

A6MARR

Sue Stevenson

Sent: 16 October 2014 09:40**To:** sarahjaneriley80@gmail.com**Cc:** SEMMMS Relief.Road; Graham Martin

Dear Dr Riley

I refer to your recent email to Mr Hill regarding the rebuttal sent to you following your objection to the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road scheme- Compulsory Purchase Orders and Side Road Orders Public Inquiry.

A number of your concerns appear to relate to existing traffic and highway maintenance issues and these have been passed to the relevant council departments for them to investigate.

In your email you raised the following issues and I enclose our response below each issue.

1. The designation of the 20mph Quiet Zone: I know this fact, as I have clearly written this in my concerns to you. My question was that the present 30mph speed limit is rarely adhered to and in fact those cars that presently use this lane as a 'rat run' or boy racers use the straight as some sort of challenge to drive up to speeds in excess of 50-60 mph.

To be clear - **how are you going to enforce the 20mph speed limit on a daily basis?**

The road is already narrow and has a number of bends. The Quiet Lane treatment uses signs and gateway treatments to highlight that pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders have priority and that the speed limit is 20mph. As part of the detailed development of the scheme other traffic calming features may be considered as appropriate.

2. The A6/Windlehurst junction is to be improved: This may be, however, as stated in my email to you, people presently use this lane as a rat run when there are traffic problems on the A6 and will do so more when there are traffic jams created on the A6 during construction of the bypass.

To be clear - **how are you going to prevent local people using this road as a rat run for the DURATION OF THE CONSTRUCTION of the bypass to avoid the inevitable traffic jams that will be created on the A6?**

The majority of the construction of the A6MARR in this area will be off the existing carriageway however there will be some disruption on the A6 and this will be managed in conjunction with the Council's network management team who manage all roadwork activity on the highway network.

To be clear - **how are you going to prevent local people from using this as a rat run to get out on the A6 bypass once it is constructed?**

The introduction of the Quiet Lane concept is the mitigation measure proposed in the Transport Assessment to discourage traffic using your route once the A6MARR is opened.

3. Your predicted AADT flow figures - to be honest, these have at best been plucked out of thin air. Clearly there has never been traffic flow figures actually recorded on this lane at any point. These figures suggest that the baseline figures are 500 cars a day driving down this lane. These are totally inaccurate. There may be somewhere in the region of 50-100 cars a day, IF that. We did point out

this inaccurate figure to Stockport Council SEMMMS representatives at the local meetings, followed up by 2 emails saying the same but obviously these have not been taken into account.

I note that there are presently traffic flow measurements occurring on every road around this area except Threaphurst Lane.

To be clear - how can you make any predictions re AADT flow figures when you do not have accurate figures in the first place?

The traffic figures are taken from the traffic model which is based upon and validated using previous traffic counts across the area. In developing the traffic model, we have not counted the actual traffic flow on every road in the model network. Threaphurst Lane is a lightly trafficked minor road. The model forecasts predict the change in traffic as a result of the proposed scheme and these show that there will be a very significant reduction in traffic along Threaphurst Lane.

All of the above do relate to the safety of the residents, children, livestock etc that use this lane. However, the most cardinal point that you have also not addressed is as follows:

The lane is a single carriageway in several places and is used on a daily basis by tractors with/without trailers/balers/spreaders, HGV wagons, skip trucks, commercial low loaders.

How do you propose that the single carriageway will be able to cope with increased number of cars in the areas where they cannot pass each other?

How do you propose the already inadequate road surface will cope with the increased number of vehicles?

This was highlighted on Sunday 5th October when there was a stand off for 15 minutes outside my front door of 2 cars that refused to reverse to let one another pass. Also, another car damaged their bumper by driving into a fallen kerb stone in trying to squeeze past - another matter in which Stockport Council has been STAGGERINGLY inefficient in correcting.

Please DO NOT say that there will not be an increase in the traffic according to your figures - I live here, I see it, I know.

The traffic you describe using the road is in keeping with the type of activities located in the properties along this and the adjacent local road.

The traffic model is forecasting a reduction in traffic on your road after the A6MARR opens with the proposed mitigation measures in place.

Your concern regarding existing traffic conditions and the maintenance of the road has been passed to the relevant council departments .

Sue Stevenson

Sue Stevenson
Investing in Growth Manager
Stockport Council
4th Floor, Fred Perry House
Stockport,

SK1 3XE

Tel:0161 474 4351

www.stockport.gov.uk

From: Sarah Riley <sarahjaneriley80@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, 6 Oct 2014 21:12:05 +0100
To: <john.hill@stockport.gov.uk>; <Kelly.Schrocksadel@dft.gsi.gov.uk>; <jaynehallam@personaassociates.co.uk>
Cc: <natalie.gorse@stockport.gov.uk>; <cldr.william.wragg@stockport.gov.uk><cldr.william.wragg@stockport.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: SEMMS A6 Manchester Airport Relief Road - Rebuttal Proof

Dear Mr Hill

Thank you for the rebuttal response dated October 3rd.

Unfortunately I am emailing again as your response did not answer any of my concerns.

I would be most grateful if you and your colleagues would take the time to read the original document and provide an answer that is specific to each of the points that I have made. I would appreciate it if your response is not a stock and standard copy/pasted one as this wastes both my time and yours, given that you are reading yet another email to do with the same topic.

Your responses and why they are unsatisfactory are highlighted below:

1. The designation of the 20mph Quiet Zone: I know this fact, as I have clearly written this in my concerns to you. My question was that the present 30mph speed limit is rarely adhered to and in fact those cars that presently use this lane as a 'rat run' or boy racers use the straight as some sort of challenge to drive up to speeds in excess of 50-60 mph.

To be clear - **how are you going to enforce the 20mph speed limit on a daily basis?**

2. The A6/Windlehurst junction is to be improved: This may be, however, as stated in my email to you, people presently use this lane as a rat run when there are traffic problems on the A6 and will do so more when there are traffic jams created on the A6 during construction of the bypass.

To be clear - **how are you going to prevent local people using this road as a rat run for the DURATION OF THE CONSTRUCTION of the bypass to avoid the inevitable traffic jams that will be created on the A6?**

To be clear - **how are you going to prevent local people from using this as a rat run to get out on the A6 bypass once it is constructed?**

3. Your predicted AADT flow figures - to be honest, these have at best been plucked out of thin air. Clearly there has never been traffic flow figures actually recorded on this lane at any point. These figures suggest that the baseline figures are 500 cars a day driving down this lane. These are totally inaccurate. There may be somewhere in the region of 50-100 cars a day, IF that. We did point out this inaccurate figure to Stockport Council SEMMMS representatives at the local meetings, followed

up by 2 emails saying the same but obviously these have not been taken into account.

I note that there are presently traffic flow measurements occurring on every road around this area except Threaphurst Lane.

To be clear - how can you make any predictions re AADT flow figures when you do not have accurate figures in the first place?

All of the above do relate to the safety of the residents, children, livestock etc that use this lane. However, the most cardinal point that you have also not addressed is as follows:

The lane is a single carriageway in several places and is used on a daily basis by tractors with/without trailers/balers/spreaders, HGV wagons, skip trucks, commercial low loaders.

How do you propose that the single carriageway will be able to cope with increased number of cars in the areas where they cannot pass each other?

How do you propose the already inadequate road surface will cope with the increased number of vehicles?

This was highlighted on Sunday 5th October when there was a stand off for 15 minutes outside my front door of 2 cars that refused to reverse to let one another pass. Also, another car damaged their bumper by driving into a fallen kerb stone in trying to squeeze past - another matter in which Stockport Council has been STAGGERINGLY inefficient in correcting.

Please DO NOT say that there will not be an increase in the traffic according to your figures - I live here, I see it, I know.

For your convenience I have attached a copy of my original email.

I look forward to your much more specific response in the very near future.

Please do not consider that your rebuttal has laid this objection to rest. For the reasons above I am sure that you can see that it has not.

Warmest wishes

Yours sincerely

Dr. Sarah-Jane Riley

ORIGINAL EMAIL BELOW:

Dear Mr. Hill

My name is Sarah-Jane Riley and I am a resident on Threaphurst Lane, Hazel Grove, Stockport.

I am writing with some concerns regarding the potential traffic implications on this lane once the construction of the bypass commences and on its completion.

The primary concern, which has also been highlighted by Stockport Council, is that the volume of traffic on this lane will significantly increase both during the construction process and subsequently once the bypass is

functional.

As I understand it from Stockport Council, the suggested measures to slow down and/or reduce the potential traffic are to designate this lane and Torkington Road a 'quiet zone' at 20 mph.

Having spoken with several residents on the lane (some of which are copied in to this email) these are the primary concerns:

1. **Traffic Volume** - currently, if there is a traffic jam on the A6, just a small increase in the traffic on the lane presents problems, due to the speed with which 'rat runners' travel and the narrow width of road in several areas (single carriageway and insufficient passing places)
2. **Traffic Speed** - people do not adhere to the 30 mph presently in force. I do not see how a 20 mph will be of any use! There are often people on the straight areas driving up to 70 mph.
3. **Types of vehicles** - see point 5 re resident commercial traffic. Often, as the lane is not wide enough, the larger vehicles drive on the verge, causing the destruction of the dykes which leads to poor drainage with the water collecting on the road creating very dangerous black ice patches, or actual water-damage to the road surface (towards the A6 end of the lane).
4. **Suitability of the road** - it is a single carriageway in the majority of places. There are some hairpin bends which people take too fast. The foundation of the road is already under strain with the present traffic weight/volume as can be seen by the undulating areas, cracking tarmac on the central and edges sections, areas of collapse into the dykes, large and deep potholes, kerb stones being driven over and pushed into the dykes, blocking them and subsequent drainage problems.

5. Other road users:

- **RESIDENT commercial traffic**
- Farm traffic - tractors with/without balers/spreaders, animal transport etc
- HGV - Wagons
- Skip Trucks (based on Torkington road)
- HGV - Low loaders
- Bin trucks (not resident)

ALL of the above take up the entire width of the road and although there are a few passing places, these are not suitable for more than 1 car to pass at a time.

- **CHILDREN:** there are 6 young children resident on the lane and more that visit family. Some cars pass at 60mph + and this is a MORTALITY WAITING TO HAPPEN.

- **HORSES:** There are stables on the lane as well as residents who own horses. Combined with the use of the lane to get to Middlewood Way by the two riding schools based on Torkington Road and Wellington Road (A6), there is daily horse traffic which is not suitable in combination with a large volume of traffic on the lane, due to the width of the lane and the speed with which people drive.

- **FARM ANIMALS:** crossing
- **DOG WALKERS:** many use this lane due to its connections with Middlewood Way
- **CYCLISTS:** used regularly by many cyclists and dangerous re the speed with which people cut through

A few suggestions have been made by the residents: (although these are limited due to the commercial traffic i.e. re width restrictions etc)

1. ACCESS ONLY - road - and for this to be properly enforced
2. SPEED HUMPS - although these are not always viable where farm traffic is concerned

I apologise that this email is a relatively late submission but I was unaware of the inquiry commencing the week until last Tuesday!

I am copying this email to the residents, Jayne Hallam (Programme Officer), Kelly Schrocksnadel (Dept, for

Transport), William Wragg (local MP).

I was informed by Jane that this email will be regarded as a formal concern and will be read out during the 'Objectors' section of the hearing.

I look forward to your response. I will not be able to attend in person due to the late notice and would like to suggest that the local residents are informed of such events directly by email or post, to enable a forum for such concerns to be properly heard.

All the best

Yours sincerely

Dr. Sarah-Jane Riley

Report it, Pay for it, Apply for it, Find it - it's quicker and easier online with the launch of our new [website](#). Give it a go!

Confidentiality:- *This email, its contents and any attachments are intended only for the above named. As the email may contain confidential or legally privileged information, if you are not, or suspect that you are not, the above named or the person responsible for delivery of the message to the above named, please delete or destroy the email and any attachments immediately and inform the sender of the error.*