

# Trans-Pennine Upgrade Public Consultation Report 2018



# Table of contents

Chapter	Pages
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 The purpose of this document	3
1.2 The scheme	3
1.3 Consultation on the scheme	3
<b>2. OUR APPROACH TO THE 2018 STATUTORY CONSULTATION</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1 Overview of the statutory consultation	6
2.2 Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC)	6
2.3 Public consultation	7
2.4 Prescribed consultees, local authorities and interested landowners	8
2.5 Additional statutory consultation	8
<b>3. RESPONSES TO THE 2018 STATUTORY CONSULTATION</b>	<b>9</b>
3.2 Overview of responses	9
3.3 Consultation response forms	9
3.4 Local authorities	13
3.5 Prescribed and non-statutory consultees	13
<b>4. KEY CONCERNS RAISED DURING THE 2018 STATUTORY CONSULTATION AND OUR RESPONSE</b>	<b>14</b>
4.1 What you said and what we are doing	14
4.2 Concerns outside the scope of the scheme	16
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>17</b>

## Tables

Table A-1 - Abbreviations and descriptions	18
Table B-1 – Summary of Free Text Responses to Question 3	21
Table B-2 - Summary of Free Text Responses to Question 5	25
Table B-3 - Summary of Free Text Responses to Question 7	31
Table B-4 - Summary of Free Text Responses to Question 8	35
Table B-5 - Summary of Free Text Responses to Question 10	36
Table B-6 - Summary of Free Text Responses to Question 17	39
Table C-1 - Summary of Responses Received from Local Authorities (s42(1)(b))	48
Table D-1 - Summary of Responses Received from Prescribed Consultees	52
Table D-2 - Summary of Responses Received from Non-Statutory Consultees	61

## Figures

Figure 1-1: Summary of Non-Statutory and Statutory Consultation Periods.	5
--	---

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 The purpose of this document

1.1.1 This is the summary consultation report for the 2018 statutory consultation on the Trans-Pennine Upgrade scheme.

## 1.2 The scheme

1.2.1 Highways England's Trans-Pennine Upgrade (TPU) is part of a £15 billion government investment in motorways and A roads under its 2014 Road Investment Strategy and involves improving journey times, tackling congestion and reducing incidents between Manchester and Sheffield. The Trans-Pennine route, which includes the A57, A628, A616 and A61, mainly consists of single carriageways with steep gradients and sharp bends and is particularly affected by bad weather. Schemes that form the Trans-Pennine Upgrade are also designed to reconnect communities divided by busy roads.

1.2.2 The scheme includes the following elements:

- Mottram Moor Link Road – a dual carriageway link from the M67 terminal roundabout to a junction at A57(T) Mottram Moor
- A57(T) to A57 Link Road – a single carriageway link from the A57 at Mottram Moor to a junction on the A57 at Brookfield, bypassing the existing A628/A57 and A57 Woolley Lane/Woolley Bridge Road junctions
- Westwood Roundabout – an extra lane on the roundabout and the approaches to increase capacity and improve journey time reliability
- Safety and technology improvements – safety measures focused on addressing collisions along the whole route and technology measures to provide driver information and inform route choices

## 1.3 Consultation on the scheme

1.3.1 There have been two earlier periods of non-statutory consultation on the scheme:

- Pre-non-statutory consultation took place between October 2015 to March 2017 comprising workshops with key stakeholders, Statutory Environmental Body meetings and public awareness events.
- A non-statutory consultation took place between 13 March and 10 April 2017, where a number of options were presented to the public. Early consultation with the public at the non-statutory stage allowed members of the public to provide feedback on the options stage and influence the development of the TPU. The views collected during this time informed the Preferred Route Announcement (PRA) in November 2017.

1.3.2 Since the non-statutory consultation on options in early summer 2017 and the Preferred Route Announcement during autumn 2017, the scheme proposals have developed:

- Improvements will be required at M67 Junction 4, to enable the scheme to perform at its best.

- The new junctions at A6018 Roe Cross Road and the new A57 link with Woolley Bridge are to be signalised 'T' junctions.
- The design of the Mottram Tunnel has been reduced in length by approximately 40m on the eastern side meaning that it is now classified as an underpass, offering significant cost savings during construction and ongoing maintenance costs.
- Opportunities for facilities for cyclists, pedestrians, equestrians and walkers are being identified through work with local authorities and TfGM.
- Crossing facilities on the A57 from the M67 Junction 4 are to be improved and a combined cycleway and footpath alongside the new A57(T) to A57 link road between Mottram Moor and Woolley Bridge will be provided.
- The existing A57(T) Hyde Road between the M67 Junction 4 and the new roundabout on Mottram Moor will no longer be part of the trunk road network and ownership will be passed to the local highway authority, Tameside MBC.
- The improvements to the community environment include lower speed limits, speed reduction measures, local junction improvements, additional parking bays, and traffic priority signals.
- Two formerly proposed elements of the scheme have been removed:
  - A61 Dualling – a dual carriageway on the A61 between the A616 roundabout and junction 36 of the M1
  - A628 Climbing Lanes – two overtaking lanes on the A628 near Woodhead Bridge and near Salters Brook Bridge

1.3.3 The statutory consultation that is the subject of this report took place from 12 February to 25 March 2018 to ensure the local community, residents, local interest groups, businesses, visitors and road users all had the opportunity to fully understand the TPU and comment on the proposals.

1.3.4 An additional Targeted Statutory Consultation was held between 4 June 2018 and 1 July 2018 to engage with interested parties missed from the first statutory consultation after ongoing review of land referencing and finalisation of the Book of Reference.

**Figure 1-1: Summary of Non-Statutory and Statutory Consultation Periods.**



## **2. OUR APPROACH TO THE 2018 STATUTORY CONSULTATION**

### **2.1 Overview of the statutory consultation**

2.1.1 The statutory consultation ran for 6 weeks from the 12 February to 25 March 2018 (42 days). This was to ensure the local community, residents, local interest groups, businesses, visitors and road users all had the opportunity to fully understand and comment on the scheme. The opportunity was also provided to comment on the parts of the scheme that can be delivered without a Development Consent Order (DCO) - Westwood Roundabout and the safety and technology elements.

2.1.2 The statutory consultation was an opportunity to seek views on a number of aspects of the scheme including:

- level of support for link roads
- agreement with community environment improvements proposals
- views and suggestions of how the land above Mottram underpass may look on completion of the scheme
- level of support for improved facilities for pedestrians, cyclists, equestrians and walkers
- level of agreement with improved safety
- whether proposals for Westwood roundabout will reduce delays

### **2.2 Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC)**

2.2.1 Before the consultation a Statement of Community Consultation was prepared, setting out the timetable for the consultation and the various activities planned. The SoCC was agreed in advance of the consultation taking place with Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council, Derbyshire County Council, Sheffield City Council and Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council, and also Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM).

2.2.2 The final version of the SoCC, revised in line with the comments and suggestions received from the local authorities was published in the national and local press and made available at local community venues:

- Broadbottom Community Centre
- Hattersley Hub
- Hattersley Library
- Hollingworth Post Office
- Magdalene Centre, Broadbottom
- Mottram Post Office
- St Mary's Church, Hollingworth
- Gamesley Community and Sports Centre

- Glossop Leisure Centre
- Glossop Library
- Hadfield Library
- High Peak Borough Council
- Peak District National Park Authority
- Barnsley Central Library
- Penistone Library
- Tankersley Post Office
- Tankersley Welfare Hall
- Stocksbridge Library

## 2.3 Public consultation

- 2.3.1 At the start of the consultation period, copies of the public consultation brochure were sent directly to residential and commercial properties in close proximity to the scheme. The brochure outlined the scheme's objectives, how proposals have developed and changed since the PRA and details of the elements which we would like views on as well as details for the public exhibitions and how to respond to the consultation. A wider distribution catchment area also received notification of the consultation period, and how to find out more information about the scheme, via an A4 flyer.
- 2.3.2 From the 12 February 2018 the consultation material, including the brochure with the customer response form, a 3D visualisation model, the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) and Non-Technical Summary (NTS), and the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC), was available to view on the dedicated scheme webpage.
- 2.3.3 The documents were also available at deposit locations within the vicinity of the scheme.
- 2.3.4 Six public consultation events were held:
- Saturday 17 February 2018 - Mottram C of E Primary School
  - Wednesday 28 February 2018 - Bradbury Community House, Glossop
  - Saturday 3 March 2018 - Tesco, Hattersley
  - Monday 5 March 2018 - Tankersley Welfare Hall
  - Friday 9 March 2018 - Bradbury Community House, Glossop
  - Saturday 10 March 2018 - Mottram Community Centre
- 2.3.5 The exhibitions gave people an opportunity to view the proposals, talk to the project team and provide comments. The public were informed of the exhibition through channels including advertisements in appropriate local newspapers, via our webpage, the media, direct communications (including brochure/flyer drop) and scheme updates (if subscribed to on the scheme website).

- 2.3.6 All responses received by Tuesday 25 March 2018 were included in the consultation. The online response form closed on the day the consultation period ended.
- 2.3.7 Councillors from Tameside MBC, High Peak Borough Council and Barnsley MBC were invited to a VIP event which was held during the first hour of the first public exhibition event. A brief presentation was given to attendees followed by the opportunity to view the exhibition and discuss the proposals with the project team.
- 2.3.8 The consultation was advertised in local and national newspapers: the London Gazette, The Guardian, Tameside Reporter, Barnsley Chronicle and Sheffield Star.
- 2.3.9 A press release detailing the consultation and how the community and road users can participate was issued on 13 February 2018.
- 2.3.10 The public consultation was also advertised on Highways England North West Twitter feed @highwaysNWEST.

## **2.4 Prescribed consultees, local authorities and interested landowners**

- 2.4.1 Highways England also formally consulted with:
- Prescribed Consultees
  - Local authorities
  - Interested landowners
- 2.4.2 Letters were sent providing an overview of the scheme, an explanation around the classification of the scheme as a National Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) and the requirement to apply for a DCO. The duty to consult and the statutory consultation process during the pre-application period was also further explained. The consultees were advised of the public consultation events and the opportunity to provide feedback and opinions on the scheme. A web link was provided to the consultation documents and the methods of providing a response.

## **2.5 Additional statutory consultation**

- 2.5.1 It was determined after the end of the statutory consultation that a number of interested landowners who were missed. The Applicant ran a targeted statutory consultation to engage with them which ran from the 4 June to 1 July 2018.
- 2.5.2 The materials used for this consultation were the same as those used in the first round of statutory consultation and were sent out on 1 June 2018 as special delivery.



### 3. RESPONSES TO THE 2018 STATUTORY CONSULTATION

3.1.1 We received a total of 594 responses by the end of the statutory consultation period on the 25 March 2018:

- 367 online consultation response forms
- 111 paper consultation response forms
- 47 emails or letters from stakeholders and members of the public who provided a written consultation response instead of filling in the consultation response form
- 69 enquiries.

3.1.2 No responses were received during the targeted Statutory Consultation (4 June to 1 July 2018).

### 3.2 Overview of responses

3.2.1 All the responses received to the consultation, via both the consultation response forms and written consultation responses, have been analysed and the subjects raised allocated to particular themes.

3.2.2 The responses to the closed questions within the consultation response form demonstrate that respondents support many elements of the scheme.

3.2.3 Respondents were asked about their level of support for the scheme in question 4 where the highest majority (217) strongly agreed, whereas 96 strongly disagreed.

3.2.4 The majority of respondents also agreed that the local junction improvements, additional parking bays, additional crossing facilities and cycle routes, will improve the community environment on the A57(T) and Woolley Lane and transform the A57(T) into a local road.

3.2.5 The majority of respondents also supported the proposals for NMUs.

### 3.3 Consultation response forms

3.3.1 A summary of the responses to the questions related to the statutory consultation in the consultation response forms and the key issues raised, is provided below. The detail of individual responses can be found in Appendix B.

**Question 1: What is your interest in the link roads based on?**

Daily user	Weekly user	Monthly user	Do not use route	Land or property owner	Total
230	121	64	7	166	588

**Question 2: To what extent will the link roads affect or impact you?**

Highly affected	Affected	Marginally affected	Not affected	Do not know
256	123	43	20	27

**Question 3: Please explain your reason(s) for your answer to question 2**

Comment	No. of respondents
I use A57 and nearby road network regularly in my commute / to visit family / leisure / business etc	75
I live near / use the A57 everyday / own property within / am affected by current traffic levels / will be affected by construction	57
The scheme will reduce traffic and improve journey times	54
Traffic in the area is awful and something needs to be done	39
Concerns the scheme will increase noise and pollution (air and light)	38

**Question 4: Please identify your level of support for the link roads**

Strongly agree / Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree / Strongly disagree	No opinion / Do not know	Total
310	28	129	5	472

**Question 5: Please explain the reason(s) for your response to question 4**

Reason	No. of respondents
Hollingworth and Tintwistle also need to be bypassed	45
It will ease congestion/improve journeys and road safety	36
Anything has to be better than what we have put up with for many years/long awaited solution/essential something is done	31
The current levels of congestion are terrible	10
It will only lead to more congestion/move the problem further along the route.	10

**Question 6: To what extent do you consider the following measures will improve the community environment on the A57(T) and Woolley Lane and transform the A57(T) into a local road?**

Measure	Strongly agree / Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree / Strongly disagree	No opinion / Do not know
20 mph speed limit	196	76	153	21
Speed cushions and chicanes	180	61	177	22
Local junction improvements	132	75	211	24
Changes to traffic signal priorities	181	63	172	29

Measure	Strongly agree / Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree / Strongly disagree	No opinion / Do not know
Additional parking bays	244	100	58	38
Additional crossing facilities	281	101	127	21
Cycle routes	244	91	75	31

**Question 7: Is there anything else you think we should consider to improve the existing roads?**

Comment	No. of respondents
Impose a tonnage restriction to reduce HGVs / restrict HGVs	51
Hollingworth and Tintwistle also need to be bypassed	32
Further consideration must be given to NMU's	18
Improve existing roads rather than spend money on new (resurfacing and repairing pot holes)	18
Use alternative methods to reduce speed other than chicanes and speed bumps	9

**Question 8: We have provided an outline proposal of how the land above the Mottram underpass might look on completion of the scheme – the plan is available at our exhibitions or visit our webpage at [www.highways.gov.uk/trans-pennine-upgrade](http://www.highways.gov.uk/trans-pennine-upgrade). We would welcome your views and suggestions on how the land above the Mottram underpass could be used after completion of the scheme to enhance the local community.**

Comment	No. of respondents
Tree and Shrub planting /more trees / landscaping to tackle pollution / create habitats for wildlife	63
No view / no comment / N/A / no strong views on this	37
A park, woodland area, community park	35
Allotments	11
Install sport facilities	10

**Question 9: Please identify your level of support for the proposals for pedestrians, cyclists, equestrians and walkers.**

Strongly agree / Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree / Strongly disagree	No opinion / Do not know	Total
274	76	37	48	435

**Question 10: Please explain the reason(s) for your response to question 9 and tell us of any particular locations or routes that we may have missed that you feel should be improved for pedestrians, cyclists, equestrians and walkers**

Comment	No. of respondents
Improved pedestrian links and crossings are welcomed	5
Only concerned for free-flowing traffic	4
Any additional cycle routes would be welcomed	4

3.3.2 Questions 11 to 16 covered the safety and technology improvements and Westwood roundabout, which were not part of the statutory consultation in preparation for our DCO application and are not described here.

**Question 17: Do you have any further comments about our proposals for the Trans-Pennine Upgrade?**

Comment	No. of respondents
Hollingworth and Tintwistle villages also need to be bypassed	98
Enforce a ton limit on the route / ban HGVs	29
It is a waste of time and money	37
Get on with it / its 20-30 years late	16
Strong objection	14

**Question 18: How did you find out about this consultation?**

Postal distribution	Poster / Public notice	Scheme website / email	Local Authority correspondence	Community group information	Newspaper advert / website
256	49	84	35	23	53

**Question 19: Have you found the consultation materials useful in answering your questions?**

Yes	No	To a certain extent
205	40	215

**Question 20: Did you attend one of our public exhibitions? If so, which one?**

Mottram Primary	Glossop	Hattersley	Tankersley	Hollingworth	Mottram Community Centre	Did not attend
45	3	17	1	30	25	17

## **3.4 Local authorities**

3.4.1 Detailed responses from local authorities can be found in Appendix C.

## **3.5 Prescribed and non-statutory consultees**

### **Prescribed consultees**

3.5.1 A total of 18 responses were received from prescribed consultees:

- Environment Agency
- Forestry Commission
- Health and Safety Executive
- Historic England
- National Grid
- Natural England
- Public Health England
- Royal Mail Group
- United Utilities

### **Non-Statutory Consultees**

3.5.2 Nine responses were received from non-statutory consultees:

- National Trust
- Campaign for Better Transport
- Charlesworth Parish Council
- Sustrans
- Friends of the Peak District and Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) South Yorkshire
- SPEED Bridleway Group
- Northwest Transport Activists Roundtable
- Pennine National Trails Partnership

3.5.3 Details of the responses from prescribed and non-statutory consultees can be found in Appendix D.

## 4. KEY CONCERNS RAISED DURING THE 2018 STATUTORY CONSULTATION AND OUR RESPONSE

### 4.1 What you said and what we are doing

4.1.1 A summary of key concerns raised in during the 2018 statutory consultation and how we are responding in developing the scheme, are provided in the table below.

The key concerns raised during the consultation	Our response
<p><b>Air quality</b></p> <p>Several respondents asked questions relating to the existing air quality in Mottram and the surrounding areas and the effect the scheme would have on this, especially bearing in mind the Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) planned by High Peak Borough Council in the village of Tintwistle and area around Dinting Vale.</p>	<p>To address these questions, Highways England is increasing the number of current air quality monitoring sites, to better understand the impacts on the existing air quality and better inform the air quality modelling for the scheme.</p> <p>This includes additional sites within the current scheme boundary and additional sites on the A57 and A628 to complement existing sites currently being monitored by the local authorities.</p>
<p><b>Traffic impacts throughout the scheme</b></p> <p>Questions were raised about the potential impacts on the existing traffic levels in the area and how these would change with the implementation of the scheme.</p> <p>Questions were also asked on how this would affect adjacent local routes in the village of Mottram and the surrounding areas.</p>	<p>During consultation it became apparent that a number of alternative routes were being used by local residents to avoid the current congestion along the A57 Mottram Moor and Hyde road.</p> <p>Highways England is planning to carry out additional traffic assessments of these alternative routes and incorporate them into the traffic model, to better understand the impacts on the wider highway network.</p>
<p><b>Noise impacts within the area</b></p> <p>Questions were raised about the current noise levels, as a number of Noise Impact Areas (NIAs) have been declared within the scheme boundary.</p> <p>These questions focused on how the scheme would impact on areas currently suffering from noise and also on adjacent areas along the proposed route of the bypass.</p>	<p>Highways England were already considering the impacts from noise and were already proposing low noise surfacing, noise bunds and noise barriers as potential mitigation strategies for any changes as a result of the scheme.</p> <p>The extent of the modelling will be revisited to incorporate any changes to the traffic modelling and design as part of the additional surveys and areas.</p> <p>The scheme design is an iterative process which is developed through the preliminary design phase, to identify the most suitable mitigation strategy to minimise landscape and visual impact. These will be incorporated within the Environmental Management Plan.</p>
<p><b>Impact on the landscape</b></p> <p>Questions were raised about the environmental impact on the existing landscape, including the loss of trees, hedgerows, pasture and any potential impacts on the wildlife habitats.</p>	<p>The scheme includes a range of measures designed to mitigate for potential effects on landscape character and visual amenity.</p> <p>These include woodland planting, woodland edge planting, linear belt of shrubs and trees, hedgerows with trees and individual trees.</p> <p>Highways England are continuing to carry out environmental surveys to assess the condition and changing nature of the current environment. Survey</p>

The key concerns raised during the consultation	Our response
	<p>information will be used to ensure there is no net loss from the implementation of the scheme and will be developed as part of the Environmental Management Plan.</p>
<p><b>De-trunking measures along the A57</b> The current proposals for the de-trunking works along the A57 Hyde Road from junction 4 of the M67 through to Mottram Moor and the additional traffic calming works to the A57 Woolley Lane, were questioned requiring greater detail/does this include a speed limit reduction to 20mph.</p>	<p>During consultation Highways England set out a combination of parking and cycling enhancements along Mottram Moor. We are progressing these proposals to develop a strategy that addresses the needs and views of the residents as a whole, as the opportunities for change vary along the length of this section of road.</p> <p>The details of the physical measures will be agreed with Tameside MBC via a statement of common ground. These measures will be developed to complement the authority's long term view for the area, including enhancing cycling provision.</p>
<p><b>Parking and cycling provision A57 Mottram Moor</b> The residents of the A57 Mottram Moor had mixed views of the proposed parking and cycling enhancements along the section from the junction of Back Moor through to the Gun Inn Junction, presented at consultation, highlighting issues with the existing access arrangements.</p>	<p>During consultation Highways England presented a combination of parking and cycling enhancements along Mottram Moor, we are to progress these proposals to develop a strategy that looks to address the needs and views of the residents as a whole, as the opportunities for change vary along the length of this section of road.</p>
<p><b>Settlement around the underpass structure</b> Questions about settlement were raised by the residents living near the proposed underpass from Roe Cross Road through to Old Hall Lane. They were concerned to understand the nature of the works and the impact on settlement as a result of the depth of the excavation and scale of the works. A previous ground investigation report from an earlier scheme in 2005 had been made available which highlighted potential settlement in the area.</p>	<p>During the consultation process Highways England were carrying ground investigations, to determine the extent of the existing ground conditions in the area.</p> <p>The results of these investigations will be used to inform potential construction techniques and shape the design of the underpass, identifying potential impacts on the surrounding area and properties.</p> <p>Further targeted investigations may be required dependent on the outcomes of the investigation report.</p>
<p><b>Access for cyclists, equestrians and walkers</b> Several responses were received relating to the existing connections to the public rights of way throughout the scheme, asking how these are to be affected during construction and by the implementation of the scheme.</p> <p>Requests were made to improve connectivity in the area, specifically looking to place additional routes throughout the scheme.</p>	<p>Highways England have met on several occasions with Tameside MBC to discuss the impact of the scheme on the existing routes in the area.</p> <p>We have held a separate meeting with Tameside MBC and representatives from the local cycling, equestrian and walking groups, and have decided to carry out a detailed assessment in the area to confirm the current use and user demands in the area.</p> <p>Once the assessment is complete we will look for opportunities to enhance the existing provisions in the area.</p>
<p><b>Roe Cross Road – underpass structure</b> During the consultation Highways England asked for consultees to indicate their preference on a long-term landscaping solution for the area on top of the underpass from Roe Cross Road through to Old Hall Lane.</p>	<p>The majority of respondents expressed a preference for trees and shrub planting, with complementary landscaping and the creation of a habitat for wildlife for the land above the underpass. Highways England are planning to develop these plans in conjunction with Tameside MBC.</p>

The key concerns raised during the consultation	Our response
<p><b>Confirmation of Speed limits throughout the scheme</b></p> <p>Questions were raised at consultation about the numerous different speed limits throughout the scheme and adjoining local roads.</p>	<p>Highways England presented the proposed speed limits of the new Links Roads as 50mph with adjoining roads remaining at 30mph, except for the sections of the de-trunked A57 Hyde Road and Woolley Lane which would be reduced to 20mph.</p> <p>Discussions with Tameside MBC have led us to re-assess this proposal and are currently considering whether the new A57 link Road from Mottram Moor to Woolley Bridge should operate at 30mph. These changes will be assessed to understand their impact on the traffic modelling assessments.</p>

## 4.2 Concerns outside the scope of the scheme

4.2.1 There were also two key concerns raised that we are unable to resolve in the delivery of the scheme. These are set out in the table below.

The key concerns raised during the consultation that we are unable to resolve	Our response
<p><b>Impose a tonnage restriction to reduce HGVs / restrict HGVs</b></p>	<p>The current A628 and A57 is owned and operated by Highways England on behalf the Department for Transport and forms part of the Primary Route Network. As such it must be open for all forms of vehicles and cannot discriminate against specific user types. Therefore, we cannot impose such restrictions on the A628 and A57 route from Manchester to Sheffield.</p> <p>The scheme is however looking to remove the HGV traffic from the centre of Mottram with the introduction of the scheme.</p>
<p><b>Concerns that Hollingworth and Tintwistle are not part of the solution</b></p>	<p>The current proposed scheme would introduce measures to alleviate the issues currently being encountered in the Mottram area.</p> <p>Additional studies have been highlighted by Transport for the North to enhance the future connectivity between Manchester and Sheffield that will look to address the issue in the adjacent villages.</p> <p>There is no commitment to any other scheme at this time. An update to the Roads Investment Strategy RIS is expected early 2020.</p>



# Appendices

# Appendix A. Abbreviations

**Table A-1 - Abbreviations and descriptions**

Abbreviation	Full text
APFP	Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure
CPRE	Campaign to Protect Rural England
DCC	Derbyshire County Council
DCLG	Department for Communities and Local Government <sup>1</sup>
DCO	Development Consent Order
DDA	Disability Discrimination Act
DfT	Department for Transport
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ES	Environment Statement
LED	Light Emitting Diode
HGV	Heavy Goods Vehicle
MBC	Metropolitan Borough Council
MP	Member of Parliament
NMU	Non-Motorised User
NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
NTS	Non-Technical Summary
PA 2008	Planning Act 2008
PAEs	Public Awareness Events
PDNPA	Peak District National Park Authority
PEIR	Preliminary Environmental Information Report
PRA	Preferred Route Announcement
PROW	Public Right of Way
RBS	Route Based Strategy
RIS	Road Investment Strategy
s42	Planning Act 2008 – Section 42: Duty to consult
s44	Planning Act 2008 – Section 44: Duty to consult each person who is within one or more of the categories set out in section 44.
s46	Planning Act 2008 – Section 46: Duty to notify Commission of proposed application
s47	Planning Act 2008 – Section 47: Duty to consult local community

<sup>1</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government is now the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government

Abbreviation	Full text
s48	Planning Act 2008 – Section 48: Duty to publicise
s49	Planning Act 2008 – Section 49: Duty to take account of responses to consultation and publicity
s55	Planning Act 2008 – Section 55: Acceptance of applications
SoCC	Statement of Community Consultation
SPRS	South Pennines Route Strategy
SRN	Strategic Road Network
TPU	Trans Pennine Upgrade
TPUP	Trans Pennine Upgrade Programme
TfGM	Transport for Greater Manchester
The Inspectorate	Planning Inspectorate
VMS	Variable Message Signs

# Appendix B. Responses to the Consultation

## B.1 Public Consultation

A total of 594 responses were received by the end of the statutory consultation period on the 25 March 2018 of which 367 were online questionnaires, 111 paper questionnaires, 47 emails or letters and 69 enquiries. In addition to receiving feedback via the customer response form, a number of stakeholders and members of the public provided a written consultation response. These have also been considered and details of the topics raised are outlined later in this report along with the responses which have been received from local authorities and prescribed consultees.

No responses were received during the Targeted Statutory Consultation (4 June to 1 July 2018).

## B.2 Analysis of Consultation Response Forms

All of the 478 completed questionnaire responses were analysed. A coding framework was created to enable analysts to organise responses by themes and issues so that key messages and specific points of detail could be captured and reported. Each code presents a specific issue or argument raised in responses. This enables all responses to be indexed according to the issues raised by the respondents.

The feedback received in the questionnaire is a self-selecting sample, meaning the respondent has either chosen to respond or not respond to each question. Consequently, the results can only be taken to apply to those who responded to the question(s) and not a representative of all consultees.

The responses have been separated into three categories of respondent type:

- Prescribed consultees (s42(a)) (s42(b))
- Persons with interest in land (s44)
- Local communities (s47)

## B.3 Closed Question Responses

Questions 1 to 10 were closed questions. The responses are summarised below.

### Question 1: What is your interest in the link roads based on?

Question 1 investigated the respondent's interest in the link roads.

There was 1 response from s42(a) who was a daily user of the existing A57 route.

There were 187 responses from s44 consultees, of which 56 were daily users of the existing roads, 17 weekly users, and 2 monthly users.

52 responded as a land / property owner / tenant along the existing A57 and 60 as a land / property owner / tenant along the new link roads.

There were 400 responses from s47 of which 173 were daily users, 104 weekly users, 62 monthly users and 7 who do not / won't use the existing A57 / new road links.

42 responded as a land / property owner / tenant along the existing A57 and 12 as a land / property owner / tenant along the new link roads.

### Question 2: To what extent will the link roads affect or impact you?

Question 2 investigated the respondent's view of the level of affect or impact the link roads would have on them.

There were 2 responses from s42(a), 1 would be affected / impacted and 1 did not know.

There were 119 respondents from s44 of which 101 would be highly affected, 12 would be affected / impacted, 2 marginally affected / impacted and 2 did not know.

There were 350 respondents from s47 of which 155 would be highly affected, 110 would be affected / impacted, 41 marginally affected / impacted, 20 not affected / impacted and 24 who did not know.

### Question 3: Please explain your reason(s) for your answer to question 2

Question 3 sought the respondents reasoning for their answer to Question 2. A number of suggestions have been made by respondents. Examples of the types of comments received and the frequency of the comment against respondent type, are shown in the table below.

**Table B-1 – Summary of Free Text Responses to Question 3**

Theme	Frequency		
	Prescribed consultee (s42)	PIL (s44)	Local communities (s47)
<b>Traffic, Vehicle Type and Access</b>			
Request for more information on traffic	1	2	
Concerns the scheme will increase traffic in other areas	1	9	19
The scheme will reduce traffic and improve journey times		10	44
It will ease traffic congestion		2	5

Construction will increase traffic delays		1	4
Concerns over the speed of traffic		1	
Concerns over use of Woolley Lane as a rat run		1	
Concerns over safety of motorists / pedestrians		1	3
I use an alternative route to avoid traffic on this route			6
Traffic in the area is awful and something needs to be done			39
It will not improve the journey / it will not work			8
It depends on change in traffic flow and access of junction 4 roundabout			1
Please consider a weight limit on the A628			1
Access to centre of Mottram will be improved			1
The public transport system needs to be improved			1
<b>Environment and local amenities</b>			
Request for more information on EIA	1		
Concerns of effect of the scheme on the Peak District National Park and other environmental designated areas	1		2
Concerns of effect of the scheme on the local landscape	1	4	5
Concerns of effect of the scheme on wildlife and countryside		6	4
Concerns the scheme will increase noise and pollution (air and light)		31	7
Concerns over the effect of current levels of air pollution			3
Expressing support as the scheme will help ease noise and pollution (air and light)		2	8
Concerns over the drainage of water locally		3	
Effect on public right of way due to construction of underpass		2	

Concerns over the effect on historical buildings in the area		2	
Nature of the solution			
Expressing support for the scheme as will improve journey times for personal and business use, and better connect Manchester and Sheffield	1	2	9
Concerns that Hollingworth and Tintwistle are not part of the solution	1	6	18
Requirement for liaisons with statutory undertakers regarding their assets	1		
Access and parking are a real problem		2	
Concerns over the proximity of the scheme to my property and what this means		11	
Concerns over effect on property prices, property blight		13	
Concerns over effect on property e.g. subsidence and settlement risks		4	
The scheme should make access to the M67 easier		1	
Concerns over construction and the level of upheaval during this period		1	
Concerns over HGV traffic and whether an HGV ban will be introduced		4	2
The scheme is perceived as expensive and inadequate		2	1
Would like to see screening proposals improved		1	
Hadfield Road and Woolley Bridge roundabout will be affected			1
<b>General</b>			
Unable to comment / no comment made / unsure		2	110
I live near / use the A57 everyday / own property within / am affected by current traffic levels / will be affected by construction		36	21

I use A57 and nearby road network regularly in my commute/to visit family/leisure/business etc			75
I used to use these roads but no longer need to			3
Who knows that the affect will be until the work starts			2
it will improve my finances as I will use less fuel as I won't be stuck in traffic as much / reduce the wear and tear of my car			2
I don't use this route much			6
Journey times to and from family			1
Please consider equestrians. We need bridleways, so we can ride safely away from traffic			2
I use public transport along the route			2
I cycle in the local area			1
It will affect my family who live in the area			2
I live outside the area			1

Question 4: Please identify your level of support for the link roads

Question 4 investigated the respondent's level of support for the link roads.

There were 3 responses from s42(a), 1 who agreed, 1 who neither agree or disagree, and 1 with no opinion / do not know.

There were 116 responses from s44 of which 31 strongly agree, 31 agree, 4 neither agree or disagree, 13 disagree and 40 strongly disagree.

There were 350 responses from s47 of which 186 strongly agree, 61 agree, 23 neither agree or disagree, 20 disagree, 56 strongly disagree and 4 with no opinion / did not know.

Question 5: Please explain the reason(s) for your response to question 4.

Question 5 sought the respondents reasoning behind their level of support identified in Question 4. Those respondents whose level of support for the scheme was high stated reasons such as:

- the scheme should help ease congestion
- it will improve the quality of life
- it will improve the air and noise pollution
- it will improve the view from my home
- journey times will be quicker and safer



Those respondents whose level of support for the scheme was low stated reasons such as:

- more needs to be done to address the commute between Sheffield and Manchester.
- Tintwistle and Hollingworth are not included in the scheme proposals, they also need a link road.
- the proposals encourage road use.
- expressed concerns over property blight, availability of parking and access for residents.

A summary of the types of comments received are provided in the table below as well as the frequency of the comment against respondent type.

**Table B-2 - Summary of Free Text Responses to Question 5**

Theme	Frequency		
	Prescribed consultee(s42a)	PIL (s44)	Local communities (s47)
<b>Traffic</b>			
The present road links from Sheffield to Manchester are slow and sub-standard with a poor road safety and resilience record.		1	2
These improvements will not deal with the amount of traffic queuing through Tintwistle on the A628 where it joins the new roundabout with the A57. There should be a bypass between the M67 roundabout and the A628 East of Tintwistle.			1
Congestion has been an issue in the village for a number of years and needs to be fixed.			1
It will only lead to more congestion/move the problem further along the route.			10
Fly pass sections should only be allowed for vehicles under 7.5 ton during peak hours.			1
It will allow for quicker commuting			3
I cannot get home easily, and this effects my time with family			1

Improving traffic flow and safety for the (through) traffic will be a significant benefit for travellers and for the local roads the reductions in traffic volumes, noise, and pollution will transform the local's businesses, homes, and lives.			3
It will ease congestion/improve journeys and road safety			36
The current network is totally inadequate for the volume of traffic particularly as a lot of it is HGV.			3
There will only be a temporary improvement in traffic			3
The current levels of congestion are terrible			10
Traffic needs to be removed if their destination is not within these residential areas			1
The upgrade of the A57 and A628 to the Mottram roundabout with M67 will ease the flow of traffic through Hollingworth			1
The signalised junction at Woolley Bridge A57 must be given priority to traffic on the A57 link road.			1
<b>Environment and local amenities</b>			
It will reduce pollution, noise, air			6
Find more environmentally friendly solutions in addition to these roads - e.g. looking at public transport (rail/ tram).			3
The queueing traffic is polluting for the area			1
The change in design of the tunnel to an underpass will have significant impacts on noise and air pollution		1	
The links to Manchester Airport from Barnsley and Sheffield would be much improved for all.			1
The current cycle facilities are poor.			1
It should move a lot of the traffic away from residential properties which will be better for air quality.			2

There will be negative local environmental impacts on people living close to the new link roads			1
The current levels of congestion cause poor air quality and quality of life for local residents			6
How much damage will there be to the trees along the route and what are the plans to restore/make good the damage?			1
It will improve the view from my home			1
The area at Woolley Bridge and Glossop has flooded a number of times			1
Concerned on the effect of the scheme on the Peak District National Park/Green Belt			4
<b>Nature of the solution</b>			
Hollingworth and Tintwistle also need to be bypassed		1	44
The link road will improve the connectivity between the Greater Manchester and South Yorkshire conurbations, provided the environmental impact is properly assessed and managed	1		
Concerns over the number of roundabouts. The use of slip roads off the main routes would be better			4
Concerns over the final connection of the link road back onto the A57 is a junction with traffic lights - this would be better as a roundabout.			1
If it can be shown that free flowing roundabouts cause less congestion than well phased ATS I might be inclined to support the proposals			1
I would like to see more done to address the situation between Sheffield and Manchester			2
It will provide a huge quality of life improvement for the village both in terms of environment and ability to commute at peak hours.			3
Build an extension to the M67 and bring it out past Tintwistle			1

Highways England should be more focused on delivering a proper motorway link			
It will improve safety			5
Building a new road will not solve the problem			2
I think a tunnel would have been better than an underpass			2
The scheme will result in time savings			8
It will cause a severe increase in the weight of standing traffic on the A628 in Hollingworth (Market Street)			1
What measures are going to be in place to stop traffic continuing to use the existing roads?			1
A dual carriageway upgrade of the whole route from the M67 and M1 is required			1
The scheme will not tackle the road closures during bad weather			1
It should be extended to the top of Woodhead Pass			2
We should have a Manchester to Sheffield Motorway			1
Ban HGV's on the A57 and A628			4
Adding a weight limit at 9 Arche's Bridge would prevent some of the heavy vehicles and the diesel pollution levels			1
Further consideration must be given to NMU's			2
<b>General</b>			
An uninterrupted segregated land from the eastbound carriageway of the M67 to the new road should be investigated		1	
Anything has to be better than what we have put up with for many years/long awaited solution/essential something is done			31

Improving the road conditions between Sheffield-Manchester is of considerable importance for the local economy of both cities and this scheme will also drastically improve living conditions for many local residents. Huge amounts of time wasted queuing here and anything that reduces this lost time will be of benefit to drivers and businesses.			2
There are to be hundreds of houses being built in the area in the next 12 -18 months causing yet more congestion			4
The delays are a massive problem for the economic wellbeing of the area.			5
Waste of time and or money / too expensive			8
Open the Woodhead Railway and put HGV's on trains			7
A link road will benefit the community			1
I have concerns on the effect the scheme will cause to my property/ a relative's property			5
The sooner this is built the better			2

Question 6: To what extent do you consider the following measures will improve the community environment on the A57(T) and Woolley Lane and transform the A57(T) into a local road?

Question 6 investigated the respondent's views on the improvement measures for the de-trunking the A57 which included a 20mph speed limit, speed cushions and chicanes, local junction improvements, changes to traffic signal priorities, additional parking bays, additional crossing facilities and cycle routes.

*20 mph speed limit*

There was 1 response from s42(a) which neither agreed or disagreed.

There were 114 responses from s44 of which 47 strongly agreed, 21 agreed, 19 neither agree or disagree, 15 disagree, 11 strongly disagree and 1 do not know.

There were 331 responses from s47 of which 66 strongly agreed, 62 agreed, 56 neither agree or disagree, 70 disagree, 57 strongly disagree and 20 do not know.

### *Speed cushions and chicanes*

There were 2 responses from s42(a) which neither agreed or disagreed or do not know.

There were 111 responses from s44 of which 48 strongly agreed, 39 agreed, 8 neither agree or disagree, 4 disagree, 11 strongly disagree and 1 do not know.

There were responses from s47 of which 47 strongly agreed, 46 agreed, 51 neither agree or disagree, 74 disagree, 88 strongly disagree and 21 do not know.

### *Local junction improvements*

There were 2 responses from s42(a) which neither agreed or disagreed or do not know.

There were 113 responses from s44 of which 28 strongly agreed, 11 agreed, 22 neither agree or disagree, 23 disagree, 26 strongly disagree and 3 do not know.

There were 331 responses from s47 of which 47 strongly agreed, 46 agreed, 51 neither agree or disagree, 74 disagree, 88 strongly disagree and 21 do not know.

### *Changes to traffic signal priorities*

There were 2 responses from s42(a) which neither agreed or disagreed or do not know.

There were 116 responses from s44 of which 55 strongly agreed, 33 agreed, 10 neither agree or disagree, 3 disagree, 7 strongly disagree and 8 do not know.

There were 331 responses from s47 of which 47 strongly agreed, 46 agreed, 51 neither agree or disagree, 74 disagree, 88 strongly disagree and 21 do not know.

### *Additional parking bays*

There were 2 responses from s42(a) which neither agreed or disagreed or do not know.

There were 110 responses from s44 of which 36 strongly agreed, 32 agreed, 23 neither agree or disagree, 5 disagree, 10 strongly disagree and 4 do not know.

There were 328 responses from s47 of which 80 strongly agreed, 96 agreed, 75 neither agree or disagree, 25 disagree, 18 strongly disagree and 34 do not know.

### *Additional crossing facilities*

There were 2 responses from s42(a) which neither agreed or disagreed or do not know.

There were 115 responses from s44 of which 54 strongly agreed, 38 agreed, 12 neither agree or disagree, 3 disagree, 7 strongly disagree and 1 do not know.

There were 328 responses from s47 of which 87 strongly agreed, 102 agreed, 77 neither agree or disagree, 30 disagree, 87 strongly disagree and 20 do not know.

### Cycle routes

There were 2 responses from s42(a) which neither agreed or disagreed or do not know.

There were 113 responses from s44 of which 38 strongly agreed, 27 agreed, 24 neither agree or disagree, 10 disagree, 10 strongly disagree and 4 do not know.

There were 326 responses from s47 of which 89 strongly agreed, 90 agreed, 65 neither agree or disagree, 20 disagree, 35 strongly disagree and 27 do not know.

### Question 7: Is there anything else you think we should consider to improve the existing roads?

A number of suggestions have been made by respondents. A summary of the types of comments received are provided in the table below as well as the frequency of the comment against respondent type.

**Table B-3 - Summary of Free Text Responses to Question 7**

Theme	Frequency		
	Prescribed consultee(s42a)	PIL (s44)	Local communities (s47)
<b>Traffic</b>			
Make it more difficult for non- residential traffic to use Mottram Moor/A57.		1	
Introduce traffic management between Roe Cross Road, Stalybridge Road and Broadbottom Road		1	
Introduce speed cameras		1	
Introduce traffic calming on Woolley Lane		1	
Install chicanes to discourage heavy traffic from continuing to use the A57T through Mottram		1	
De-trunk Stalybridge Road		1	
Introduce a 20mph speed limit/reduce speed through the villages of Mottram, Hollingworth and Tintwistle		1	6
Make better use of traffic lights using filtering and synchronising signals	1	1	2
Changing of the priorities at the junction of Staybridge Road and B1674 (Hyde Road A57). No change to the A57 timings as these must remain the priority to accommodate flow.		1	
Ensure traffic from the M67 roundabout is discouraged from using local roads around and through Longdendale		1	
Limit traffic via Broadbottom Road / Long Lane to encourage the use of the new link road		1	

Make it safer / easier turning right at the Mottram traffic lights, when coming from Broadbottom			1
Limit traffic via Broadbottom Road / Long Lane to encourage use of the new link road			1
30mph speed limit would be best, 20mph is too slow			1
Clear signage to remind people how to use merge lanes			1
The current levels of congestion are terrible			2
30mph speed limit would be best, 20mph is too slow			2
Introduce average speed cameras at either side of the villages			2
It will only redirect traffic / it's a short- term solution			1
De-trunk the A57/A628			1
<b>Environment and local amenities</b>			
Plant trees and shrubs to soften and to assist with noise pollution and air quality		3	5
Do not introduce speed bumps as these cause pollution and damage cars		3	
Include flood plain provision		1	
Install "Keep Clear" zones to allow residents to exist their property		1	
If the two petrol stations remain these will encourage drivers to use Hyde Road		1	
Will homes on Woolley Lane be given parking permits?		1	
Better drainage solution on Woolley Lane		1	
Install additional parking bays on Woolley Lane		1	
Install more off-road parking for home owners			2
Introduction of tunnels to reduce effect on Peak District National Park			1
Current crossing of the River Etherow could be improved			1
Concerns over the effect of the scheme on wildlife, protected species and Peak District National Park			4
Concerns over loss of agricultural land			1



Low noise surfaces. Improvements to drainage. Strengthening of manholes/grid covers			1
This will improve traffic flow and quality of life in surrounding villages			1
<b>Nature of the solution</b>			
Improve existing roads rather than spend money on new (resurfacing and repairing pot holes)		10	8
Impose a tonnage restriction to reduce HGVs / restrict HGVs		19	32
Hollingworth and Tintwistle also need to be bypassed		9	23
Install a pedestrian crossing for the schools and businesses of the area		1	1
We should have a Manchester to Sheffield Motorway		1	
Install additional crossing facilities on the A57 Hyde Road		2	
Reduce the amount of parking restriction on A57 Hyde Road		1	
Purchase all properties along the existing route, knock them down and build a wider road		1	
Improve the public transport links to Manchester, Stockport and Ashton-under-Lyne.		1	
Increase the frequency of buses		1	
Implement a one-way system through Mottram, combined with the new link from the M67 to Roe Cross Road		2	
Use alternative methods to reduce speed other than chicanes and speed bumps	1	3	5
Improve pedestrian crossing facilities		1	2
Further consideration must be given to NMU's	2	1	15
Further consideration must be given to public transport, bus lanes, allocation of shelters		2	3
The job should be done properly		1	1
The Trans-Pennine Tunnel should be built			2
Once the new link road is built, the existing road will be fine as it is			1
More winter gritting and ploughing should be introduced			2

Remove the access roundabout from the new road link			1
Closure of Junction 35A on the M1 will provide immediate improvement			1
Include the introduction of speed cameras and speed camera signs/traffic light cameras			3
Widen existing roads			5
Introduce a congestion charge			2
Improve travel times from the M1 to the M76			1
Roundabouts are more successful than traffic lighted junctions			1
Introduce access only for some of the local roads			2
Reduce the number of roundabouts			1
Consideration of one-way system			1
Invest in further improvements for Trans Pennine			1
Reinstate the original plans for the cut and cover tunnel under Old Hall Lane.			1
Install yellow boxed junction at the Gunn Inn Junction			1
Width restrictions on Back Moor			3
<b>General</b>			
Give Mottram Moor residents ability to pull off their drives and use pavements safely		1	
Open the Woodhead Railway and put HGV's on trains/Improve rail links		3	6
Get on with it			2
Encourage less use of the roads at peak times i.e. car share incentives, survey driver habits, stagger working day starts			2
Stop building houses in the area as there are too many people			4

Question 8: We have provided an outline proposal of how the land above the Mottram underpass might look on completion of the scheme – the plan is available at our exhibitions or visit our webpage at [www.highways.gov.uk/trans-pennine-upgrade](http://www.highways.gov.uk/trans-pennine-upgrade). We would welcome your views and suggestions on how the land above the Mottram underpass could be used after completion of the scheme to enhance the local community.

A summary of the types of comments received are provided in the table below as well as the frequency of the comment against respondent type.

**Table B-4 - Summary of Free Text Responses to Question 8**

Theme	Frequency		
	Prescribed consultee (s42a)	PIL (s44)	Local communities (s47)
<b>Environment and local amenities</b>			
A park, woodland area, community park		15	20
Nature reserve		1	7
Tree and Shrub planting /more trees / landscaping to tackle pollution / create habitats for wildlife		41	22
Wildflower Meadow		1	2
Allotments	1	4	6
Children's playground (as part of a community park)		2	3
Gift the land to the Borough and County Council		2	2
Install sport facilities		4	6
You are destroying the green belt unnecessarily			1
What will this look like from my house?		4	1
Include a bridleway or multi-user track passing over the underpass	1	3	
<b>General</b>			
No view / no comment / N/A / no strong views on this	1	5	31
Land currently has no use so won't matter what you do			1
Leave it as it is			1
Who would maintain this?		5	1
Ensuring this land could not be used for industrial/commercial buildings/housing		5	3
The local residents should make the decision	1		2
I can't see the plan / proposal not seen		5	2

The scheme is not going happen / I oppose the whole scheme		1	2
You should come back to this when the tunnel is back in the plans			1

Question 9: Please identify your level of support for the proposals for pedestrians, cyclists, equestrians and walkers.

Question 9 investigated the respondent's level of support for the proposals for NMUs. There were 2 responses from s42(a) which both agreed.

There were 113 responses from s44 of which 31 strongly agreed, 37 agreed, 20 neither agree or disagree, 4 disagree, 14 strongly disagree and 7 do not know.

There were 320 responses from s47 of which 89 strongly agreed, 115 agreed, 56 neither agree or disagree, 7 disagree, 12 strongly disagree and 41 do not know.

Question 10: Please explain the reason(s) for your response to question 9 and tell us of any particular locations or routes that we may have missed that you feel should be improved for pedestrians, cyclists, equestrians and walkers

A summary of the types of comments received are provided in the table below as well as the frequency of the comment against respondent type.

**Table B-5 - Summary of Free Text Responses to Question 10**

Theme	Frequency		
	Prescribed consultee (s42a)	PIL (s44)	Local communities (s47)
<b>Traffic</b>			
The issue is to fix the removal of Glossop traffic		1	
You want to bring more people, more vehicles and more issues		1	
The roads would be quieter and safer		1	2
Place speed cameras along new 50mph routes		1	
No speed ramps/bumps outside my property			1
The speed of traffic needs to be slowed down		1	
Extra traffic from the scheme will make life intolerable for the villagers		1	
Only concerned for free-flowing traffic			4
These groups have not suffered due to congestion			2
<b>Environment and local amenities</b>			
Noise pollution is our concern		1	

Such changes are vital to discourage road users and improve air quality			3
Any additional cycle routes would be welcomes		4	
Make the area a safer and more positive environment for walker		1	
It would increase tourism		1	
Improved pedestrian links and crossings are welcomed		3	2
I am not in favour of cycle lanes going past my house		1	
I am pleased to see the provision of parking spaces for residents of Mottram Moor		1	
Ensure surfacing is suitable for pedestrians and cyclists		2	
Vital to improve the facilities for walkers, cyclists and equestrians		2	
Connectivity is really important		3	
Safety is important			3
Make the cycle ways continuous		1	
Should make use of this Peak District area once heavy traffic flow is diverted			1
Access to these facilities and the surrounding countryside is important			2
scheme is taking away greenspaces			2
<b>Nature of the solution</b>			
There are already plenty of walking/equestrian places around here			1
If the full bypass was built around the villages of Mottram, Hollingworth and Tintwistle then there would be no need to improve the NMU facilities		1	
The crossing points for pedestrians at Back Moor / Mottram Moor are too complicated		1	1
Pedestrian crossing should be thought about more - especially for children walking to school		2	
Old Hall Lane is frequently used by pedestrians, equestrians and cyclists and you are taking this away - reinstate the tunnel		1	1
Install a pelican crossing at Gun Inn		1	
Possible footpath opposite Woolley Lane for walkers along the small river		1	
A link for pedestrians etc between M67 roundabout up to Roe Cross Road would be beneficial		1	

Current road is very dangerous for NMU			2
Would like to see separate cycle paths and footpaths added to join from Hattersley roundabout to Roe Cross Green. Shared footpaths are not ideal			2
The current condition of the pavements are very poor			1
<b>General</b>			
Support the proposals put forward.	2	3	21
More can always be done	1		2
Not clear what the proposals are / not enough detail / too broad		4	10
What you have suggested is inappropriate		2	
Who wants to walk/cycle/horse ride next to four lanes of traffic?		1	
There needs to be regard hard to Hollingworth, Tintwistle and A628 Woodhead		1	
Cyclists and equestrians are a danger to themselves and vehicles / they should not use A roads		2	
Cyclists would benefit from having their own lanes		1	
Discourage cyclists from riding on the pavement		1	
Need better education in driver behaviour towards NMUs		1	
Bus services need to be maintained for pedestrians		1	
The area is not used by pedestrians, cyclists, equestrians or walkers / they should be banned from using the road			2
I'm not local / don't know the area well enough / no opinion			8
Mottram is not an attractive route for cyclists due to the levels			1
I don't cycle any longer / I am unlikely to use these facilities / doesn't affect me			5
Are the roads wide enough to support cycle lanes where planned?			2
Walkers are more likely to go to the Peak District rather than stay near the roads in Mottram			1

Questions 11 to 16 cover the safety and technology improvements and Westwood roundabout, which are not part of this DCO application and not described here.

Question 17: Do you have any further comments about our proposals for the Trans-Pennine Upgrade?

A summary of the types of comments received are provided in below as well as the frequency of the comment against respondent type.

**Table B-6 - Summary of Free Text Responses to Question 17**

Theme	Frequency		
	Prescribed consultee(s42a)	PIL (s44)	Local communities (s47)
<b>Traffic</b>			
There needs to be measures put in place to reduce the amount of traffic			1
It will only move the traffic problem elsewhere / it won't improve / there will only be temporary congestion relief		3	2
Speed cameras should be installed		2	
Better signage should be installed on the hill up from Gun Inn to Mottram			1
Include climbing lanes in proposals so slow traffic can be overtaken			1
<b>Environment and local amenities</b>			
Concerns around the wider environmental impacts of the scheme on surrounding areas	1		1
More cycle routes are needed		1	1
Concerns around the impact of the scheme on the Peak District National Park			2
Ensure it is safe for equestrians and cyclists in the area			1
The scheme should bring relief from the noise and vibrations of HGVs			1
High quality ecologically-friendly environmental works should be implemented			1
Sceptical of air quality and traffic data		1	1
Pedestrians need safe crossing points		1	
Concerns on the level of noise and light pollution		1	

Noise and visual barriers will be needed due to the location of our house		1	
Additional parking is needed for residents on Woolley Lane.		1	
<b>Nature of the solution</b>			
Start again and come up with a better solution	1	3	5
Enforce a ton limit on the route / ban HGVs	1	11	17
Hollingworth and Tintwistle villages also need to be bypassed	1	30	57
It is only a short-term solution - you are moving the congestion elsewhere			2
Focus should be on improving public transport			1
The proposals don't go far enough, it is needed the whole way to Sheffield			1
The proposals don't go far enough, need to extend the M67 all the way over the Pennines			1
This will improve the daily traffic problems			1
The new section of the road from Mottram roundabout towards Glossop should be a dual carriageway			1
Roundabouts will only add to the delays			3
Traffic lights at the motorway junction are unnecessary and will cause delay			2
The existing condition of the road needs to be improved			1
The underpass at Old Hall Lane should be made back in to a tunnel			3
Don't forget about the A628 in the longer term			1
Concerns over the effect of the scheme on my property		1	
Concerns over parking		1	
Road Safety needs to be improved		1	
<b>General</b>			
Very supportive of proposals	1	3	4
No comment / no opinion / N/A		2	6
Strong objection	2	6	6



Proposals and how they affect me, and my property are unclear		1	
Request for more information		5	
Get on with it / its 20-30 years late		2	14
It is a waste of time and money		17	20
Re-open the Woodhead tunnel for lorries /trains			5
You don't have enough money to do it		1	1
These consultations seem costly and don't appear to move the scheme on / does not meet the requirement of a proper consultation			2
Invest in public transportation such as rail			3
There is a lack of consideration and compensation for affected individuals		2	

#### Question 18: How did you find out about this consultation?

Question 18 sought to find out how the respondent found out about the consultation, providing the options of flyer or letter through door, poster-public notice, newspaper advertisement, article or website, the scheme website or email, local council website or email or local community group.

There were 2 responses from s42(a) of which both responded that they found out about the consultation from the scheme's website or email.

There were 168 responses from s44 of which 91 received flyer or letter through door, 18 received poster/public notice, 21 through the scheme website or email, 4 through local council website or email, 23 through a local community group, 9 through newspaper article and 2 through newspaper advertisement.

There were 394 responses from s47 of which 165 received flyer or letter through door, 31 received poster/public notice, 61 through the scheme website or email, 31 through local council website or email, 64 through a local community group, 15 through newspaper article, 22 through newspaper advertisement and 5 through newspaper website.

#### Question 19: Have you found the consultation materials useful in answering your questions?

Question 19 sought to find out whether the respondent thought the consultation materials were useful in answering their questions on the scheme.

There were 2 responses from s42(a) of which 1 responded yes and the other to a certain extent.

There were 114 responses from s44 of which 39 answered yes, 14 answered no and 61 answered to a certain extent.

There were 344 responses from s47 of which 165 answered yes, 26 answered no and 153 answered to a certain extent.

### Question 20: Did you attend one of our public exhibitions? If so, which one?

Question 20 sought to find out whether the respondent attended one of the public exhibition events and if so which one out of Mottram C of E Primary School, Glossop, Hattersley, Tankersley, Hollingworth, Mottram Community Centre or did not attend.

There were 2 responses from s42(a) of which 1 attended Tankersley's event and the other did not attend an event.

There were 136 responses from s44 of which 45 attended the event at Mottram C of E Primary School, 3 attended Glossop, 17 attended Hattersley, 30 Hollingworth, 25 Mottram Community Centre and 16 did not attend an event.

## B.4 Written Consultation Responses

In addition to completing a consultation response form, written consultation responses were accepted via post, email or hand delivered at the public exhibitions. Analysis and categorisation were completed for these responses following the same methodology as for the free text responses.

A summary of the types of comments received are provided in the table below as well as the frequency of the comment against respondent type.

Theme	Frequency		
	Prescribed consultee (s42a)	PIL (s44)	Local communities (s47)
<b>Environment, Air Quality, Noise and Vibration</b>			
What are the air quality expectations at A61 junction 36 and the school at Tankersley village?			1
Concerns relating to the effect of the scheme on air, noise, light to local residents		2	
I would like more information in regard to how this noise and vibration will affect my property and what will be done to mitigate it		3	1
Concerns raised of proximity of new road to property in terms of noise and pollution		1	
Concerns raised about noise from new section of road going over Carrhouse Lane.			1
What will be the noise and vibration implications during construction old underpass?		1	
Will the construction of the underpass at Old Hall Lane affect resident access?		1	
How would destroying local wildlife habitats and vital areas of local green space and simply replacing them with shrubs be a benefit of slightly reduced traffic?		1	1
<b>Traffic</b>			

Concerned that traffic flows are set to increase particularly in Langsett.			1
Request for traffic figures before / after on Mottram Moor.			1
The Dinting T-junction needs 2 lanes on the approach to the T-junction.			1
Restrict HGV on A628 through Hollingworth.		1	1
Open Woodhead rail			1
Concern over rat running from M1 junc.36		1	
Will the scheme increase traffic through Glossop and Dinting Road?		2	
Objection to the alteration of the flow of traffic in the opposite direction along Wedneshough Green as visibility when reversing my car from its garage is obstructed by my garden wall and any vehicle travelling down the lane would be hazardous to me.		1	
It will be harder to enter or exit the A628 from the junction of B6105 that comes from Glossop	1		
It will be harder to enter or exit the A628 from the junction of Goddard Lane that comes from Dunford Bridge	1		
All the junctions have poor visibility for entering and exiting the A628 and you have to be careful at all three junctions as traffic on the A628 moves at speed and there is currently a lot of traffic using the A628 making it hard to enter the A628.	1		
Concerns raised that traffic would be increased through Charlesworth village traffic would be detrimentally impacted.			1
The scheme would increase traffic on Mottram Moor, poorer air quality, cause further congestion. The A628 is not fit for purpose and there is no reference to A628 / B6105 junction which is in poor repair.			1
The A628 is not fit for purpose and there is not reference to A628 / B6105 junction which is in poor repair			1
The scheme will only move the problem of traffic further on into Hollingworth. It will still be causing pollution and will not ease the problem of traffic and just sending it further along.		1	
<b>De-trunking</b>			
The current plans show parking bays for 45-57 Mottram Moor - these bays are not required due to all properties having off-road parking. We are concerned about this becoming a layby for trucks and other motorists.		1	

Would it not be better to keep the A57T trunked to the lights and de- trunk after the right turn to Broadbottom?			1
<b>Safety</b>			
We need safe turning into Dog & Partridge			1
We need a safe link from Snow Road to Swinden Lane for pedestrians, cyclists and horses			2
<b>Non-Motorised User (NMU)</b>			
On the M67 roundabout - how do NMUs get from Hattersley / Mottram road across the roundabout Pegasus crossing?		1	1
Where are the segregated cycle routes?		2	
<b>Support for the scheme</b>			
Wishing to report its support for the scheme which will contribute to improved journeys for residents and businesses and therefore support our economy.	2		
<b>Complaint</b>			
Formal Objection - issues relating to effect of the scheme on the Dark Peak and countryside		2	
Formal Objection - concerned that CPOs are not transparent		2	
Formal Objection - concerned about effect of the scheme on property		3	
<b>Consultation</b>			
Concerns over consultation process			1
Feels information relating to changes to existing roads should be more readily available		1	
Feels the change from the tunnel to the underpass should have been consulted on	1	1	
Concerns raised on whether hand-written response forms are legible		1	
<b>Signage</b>			
There is a lack of signal for ahead/right turn traffic and reverse at Junction 35A			1
Signage is needed to indicate Woodhead Pass is closed earlier one to avoid traffic reaching the Gun Inn.			1
<b>Public Transportation</b>			
Can bus services be scheduled to ensure connections are not missed?			1
<b>Design</b>			

Junction 35A will impact the roundabout and the current plans that are proposed			1
The mini roundabout at Chapeltown (off the 35A slip road) would benefit from a dedicated left-hand lane and a straight over lane?			1
The two lanes at the roundabout A61(T) would benefit from a longer run up to the roundabout to allow traffic to queue earlier.			1
Consideration should be given to the addition of a Northbound slip at J35A. This restricted slip road to south only forces traffic onto the A61(T) and adds to the queues. This should be added to the modelling to access any potential benefits.			1
Suggest that the standard / cross section for the footway / bridle-way is the same as for the A34 Alderley Edge bypass			1
Pelican crossings are needed on junction of Back Moor and Mottram Moor to enable children to safely cross on their way to Longdendale High.		1	
Consider additional / new pedestrian crossing on Back Moor		1	
Can the roads that join Woolley Lane, Cross St etc. be made 2 way again?		1	
Can a 20mph speed limit be put in adjacent to school in Hollingworth?		1	
Can Wedneshough Green Road be changed to one-way traffic in the opposite direction?			1
Ensure all users still have access to Carr House Lane.			1
20mph outside the school. Variable message sign.			1
No assurance that Tollemache Close will remain a true cul de sac (without any through route for traffic or pedestrians).		1	
Concerns over loss of tunnel and creation of underpass	2	4	
<b>Property</b>			
Enquiries regards discretionary purchase scheme and part 1 compensation.		1	
View from back of 60 Mottram Moor and information on part 1 claims.		1	
Own 105 rent out. Grandad lives in next property.		1	
Enquiry regarding blight and how it will affect house.		2	

---

Enquiry into property insurance and settlement - will structural surveys be undertaken on properties?		1	
---	--	---	--

## B.5 Overview of Responses

All of the responses received to the consultation, via both the Consultation Response Forms and written consultation responses, have been analysed and the subjects raised allocated to particular themes.

The responses to the closed questions within the Consultation Response Form demonstrate that respondents support many elements of the scheme.

Respondents were asked about their level of support for the scheme in question 4 where the highest majority (217) strongly agreed, whereas 96 strongly disagreed.

The majority of respondents also agreed that the local junction improvements, additional parking bays, additional crossing facilities and cycle routes, will improve the community environment on the A57(T) and Woolley Lane and transform the A57(T) into a local road.

The majority of respondents also supported the proposals for NMUs.

## Appendix C. Local Authorities

The responses received from the local authorities are summarised in the table below along with the Highways England's response. It should be noted that a response was not received from Tameside MBC. Tameside MBC advised this was because they have worked closely with the project team throughout the life of the scheme.

**Table C-1 - Summary of Responses Received from Local Authorities (s42(1)(b))**

Consultee	Summary of Response	Change Y/N?	Regard Had to Response (s49)
Derbyshire County Council and High Peak Borough Council	In a joint response, Derbyshire County Council and High Peak Borough Councils submitted a holding objection to the public consultation exercise pending the publication of more detailed and robust evidence on the likely highways impacts of the scheme.	N	There is ongoing engagement with High Peak Borough Council and Derbyshire County Council on their holding objection and the Applicant has sought to address their issues raised.
	They express significant concerns over: 1. <b>Traffic issues:</b> lack of supporting evidence, including a lack of substantive traffic modelling and assessment and substantive traffic flow information in the PEIR in particular the roads within Glossop and Tintwistle and their associated communities and the wider area on the A57 and A628.		1. Traffic flow information was provided and the impacts on air and noise were described, however it was acknowledged that this was preliminary information. Since the statutory consultation process, significant additional traffic modelling has been undertaken. This traffic modelling has informed the assessments of relevant environmental topics, which will be presented in the ES. Further information on the traffic modelling undertaken will be presented in the Transport Assessment
	Air quality issues: lack of receptors in Tintwistle – requested to address this omission in the preparation of the ES the receptor locations in Glossop are acknowledged but will want to understand the air quality impacts here once full modelling can be undertaken which will only be once traffic modelling work and predicted traffic flows are established discrepancies between EIA scoping report and PEIR and request air quality assessment is repeated using the receptors identified in the EIA scoping report. Concerns that air quality will exceed limits along the A57 and want this potential impact to be assessed and mitigated. Should the air quality modelling show an increase in air quality pollution, the mitigation measures as outlined in the EIA scoping report should be undertaken by the Highways Authority to reduce the impact and inform the future air quality plan for the area.		2. Air quality receptors have been determined in accordance with the guidance outlined in Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 (HA 207/07) A full air quality assessment is being undertaken based on the updated traffic modelling.



	<p>3. Cultural Heritage Issues: The scheme could impact on Roman or prehistoric archaeology and have setting impacts on Melandra Castle. For archaeology they recommend a desk-based study and field evaluation (including geophysics and trial trenching) and for Melandra Castle they suggest a setting study following the 5-step principle established in Historic England guidance and including appropriate viewpoint photography and visualisation photomontage to show the potential impacts of the development. Request both mitigation and careful design.</p>		<p>3. A Cultural Heritage Desk-Based Assessment has been supported by a geophysical survey and geoarchaeological assessment and deposit modelling at locations agreed with Greater Manchester Archaeological Advisory Service. The results of these surveys and assessments will be presented in the ES, including an assessment of the impact on the setting of Melandra Castle</p>
	<p>4. Ecology: It appears to be adequate in scope, robust in approach and suitable with regards to the surveys undertaken.</p>		<p>4. Noted</p>
	<p>5. <b>Landscape and Visual Impact:</b> acknowledge that their landscape architect was consulted, and key viewpoints were agreed. A recommendation is made to ensure that significant land is acquired to truly integrate the road improvements with the surrounding landscape and screening planting.</p>		<p>5. The Draft Order Limits have been devised to allow sufficient space for landscaping and screen planting to be achieved.</p>
	<p>6. People and Communities: Economic Development and Regeneration Issues: Feel residents and businesses based in Glossopdale would benefit from the improved connectivity to the Strategic Road Network and Greater Manchester – feel that this was poorly reflected in the relevant section of the PEIR and the ES should include a more extensive and robust assessment of the likely economic and regeneration benefits, and should quantify the benefits in the context of jobs created, expenditure multipliers for the local economy including both the construction and operational phases of the scheme. Equally, the negative economic development and regeneration impacts of the scheme should be assessed in the ES.</p>		<p>6. In accordance with The Planning Inspectorate’s Scoping Opinion (document reference TR010034/APP/6.5.1), strategic employment sites have been scoped out of the ES but impacts on agricultural businesses will be addressed in the ES.  An Economic Appraisal Report for the scheme will detail the wider economic benefits including Induced Investment (output change in imperfectly competitive markets, Employment Effect due to labour supply and Productivity (agglomeration impacts) This report does not form part of the DCO application and will not be made publicly available unless requested under the Freedom of Information Act.</p>
Sheffield City Region	<p>Supports the scheme and preferred option identified which will contribute to improved journeys for Sheffield City Region residents and businesses and therefore support the economy.</p>	N	<p>Noted</p>

	Believe it will reduce bottlenecks that exist on the A57/A628 around Mottram and will form an important stage in the wider Trans-Pennine Road Upgrade between Sheffield and Manchester which in its current state hinders economic agglomeration and growth between the major northern City Regions and is a key priority as part of their revised Transport Strategy.		
Sheffield City Council	Supports shorter term proposals and the longer-term Trans- Pennine Strategic Study'. Mindful that improvements along this corridor can be expected to increase its use and that of adjoining roads. Aware of local concerns regarding existing congestion on this corridor in the Chapeltown area; improvement works need to consider these and offer appropriate mitigation which can be considered in future engagement with Highways England.	N	Noted. This area of the scheme consists of Non DCO elements and so had not been considered in this report. Noted This is a Non DCO Element and so has not been considered in this report
	Feel improved Trans-Pennine connectivity adds further importance to the Innovation Corridor proposals that are being developed with Rotherham MBC and Highways England. Unable to comment on Westwood Roundabout without further information (non-DCO element)		
Barnsley MBC (Regulatory Services, Pollution Control)	Does not support or oppose the scheme. 1. Has concerns around the potential environmental impact within Barnsley Borough, including air quality issues on the A616 at Langsett.	N	An EIA will be undertaken for the scheme which includes an air quality assessment. Noted.
	2. Agrees that link roads will improve connectivity between Greater Manchester and South Yorkshire if the environmental impact is assessed and managed.		

# Appendix D. Prescribed and Non-Statutory Consultee Responses

## D.1 Prescribed Consultees

A total of 18 responses were received from prescribed consultees:

- Environment Agency
- Forestry Commission
- Health and Safety Executive
- Historic England
- National Grid
- Natural England
- Public Health England
- Royal Mail Group
- United Utilities

## D.2 Non-Statutory Consultees

Nine responses were received from non-statutory consultees:

- National Trust
- Campaign for Better Transport
- Charlesworth Parish Council
- Sustrans
- Friends of the Peak District and Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) South Yorkshire
- SPEED Bridleway Group
- Northwest Transport Activists Roundtable
- Pennine National Trails Partnership

A summary of the responses received from prescribed and non-statutory consultees and Highways England's responses can be seen the tables below.

**Table D-1 - Summary of Responses Received from Prescribed Consultees**

Consultee	Summary of Response	Change Y/N?	Regard had to Response (S49)
Forestry Commission	<p>Noted that there are direct and indirect impacts on a number of broadleaf woodlands including:</p> <p>To the south east of the M67/A57 roundabout along the Hurst Clough Brook (c. 4ha), and associated with the Great Wood Local Nature Reserve (LNR) to the south</p> <p>At the eastern end of the preferred route, bisected by the existing A57 (c. 3.6 ha) Between Mottram Old Hall and Mottram in Longdendale (c. 6.6ha)</p> <p>Unable to assess the extent and depth of impact on the woodlands without detailed plans. The Forestry Commission would welcome the extension of the commitment to ensuring no net loss of area or quality of Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland S41 Habitat to avoid net deforestation.</p> <p>Has noted the design measures/consideration for the ES include protecting the fabric of the landscape through the limited removal and replacement of hedges and woodland and commitment to ensure no net loss in quantity and quality.</p>	N	<p>1&amp;2. The effects of the scheme on woodlands will be detailed and assessed in the ES. Mitigation measures for loss of woodland will also be set out.</p> <p>3. Noted</p>
	<p>4. Also note Highway England’s commitments to no net loss by 2020 and for net gain by 2040 and the scheme objective to avoid unacceptable impacts on the natural landscape. Feels these will afford sufficient protection to these habitats.</p>		<p>4. Noted</p>

	<p>5. Ancient Woodland: several ancient woodlands that may be directly or indirectly impacted, PEIR does not appear to fully reflect the value and potential impact on these habitats. Recommendation that every effort is afforded to avoid this scheme affecting ancient woodlands or veteran trees, they should be included in all future habitat and species surveys and should be included within a 2km area of search on desk-based studies as per good practice shown on other NSIPs. Refer to joint Standing Advice with Natural England.</p>		<p>5. The ES will confirm that no areas of ancient woodland will be affected by the scheme, as none fall within the Draft Order Limits. Therefore, ancient woodland has been scoped out of the assessment.</p>
	<p>6. Biodiversity: The PEIR discusses the appropriate measures to avoid the spread of invasive and non-native plants – advises that this needs to be expanded on to include pest &amp; diseases and also handling of soil and contractor plant and machinery.</p>		<p>6. Invasive and non-native plants will be addressed in ES and the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan. Handling of soil will be also be addressed.</p>
	<p>Climate Change: It is recommended that a wider range of UK Native and honorary native species with a wider genetic base than local, including more southerly origin is used in relation to the delivery of more resilient landscapes.</p> <p>Mitigation and Compensation: If the decision is made to lose woodland, the Forestry Commission has advised a series of mitigation and compensation measures.</p>		<p>Species proposed to be incorporated within the landscape design will be set out both in the ES and the Environmental Masterplan.</p> <p>The effects of the scheme on woodlands and mitigation for loss of woodland are also detailed.</p>
<p><b>Health and Safety Executive</b></p>	<p>Does not support or oppose the scheme.</p> <p>Provides comments on safety considerations, confirming there are no Major Hazard Installations, Major Accident Hazard Pipelines or licensed explosive sites in the vicinity of the proposed schemes.</p> <p>Requests that if a Hazardous Substances Consent [The Planning (Hazardous Substances) (England) 2015 Regulations (as amended)] be granted prior to the determination of the present application, and/or HSE receives a notification under the Pipeline Safety</p>	<p>N – not required at this stage</p>	<p>Comments regarding safety considerations and right to revise advice have been noted.</p>

	Regulations 1996 then HSE reserves the right to revise its advice		
Historic England	1. We would expect the NSIP application to include a thorough assessment of the likely effects which the proposed development might have on designated features	N – not required at this stage	1. The likely effects the scheme may have on designated features will be set out in the ES.
	2. We would expect the NSIP application to consider the potential impacts on non- designated features of historic, architectural, archaeological or artistic interest.		2. Non-designated features will be assessed within the ES. We have identified 155 non-designated receptors.
	Comments on the PEIR: 3. Strongly recommend continued involvement of Conservation Officers and archaeological advisors at the relevant local authorities for the project.		3. Greater Manchester Archaeological Advisory Service (GMAAS), Tameside Archaeological Society, Portable Antiquities Scheme NW as well as Derbyshire County Council Archaeological Officer and Peak District National Park Archaeological Officer have been consulted during the preparation of the desk-based assessment, requesting views on the studies and general thoughts on the scheme.
	4. Recommend that design of the lighting takes cultural heritage effects into account		4. The lighting for the scheme has been designed to be sympathetic to all receptors, whilst adhering to industry guidance/best practice and the requirement to provide a safe driving environment for road users.
	5. Specific mention to St Michael’s and All Angels’ Church and Melandra Fort in Mottram-in-Londendale which could be impacted by the construction and operation of the new link roads. It is advised that the photographic view provided in the PEIR does not help determine impact because it is taken a distance from the church and shows a road section in a cutting rather than a raised section. The lack of photographic views for Melandra Fort in the PEIR is described as an omission that should be addressed prior to the DCO submission.		5. The impact of the scheme on the setting of the Church of St Michaels and All Angels and Melandra Castle (Roman Fort) will be assessed in the ES.

	<p>6. There is high potential for deposits on the route and that the EIA should focus on the evidence for landscape use and occupation in associated periods Iron Age through Roman into the Early Medieval, with substantial effect on sub-surface archaeology. Geotechnical boreholes should be undertaken as part of any ground investigation.</p>		<p>6. Historic landscape character will be assessed in the ES. A geophysical survey and geoarchaeological assessment and deposit modelling at locations agreed with Greater Manchester Archaeological Advisory Service have been undertaken. Highways England intends to undertake additional trial trenching, the general scope of which has been agreed with Greater Manchester Archaeological Advisory Service. A Ground Investigation was undertaken from January to July 2018 which included drilling a number of boreholes.</p>
	<p>7. Recommend that the Historic England 'Preserving Archaeological Remains' advice is taken into account.</p>		<p>7. This advice will be taken into account during trial trenching, test pitting and augering that is yet to be undertaken for the scheme.</p>
<p>National Grid</p>	<p>1. Does not oppose or support the scheme. Advised a high-voltage electricity overhead transmission line protected by a Deed of Easement / Wayleave agreement is close to the scheme and full rights of access and electrical safety clearances must be maintained at all times.</p>	<p>N – not required at this stage</p>	<p>1. Noted – there are ongoing discussions with National Grid to establish a Deed of Easement / Wayleave agreement on access to overhead lines and pylon ZZC014.</p>
	<p>2. Advises that landscaping should only use slow and low growing species beneath and adjacent to the overhead lines to avoid compromising safety clearances.</p>		<p>2. Species proposed to be incorporated within the landscape design will be discussed in ES and within the Environmental Masterplan.</p>
	<p>3. Drilling and excavation works are not undertaken if they have the potential to disturb the foundations or support structures of any towers.</p>		<p>3 &amp; 4. There are ongoing discussions with National Grid. All agreements will be set out in a Statement of Common Ground between the Applicant and National Grid.</p>
	<p>4. No structure can be built over any high voltage underground cables</p>		
	<p>5. Any potential impact on National Grid assets should be considered in any reports including ES and where acquisition of land or rights that would interfere with National Grid apparatus 'protective provisions' acceptable to National Grid would be included in the DCO.</p>		<p>5. Potential impacts on services are not within the scope of the ES. However, known existing services will be referenced within the Statement of Reasons.</p>

Environment Agency	Flood Risk The submitted report (PEIR) is satisfactory and meets with their approval.	N	Noted. In addition, the flood mitigation model produced as part of the Flood Risk Assessment was reviewed by the Environment Agency.
	Biodiversity 1. Embedded mitigation – the overall design philosophy of achieving no net loss in habitat meets with their approval.		1. Noted.
	2. A recommendation was made for new culvert design for watercourse crossing adopts best practice design and minimises the length of proposed new culvert to reduce environmental impacts.		2. Water diversions are to be used rather than culverts due to the low levels of water in the watercourses.
	3. To ensure the quality of riparian wildlife corridor is protected and enhanced where feasible, the Environment Agency would seek clear details in regard to bridge crossing design over the River Etherow and key ecological network		3. Noted. The bridge design for the crossing at River Etherow will be submitted to the Environment Agency for comment.
	4. The Environment Agency recommend that any new semi-natural or mitigation habitat is targeted towards existing priority habitat located within the scheme footprint and aim to interlink and connect these with similar ecological habitat types.		4. Noted. The approach of the design of mitigation habits has been to create a corridor either side of the proposed road and the main aim is to reduce fragmentation. Historical mapping has been studied to attempt to recreate past environments, regenerating woodlands and hedgerows where possible. Mitigation for habitat loss will be presented within ES and the Environmental Masterplan.
	5. The Environment Agency would welcome the adoption of a multifunctional approach to surface water drainage design, and aim to integrate existing environmental topics (flood, water quality, biodiversity) to maximise their value as identified through CIRIA best practice guidance.		5. Noted. Balancing ponds are part of the design and will serve the highway.
	6. Appropriate best practice methodology and biosecurity will need to be adopted as part of any construction works within River Etherow and incorporated into the CEMP based on records of		6. Noted. The presence of records of Signal Crayfish will be noted within the ES. The design does not hold a requirement for works within the channel of the River Etherow meaning that Signal Crayfish have not been considered further.



	<p>invasive Signal Crayfish in the River Etherow catchment.</p>		
	<p>7. A number of invasive / non-native species identified within red line area. The Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) should refer to best practice and avoiding spread of such species. There may be opportunity to improve ecological quality of some priority habitats currently identified as having these non-native species.</p>		<p>7. Noted. Mitigation measures to prevent the spread of invasive/non-native species will be considered within the ES and the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan</p>
	<p>8. A key design aim for realigning Hurst Clough Brook or other River Etherow tributaries should be to retain the ecological and hydrological connectivity in the catchment, adopting environmental best practice in regard to any new culvert crossing, and appropriate mitigate for any lost riparian or priority wetland habitat associated with construction.</p>		<p>8. The ES will state that areas of temporary riparian habitat loss during the construction phase will be reinstated prior to the scheme becoming operational (i.e. at proposed culverts and including banks and associated vegetation such as hedgerows). Reinstated habitat will be returned to a condition of ecological value equal to or above that identified during baseline surveys. The proposed culverts will be appropriately designed to maintain connectivity for wildlife along the ditches.</p>
	<p>9. The Environment Agency recommend that any mitigation is shaped by proposed River Corridor Surveys conducted in 2018, ensuring there is no deterioration of River Etherow WFD waterbody and integrate potential environmental enhancements/river restoration opportunities of existing heavily modified riparian corridor within the proposed permanent land take areas.</p>		<p>9. Noted. River corridor surveys have been undertaken and the results will be presented in ES. The results of these surveys will inform the mitigation and enhancement measures proposed for the River Etherow.</p>
	<p>10. New mitigation ponds should be carefully designed to ensure wider ecological connectivity within the landscape and with other neighbouring wetlands.</p>		<p>10. The scheme includes the provision of three wetland areas with a combined approximate area of 5,121m<sup>2</sup> (at permanent water level). Additionally, three smaller ponds with a combined approximate area of 1,060m<sup>2</sup> would be created. Further information will be presented in ES and within the Environmental Masterplan. The new ponds will be maintained during the operation of the scheme and would further</p>

			increase habitat quality with the study area and habitat connectivity on either side of the scheme.
	<p>People and Communities Public Rights of Way (PRoW) and bridleway diversions should be sensitively designed and located. Those near waterbodies need appropriate green space buffers.</p>		PRoW and bridleway diversions will be discussed within ES. The NMU route plans were provided to the Environment Agency for their comment.
	<p>Water Environment Any new crossing of the River Etherow should avoid further canalisation and look to remove or modify any redundant riparian walls and or replace these with more environmentally beneficial bio-engineering approaches where deemed necessary.</p>		The River Etherow is being enhanced as part of the flood mitigation and will not have a negative effect on the WFD classification. The Environment Agency was provided with the necessary information to show how this would be achieved as part of the scheme design.
Natural England	<p>Consideration should be given to potential air quality impacts.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to potential landscape impacts within the Peak District National Park due to through traffic changes, which could affect the South Pennine Moors SAC, Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA and Dark Peak SSSI.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to potential noise impacts.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to potential biodiversity impacts.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to mitigating the above impacts</p> <p>Broadly supports the inclusion of facilities which allow greater access to the environment through improved green infrastructure.</p>	N	These issues will all be assessed in the ES.

<p>Public Health England</p>	<p>Does not support or oppose the scheme but provides comment on the PEIR. Requests that the ES includes a full assessment of potential public health impacts. Requests a separate section summarising public health impacts. Requests an assessment of fine particulate matter (PM2.5) should be carried out. An appendix is provided detailing what applicants should address when preparing an ES.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Comments have been taken onboard. An assessment of potential public health impacts will be presented in the ES. An assessment of fine particulate matter (PM2.5) will not be included in the ES, on the basis that available monitoring data (collected by Defra) measured PM2.5 substantively below the limit value (the maximum UK level was measured at 16ug/m3 at Camden roadside in 2017) and it would take an extremely large increase in AADT (&gt;10,000) to affect PM2.5 concentrations even by 1ug/m3. As such, it is considered that there is no risk that the scheme would exceed the PM2.5 EU limit value and therefore no need to include PM2.5 as part of the assessment. However, PM10 has been modelled and the results will be presented in the ES. It should be noted that PM2.5 forms part of the PM10 fraction. Appendix A will be considered in preparation of the ES.</p>
<p>United Utilities</p>	<p>Does not support or oppose scheme It has various water and wastewater infrastructure passing through the site boundary and should therefore be contacted regarding this prior to the submission of any application for consent. Advised of its free pre-application service for applicants to discuss and agree drainage strategies. It also says that surface water should be disposed of in a sustainable way and not get discharged into the public sewerage system.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Ongoing engagement has been undertaken with United Utilities via email and meetings. A Statement of Common Ground is being developed to set out areas of agreement against their assets in the region of the scheme. A record of engagement is included in the statement which details all correspondence.</p>

Royal Mail	Royal Mail requests: All proposed road closures/diversions/alternative access arrangements, hours of working and content of the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) and that the final CTMP includes provision for a mechanism to inform major road users about works affecting the local network (with particular regard to Royal Mail's distribution facilities in the vicinity of the DCO application site).		Royal Mail will be informed of requested information prior to the commencement of construction.
------------	---	--	---

The following consultee responses are not prescribed but were considered to be a relevant consultee on the scheme proposals.

Table D-2 - Summary of Responses Received from Non-Statutory Consultees

Consultee	Summary of Response	Change Y/N?	Regard had to Response (S49)
National Trust	1. Does not support or oppose the scheme. advises that the Peak District National Park Authority advice is given full cognisance.		1. Refer to Table 5-8.
	2. Suggests consideration is given to alternatives such as making new roads single carriageway or introducing route restraint measures such as HGV bans or weight limits.		2. Alternatives has been considered and the assessment will be presented in the ES.
	3. Wildlife and heritage impacts should be minimised, and impacts mitigated or compensated as a last resort.		3. Wildlife impacts, together with proposed mitigation and enhancement measures, will be discussed in ES, together with proposed mitigation and enhancement measures,
	4. Suggests assessment should be made including air quality, cultural heritage, biodiversity, landscape, noise and greenhouse gas emissions.		4. These topics will be discussed in the ES.
	5. The safety and technology improvements (non-DCO elements) should be sensitively designed in consultation with Peak District Park Authority.		5. These are non-DCO elements and are not considered in this report
Campaign for Better Transport	Formally object to the proposals to build the Mottram Moor link road and new A57(T) to A57 link road. 1. The proposals will do nothing to reduce traffic, will permanently damage the Peak District National Park, undermine statutory targets on reducing CO2 and air pollution and cause an adverse environmental impact.	N	1. Environmental impacts will be discussed within ES.
	2. Feel there is a lack of an integrated approach and that a better solution would be to invest in sustainable transport such as rail and integrated multi-modal options.		2. Outside of the Highways England's scope.

	<p>3. Tameside has a housing requirement and so losing any housing to accommodate the works will undermine this target.</p>		<p>3. Highways England has consulted Tameside MBC throughout the scheme and is working closely with this local authority.</p>
	<p>4. Should the new road go ahead, we would expect Highways England to deliver traffic calming improvements to the existing road and not as a post-opening legacy from the new road.</p>		<p>4. Highways England is working with Tameside MBC and TfGM to develop a package of measures along this section of the route to transform it to a local road and improve the community environment.</p>
Charlesworth Parish Council	<p>Feels the scheme would detrimentally impact Charlesworth Village traffic because:</p> <p>1. It will allow traffic to progress quickly to the outskirts of Glossop but does not address the problem of the locally known Glossop Crawl.</p> <p>Movement of traffic along Dinting Vale and High Street West.</p> <p>Existing and proposed housing developments will require many people needing to travel to the east of Glossop</p> <p>The scheme will have no impact on traffic using Ashworth Lane through Hattersley to Broadbottom, Mottram.</p>	N	<p>1-4. The project team are working with High Peak Borough Council &amp; Derbyshire County Council to address wider traffic impacts.</p>
	<p>5. The current A57T de-trunking will slow local traffic.</p>		<p>5. The majority of the traffic will use the new bypass and traffic reduction in excess of 70% is expected on the current A57(T) proposed de-trunking section. Local traffic will be able to move more freely with smoother flows once the bypass is open.</p>
	<p>6. The de-trunking means the timing of the lights in the centre of Mottram are to be altered in favour of Stalybridge traffic entering Mottram along Stalybridge Road and Broadbottom Road.</p>		<p>6. The current proposal is to adjust the timings of the signals to favour a north-south movement. There is ongoing dialogue with Tameside MBC to develop a final solution for the de-trunking.</p>
	<p>7. Alteration in traffic light timing will encourage traffic to by-pass the Glossop Crawl by going across the lights along the B6174 through Broadbottom and Charlesworth.</p>		<p>7. The variable demand modelling accounts for the statement at present. The model shows no issue once the scheme opens.</p>

	8. Once in Charlesworth, traffic will either travel onwards to Glossop, Gamesley or along High Lane through Simmondley and the low end of the Chunal Lane to the centre of Glossop.		8. Noted
	9. The increased traffic through Charlesworth (measured at 12,000 cars per day in 2012) requires investment into the village roadways which at present do not have an unmanned pedestrian crossing.		9. The scheme scope does not include this area however the Applicant is in continued dialogue with Derbyshire County Council about issues such as these.
Sustrans	Suggests that the standard cross-section for the footway / bridleway is the same as for the A34 Alderley Edge bypass. Advises to check the standard/drive it/take photos of this bypass example.		Scheme design for the footways/bridleways are in line with current standards. The project team has liaised with the A34 Alderley Edge Bypass team and shared best practice/lessons learnt. The team has also met with Tameside MBC's NMU group to discuss such routes.
Friends of the Peak District and CRPE South Yorkshire	Friends of the Peak District object to the scheme and also submitted their 2016 and 2017 responses and requested that they were also considered. They are fully supportive of finding a solution to the traffic conditions on the A628T road corridor between the M67 and the M1. Confirmed Campaign for National Parks also object to the scheme and support the points Friends of the Peak District have made. A lot of details provided against the following objections:	N	1&2. Noted.
	1&2. the lack of information accompanying the current consultation. The piecemeal approach to developing the road corridor		
	3. an example of the omissions in the PEIR in respect of air quality. They provided a summary of CPRE research (March 2017) which would not have been available to HE when developing 2017 consultation - research supports their objection to TPU - advises that HE needs to apply lessons from the outcomes of its own scheme to all future developments.		3. The PEIR was compliant with HE guidelines and provided the expected air quality statements. It is understood from consultation that air quality was a concern to certain individuals. To this extent Highways England have installed additional monitoring locations to show its commitment to air quality.

	4. They do not believe that alternatives have been fully considered in line with WebTAG.		4. Alternatives for the scheme have been fully considered in line with WebTAG. A transport model has been created for the appraisal of alternative solutions which has been used to support the transport business case.
			Additionally, Schedule 4, Part 2 of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (SI No. 572) requires the ES to include “a description of the reasonable alternatives (for example in terms of development design, technology, location, size and scale) studied by the developer, which are relevant to the proposed project and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option, including a comparison of the environmental effects”. This will be presented in the ES.
SPEED Bridleway	Based in Charlesworth and Chisworth, support the NMU opportunities of the scheme and suggest the following: A bridleway running by the side of the Glossop Spur would greatly benefit the local riders If this bridleway connected to the Pennine Bridleway, the benefit would be greater If a bridleway passed over the top of the proposed underpass, the riding community would continue to be connected without resorting to dangerous road passages.	N	The NMU route on the proposed Glossop Spur is multi-user therefore can be used by local riders. The proposed Glossop Spur ties in at the proposed Woolley Bridge Junction. The existing Pegasus crossing will remain; therefore, the scheme will connect into the Trans Pennine Way. The project team has met with Tameside MBC NMU group. At present the connectivity around the underpass for NMUs is being further developed.
North West Transport Activists Roundtable (NW TAR)	Operates under Campaign for Better Transport (CfBT). Objects to the scheme and provide the following comments:  1. Information is not enough to base an informed judgement on, final traffic and air quality data, carbon emissions, noise and flood risk assessments not available.	N	1. Assessment of environmental issues will be presented in the ES
	2. Landscape assessment only conducted in summer months		2. The landscape and visual impact assessment assessed Winter Year 1 and Summer Year 15. The results of the assessment will be presented in the ES



	<p>Approach towards Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) is unclear</p> <p>Ground surveys are ongoing</p> <p>No information on road safety</p> <p>Appears no investigation of the impacts of increased traffic on the PDNP has taken place, including on the national trails that cross the Park.</p>		<p>The approach to the HRA is documented in the Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report'</p> <p>The results of the Ground Investigations undertaken are reported in Ground Investigation Report.</p> <p>No road safety information was presented at consultation. This information will be available via the Planning Inspectorate's website once the DCO application is submitted. The project team are willing to share this information with the public prior to the DCO application.</p> <p>An assessment of the indirect effects of traffic changes within the Peak District National Park will be presented in the ES.</p>
Pennine National Trails Partnership	<p>1. The interim route of the Pennine Bridleway for walkers will be severed by the link road</p> <p>– the new footpath provided has no clear provision for walkers on this route during construction. We would like to agree a suitable diversion for use during construction of the Pennine Bridleway. Provides points around improving screening roads both visually and audibly.</p>	N	<p>1. No existing route will be permanently severed. This includes during construction. Once the contractor is on board in 2019 diversion routes will be fully developed. It is Highways England's commitment to liaise with stakeholders to address comments such as screening.</p>
	<p>2. The interim route for cyclists (the final route for all users once route is completed at Glossop) crosses the A57 – the consultation plans show this as a public footpath when it is a bridleway. This use for cyclists and horse riders must be maintained during construction unless a suitable diversion is available. The crossing of the A57 should be reviewed to ensure it is still safe and appropriate once works are complete.</p> <p>3. Any measures which can be implemented to screen the roads visually and audibly would be beneficial.</p>		<p>2. As above. Safety is one of the Applicant's core values and is one of the scheme's objectives. A junction would not be opened unless it had passed the required safety audit.</p> <p>3. The proposals for visual screening and noise barriers will be provided in the ES and the Environmental Masterplan</p>



© Crown copyright (2017).

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence:

visit [www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/](http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/)

write to the Information Policy Team, **The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU**,  
or email [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk).

Printed on paper from well-managed forests and other controlled sources.

Registered office Bridge House, 1 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford GU1 4LZ  
Highways England Company Limited registered in England and Wales number 09346363

