

**THE HIGHWAYS ACT 1980**

**-and-**

**THE ACQUISITION OF LAND ACT 1981**

**THE HIGHWAYS (INQUIRIES PROCEDURE) RULES 1994**

**COMPULSORY PURCHASE (INQUIRIES PROCEDURE) RULES 2007**

**REFERENCE: LAO/NW/SRO/2013/40 and LAO/NW/CPO/2013/41**

**REBUTTAL PROOF**

**-of-**

**James McMahon in relation to the Proof**

**of**

**Julie Waddicor, 17 Mill Hill Hollow, Poynton**

**The Metropolitan Borough Council of Stockport**

**acting on its behalf and on behalf of**

**-Manchester City Council -and-**

**Cheshire East Borough Council**

**to be presented to a Local Public Inquiry on the 30<sup>th</sup> September 2014 to consider  
objections to**

**THE METROPOLITAN BOROUGH OF STOCKPORT (HAZEL GROVE (A6) TO  
MANCHESTER AIRPORT A555 CLASSIFIED ROAD) COMPULSORY PURCHASE  
ORDER 2013**

**THE METROPOLITAN BOROUGH OF STOCKPORT (HAZEL GROVE (A6) TO  
MANCHESTER AIRPORT A555 CLASSIFIED ROAD) (SIDE ROADS) ORDER 2013**

**Parveen Akhtar**

**Head of Legal and Democratic Governance**

**The Metropolitan Borough Council of Stockport**

**Corporate and Support Services**

**Town Hall, Stockport SK1 3XE**

This rebuttal proof of evidence sets out the Council's response to the objector's proof in relation to their objection to the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road Compulsory Purchase Order and/ or Side Road Order that was submitted to the Department for Transport by Julie Waddicor, 17 Mill Hill Hollow, Poynton.

This rebuttal proof is presented by the Council's Project Director for the A6MARR scheme. James McMahon, however, contributions to this rebuttal have been made by the Council's Expert Witnesses as indicated alongside the responses.

The Expert Witnesses contributing to the responses to the objections submitted are as follows:

<b>Expert Witness</b>	<b>Initials</b>	<b>Proof of Evidence Name and Reference Number</b>
James McMahon	JMcM	Volume 1
Naz Huda	NH	Volume 2
Nasar Malik	NM	Volume 3
Paul Reid	PR	Volume 4
Paul Colclough	PC	Volume 5
Jamie Bardot	JB	Volume 6
Alan Houghton	AC	Volume 7
Sue Stevenson	SS	Volume 8
James McMahon	JMcM	Volume 9
Henry Church	HC	Volume 10

Objector 46: Julie Waddicor  
 17 Mill Hill Hollow, Poynton, Cheshire, SK12 1EQ

Element of objector proof	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
46/R01	I am a local resident of Poynton and I strongly object to the construction of an expensive and ineffectual dual carriageway through our precious greenbelt countryside.	<p>The concept of a relief road in the area has been around since the 1930's, is well documented in the 1960's and the Highways Agency has protected a route for decades. Specific plans for a Relief Road have been around since 2001 when the South East Manchester Multi-Modal Strategy (SEMMMS) recommended that the three councils work on developing plans for improving transport in the area for the benefit of both local communities and the local economy. Throughout each stage of the SEMMMS scheme, detailed assessments have been undertaken to analyse the need for the proposed Relief Road. Results identified the following main reasons for the development of the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relieve existing traffic congestion and address poor connectivity which constrains the economy through lengthening journey times. Current congestion reduces labour market catchments and business-to-business activity as well as creating delays on designated freight routes (e.g. the A6) which, in turn, generates productivity losses for businesses;</li> <li>• Address the current poor access to/from the east to Manchester Airport which acts as a barrier for economic growth and regeneration;</li> <li>• Improve the existing poor transport links in communities throughout south Manchester in particular relating to the east-west highway network;</li> <li>• Relieve current congestion on current roads, where</li> </ul>	JMcM

		<p>average peak time vehicle speeds of less than 10mph have been recorded on many parts. This congestion has led to journey times that are longer than all other 'large' urban areas across the UK, including those in London;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce existing trips using residential streets as well as passing through local centres which will in turn reduce levels of pollution, road traffic incidents and journey times;</li> <li>• Relieve current congestion problems along the A6 and in local centres including Gatley, Bramhall, Heald Green, Hazel Grove, Poynton, Wilmslow, Handforth and Cheadle Hulme which currently affect accessibility and lead to delays;</li> <li>• Improve existing poor environmental conditions in local communities caused by the high volumes of traffic passing through the areas to reach other destinations; and</li> <li>• Relieve currently congested conditions for pedestrians and cyclists which results in non-motorised transport users facing problems of safely accessing education, employment and leisure facilities.</li> </ul> <p>Detailed information about the scheme benefits and any adverse impacts are set out within the scheme's business case.</p> <p>The A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road has been identified as the best solution to address this problem, as part of the overall SEMMMS Strategy.</p> <p>The analysis and appraisal undertaken in developing the scheme has demonstrated that the scheme is effective in addressing the problems set out above and, as set out within the business case, represents good value for money.</p>	
--	--	--	--

46/R02	<p>This area is renowned for its rural character, rolling countryside and unparalleled views of the Cheshire and Derbyshire Peaks. The land this road will destroy is working agricultural land, and the loss if it will change the character and landscape of Poynton irreversibly, paving the way for further development along its route and closing up the narrow green space between the Greater Manchester conurbation and Cheshire East.</p>	<p>The location of the proposed scheme in countryside which is part of Green Belt has been a matter which all three authorities responsible for determining the three planning applications for the proposed scheme have considered with full knowledge of their obligations relative to the need to establish that exceptional circumstances apply in light of the benefits offered by the scheme. It is acknowledged the proposed scheme will have an impact on landscape character but it is not agreed that the landscape character of the area will be destroyed or that the road will act as a catalyst for development in the Green Belt.</p>	AH
46/R03	<p>As an actively concerned member of the public, I have taken part in each of the public consultations and local liaison forums of last year and can attest to the fact that the whole process has been fraught with confusion and obfuscation.</p> <p>To begin with, the fundamental purpose of building this dual carriageway is confused and contradictory. The scheme's stated purpose was to improve LOCAL traffic flow. Originally it was supposed to bypass Hazel Grove, causing considerably more problems than it solves. The additional traffic generated by the scheme, particularly in High Lane and Disley, does not support the claim that this road will ease local congestion. So if not, then why build it?</p>	<p>The project team has carried out an extensive consultation process including in phase 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• two leaflet drops to local residents and businesses, to over 85 thousand properties;</li> <li>• 17 exhibitions across the Relief Road Route;</li> <li>• a dedicated interactive website;</li> <li>• information campaign in local media;</li> <li>• briefing events for local/regional businesses and groups through a number of 'Local Liaison Forum' (LLF) meetings;</li> <li>• postal/phone/social media feedback system; and</li> <li>• letters to general stakeholders, statutory consultees and regional MP's and MEP's.,</li> </ul> <p>A similar level of consultation with 9 exhibitions was undertaken as part of the phase 2 consultation.</p> <p>In addition meetings have been held with representatives of PAULA- Poynton against unnecessary link roads to the airport which the objector has attended to try to understand and address their concerns.</p> <p>A meeting was also held at the objector's house to understand her and her neighbours' concerns regarding</p>	JMCM/ SS

		<p>the potential impact of the link road in the area of Mill Hill Hollow including potential visual and noise impacts and potential mitigation measures.</p> <p>The purpose of the scheme, as set out in response to 46/R01, remains consistent with that detailed in the SEMMMS strategy of 2001.</p> <p>Traffic forecasts showing the impact of the A6MARR are included in the Transport Assessment Report for the scheme. Figure 9.6 of this report presents on a map based diagram the traffic volumes on roads across the scheme area for three scenarios: a) 2009 flows; b) 2017 forecast traffic flows without the A6MARR; and c) 2017 forecast traffic flows with the opening of the A6MARR. The plan shows roads that have a decrease or an increase of more than 5% in traffic volume and those roads that have a flow change of less than 5% as a result of the construction of the A6MARR which illustrates that the scheme will result in a reduction in traffic in the areas identified in the response to 46/R01.</p> <p>It is recognised that the scheme will result in traffic increases in a small number of areas and the Council has sought to keep such traffic increases to a minimum. Since the Phase 2 consultation on the emerging preferred scheme for the A6MARR, which took place in Summer 2013, further development work has taken place to address the traffic impact of the scheme on the A6 through High Lane and Disley. During the Phase 2 consultation, traffic flows were presented which showed a forecast traffic increase of 25-30% on the A6 through High Lane and Disley in 2017 (the year of opening for the A6MARR) as a result of the scheme. Following the development work that has taken place there is now forecast an increase in</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>traffic of 11- 16% in 2017.</p> <p>Where increases in traffic levels approximately in excess of 5% have been identified, a range of traffic mitigation strategies and measure have been included to address any potential impacts that may arise. Cheshire East Council has placed a condition as part of the Planning permission for the scheme which requires a package of traffic mitigation measures to be agreed by the Council that will be designed to ensure that traffic increase along the A6 are no more than the levels indicated in the Transport Assessment.</p>	
46/R04	<p>Secondly, the SEMMMS strategy is supposed to be a multi modal scheme of transport measures, only one of which was a road, and which was specifically intended to reduce local congestion. When the public were offered a choice of solutions to local traffic issues during consultation in 2004, the building of a road was far from the most popular choice. At the public consultation of 2013, no other choices were made available to the public and instead, they were presented with the road as a fait accompli, the consultations were only on which junctions the public preferred.</p>	<p>The route for the Relief Road has been established in local plans since the 1960's.</p> <p>Specific plans for a Relief Road have been around since 2001 when the South East Manchester Multi-Modal Strategy (SEMMMS) recommended that the three councils work on developing plans for improving transport in the area for the benefit of both local communities and the local economy. These plans have included public transport, walking and cycling improvements over the last ten years.</p> <p>The reference to the 2004 consultation is not understood as it did not ask that question.</p> <p>The consultation on the South East Manchester Multi Modal Study in 2000 asked the following questions. The questionnaire contained three questions about transport in South East Manchester:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the first asked respondents to identify the three transport related problems which affected them most (from a list of 11);</li> <li>• the second question asked respondents about their perceptions of congestion levels in the area where they lived; and</li> <li>• the third question asked respondents to identify three measures they thought would be most effective way of</li> </ul>	JMcM/ SS

		<p>relieving the problems highlighted by the first question.  The responses were  Responses to Question 1: Which of these problems affect you most?  (The response numbers were a weighted percentage of sample viewing it as severe)  Delays caused by too many cars and lorries 40  Badly maintained pavements and footpaths 32  Poor road maintenance 31  Pollution from traffic 30  Poor bus and rail services 30  Expensive bus and rail fares 24  Car theft/ vandalism 24  Pedestrian safety 15  High cost of car parking 14  Fear for personal security when travelling by public transport 14  Cyclists' safety 11</p> <p>Responses to Question 3: What do you see as potential solutions to transport problems in South East Manchester?  (Responses were a weighted percentage of Sample)  Better maintenance of roads, pavements and Footpaths 46  Extending Metrolink 35  Better bus services 28  Cheaper bus and rail fares 28  Building new roads 26  Improving existing roads to increase their Capacity 21  Traffic calming in residential areas 14  Better rail services 12  Better facilities for cyclists 11  Better facilities for pedestrians 9</p>	
--	--	--	--



		<p>More “park and ride facilities 8          Better information for bus and rail travellers 8          More school buses 6          Charging for using congested roads and spending the money on transport 6          More bus lanes and bus priority routes 6          Better information on current traffic conditions 3          Charging for parking at work and spending the money on transport 3</p> <p>The outcome from this consultation was used to inform the development of the multi modal strategy in 2001 SEMMMS that identified a package of measures including improved public transport, improved cycle and pedestrian facilities, regeneration of local centres and a relief road.</p> <p>In 2003-2004 there was consultation on the ‘SEMMMS road scheme’ which linked the M60 in north Stockport with Manchester Airport, via Hazel Grove and Poynton, and included the Poynton Relief Road. That first phase of that consultation asked-</p> <p>“In order to make sure the scheme meets the needs of local communities, we are very keen to hear your views and opinions on the proposals, especially on the topics below. There will be a second consultation exercise to help us finalise the preferred routes and junction locations for the new roads following completion and assessment of feedback from this one. Further consultation, both at a very local level and along the routes chosen for the road will also be undertaken as the details of the scheme are developed.</p> <p>Have Your Say          Do you think the road scheme is needed to help give traffic relief to local communities and businesses? Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Do you agree with the principles of the road scheme recommended by SEMMMS? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> In broad terms, do you think the route is in the right corridor? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>If no to any of the above please describe the changes you think should be made:”</p> <p>Feedback from that consultation indicated strong support, with 92% of respondents agreeing that the road scheme was needed to help give traffic relief to local communities and businesses.</p> <p>Since that time the three councils have been working on how the SEMMMS road schemes can be delivered in phases, and funding has been identified to deliver the first phase of the scheme. This first phase is the 10km A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road. Plans for the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road follow the same alignment as that which was consulted on in 2003-2004.</p> <p>A further phase, Poynton Relief Road, has recently been the subject of a consultation exercise by Cheshire East Council.</p> <p>In the publicly available material produced during the consultation on the scheme, it has been made clear that the current proposals relate to the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road element of the SEMMMS road schemes.</p> <p>In 2012-13 the first phase of the consultation on the A6 To Manchester Airport Relief Road scheme asked people.</p> <p>Q1) What is your overall opinion on the proposed A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road?</p> <p>Through examination of all of the feedback received from all respondents on the proposed A6MARR during Phase 1, the following conclusions can be drawn:</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 69% (6,208) support the proposed A6MARR with approximately 50% (4,505) of all respondents specifying that they are strongly in favour of the Scheme;</li> <li>• 13% (1,132) of respondents are not in favour or definitely not in favour of the proposed Scheme;</li> <li>• The remaining 18% (1,691) of respondents have indicated that they have no feeling either way, do not know or have not provided an answer on whether they support the overall proposed Scheme or not.</li> </ul> <p>The objector is therefore incorrect in stating that <i>“At the public consultation of 2013, no other choices were made available to the public and instead, they were presented with the road as a fait accompli, the consultations were only on which junctions the public preferred.”</i></p>	
46/R05	<p>Alarming, the public consultations on this scheme in 2013 omitted vital information. Stockport Council was made aware of this information well ahead of the consultation period, and yet did not include it in their engagement with the public.</p> <p>The first is that Carr Wood – an ancient bluebell woodland and local treasured beauty spot which is on the national inventory and legally protected – is in the path of the road and will be largely destroyed. Because the SEMMMS project team originally misinterpreted the ancient woodland as an SBI and inaccurately recorded its position on their map, any alternative route to avoid its destruction was not considered until very late in the process, was not disclosed during the</p>	<p>The suggestion that the public consultations held in 2013 omitted important information relating to Carr Wood is not correct. The ancient woodland was indicated on a drawing entitled ‘Emerging Preferred Scheme, Landscape and Ecology Mitigation - Sheet 10’. The drawing was on display at the consultation exhibitions and available on the project website and correctly represented on the map.</p> <p>The Council does not agree that the wood will be largely destroyed. The Environmental Statement makes due recognition of the ancient woodland in its assessment of the environmental impact of the scheme. It notes that 0.08 ha of the 2.4 of the ancient woodland would be lost, representing a small proportion of the wood as a whole.</p> <p>It is not the case that ancient woodland is legally protected, it is, however, acknowledged the National Planning Policy Framework notes that:</p>	SS/ PR

	<p>public consultation period and was dismissed by SMBC.</p>	<p><i>planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss;</i></p> <p>It is, therefore, the responsibility of the relevant planning authority to determine if there is such a case where a development will involve loss of ancient woodland. The loss of ancient woodland was specifically addressed in the officer report to the East Cheshire Council planning committee prior to the committee's decision to approve the application. The approval by committee in light of the information made available is a clear indication it was concluded the need and benefits outweigh the small-scale loss in this instance.</p> <p>The alternative route to which the objector makes reference was an interpretation of a written suggestion put forward by Poynton Against Unnecessary Links to the Airport (PAULA) from PAULA's submission to the Phase 2 consultation on the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road. The alignment drawn in response to PAULA's request has never been put forward in the consultation because it is the Council's view that it is not deliverable for a number of reasons, which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternative A6/SEMMMS junction location does not provide future proofing for a continuous route to Jct25 of M60 Motorway;</li> <li>• Alternative A6/SEMMMS junction located immediately adjacent to residential properties;</li> <li>• Under the alternative alignment, a continuous line to the</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

		M60 would require the demolition of residential properties and an underground reservoir. It would also severely impact Hazel Grove Golf Course.	
46/R06	The second is the fact that this road scheme is highly likely to cause a breach of the Air Quality Directive, generating increased levels of pollutants in an established AQMA at Disley and potentially pushing other areas over the current safe limits. The SEMMMS project team are predicting a 30% increase in traffic through Disley and yet claim only a 6% increase in pollutants. This seems highly unlikely and has not been explained. The measurement details provided by SMBC are vague and insufficient and the SEMMMS team have failed to explain how they plan to reduce the 3 exceedances they do recognise to within limits stipulated by the Directive.	<p>The Directive defines and establishes “objectives for ambient air quality designed to avoid, prevent or reduce harmful effects on human health and the environment as a whole”.</p> <p>The Compliance risk assessment undertaken following advice presented in IAN175/13 determined the scheme to be low risk and would not result in delaying compliance with the Directive.</p> <p>The scheme produced a net reduction of 844 sensitive receptors in the study area exceeding the annual mean NO<sub>2</sub> objective, with the scheme when compared to without the scheme.</p> <p>The impact of road transport emissions on receptors is dependent not only on traffic flows but also on traffic composition, speed, local atmospheric dispersion and the distance of those receptors from those emissions sources. The changes in predicted annual mean NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations at the 3 new predicted exceedances in Disley (DM - 37.7 to DS - 40.1 µg/m<sup>3</sup>; DM - 37.8 to DS - 40.3 µg/m<sup>3</sup>; and DM - 38.4 to DS - 40.6 µg/m<sup>3</sup>) will reflect not only changes in traffic characteristics but also the location of the receptors.</p> <p>Details of monitoring measurements and their locations undertaken by SMBC, MCC, CEC and the scheme specific study are reported in Appendix 8B and 8C of the ES.</p> <p>Neither the scheme presented in the ES nor the provision of enhanced mitigation on the A6 corridor, with traffic management in Disley AQMA, will result in a zone/</p>	PC

		agglomeration becoming non compliant, or affecting the time to achieve compliance within the timescales reported to the EU by Defra.	
46/R07	The mitigation measures for reducing the 30% traffic increase brought about by the building of this road have not been made clear to the public, despite persistent and repeated requests. As far as anyone can make out, the best solution the project team have offered is that the local traffic will be dissuaded from using the new road, due to the heavy traffic on it, and instead will find ways of avoiding it by driving much longer distances through villages in and around the area. I would like someone to explain to me how this constitutes a value for money scheme which is supposed to ease local congestion?!	<p>Cheshire East Council has placed a condition as part of the Planning permission for the scheme which requires a package of mitigation measures to be agreed by the Council that will be designed to ensure that traffic increase along the A6 are no more than the levels indicated in the Transport Assessment.</p> <p>For traffic modelling purposes, the exact detail of these mitigation measures are not required, but rather it's the impact of these measures that is important and this has been reflected in the traffic modelling. An appropriate mitigation scheme will be developed with input from the public and presented to the local planning authority in order to discharge the planning condition. A Delivery Agreement is being prepared between Stockport Council and Cheshire East Council for the development and implementation of the mitigation measures.</p> <p>The forecast increase in traffic along the A6 as a result of the scheme is due to traffic re-routing from other less suitable roads to the A6 because there is now a small time advantage in using this route than the other routes currently used by traffic. The mitigation measures will be designed to limit this time advantage which in turn will limit the level of traffic re-routing to the A6. This does not mean forcing traffic to use longer routes through villages but rather, limiting the volume of traffic that is likely to transfer off other routes with the completion of the scheme. The planning conditions for the relevant Local Authorities say; Cheshire East Council Prior to the new sections of the</p>	NM

		<p>scheme hereby approved being brought into use a scheme detailing a package of mitigation measures (intended to restrain, alleviate and manage traffic flow increases at locations identified and to levels indicated through enhanced mitigation as shown in figures 9.6 and 9.7 in the submitted Transport Assessment) has been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Such scheme shall include details of and a methodology and timetable for delivery of the measures, a programme for review, surveys and monitoring of the impact of the measures and if required reappraisal of an addition to the agreed package of measures. The new sections of road shall not be brought into use until the measures have been implemented in accordance with the approved details unless the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority has been obtained. (note: this includes mitigation measures for, but not limited to, Disley Village Centre, the A6 corridor, Clifford Road Poynton and B5358 Station Road / Dean Road Handforth. Where this condition requires approval or consent by the Local Planning Authority those matters shall be referred to the Council's Strategic Planning Board. Stockport Council</p> <p>Prior to the new sections of the scheme hereby approved being brought into use a scheme detailing a package of mitigation and complementary measures intended to restrain, alleviate and manage traffic flow increases at locations identified and to levels indicated in Table 9.3 A6MARR: Forecast Annual Average Daily Traffic (Base Year, 2017 Without A6MARR, 2017 With A6MARR plus Mitigation) and shown in Figures 9.6 and 9.7 in the submitted Transport Assessment has been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Such scheme shall</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>include details of and a methodology and timetable for delivery of the measures, a programme for review, surveys and monitoring of the impact of the measures and if required reappraisal of and addition to the agreed package of measures. The new sections of road shall not be brought into use until the measures have been implemented in accordance with the approved details unless the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority has been obtained.</p> <p>The transport assessment for the scheme states “Traffic modelling of the A6MARR scheme previously predicted an increase in traffic of up to 30% on the A6 through High Lane and Disley. The introduction of enhanced mitigation measures markedly reduces this increased traffic flow to between 11 to 16%, as shown in Figures 9.6 and 9.7.” The transport assessment for the scheme provides the following details of the proposed advanced mitigation measures and as can be seen from the planning conditions above their detailed design will need to be agreed with the planning authorities.</p> <p>“ These enhanced mitigation measures seek a balanced approach to managing the predicted traffic on the A6 through High Lane and Disley by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• better managing traffic flows for local residents at the A6 Buxton Road/ Windlehurst Road junction through a local junction improvement scheme;</li> <li>• enhancing the local district centre environment in Disley village through the introduction of shared-space type interventions; and</li> <li>• limiting the attractiveness of the A6 to longer distance traffic which would otherwise switch from other cross-county routes with the A6MARR in place. This will be achieved through a combination of gateway treatments and reduced speed limits.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--



		<p>9.66 Indeed, these enhanced measures build upon the package of mitigation measures promoted as part of the Phase Two consultation which focussed on improvements to non-motorised user facilities, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• cycle lanes on sections of the A6 between Hazel Grove and New Mills Newtown where practicable;</li> <li>• a new pedestrian refuge on the A6 Buxton Road at Wellington Road;</li> <li>• a new Puffin crossing on the A6 Buxton Road outside the Church/ War memorial in High Lane;</li> <li>• new uncontrolled pedestrian crossings with refuge islands on Windlehurst Road;</li> <li>• a new pedestrian refuge on the A6 Buxton Road West outside Lyme Park to link bus stops and the park entrance; and</li> </ul> <p>a new cycle link between Disley and High Lane/ Poynton through Lyme Park.”</p>	
--	--	---	--