensure the number of private vehicles using Mode Hill Lane to access the main site compound are minimised as far as possible and explain how this would be secured in the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO).	Applicant	D4
14	Confirm whether the noise assessment accounted for the condition of Mode Hill Lane. Also explain how, if any preconstruction work was required on sections of Mode Hill Lane outside the Order Limits, this could be secured as part of the dDCO.	Applicant	D4
15	Explain why a medium value was assigned to footpath 9WHI as opposed to high and whether any change to the value would change the assessment findings.	Applicant	D4
16	Review what is included within the proposed Scheme in respect of safety measures for footpath 9WHI and whether any planting/screening from the motorway for mitigation is included, or could be included, which could be considered an enhancement.	Applicant	D4
17	Consider whether any measures could be undertaken as part of the Scheme to improve the Haweswater Underpass Permissive Path. Detail how any measures identified could be secured as part of the dDCO.	Applicant	D4
18	Currently the junction is stated as having a capacity of 90,000 vehicles. Provide the	Applicant	D4

Action	Description	Action by	When
	equivalent future capacity of the junction if this Scheme was constructed.		
19	Supply a written submission of the further detail supplied in the hearing which explained how much traffic would be induced by the proposed Scheme, which parts of the network this traffic would affect and how this additional traffic has been incorporated into the modelling. Also explain how induced traffic was accounted for in the BCR.	Applicant	D4
20	Provide further detail to your response to ExQ1 question TTA.1.1 to include comment regarding the predicted increase in traffic on the A576 as detailed in paragraph 4.2.11 of ES Chapter 4 [APP-149].	BMBC	D4
21	Explain why it is appropriate to use a figure of 75% for activity time in noise calculations for this Scheme when 83% was applied in the A12 Chelmsford to A120 Widening Scheme.	Applicant	D4
22	Consider if further noise barriers should be included within the Proposed Scheme to provide long term noise reduction in the Noise Important Areas. Supply detail of how any additional barriers would be secured in the dDCO or explain why additional barriers are not proposed.	Applicant	D4
23	Include detail of how the proposed dust mitigation measures for this Scheme would be successful in mitigating impacts from construction dust relating to stockpiles (and other dust issues related to site compounds). Include details of any examples where these measures have been used successfully on other projects.	Applicant	D5
24	Provide further detail on the need for future monitoring of air quality. Detail what measures would be required for air quality monitoring during the operational period and how this could be secured in the dDCO.	BMBC	D4
25	Respond to the four points of context raised by BMBC which detailed why they are requesting future monitoring of air quality.	Applicant	D4
26	Identify what policies could be relied upon to support the request to consider local carbon budgets as well as the national budgets.	BMBC	D4
27	Provide written submissions on the comments raised by BMBC in respect of the Boswell judgements.	Applicant and BMBC	D4

Action	Description	Action by	When
28	Provide detail of the sensitivity tests undertaken relating to climate resilience.	Applicant	D4
29	Confirm if there is a section of the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN) 2015 which supports the approach being undertaken in relation to the proposed environmental mitigation.	Applicant	D4
30	Provide in writing the evidence supplied orally during the hearing detailing the reasons why the location and scale of the environmental mitigation to the land to the north-east of M60 Junction 18 is required and why it is considered that other locations would not be suitable.	Applicant	D4
31	Provide a written submission of the evidence supplied orally during the hearing detailing the reasons why it is considered the location and scale of the environmental mitigation proposed to be implemented within plots 2/16b and 2/16d is not appropriate. Applicant to respond at D5.	The Hilary Family (represented by Mr Chris Stroud) and Applicant	D4 and D5
32	Provide a written submission of the evidence supplied orally during the hearing detailing the concerns regarding the use of plots 2/16b and 2/16d to provide landscaping/screening which is proposed to reduce significant visual effects at visual receptors (VP3, VP4, VP5 and VP7). Applicant to respond at D5.	The Hilary Family (represented by Mr Chris Stroud) and Applicant	D4 and D5
33	Provide further details and submit a copy of the scheme-wide lighting assessment referred to in paragraph 2.5.38 and the lighting appraisal referred to in paragraph 2.5.39 in ES Chapter 2 [APP-041].	Applicant	D4
34	Explain how the landscape and visual impact assessment has taken into account any findings within the lighting assessments referred to in action point 33 and whether an assessment was undertaken of the receptors that would be most susceptible to impacts from lighting.	Applicant	D4
35	Consider if a new requirement should be added to the dDCO requiring the details of the final design for the netting to Pike Fold Golf Course to be approved by the SoS following consultation with BMBC to ensure that impacts of any netting would be minimised.	Applicant and BMBC	D5
36	Provide more detail regarding the 'less than substantial harm' that would arise to the	Applicant	D4

Action	Description	Action by	When
	heritage significance of Heaton Park Registered Park and Gardens.		
37	Provide more detail regarding the 'less than substantial harm' that would arise to the heritage significance of Brick Farmhouse during construction.	Applicant	D4
38	Provide in writing the evidence supplied orally in the hearing detailing how the locations of the boundaries between each of the land types as shown in Figure 9.3 [APP-069] was determined.	Applicant	D4
39	Provide details of the typical life spans of low and very low noise surfacing proposed to be used on this Scheme. Provide a comparison of these life spans to conventional non noise reducing surfacing.	Applicant	D4
40	Explain why it is acceptable for waste generation for operation to be scoped out for this Scheme when the use of a material (low and very low noise surfacings) is proposed which may create more waste during operation.	Applicant	D4
41	Supply further detail on the issue of waste management for construction. Include whether landfill capacities have been considered as part of the cumulative impacts in relation to other schemes or developments which may also have landfill needs that coincide with the proposed scheme.	Applicant	D4
42	Provide evidence to demonstrate that the waste recovery percentages are appropriate.	Applicant	D4
43	Explain how far waste may need to be transported if there was not sufficient capacity in the Greater Manchester sub region and explain how this has been accounted for in the transport assessment.	Applicant	D4
44	Explain why it is acceptable that the disposal of hazardous waste quantities has not been considered in the ES when all hazardous waste produced, regardless of the amount, will need to be transported out of the Greater Manchester sub region.	Applicant	D4
46	Consider the submissions at D4 by the Applicant on waste and then detail any concern over the capacities of local waste infrastructure and the effect this Scheme could have on them. Explain if the scheme proposals for waste accord (and if so how) with your mineral and waste policy.	BMBC	D5

Action	Description	Action by	When
47	Provide further detail on the likely vehicle movements associated with hauling materials and how this has been accounted for in the transport assessment.	Applicant	D4
48	Advise whether the worst-case material requirements have been considered as part of the cumulative impacts in relation to other schemes or developments which may also have material needs that could coincide with the construction of the proposed Scheme.	Applicant	D4
49	Consider the submissions at D4 by the Applicant on the Scheme's material requirements and detail any concern about the ability of your region to supply the materials required for the scheme. Explain if the scheme's estimated material requirements accord (and if so how) with your mineral and waste policy.	BMBC	D5
50	Provide examples of how the use of the term 'significant' would work in practice in relation to future changes to the Scheme. Clarify whether the Applicant considers any changes could be significant.	Applicant	D4
51	Consider if a more precise restriction for limits of deviation for the proposed attenuation ponds needs to be added to the dDCO.	Applicant	D5
52	Provide more detail to explain why Article 45(3) is required and clarify whether any other made DCO has included a similar provision to Article 45(3).	Applicant	D5
53	Consider whether reference to 'hard landscaping' should be included in Requirement 5(3).	Applicant and BMBC	D4