



TAR

NW

Transport Activists' Roundtable

North West

www.nwtar.org.uk

NW TAR CORE GROUP

Convenor:

LILLIAN BURNS

Acting Chair, NW Regional Group,
Campaign to Protect Rural England/
Director, TravelWatch NorthWest/
25 Heybridge Lane,
Prestbury, Cheshire, SK10 4ES
t: 01625 829492
f: 01625 828015
e: BrLln@aol.com

Members:

DAVID BUTLER

CTC Right-to-Ride representative
10 Gladstone Grove
Stockport, SK4 4DA
t: 0161 432 4611
e: dsbutler@ntlworld.com

PETER COLLEY

Federation of Cumbrian
Amenity Societies/ NW ACTs
Friends of the Lake District
12 Rawes Garth
Staveley Cumbria LA8 9QH
t: 01539 821629
e: colleygarth@btpenworld.com

JANET CUFF

Ramblers Association/ CPRE
33 Tatton Road North
Stockport SK4 4QX
t: 0161 431 7654
e: Janet.Cuff@talktalk.net

ADRIAN DUNNING

NW Association of Civic Trusts
11 Crombouke Fold, Worsley
Manchester M28 1ZE
t: 0161 790 9507
e: ajdunning@gmail.com

SANDRA DUTSON

NW TAR Treasurer/ Road Peace
12 Queenscroft,
Eccles, M30 9QQ
t: 0161 707 3546
e: smdutson@btinternet.com

HELEN RIMMER

North West Campaigner,
Friends of the Earth
60 Duke St Liverpool L1 5AA
t: 0151 707 4328

Webmaster:

GRAEME SHERRIFF

e: graemesherriff@googlegmail.com

Highways England TransPennine Upgrade team

Thursday March 22nd, 2018

Dear Team,

TRANSPENNINE UPGRADE CONSULTATION

The North West Transport Roundtable (NW TAR), which operates under the auspices of the Campaign for Better Transport (CfBT), promotes sustainable transport and land use and healthier lives. We espouse 'Smart Growth' and reducing the need to travel.

The bulk of the proposals which make up the TransPennine upgrades lie physically outwith the North West region. However, the consequences of major upgrades to this corridor from the M67 at Mottram through to the M1 would be far reaching. Over the years, the NW TAR has consistently objected to upgrades to this corridor because we believe it would attract more traffic to it, when the bulk of strategic traffic should be encouraged to use the M62, even if it means travelling more miles.

We note that, in addition to Highways England's aspirations for this route, Transport for the North's (TfN's) strategy also includes the Hollingworth-Tintwistle Bypass and dualling across the Park to the M1. We understand that such dualling would result in the route becoming a motorway in all but name. No evidence has been offered to show that the proposed 'improvements' would pass the test of major development in a National Park. A new expressway/motorway would conflict with all national park policy.

HE's 'TransPennine Upgrade' is going through a consultation process with very little information on which to base an informed judgement of the impacts of the scheme. Final traffic and air quality data, carbon emissions, noise and flood risk assessments are not available. The landscape assessment, we understand, has only been done in the summer months. The approach towards the Habitats Regulation Assessment is unclear, ground surveys are ongoing, and there is nothing on road safety. Although the scheme lies in the Peak District National Park setting and there would be traffic increases on roads within the National Park, it would appear that no investigation of these impacts has taken place, including on the national trails that cross the Park.

National Park policy requires any investment in trunk roads, which the proposals at Mottram (in the North West) represent, to develop routes for long distance traffic that avoid the Park. Any increase in traffic would substantially worsen the already unacceptable traffic situation and create visual intrusion, poor air quality, noise, loss of tranquillity and wildlife, poor quality of life for communities along the route and road danger for visitors using national trails and exploring the countryside.

continued ...

The proposed infrastructure around Mottram would have an unacceptable impact on the surrounding countryside, which is mainly Green Belt at this point, and do nothing to alleviate the conditions for adjacent communities in Hollingworth and Glossop. Once new road capacity is supplied, it would unleash suppressed demand to which would be added induced traffic.

Recent research by the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) scrutinising Highways England schemes found that induced traffic reached up to 47% over and above forecast traffic growth ¹. We know from work done on the TransPennine Tunnel Study that the impacts of a dual carriageway carrying 35,000 AADF - similar flows to those that would be seen on the proposed Mottram dual carriageway - on the environment would be severe.

Consequently, we are re-confirming here our long held objections to Transpennine highway upgrades. We can only support very localised, appropriately designed, safety and other measures which tackle accident black spots and help to reduce the impacts of traffic on residents who live along the corridor. The answers, we believe, lie in demand management and investment in public transport and active travel. Also in reducing the need to travel. As the CPRE report demonstrates, the answers do not lie in expanding road space. That 'solution' only ever provides a temporary 'fix' and it does nothing for modal shift. Please ensure that we remain registered objectors to the TransPennine highway upgrade schemes. Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

LILLIAN BURNS, Convenor, NW TAR E: BrLlln@aol.com Tel: 01625 829492

¹ <http://www.cpre.org.uk/resources/transport/roads/item/4543-the-end-of-the-road-challenging-the-road-building-consensus>