

**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**

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

A proof of evidence relating to the COMPOSITE OBJECTIONS REBUTTALS aspect of

the

A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road

-of-

James McMahon

BSc CEng MICE

on behalf of

The Metropolitan Borough Council of Stockport

acting on its behalf and on behalf

-of-

Manchester City Council

-and-

Cheshire East Borough Council

VOLUME 1 – EVIDENCE IN CHIEF

This Proof of Evidence sets out the Council's responses to the objections to the A6MARR Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) and Side Road Order (SRO) that were submitted to the Department for Transport by the objectors to the CPO and SRO processes. The Proof is presented by the Council's Project Director for the A6MARR scheme, James McMahon, however, the responses have been written by the relevant Expert Witnesses. The initials of the Expert Witness(es) responsible for the production of the rebuttals are provided alongside the response. Reference should be made to the individual Proofs of Evidence of the Expert Witnesses for further information pertaining to the response.

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

Expert Witness	Initials	Proof of Evidence Name and Reference Number
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

1: Harrison Developments Holdings
 Cramond, Broadway, Bramhall, Stockport, SK7 3BR
 CPO Plots: 1/1 1/1A 1/1B 1/1C
 Agent:
 John Houston
 John Houston Consulting, 82 King Street, Manchester, M24WQ

Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
1-01	The company acquired the Property in 2005 for the purposes of carrying out residential development, for which the company has planning permission, and has a right of way over Occupiers Lane, shown shaded green on the attached plan.	Our investigations indicate that according to both Land Registry and the owner of the lane (Mr Brian Taylor), that Harrison Developments Holdings Ltd does have any recorded right of access over Occupiers Lane. The existence of a right of way is a matter of fact and law, the onus of proof as to its existence being on the claimed beneficiary of that right. Insofar as the Council's scheme can be shown to impact on any right of way then, following confirmation and implementation of the CPO, it will be replicated or compensation assessed in accordance with the compensation code will be payable.	HC / CR
1-02	The company has not been served with any notices in connection with the Scheme, and a director of the company, Mr John Harrison, only came across the Schemes by chance.	See above.	HC / CR
1-03	The Company objects to the scheme. It is evident that the scheme will have an adverse impact on the Property, specifically with respect to access.	Insofar as the Company's interests are affected compensation will be payable, assessed in accordance with the compensation code.	HC

2: Michael E Simpson and Mrs K O Livesey
 CPO Plots: 1/4, 1/4A-1/4K, 2/9, 2/9A-2/9Z, 2/9AA, 2/9AB
 Agent:
 John Seed
 Brown Rural Partnership, 29 Church Street, Macclesfield, Cheshire, SK11 6LB

Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
2-01	No part of road, cutting or embankment is intended to be placed on 2 substantial plots shown edged/ coloured green on the attached plans. Accordingly such parts are not so required for the purpose of the construction of a highway should be deleted from Schedule 1 of CPO.	Only the land required for the scheme and its construction has been included within the CPO. The Council will demonstrate that all of this land is required to construct the road. 9.4 ha is required in order to construct the new road and its earthworks, essential ecological and social mitigation and landscape bunding. Only ~1.3 ha is required for the contractor's compound and 2.4 ha for material storage. The Council would prefer to reach an agreement with the objector but no agreement has yet been reached. Until such a time as an agreement is reached the land must be retained with the Order.	NH/HC
2-02	The Acquiring Authorities have failed to show any compelling case to take land for purposes that are not for the purpose of constructing thereon a highway, namely a road, and its cuttings and embankments.	Only the land required for the scheme and its construction has been included within the CPO. The Council will demonstrate that all of this land is required to construct the road and for the contractor's compound and material storage.	HC/NH
2-03	No provisions of the CPO authorise the taking of any land for temporary purposes and accordingly such parts of the Plots as are not required for permanent compulsory acquisition should be deleted from Schedule 1 to the CPO.	The Acquiring Authority is unable to acquire the land required for the contractor's compound and material storage on a temporary basis via the CPO process. Once construction of the scheme is completed then the land not required on a permanent basis will be offered back to the original land owner in accordance with the Crichel Down rules. The Council would prefer to reach an agreement with the objector but no agreement has yet been reached. Until such	HC

		a time as an agreement is reached the land must be retained with the Order.	
2-04	The Objectors believe that the Acquiring Authorities' proposed taking the two parts of the Plots identified on the attached plans for temporary purposes only and contend that there is no power under the CPO to do so.	The land referred to is required for the contractor's compound and material storage. The Council would prefer to reach an agreement with the objector but no agreement has yet been reached. Until such a time as an agreement is reached the land must be retained with the Order... There is no provision to acquire land temporarily under compulsory purchase powers therefore the Council has no choice but to include it for permanent acquisition. Once construction of the scheme is completed then the land not required on a permanent basis will be offered back to the original land owner in accordance with the Criche Down rules.	HC
2-05	By paragraph 1 the CPO will authorise the acquisition of "land" described in paragraph 2. Paragraph 2 describes the "land" only by reference to the "land" described in Schedule 1 shown coloured pink on the CPO plan. Neither Schedule 1 nor the map describe, in relation to the Plots, that only a temporary possession is required in part of those Plots. If the intention of the Acquiring Authorities is take all parts of the Plots permanently, but then give a written undertaking to return the parts after temporary use, then this is a misuse of powers for it shows that the Acquiring Authorities cannot show a compelling case to acquire permanently the parts of the Plots required only for temporary use. If, contrary to the above, the CPO does not contain powers to take part of the Plots identified above temporarily, then the land in question should not be acquired permanently.	The permanent land take includes land required for the new road and its earthworks, essential ecological and social mitigation and landscape bunding. Only the land required for the scheme and its construction has been included within the CPO. The Council will demonstrate that all of this land is required to construct the road. The position with the land required for the contractor's compound is described above.	NH/ PR

2-06	No part of the Plots should be used for tipping of permanent spoil which will severely prejudice the future use of the said lands for agricultural and development purposes.	Only the land required for the scheme and its construction has been included within the CPO. The Council will demonstrate that part of the land is required to construct environmental bunds. The effects of any changing levels of land intended to be returned to the original land owner will be considered as part of any potential compensation.	NH/HC
2-07	The extent of permanent land take to provide for bunding and environmental mitigation works is excessive, severely prejudicing the future use of said lands for agricultural and future development purposes.	Plots 1/4A, 1/4B, 1/4D and 1/4E. Plots 1/4A, 1.4D and 1.4E have been included to enable a combination of mounding, woodland planting and scrub with intermittent trees to be established with the objective of mitigating noise and visual impacts for property located along the existing A6 Buxton Road. Plot 1/4B has been taken to enable replacement ponds to be provided for a pond which will require removal to facilitate construction of the road. Should a person feel that the value of their land and property has decreased or that they have suffered other losses as a direct consequence of the road scheme, they are entitled to claim compensation under the statutory compensation code and each claim will be determined on its merits.	PR/ HV
2-08	The extension of the westerly footway/ shared use facility/ bridleway, on the land to the north of the A6, in particular exacerbates the impact of land take.	The Council has had regards to all comments and this section has been optimised to reduce the land take whilst still meeting the scheme objectives and constraints. The connection between the A6 Buxton Road and the shared use footway / cycleway adjacent to the dual carriageway is required in order to provide access to and encourage use of the new facility for the existing A6 Buxton Road. The alignment of this connection is now opposite 176 Buxton Road which has been realigned from a previous design in order to minimise the land required.	NH

2-09	There is no satisfactory access arrangement to the land to be retained at the northern end of the land holding. The proposed access arrangement involves excessive travel for farm machinery.	The design of the scheme must consider the number of accesses available onto this type of road. Where possible accesses and rights of way are accommodated within the scheme, however where this is not possible for safety or other reasons compensation will be payable in accordance with the compensation code. The access location has also considered the proximity of the realigned A6/ A6MARR junction and the safety impacts of slow moving agricultural vehicles when determining a suitable location. The Council considers that the identified access location provides a suitable and reasonably convenient access.	HC/NH
2-10	The Acquiring Authorities have failed to show any compelling case to take land for the purposes of pedestrian and cycle routes and bridleways; these routes are not required for, or critical to, the purpose of constructing the Relief Road and its cuttings and embankments. The land required for these routes should be deleted from Schedule 1 of the CPO.	The shared use cycleway/footways and bridleways are part of the main scheme objectives and aim to increase social benefit and safety in the area. The Council considers that there is a compelling case for them to be included within the scheme and CPO.	SS
2-11	The stopping up or removal of any private means of access is unacceptable and irrational where it is not replaced with an alternative and viable means of access.	All known private means of access and rights of way have been maintained or re-provided. Farm access is provided to retained land off the A6 and Mill Lane and an accommodation bridge is provided for the severed land between the relief road and Norbury Brook. It is considered that the new access arrangements are suitable and reasonably convenient.	HC

3: United Utilities PLC
 Stephen Tomlinson, UU PLC, Haweswater House, Lingley Mere Business Park, Warrington. WA5 3LP
 CPO Plots: 1/5, 1/5A-1/5E
 Agent:
 John Seed
 Brown Rural Partnership, 29 Church Street, Macclesfield, Cheshire, SK11 6LB

Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
3-01	<p>By paragraph 1 the CPO will authorise the acquisition of "land" described in paragraph 2. Paragraph 2 describes the "land" only by reference to the "land" described in Schedule 1 shown coloured pink on the CPO plan. Neither Schedule 1 nor the map describe, in relation to the Plots, that only a temporary possession is required in part of those Plots. If the intention of the Acquiring Authorities is take all parts of the Plots permanently, but then give a written undertaking to return the parts after temporary use, then this is a misuse of powers for it shows that the Acquiring Authorities cannot show a compelling case to acquire permanently the parts of the Plots required only for temporary use. If, contrary to the above, the CPO does not contain powers to take part of the Plots identified above temporarily, then the land in question should not be acquired permanently.</p>	<p>The permanent land take includes land for the new road and its earthworks, essential ecological and social mitigation and landscape bunding. The Acquiring Authority is unable to acquire land on a temporary basis via the CPO process. Once construction of the scheme is completed then any land not required on a permanent basis will be offered back to the original land owner in accordance with the Criche Down rules. The Council will demonstrate that all of this land is required to construct the road. The Council would prefer to reach an agreement with the objector but no agreement has yet been reached. Until such a time as an agreement is reached the land must be retained with the Order.</p>	HC/NH

3-02	Acquisition and/or use of the land in the CPO will damage existing and planned operational assets unless there is a formal agreement with United Utilities detailing appropriate protective measures including easements and/or protective corridors.	Operational infrastructure will be maintained and the Council will work with United Utilities to ensure required protective measures are put in place. Formal agreements are in place for determining the UU PLC apparatus diversions requirements as a result of the scheme in accordance with New Roads and Streetworks Act 1991. The design of the diversions includes the requirements for protective measures including easements. The Council and its contractor are in direct liaison with the diversions team at UU PLC in respect of the diversions in terms of design, construction sequence/methodology and costs to the Council. Should a person feel that the value of their land and property has decreased or that they have suffered other losses as a direct consequence of the road scheme, they are entitled to claim compensation under the statutory compensation code and each claim will be determined on its merits.	HC
3-03	The extent of permanent land take to provide for bunding and environmental mitigation works is excessive, compromising future uses of the land.	Plots 1/5A and 1/5E have been included to accommodate mounding to partially screen and contribute to mitigation of traffic-related noise for property on existing A6 from traffic on diverted section of A6. Woodland planting on mounding completes screening and contributes to the integration of the diverted section of the A6 into the woodland-framed landscape associated with the agricultural land and golf course north of the existing A6. They are, therefore required for the purposes of road construction.	PR/NH

3-04	The Acquiring Authorities have failed to show any compelling case to take land for the purposes of pedestrian and cycle routes and bridleways; these routes are not required for, or critical to, the purpose of constructing the Relief Road and its cuttings and embankments. The land required for these routes should be deleted from Schedule 1 of the CPO.	The shared use cycleway/footways and bridleways are part of the main scheme objectives and aim to increase social benefit and safety in the area. The Council considers that there is a compelling case for them to be included within the scheme and CPO.	SS/NH
3-05	The stopping up or removal of any private means of access is unacceptable and irrational where it is not replaced with an alternative and viable means of access.	All known private means of access and rights of way have been maintained or re-provided. Farm access is provided to retained land off the A6 and Mill Lane and an accommodation bridge is provided for the severed land between the relief road and Norbury Brook. It is considered that the access provided is suitable and reasonably convenient.	NH

4: Helen Harrison
 1 Red Row, Buxton Road, Hazel Grove, Stockport, SK7 6ND
 CPO Plots: 1/4E 1/4F
 Agent:
 Steer Ethelston Rural Ltd
 Estate Office, Deer Park Farm, Kermincham, Crewe, Cheshire, CW4 8DX

Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
4-01	<p>The Side Roads Order proposes to stop pedestrian access to numbers 2-5 Red Row this is of concern to my client as this will sever the pedestrian access from 1 Red Row to the Mill Farm Riding School mentioned above.</p>	<p>Pedestrian access will continue to be provided between Red Row and the Mill Farm riding school throughout construction, as far as practicable and once the road is completed. The stopping up and creation of the pedestrian private means of access is there to ensure that a step is not created between the private land and the footway but rather create a gradient or slope. Once the exact design levels are determined by the Council's contractor the slope will be known. The minor civils works will be carried out at a time that is convenient as far as practicable but as mentioned above access will always be maintained. The Council and its contractor will liaise with the objector to ensure that the riding school can be accessed in an appropriate manner. Construction works will be carried out in an efficient manner and also in order to minimise disruption to the riding school. Post completion of the works the realigned A6 will unfortunately sever the off road connection between 1 Red Row and Mill Farm Riding School. However, various highway improvements will improve the on road access between the two properties including the signalised traffic junction, the pedestrian refuge island, the widened verge that can act as a landing area of equestrians, the lower traffic flows on the existing A6 Buxton Road.</p>	NH/HC

4-02	The maintenance of vehicular access to the property is also unclear, especially during construction.	Vehicular access will be maintained throughout construction and once the road is completed. There may be short periods of time where access is restricted, but those parties affected will be liaised with to mitigate the impact.	NH
4-03	The proposals will create a position where the above property is situated between two road with the impact of extra noise dusting and lighting not only during construction but when the proposed road is in operation and will therefore considerably affect our client's enjoyment of the property.	The scheme has been designed in order to minimise the effect on neighbouring properties, both throughout construction and once the road is completed. Should a person feel that the value of their land and property has decreased or that they have suffered other losses as a direct consequence of the road scheme, they are entitled to claim compensation under the statutory compensation code and each claim will be determined on its merits. The ES for the proposed scheme identifies a range of mitigation measures focused on the control of dust and noise during construction. They are measures which are routinely adopted for the construction of major road schemes and which recognise the nature of the principal activities associated with the generation of dust and construction related noise. The planning consents for the project include conditions requiring the implementation of the commitments made in the ES. It will be a requirement of the contracts for the construction of the proposed scheme that the measures are formalised in a project specific Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). Dust will not be an issue once the proposed scheme is in operation. The assessment undertaken relating to traffic-related noise during operation has indicated that levels will be lower than those currently experienced from the property as traffic is relocated from the immediate front facade of the property to a point some 50m from the rear facade of the property and beyond a planted mound which has been introduced to reduce the immediate visual impact of traffic on the new section of the A6 and which will also reduce traffic related noise. The assessment has indicated the reduction in average daily levels will be of the order of 20 dBA	PR/NH

		<p>(decibels). Road-related lighting will comprise full cut-off luminaires which will contain the lighting within the carriageway areas and minimise light spill and upward glare. The introduction of a light source to the rear of the objector's property, albeit contained within the new road corridor, will be discernible.</p> <p>The claimant may be entitled to recover compensation under Pt1 LCA1973.</p>	
--	--	--	--

5: Helen Harrison
 Mill Farm Riding School, Wellington Road, Hazel Grove
 CPO Plots: 1/4E 1/4F
 Agent:
 Steer Ethelston Rural Ltd
 Estate Office, Deer Park Farm, Kermincham, Crewe, Cheshire, CW4 8DX

Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
5-01	The draft Compulsory Purchase Order in respect of land forming part of the land forming part of the land comprising Mill Farm Riding School does not appear to include a notice of her interest a secure tenant of Mr M Simpson Ms K Livesey, detailed on Site Plan No 1 of the Draft Order.	This was not picked up in the Land Referencing at the time of publishing the CPO and SRO. The Council has requested a copy of the lease. Discussions to date with the objector and her agent have not resulted in forthcoming details regarding the lease.	HC
5-02	The Side Roads Order (Page 8 number 21s) proposed to stop up vehicular access to Wellington Road. This is the only form of vehicular access into the Mill Lane Riding School. This will render the property unusable if no right of vehicular, equestrian and pedestrian access is properly provided at all times. Our client is unclear as to the detail of how both safe vehicular and horse/ pedestrian access is to be provided and maintained both during construction of the proposed highway and on completion.	Access will be maintained throughout construction and once the road is completed. There may be short periods of time where access is restricted, but those parties affected will be liaised with to mitigate the impact. A new Private Means of Access will be created permanently as noted in the Side Road Order (Page 8 number 33 and Site Plan 1 Inset C). It is considered that this is reasonable convenient and the most suitable access possible following the construction of the new road.	NH

5-03	<p>Our client at present crossed the existing Buxton Road with horses and ponies and is able to ride down Mill Lane, onto Old Mill Lane and into the semi natural ancient woodland. Part of this woodland is to be lost to the proposed scheme and this part severs this only access into the woodland for our client. It is unclear as to how this access will be maintained during construction of the proposed road scheme. In addition horses are grazed in the woodland and vehicular access for farm machinery is required into the wood to feed/ look after the ponies and horses.</p>	<p>The objector will be afforded an equivalently commodious route once the scheme is complete. Buxton Road will become much quieter as a result of realigning the A6. Buxton Road will accommodate equestrians via the bus bridge which will provide equestrian height parapets. Old Mill Lane is proposed to be adopted highway and a further bridge is proposed over the relief road. This will cater for farm vehicles and again equestrian height parapets have been specified. A bridle specification bridge is proposed over the brook and the council wishes to upgrade various footpaths in the vicinity of the ancient woodland to bridleway status as complimentary to the A6MARR scheme.</p>	NH
5-04	<p>The proposed completed scheme provides a bridge across the proposed road however the track is insufficient to cater for vehicles/ tractors to the east of the bridge thus severing access for the above use, unless the above track is upgraded to one sufficient to provide farm/ vehicles access.</p>	<p>The permanent situation allows for an accommodation bridge, 4m wide between 1.8m high parapets, all suitable for equestrians. The bridge is 3m wide between kerbs and ramps suitable for agricultural vehicles. The track gradients have been specifically designed for farm vehicles in terms of gradients, widths and radii.</p>	NH
5-05	<p>There appears to be no provision on the proposed road for safe crossing for horses at the new proposed junction immediately to the north of the start Norbury Hollow Road.</p>	<p>There are pedestrian landing areas although there are no specific equestrian measures in this location. A crossing of this nature is not usually provided for a business although the Council will show that a thorough safety and risk assessment has informed the design of the scheme to ensure the safety of all road users including equestrians.</p>	NH

5-06	The proposed new road is likely to carry a greater volume of faster moving traffic and without proper infrastructure in place it will render the access to both areas of our client's property more dangerous to use than at present.	A Road Safety Audit Stage 1 has been commissioned and has informed the scheme design and the Council is satisfied that the road is as safe as it can be. Visibility sight lines from Wellington Road have been maintained hence the widened highway verges. With the installation of traffic signals to the west of the junction of Wellington Road /A6 platoons of traffic are expected which will enable more windows of opportunity to access from the riding school. A pedestrian refuge island is also proposed in this section of the A6.	NH
5-07	Approximately one third of the grazing land is likely to be lost to the scheme. The loss of this land would require replacement land elsewhere or a reduction on the numbers of horses kept. Reducing the number of horses would mean that some of the older horses (estimated 10 to 12 animals) would need to be sold and there is a very poor or non-existent.	The scheme has been designed in order to minimise land take where possible. Should a person feel that the value of their land and property has decreased or that they have suffered other losses as a direct consequence of the road scheme, they are entitled to claim compensation under the statutory compensation code and each claim will be determined on its merits. The scheme has also been redesigned in this area to relocate proposed ecological mitigation works (ponds and other habitats) away from here thus reducing the land requirements.	HC/PR
5-08	Our client has considerable concerns about the impact on the horses and rider safety both during construction and use of the proposed road.	Every effort will be made to minimise disruption during construction and once the scheme has been completed. The specification and details of the boundary fencing can be determined as part of the accommodation works to be agreed with the landlord and the tenant. The fencing requirements during construction can also be agreed prior to construction commencing on site.	HC

5-09	Heavy excavators, plant, machinery and lorries working within a few yards are very likely to frighten the horses/ ponies and create a safety issue.	The ES for the proposed scheme identifies a range of mitigation measures focused on the control of dust and noise during construction. They are measures which are routinely adopted for the construction of major road schemes and which recognise the nature of the principal activities associated with the generation of dust and construction related noise. The planning consents for the project include conditions requiring the implementation of the commitments made in the ES. It will be a requirement of the contracts for the construction of the proposed scheme that the measures are formalised in a project specific Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).	NH
5-10	Our client is also concerned about the noise, dust and air quality impacts both in the construction phase and afterwards on the safe operation of the site. No provision for these matters appears to have been made in the scheme proposals.	The implementation of all works, including measures focused on the control of noise and dust in a safe manner during construction, is a fundamental requirement of all major construction projects and will be so in the case of the contracts for the construction of the proposed scheme. Dust will not be an issue once the proposed scheme is in operation. With regard to traffic-related noise once the scheme is in operation, there will be an increase in levels in the vicinity of the riding school but in a situation where the horses are already accustomed to nearby traffic noise and the characteristics of the increased noise will not be different from that which is currently experienced. The assessments undertaken relating to local air quality once the proposed scheme is in operation indicated that the predicted increase for nitrogen dioxide of 2ug/m ³ and less than 1ugm ³ for particulates (PM ₁₀) at the property will result in NO ₂ and PM ₁₀ concentrations of 14.8 and 14.4ugm ³ respectively. These concentrations are well below the 40ugm ³ air quality objectives. Environmental Protection (UK) in its guidance on air quality impacts would deem such a change at these pollutant concentrations as 'negligible'.	PC/ PR

5-11	The removal of the hedge and the construction of the proposed road will create a much less attractive environment for the users of the facilities.	A new hedgerow will be planted on the boundary to the proposed road.	PR
5-12	The removal of part of the semi natural ancient woodland as above and the listed old Norbury Corn Mill which is situated in this woodland area will again impact on the pleasure of the use of this woodland for riders from Mill Farm. The loss of the corn mill and its associated features does constitute a significant impact in the context of the scarcity of such important remains in Greater Manchester.	The scheme has been designed to minimise the impact on this type of land and property, but the Council will demonstrate that this is the right alignment for the road. The proposals will involve the loss of a small area of the ancient woodland at Carr Wood. The impact on the ancient woodland has been minimised as far as possible. The proposals also provide for the planting of woodland to mitigate the loss, though it is not possible to replace ancient woodland. It is acknowledged that, notwithstanding these measures, there will be an impact on the amenity value for users of the area, including horse riders, by virtue of the presence of the proposed road and its traffic. The corn mill has previously been the subject of on site investigation and recording and the removal of features. The impacts on the mill site and remaining features have been the subject of assessment and have been reported in the ES for the project. The information has been taken into account by the planning authority when it determined the planning application in light of that information and responses from consultees responsible for the listing and safeguarding of such features.	PR
5-13	My client has 40 horses and ponies on the properties. She is concerned that the maintenance of mains supplies of water may have been overlooked with the resulting animal welfare issues should such supplies be severed.	Mains water supplies will form part of the accommodation works package once agreed. This will be carried out by UU PLC as required and will be instructed in a timely manner.	NH

5-14	<p>The proposed timescale for the CPO and construction are also of great concern as the loss of facilities potentially as early as Autumn 2014 are likely to have huge impact on animal welfare and the therapeutic value to the riders as well as impacting on the efficient functioning of the business. We consider this timescale too tight to establish any sensible strategy with the council for the mitigation of the severe impacts of this scheme on our client's interest in the property.</p>	<p>The programmed start date for construction of the scheme is now early 2015. We will work with the objector regarding the timing of taking possession of the land and in order to mitigate the impacts on the welfare of the animals and the business operation.</p>	HC
------	---	--	----

6: Paul Gwinnett Peak Group, Goyt Mill, Upper Hibbert Lane, Marple, Cheshire, SK6 7HX CPO Plots: 1/8 1/8A			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
6-01	Further to my numerous conversations, letters and emails with Mr Ian Keyte, Estates Projects on behalf of Manchester Airport relief road, I would like to reiterate the major effect on my multi-tenanted business. The reason for this being that all my car parking will disappear and several of my tenants will lose their units.	The scheme has been designed to meet its primary objectives and only land that is directly needed for the scheme has been included within the CPO. Should a person feel that the value of their land and property has decreased or that they have suffered other losses as a direct consequence of the road scheme, they are entitled to claim compensation under the statutory compensation code and each claim will be determined on its merits. On street car parking has been introduced as part of the scheme which can be refined with further discussion with the land owner adjacent including its businesses. A reasonably convenient and suitable access will be provided for the land severed to the east of the Relief Road off the A6 Buxton Road.	HC/NH
6-02	We were lead to believe by Mr Ian Keyte that alternative land for Simpsons would be allocated for the tenants. He also lead us to believe that the old wooden building which has been occupied for over 10 years would be rebuilt elsewhere upon the site together with other several tenants that also occupy the same land. The land in question has a small rent roll of £15,646.35 per annum. Mr Keyte has recently apologised but cannot carry out any of his promises as he has been overruled. This therefore put my company in an impossible position in trying to run a multi-tenanted business due to the site being landlocked plus loss of buildings	No such comment in respect of the allocation of alternative land to the Objectors tenants was made by the Council's land agent, Ian Keyte. The possibility of land which has been identified for public off street parking being allocated for the objector's exclusive use was explored by the Council, however, this was not considered to be acceptable in the circumstances. With regard to the rebuilding of the "old wooden building" referred to by the objector, the Council's land agent enquired with Stockport Planners as to the possibility of relocating the building and other items on the part of the site to be retained by Gwinnett but this was not considered to be in accordance with current planning policy and would not be supported by the Stockport Council in its role as Local Planning Authority. This was confirmed in a letter to Gwinnett dated 10 th May 2013. The Council's land agent	HC

	and rent.	can confirm that he made no comment in respect of "being overruled". Should a person feel that the value of their land and property has decreased or that they have suffered other losses as a direct consequence of the road scheme, they are entitled to claim compensation under the statutory compensation code and each claim will be determined on its merits.	
--	-----------	---	--

<p>7: Network Rail Roger Brighthouse Manchester Square One, 4 Travis Street, Manchester, M1 2NY CPO Plots: 1/7 4/4 9/8 9/8B 9/8C</p>			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
7-01	Formally object to the orders on the grounds that "operational railway land is adversely affected." I reserve the right to provide additional and further grounds of objection when further details of the orders and the affects upon Network Rail are available. I have also made representation to Rail Sponsorship Division in accordance with Schedule 3 part 11 of the Acquisition of Land Act 1981.	Discussions between Network Rail and the Council are on-going in regard to the scheme's effect and the Council is seeking an agreement with Network rail and will endeavour to minimise the effects of the scheme on the operational railway.	NH

8: Mrs Janet Shirt83 Mill Lane, Hazel Grove, Stockport, SK7 6DW CPO Plots: 1/4H-1/4J 2/5 2/5A 2/5B 2/9 2/9A-2/9N 2/9AA 2/9ABA Agent: John Seed Brown Rural Partnership, 29 Church Street, Macclesfield, Cheshire, SK11 6LB			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
8-01	No parts of proposed road, cutting, embankment is intended to be placed on plots shown as edged/ coloured green on the attached plan. Accordingly and such parts as are not so required for the purpose of the construction of highway should be deleted from Schedule 1 to the CPO.	Only the land required for the scheme and its construction has been included within the CPO. The Council will demonstrate that all of this land is required to construct the road including land required for the contractor's compound and material storage..	NH/NC
8-02	The Acquiring Authorities have failed to show any compelling case to take land for purposes that are not for the purpose of constructing thereon a highway, namely the road, and its cuttings and embankments. Mrs Shirt is the occupier of the land and its loss, even on a temporary basis, combined with the extent of land take of the other land she tenants will severely prejudice the functioning and viability of her equestrian business.	The Acquiring Authority is unable to acquire land on a temporary basis via the CPO process. Once construction of the scheme is completed then the land not required on a permanent basis will be offered back to the original land owner in accordance with the Criche Down rules. Only the land required for the scheme and its construction has been included within the CPO. The Council will demonstrate that all of this land is required to construct the road including land required for the contractor's compound and material storage.	HC/NH
8-03	No provisions of the CPO authorise taking of any land for temporary purposes and accordingly such parts of the Plots as are not required for permanent compulsory acquisition should be deleted from Schedule 1 to the CPO.	Only the land required for the scheme and its construction has been included within the CPO. The Council will demonstrate that all of this land is required to construct the road including land required for the contractor's compound and material storage.	HC

8-04	Neither Schedule 1 nor the map describe, in relation to the Plots, that only a temporary possession is required in part of those Plots. If the intention of the acquiring authorities is take all parts of the Plots permanently, but then give a written undertaking to return the parts after temporary use, then this is a misuse of powers for it shows that the Acquiring Authorities cannot show a compelling case to acquire permanently the parts of the Plots required only for temporary use. If contrary to above, the CPO does contain powers to take part of the Plots identified above temporarily, then land should not be acquired permanently	The Acquiring Authority is unable to acquire land on a temporary basis via the CPO process. Once construction of the scheme is completed then the land not required on a permanent basis will be offered back to the original land owner in accordance with the Crichel Down rules. The Council would prefer to reach an agreement with the objector but no agreement has yet been reached. Until such a time as an agreement is reached the land must be retained with the Order.	HC/NH
8-05	No part of plots to be used for tipping of permanent spoil which will severely prejudice future use of the said lands for equestrian, agricultural and development purposes.	Material may be deposited on land that is permanently acquired under the CPO. However, material will not be deposited on third party land without prior agreement from the all those with an interest in the land.	HC/NH
8-06	The extent of permanent land take to provide for bunding and environmental mitigation works is excessive severely prejudicing future use of the said lands for equestrian, agricultural and development purposes.	2 of 22 plots included in the CPO have been included on environmental grounds. These comprise plots 2/E and plot 2/9E. They provide for mounding to partially screen and contribute to mitigation of traffic-related noise for property on Millbrook Fold and traffic-related noise for property on Mill Lane from traffic on dual carriageway. Woodland planting on mounding completes screening and contributes to the integration of the dual carriageway where it runs close to the wooded Norbury Brook. Environmental measures, including planting have been introduced onto other plots which have been taken for the purposes of engineering the road or associated paths, cycleways and bridleways.	PR/NH

8-08	The acquiring Authorities have failed to show any compelling case to take land for the purposes of pedestrian and cycle routes and bridleways; these routes are not required for, or critical to, the purpose of constructing the Relief Road and its cuttings and embankments. The land required for these routes should be deleted from Schedule 1 of the CPO.	The shared use cycleway/footways and bridleways are part of the main scheme objectives and aim to increase social benefit and safety in the area. The Council considers that there is a compelling case for them to be included within the scheme and CPO.	SS/NH
8-07	The stopping up or removal of any private means of access is unacceptable and irrational where it is not replaced with an alternative and viable means of access.	All known private means of access and rights of way have been maintained or re-provided. Farm access is provided to retained land off the A6 and Mill Lane and an accommodation bridge is provided for the severed land between the relief road and Norbury Brook. It is considered that these are reasonably convenient and suitable accesses.	NH

9: Klondyke New Limited
 Beancross Road, Pulmont, Falkirk, FK2 0XS
 CPO Plots: 2/3 2/3A 2/3B 2/4D
 Agent:
 Ian Coulson
 Coulson Property Services Ltd, 124 Wellington Road North, Stockport, Cheshire, SK4 2LL

Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
9-01	The proposed order includes land which proposes to take possession of the existing vehicular and pedestrian access point into our Client's property from London Road North. This means that the Council, if the Order is confirmed in its present form, will remove all of our Client's access points and render their retained land inaccessible and landlocked.	The scheme has been designed to meet its primary objectives and only land that is directly needed for the scheme has been included within the CPO. Should a person feel that the value of their land and property has decreased or that they have suffered other losses as a direct consequence of the road scheme, they are entitled to claim compensation under the statutory compensation code and each claim will be determined on its merits. Only the 'exit' onto London Road North will be removed and that the 'entrance' access has been included in the CPO, in order to create an upgraded single entrance and exit access. The scheme therefore allows for re-provision of reasonably convenient access at the only suitable location.	HC/NH
9-02	Plot 2/4d also removes a substantial part of land used for essential car parking in conjunction with the running of our client's business in this location. Our client tenant operates a garden centre business from its land to include a number of ancillary uses all of which will be rendered worthless if the current scheme proposals proceed.	As explained in the earlier paragraph only land that is directly needed for the scheme has been included within the CPO. Only a small number of spaces will actually be required Discussions have been had with the objector and his agent on the basis that that the defining of spaces on the ground would mean the retained land would be used more efficiently and would effectively provide the same number of spaces. This remodelled car park has been developed with the objector's appointed designer and the Council's Project Team to mitigate the impacts of the loss of parking. Should a person feel that the value of their land and property has decreased or that they have suffered other losses as a direct consequence of the road scheme, they are entitled to	HC/NH

		claim compensation under the statutory compensation code and each claim will be determined on its merits.	
9-03	Preliminary discussions have taken place with the Local Authority's Highway engineers but as yet, these have not yet reached a satisfactory conclusion and in any event the proposals thus far involve the demolition of substantial, fully occupied buildings within our Client's retained land. These premises generate a large part of the income for our client's tenant which makes our Client's site in this location viable and there is no alternative location for relocating the existing buildings on our clients retained land if an alternative vehicular and pedestrian access solution could be found.	As mentioned, the Council's land agent has met with the objector and his agent to discuss the options available. It was agreed that reasonable fees will be covered to employ suitable professionals to establish reasonable options that works for the scheme and the objector. Discussions have been based around the potential accommodation works and also the various heads of compensation in accordance with the Compensation Code.	HC
9-04	The amount of car parking remaining after the proposed land take will severely restrict the number of visitors to our Client's premises and thereby substantially affect the ability of our client to maintain the running of its business from this location successfully in the future.	See responses above.	HC

9-05	Accordingly, our Clients do not believe that the above Order, as submitted, can be made by the Secretary of State if he believes, as the garden centre would strenuously contend, that the promoter of the Order should come forward with more detailed proposals to deal with the issues relating to the damage caused to our Client's remaining land ownership in this area if the scheme was to proceed as drafted.	See responses above.	HC
------	--	----------------------	----

<p>10: William Strike Ltd The Roundabout, Meadowfields, Stokesley, Cleveland, TS9 5HJ CPO Plots: 2/3 2/3A 2/3B Agent: Ian Coulson Coulson Property Services Ltd, 124 Wellington Road North, Stockport, Cheshire, SK4 2LL</p>			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
10-01	<p>The proposed order includes land which proposes to take possession of the existing vehicular and pedestrian access point into our Client's property from London Road North. This means that the Council, if the Order is confirmed in its present form, will remove all of our Client's access points and render their retained land inaccessible and landlocked.</p>	<p>The scheme has been designed to meet its primary objectives and only land that is directly needed for the scheme has been included within the CPO. Should a person feel that the value of their land and property has decreased or that they have suffered other losses as a direct consequence of the road scheme, they are entitled to claim compensation under the statutory compensation code and each claim will be determined on its merits. It is envisaged that only the 'exit' onto London Road North will be removed and the 'entrance' access has been included in the order to create an upgraded single entrance and exit access. The scheme therefore allows for re-provision of reasonably convenient access at the only suitable location.</p>	HC/NH
10-02	<p>Plot 2/4d also removes a substantial part of land used for essential car parking in conjunction with the running of our client's business in this location. Our client tenant operates a garden centre business from its land to include a number of ancillary uses all of which will be rendered worthless if the current scheme proposals proceed.</p>	<p>As explained in the earlier paragraph only land that is directly needed for the scheme has been included within the CPO. Only a small number of spaces will actually be required and discussions have shown that the defining of spaces on the ground would mean the retained land would be used more efficiently and would effectively have the same number of spaces. This remodelled car park has been developed with the objector's appointed designer and the Council's Project Team to mitigate the impacts of the loss of parking. Should a person feel that the value of their land and property has decreased or that they have suffered other losses as a direct consequence of the road scheme, they are entitled to claim compensation under the statutory compensation code and each claim will be determined on its</p>	HC/NH

		merits.	
10-03	<p>Preliminary discussions have taken place with the Local Authority's Highway engineers but as yet, these have not yet reached a satisfactory conclusion and in any event the proposals thus far involve the demolition of substantial, fully occupied buildings within our Client's retained land.</p> <p>These premises generate a large part of the income for our client's tenant which makes our Client's site in this location viable and there is no alternative location for relocating the existing buildings on our clients retained land if an alternative vehicular and pedestrian access solution could be found.</p>	As mentioned the Council's land agent has met with the objector and his agent earlier to discuss the options available. It was agreed that reasonable fees will be covered to employ suitable professionals to establish reasonable options that works for the scheme and the objector.	HC
10-04	The amount of car parking remaining after the proposed land take will severely restrict the number of visitors to our Client's premises and thereby substantially affect the ability of our client to maintain the running of its business from this location successfully in the future.	See above responses.	HC
10-05	Accordingly, our Clients do not believe that the above Order, as submitted, can be made by the Secretary of State if he believes, as the garden centre would strenuously contend, that the promoter of the Order should come forward with more detailed proposals to deal with the issues relating to the damage caused to our Client's remaining land ownership in this	See above responses.	HC

	area if the scheme was to proceed as drafted.		
--	---	--	--

11: Mr and Mrs Gilchrist 111 Macclesfield Road, Hazel Grove, Stockport, SK76DT			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
11-01	Objection to both Option 1 and Option 2 of the SEMMMS scheme.	<p>The use of junctions integrates the route with the local areas. Not having junctions would make it difficult for the local population to join the route in reaching areas of employment and other desired locations.</p> <p>Local traffic would then continue to be confined to local routes and the predicted reduction in traffic congestion in many areas may not be realised.</p> <p>The junction designs presented within the scheme design are based on a range of considerations including Phase 1 consultation results, engagement with key stakeholders, cost, land take, forecast traffic flows, engineering constraints and environmental impact. The design for the junctions has been developed further as a result of feedback received during the Phase 2 consultation to take into account, where possible, comments and concerns raised by the local community.</p> <p>Based on our analysis, it is considered that an effective solution in terms of noise, visual and traffic impacts can be provided with Option 1, as well as being the most cost effective solution.</p>	JMcM
11-02	Objection to the subsequent Side Road Order.	<p>The Side Road Order allows the proposed junction to tie in efficiently and safely with the existing highway network. The detailed alignment and vertical levels are yet to be determined. This will be carried out by the Council's appointed contractor following further, more detailed topographical surveys prior to construction. The SRO, coupled with this next step of design, ensures that the optimum design is implemented for access on and off the adopted highway.</p>	NH

11-03	<p>Option 1 will be a large junction focussed on one location. This is undoubtedly the least aesthetically pleasing of the 2 options and will directly affect the view from our property, destroying long established green belt. Aside from the disruption while constructing which will be close to our home it will pose significant restrictions of access to our property.</p>	<p>Views from the objectors' property will not be markedly changed by the introduction of an at-grade signalised junction where the proposed dual carriageway and A5103 Macclesfield Road cross some 100m south of the property and outside of the main line of view which is across Macclesfield Road to property on the west side of the road. In relation to green belt, it is the case that parts of the proposed scheme will be located in green belt. The planning authorities have taken this relationship into account when granting planning permission and have concluded the form of development proposed is acceptable in the context of the green belt designation when taking into account the benefits of the proposed scheme. Access to the property will remain similar to the existing situation. Occupiers of property fronting a highway are advised to reverse onto their driveway and drive in a forward gear onto the highway. The footway widths will enable good visibility onto the footway and carriageway when entering the highway. It is envisaged that the loading and waiting restrictions will be retained which will again safeguard visibility when entering the highway.</p>	AH/PR
11-04	<p>The disruption will no doubt affect our property price and indeed our ability to sell our property should we wish throughout the construction phase, it is yet to be seen the longer term affects this will pose to our ability to sell or retain our property value.</p>	<p>The Council has developed a draft Code of Construction Practice to protect the interests of local residents, businesses and the general public in the immediate vicinity of the construction works. The Code will seek to minimise impacts, such as noise, vibration and traffic, during the period of construction. The Code will be submitted as part of the Planning Application for the scheme. It will be the responsibility of the appointed contractor to comply with the Code. A construction traffic management plan will be developed which will seek to identify the most appropriate routes for construction traffic to taken and ensure that construction traffic does not use unsuitable roads. Further information about compensation can be found on the SEMMMS</p>	HC

		<p>website.</p> <p>Affected parties may be entitled to compensation under pt1 LCA1973.</p>	
11-05	<p>There will be 2 lanes of traffic on our side of Macclesfield road. The proposed Option 1 specifies that there will be 2 lanes of traffic and a cycle lane directly in front of our property. This severely restricts access to the property as it will be impossible to turn into our drive from 2 lanes of traffic. Apart from the significant threat to our safety, the proposed 2 lanes of traffic will prevent us from reversing into our drive as we do currently so as to allow for easy exit onto the flow of traffic.</p>	<p>The manoeuvre will still be able to be carried out. Platoons in traffic following the construction of the signalised junction at the Macclesfield Road / A6MARR junction will mean that there will be more windows of opportunity to carry out this particular manoeuvre.</p>	NH
11-06	<p>We were subjected to further distress when we received the letter referred to in the opening paragraph relating to the Side Road Order. This was new information and had not been highlighted at any point throughout the consultation process.</p>	<p>The SRO was not mentioned at the consultation events as it was not sufficiently developed to know who would be affected by the SRO. Representatives of SMBC have been to visit the objectors on two occasions to explain the design and the SRO. Access to private property will be maintained as far as practicable during construction.</p>	NH

11-07	Increased traffic flow will be brought closer to our property. Having met with a representative from SMBC before Christmas, we now understand that the proposed scheme will impose a further (yet to be confirmed) distance of up to 1.8m towards our property. Given my previous points relating to restricted access, this is deeply distressing to learn at such a late stage and if would like to request a review of this requirement give the fact residents' views on their preferred scheme or objection appear not to have been considered.	There are currently waiting and loading restrictions in place on Macclesfield Road in front of the objectors' property. The scheme Traffic Regulation Order is yet to be determined. Consultation will take place locally when these are proposed in order to determine the most appropriate scheme. In discussion with residents the Council has committed to not altering the existing kerb line.	NH
11-08	It is quite evident that such a scheme will result in the enforcement of parking restrictions on part, if not all, of Macclesfield Road. This will again have a detrimental effect to the residents in that visitors will be unable to park, it will also make deliveries to the property impossible. I therefore request personal consultation on any proposed restrictions being considered to ensure there is not further detrimental effect on our lives through the lack of consideration the Council has shown through the whole process.	There are currently waiting and loading restrictions in place on Macclesfield Road in front of the objector's property. The scheme Traffic Regulation Order is yet to be determined. Consultation will take place locally when these are proposed in order to determine the most appropriate scheme.	NH
11-09	The proposed scheme will detrimentally affect our lives irreversibly and will destroy established greenbelt.	It is the case that parts of the proposed scheme will be located in green belt. All three planning authorities have taken this relationship into account when granting planning permission and have clearly concluded the form of development proposed is acceptable in the context of the green belt designation when taking into account the benefits of the proposed scheme.	AH

11-10	It concerns me greatly that this will progress despite local residents' objections and pleas to be consulted in the process.	The Council has been committed to considering the concerns raised by local residents in developing the scheme. Following the Phase 1 consultation, the Council revisited the proposals and demonstrated that similar levels of noise mitigation can be provided in Option 1 as for Option 2. Changes to the proposals in the vicinity of the junction following the Phase 1 consultation include the introduction of noise fencing, low noise surfacing, moving the road further south, lowering the vertical alignment of the road and adjusting the noise bunds accordingly. In developing the design prior to the submission of the planning application, alternative designs and developed mitigation measures which are less visually intrusive have been explored. The Council can demonstrate that the interaction between the proposed Macclesfield Road junction and the Fiveways junction can be accommodated in terms of traffic capacity at these junctions. The Environment Agency stated "a strong preference for Option 1 as the preferred option at this location, as from a Biodiversity perspective, (the EA) believe that this option is likely to have the least impact on Norbury Brook". Option 1 will result in less disruption during construction. The Council therefore considers that an effective solution in terms of noise, visual and traffic impacts can be provided with Option 1, as well as being the most cost effective solution. Following the Phase 2 consultation, the Council has further developed the mitigation and landscaping proposals in response to comments received.	SS/AH
11-11	There is no evidence to support the fact the scheme will achieve any of the historically stated objectives to relieve traffic in the surrounding areas.	The assessments and analysis undertaken is consistent with government guidance for traffic forecasting. The traffic modelling demonstrates that the Relief Road will reduce congestion on local roads in the surrounding areas, however, it is recognised that some areas will see some increases in traffic. A package of measures, known as Complementary and Mitigation Measures, is being proposed to address these changes to traffic flows. Where there are	JMCM

		<p>predicted to be reductions in traffic flow, Complementary Measures will include schemes to encourage walking and cycling and support local centres. Mitigation Measures will seek to address the impact of the scheme on local communities where there are predicted to be increases in traffic flow and junction delay. These schemes will be site specific, route or centre based and could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•The provision of new cycleways and footpaths to link the existing network to the new, segregated cycleway forming part of the core scheme;•Enhancement of existing networks for cyclists, pedestrians and horse riders;•Priority schemes for public transport;•Public realm improvements;•Modest traffic management proposals, such as traffic calming on residential routes; and•Junction remodelling to optimise the operational capability of existing junctions, where required. <p>Based on the latest traffic modelling information, a number of areas have been identified for Complementary and Mitigation Measures. The proposed Complementary and Mitigation Measures form part of Transport Assessment for the scheme that was submitted as part of the planning application</p>	
--	--	---	--

12: C Krystek & U Krystek-Walson 113 Macclesfield Road, Hazel Grove, Stockport, SK76DT			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
12-01	Objection to both Option 1 and Option 2 of the SEMMMS scheme.	<p>The use of junctions integrates the route with the local areas. Not having junctions would make it difficult for the local population to join the route in reaching areas of employment and other desired locations.</p> <p>Local traffic would then continue to be confined to local routes and the predicted reduction in traffic congestion in many areas may not be realised.</p> <p>The junction designs presented within the scheme design are based on a range of considerations including Phase 1 consultation results, engagement with key stakeholders, cost, land take, forecast traffic flows, engineering constraints and environmental impact. The design for the junctions has been developed further as a result of feedback received during the Phase 2 consultation to take into account, where possible, comments and concerns raised by the local community.</p> <p>Based on our analysis, it is considered that an effective solution in terms of noise, visual and traffic impacts can be provided with Option 1, as well as being the most cost effective solution.</p>	JMcM
12-02	Objection to the subsequent SRO order.	<p>The Side Road Order allows the proposed junction to tie in efficiently and safely with the existing highway network. The detailed alignment and vertical levels are yet to be determined. This will be carried out by the Council's appointed contractor following further more detailed topographical surveys prior to construction. The SRO, coupled with this next step of design, ensures that the optimum design is implemented for access on and off the adopted highway.</p>	NH

12-03	Lack of consideration to the Council's residents throughout the planning period;	<p>Throughout the scheme development the Council has endeavoured to provide as much information as possible to the public. During the Phase 1 consultation detailed plans of the scheme and information about how the scheme impacts including noise, air quality and traffic impacts were made publicly available. For the Phase 2 consultation this information was updated based on the emerging preferred scheme and has been supplemented with further details about the scheme, including landscaping and ecology mitigation proposals and photomontages showing how the scheme could look. The Council has engaged directly with local residents living closest to the scheme. To this end, a total of 14 Local Liaison Forum groups for areas in closest proximity to the scheme have been set up with the aim of providing more detailed information about the proposals and giving local residents an opportunity to have their questions about the scheme answered by relevant technical experts. At the Local Liaison Forums detailed drawings of the scheme have been tabled along with further information about how the scheme will affect the local area. A team of technical experts has been present at each Local Liaison Forum meeting to explain any aspects of the scheme in more detail to attendees. In advance of the planning application being submitted Local Liaison Forum drop-in sessions were held to provide Local Liaison Forum members an early opportunity to viewed the preferred scheme for which a planning application would be submitted. In addition to the Local Liaison Forums, a series of public exhibitions associated with the Phase 1 and 2 consultations were held in venues across the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road area, to which individuals with an interest in the scheme can go to find out more. For anyone who was unable to attend an event, a dedicated information line and email which people could use to get their questions answered directly was available.</p>	JMCM
-------	--	---	------

12-04	Disruption to the local residents; in particular our children, neighbours children and the large number of families who use the pavement to access a number of popular walks in the local area, both during the construction phase and on completion of the proposed SEMMMS scheme.	The construction works will be managed utilising the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and also the Code of Construction Practice. During the works diversions of footways during construction will be provided. The Council and its contractor will work with local residents to keep them informed of the works and also to minimise disruption. All works on the carriageway and footway will require the Local Highway Authority's Traffic Manager's approval when sections of the highway are affected. The Traffic Manager will take regard for all highway users including Non-Motorised Users (NMUs). The design of the scheme has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit which considers all users of the highway including pedestrians. The footways will in fact be of a greater standard width than the minimum required in this location.	NH
12-05	Restricted access to our property during and after the completion of the scheme.	Vehicular access will be maintained throughout construction and once the road is completed. There may be short periods of time where access is restricted, but those parties affected will be liaised with to mitigate the impact.	NH
12-06	Limited parking for visitors and restrictions for delivery vehicles.	There are currently waiting and loading restrictions in place at Macclesfield Road. The scheme's Traffic Regulation Orders are yet to be determined. Consultation will take place locally when these are proposed in order to determine the most appropriate scheme. Waiting and loading restrictions will be determined to manage the safety and capacity of the highway as well as having consideration for visitor parking.	NH
12-07	Increased risk when gaining access to and from the property due to increase in traffic lanes and traffic volume;	It is likely that the new signalised junction at Macclesfield Road / A6MARR will create platoons of traffic flow. This may increase the window of opportunity to carry out this particular manoeuvre. Also the proposed retention of the width of the existing footway will provide good visibility will create good visibility when entering the highway. Waiting and loading restrictions will be considered to ensure that visibility is safeguarded when entering the highway.	NH

12-08	Increase in traffic noise, light and air pollution;	<p>The assessments undertaken relating to traffic-related noise have indicated that an increase in levels just below 3dBA (decibels) is anticipated at the objector's property. This equates to a change which is considered to be discernible but slight in a context where traffic-related noise is an established characteristic of the urban environment. New lighting will comprise full cut-off luminaires which will contain the lighting within the carriageway areas and minimise light spill and upward glare. The existing light column to the front of the objector's property will remain. There will accordingly not be a marked change in the influence that road-related lighting will have on views from the objector's property onto Macclesfield Road by virtue of the presence of the proposed lighting at the junction some 80m south of the property.</p> <p>The assessments undertaken relating to local air quality have indicated that increases in levels of $7\mu\text{g}\text{m}^{-3}$ for nitrogen dioxide and less than $1\mu\text{g}\text{m}^{-3}$ for particulates (PM_{10}) are anticipated at the property once the proposed scheme is in operation. The predicted concentrations with the proposed scheme in place are 35.4 and $15.9\mu\text{g}\text{m}^{-3}$ respectively. Both are within the stipulated national air quality standards which provide an indicator relative to human health. The Environmental Protection (UK) guidance would deem these changes as slight adverse and negligible respectively.</p> <p>Compensation is available for those whose property is injuriously affected by physical factors arising from the use of the works under part 1 LCA1973</p>	PR/PC
-------	---	---	-------

12-09	Destruction of established greenbelt areas including ancient woodland area.	<p>It is the case that parts of the proposed scheme will be located in green belt. All three planning authorities have taken this relationship into account when granting planning permission and have clearly concluded the form of development proposed is acceptable in the context of the green belt designation when taking into account the benefits of the proposed scheme. The proposed scheme involves the loss of 0.08ha of a total of 2.3ha of ancient woodland at Carr Wood. Ancient woodland is not legally protected. The National Planning Policy Framework does, however, note that:</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 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>	AH
-------	---	--	----

13: Mr and Mrs Deen 117 Macclesfield Road, Hazel Grove, Stockport, SK76DT			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
13-01	Objection to both Option 1 and Option 2 of the SEMMMS scheme.	The use of junctions integrates the route with the local areas. Not having junctions would make it difficult for the local population to join the route in reaching areas of employment and other desired locations. Local traffic would then continue to be confined to local routes and the predicted reduction in traffic congestion in many areas may not be realised. The junction designs presented within the scheme design are based on a range of considerations including Phase 1 consultation results, engagement with key stakeholders, cost, land take, forecast traffic flows, engineering constraints and environmental impact. The design for the junctions has been developed further as a result of feedback received during the Phase 2 consultation to take into account, where possible, comments and concerns raised by the local community. Based on our analysis, it is considered that an effective solution in terms of noise, visual and traffic impacts can be provided with Option 1, as well as being the most cost effective solution.	JMcM
13-02	Objection to the subsequent SRO order.	The Side Road Order allows the proposed junction to tie in efficiently and safely with the existing highway network. The detailed alignment and vertical levels are yet to be determined. This will be carried out by the Council's appointed contractor following further more detailed topographical surveys prior to construction. The SRO, coupled with this next step of design, ensures that the optimum design is implemented for access on and off the adopted highway.	NH

13-03	Lack of consideration to the Council's residents throughout the planning period.	<p>Throughout the scheme development the Council has endeavoured to provide as much information as possible to the public. During the Phase 1 consultation detailed plans of the scheme and information about how the scheme impacts including noise, air quality and traffic impacts were made publicly available. For the Phase 2 consultation this information was updated based on the emerging preferred scheme and has been supplemented with further details about the scheme, including landscaping and ecology mitigation proposals and photomontages showing how the scheme could look.</p> <p>The Council has engaged directly with local residents living closest to the scheme. To this end, a total of 14 Local Liaison Forum groups for areas in closest proximity to the scheme have been set up with the aim of providing more detailed information about the proposals and giving local residents an opportunity to have their questions about the scheme answered by relevant technical experts.</p> <p>At the Local Liaison Forums detailed drawings of the scheme have been tabled along with further information about how the scheme will affect the local area. Our team of technical experts has been present at each Local Liaison Forum meeting to explain any aspects of the scheme in more detail to attendees. In advance of the planning application being submitted Local Liaison Forum drop-in sessions were held to provide Local Liaison Forum members an early opportunity to view the preferred scheme for which a planning application would be submitted.</p> <p>In addition to the Local Liaison Forums, a series of public exhibitions associated with the Phase 1 and 2 consultations were held in venues across the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road area, to which individuals with an interest in the</p>	JMCM
-------	--	--	------

		<p>scheme can go to find out more.</p> <p>For anyone who was unable to attend an event, a dedicated information line and email which people could use to get their questions answered directly was available.</p>	
13-04	Disruption to the local residents during the construction phase.	The construction works will be managed utilising the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and also the Code of Construction Practice. During the works diversions of footways during construction will be provided. The Council and its contractor will work with local residents to keep them informed of the works and also to minimise disruption. All works on the carriageway and footway will require the Local Highway Authority's Traffic Manager's approval when sections of the highway are affected. The Traffic Manager will take regard for all highway users including Non-Motorised Users (NMUs).	NH
13-05	Accessibility to my property will be restricted during and after completing of the scheme.	Vehicular access will be maintained throughout construction and once the road is completed. There may be short periods of time where access is restricted, but those parties affected will be liaised with to mitigate the impact.	NH
13-06	Limited parking for visitors and restrictions for delivery vehicles.	There are currently waiting and loading restrictions in place at Macclesfield Road. The scheme Traffic Regulation Order is yet to be determined. Consultation will take place locally when these are proposed in order to determine the most appropriate scheme. Waiting and loading restrictions will be determined to manage the safety and capacity of the highway as well as having consideration for visitor parking.	NH

13-07	Increase in traffic noise and pollution	<p>The assessments undertaken relating to traffic-related noise have indicated that an increase in levels of some 3.6 dBA (decibels) is anticipated at the objector's property. This equates to a change which is considered to be discernible but slight in a context where traffic-related noise is an established characteristic of the urban environment.</p> <p>The assessments undertaken relating to local air quality have indicated that increases in levels of 7ugm³ for nitrogen dioxide and 1ugm³ for particulates (PM₁₀) are anticipated at the objector's property. The predicted concentrations with the proposed scheme in place are 35.4 and 16 ug^m³ respectively. Both are within the stipulated national air quality standards which provide an indicator relative to human health. The Environmental Protection (UK) guidance would deem these changes as slight adverse and negligible respectively.</p> <p>Compensation is available for those whose property is injuriously affected by physical factors arising from the use of the works under part 1 LCA1973</p>	PR / PC
13-08	Destroying established greenbelt areas.	It is the case that parts of the proposed scheme will be located in green belt. All three planning authorities have taken this relationship into account when granting planning permission and have clearly concluded the form of development proposed is acceptable in the context of the green belt designation when taking into account the benefits of the proposed scheme.	AH

14: Mr and Mrs Barson 119 Macclesfield Road, Hazel Grove, Stockport, SK76DT			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
14-01	Objection to both Option 1 and Option 2 of the SEMMMS scheme	The use of junctions integrates the route with the local areas. Not having junctions would make it difficult for the local population to join the route in reaching areas of employment and other desired locations. Local traffic would then continue to be confined to local routes and the predicted reduction in traffic congestion in many areas may not be realised. The junction designs presented within the scheme design are based on a range of considerations including Phase 1 consultation results, engagement with key stakeholders, cost, land take, forecast traffic flows, engineering constraints and environmental impact. The design for the junctions has been developed further as a result of feedback received during the Phase 2 consultation to take into account, where possible, comments and concerns raised by the local community. Based on our analysis, it is considered that an effective solution in terms of noise, visual and traffic impacts can be provided with Option 1, as well as being the most cost effective solution.	JMcM
14-02	Objection to the subsequent SRO order.	The Side Road Order allows the proposed junction to tie in efficiently and safely with the existing highway network. The detailed alignment and vertical levels are yet to be determined. This will be carried out by the Council's appointed contractor following further more detailed topographical surveys prior to construction. The SRO, coupled with this next step of design, ensures that the optimum design is implemented for access on and off the adopted highway.	NH

14-03	Lack of consideration to the Council's residents throughout the planning period.	<p>Throughout the scheme development the Council has endeavoured to provide as much information as possible to the public. During the Phase 1 consultation detailed plans of the scheme and information about how the scheme impacts including noise, air quality and traffic impacts were made publicly available. For the Phase 2 consultation this information was updated based on the emerging preferred scheme and has been supplemented with further details about the scheme, including landscaping and ecology mitigation proposals and photomontages showing how the scheme could look.</p> <p>The Council has engaged directly with local residents living closest to the scheme. To this end, a total of 14 Local Liaison Forum groups for areas in closest proximity to the scheme have been set up with the aim of providing more detailed information about the proposals and giving local residents an opportunity to have their questions about the scheme answered by relevant technical experts.</p> <p>At the Local Liaison Forums detailed drawings of the scheme have been tabled along with further information about how the scheme will affect the local area. Our team of technical experts has been present at each Local Liaison Forum meeting to explain any aspects of the scheme in more detail to attendees. In advance of the planning application being submitted Local Liaison Forum drop-in sessions were held to provide Local Liaison Forum members an early opportunity to view the preferred scheme for which a planning application would be submitted.</p> <p>In addition to the Local Liaison Forums, a series of public exhibitions associated with the Phase 1 and 2 consultations were held in venues across the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road area, to which individuals with an interest in the</p>	JMCM
-------	--	--	------

		<p>scheme can go to find out more.</p> <p>For anyone who was unable to attend an event, a dedicated information line and email which people could use to get their questions answered directly was available.</p>	
14-04	Disruption to the local residents during the construction phase.	The construction works will be managed utilising the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and also the Code of Construction Practice. During the works diversions of footways during construction will be provided. The Council and its contractor will work with local residents to keep them informed of the works and also to minimise disruption. All works on the carriageway and footway will require the Local Highway Authority's Traffic Manager's approval when sections of the highway are affected. The Traffic Manager will take regard for all highway users including Non-Motorised Users (NMUs).	NH
14-05	Accessibility to my property will be restricted during and after completing of the scheme.	Vehicular access will be maintained throughout construction and once the road is completed. There may be short periods of time where access is restricted, but those parties affected will be liaised with to mitigate the impact.	NH
14-06	Limited parking for visitors and restrictions for delivery vehicles.	There are currently waiting and loading restrictions in place at Macclesfield Road. The scheme Traffic Regulation Order is yet to be determined. Consultation will take place locally when these are proposed in order to determine the most appropriate scheme. Waiting and loading restrictions will be determined to manage the safety and capacity of the highway as well as having consideration for visitor parking.	NH

14-07	Increase in traffic noise and pollution	<p>The assessments undertaken relating to traffic-related noise have indicated that an increase in levels of some 4.4 dBA is anticipated at the objector's property. This equates to a change which is considered to be discernible but slight in a context where traffic related noise is an established characteristic of the urban environment.</p> <p>The assessments undertaken relating to local air quality have indicated that increases in levels of 7ugm³ for nitrogen dioxide and 1ugm³ for particulates (PM₁₀) are anticipated at the objector's property. The predicted concentrations with the proposed scheme in place are 35.3 and 16 ug^m³ respectively. Both are within the stipulated national air quality standards which provide an indicator relative to human health. The Environmental Protection (UK) guidance would deem these changes as slight adverse and negligible respectively</p> <p>Compensation is available for those whose property is injuriously affected by physical factors arising from the use of the works under part 1 LCA1973</p>	PR / PC
14-08	Destroying established greenbelt areas.	It is the case that parts of the proposed scheme will be located in green belt. All three planning authorities have taken this relationship into account when granting planning permission and have clearly concluded the form of development proposed is acceptable in the context of the green belt designation when taking into account the benefits of the proposed scheme.	AH
14-09	Lack of investigation as to water table adding to flooding issues.	A Flood Risk Assessment has been carried out and is contained within the planning application which the local flood authorities and Environment Agency has commented on.	PR

15: Mr and Mrs Hadfield 121 Macclesfield Road, Hazel Grove, Stockport, SK76DT			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
15-01	Objection to both Option 1 and Option 2 of the SEMMMS scheme	The use of junctions integrates the route with the local areas. Not having junctions would make it difficult for the local population to join the route in reaching areas of employment and other desired locations. Local traffic would then continue to be confined to local routes and the predicted reduction in traffic congestion in many areas may not be realised. The junction designs presented within the scheme design are based on a range of considerations including Phase 1 consultation results, engagement with key stakeholders, cost, land take, forecast traffic flows, engineering constraints and environmental impact. The design for the junctions has been developed further as a result of feedback received during the Phase 2 consultation to take into account, where possible, comments and concerns raised by the local community. Based on our analysis, it is considered that an effective solution in terms of noise, visual and traffic impacts can be provided with Option 1, as well as being the most cost effective solution.	JMcM
15-02	Objection to the subsequent SRO order.	The Side Road Order allows the proposed junction to tie in efficiently and safely with the existing highway network. The detailed alignment and vertical levels are yet to be determined. This will be carried out by the Council's appointed contractor following further more detailed topographical surveys prior to construction. The SRO, coupled with this next step of design, ensures that the optimum design is implemented for access on and off the adopted highway.	NH

15-03	Lack of consideration to the Council's residents throughout the planning period.	<p>Throughout the scheme development the Council has endeavoured to provide as much information as possible to the public. During the Phase 1 consultation detailed plans of the scheme and information about how the scheme impacts including noise, air quality and traffic impacts were made publicly available. For the Phase 2 consultation this information was updated based on the emerging preferred scheme and has been supplemented with further details about the scheme, including landscaping and ecology mitigation proposals and photomontages showing how the scheme could look. The Council has engaged directly with local residents living closest to the scheme. To this end, a total of 14 Local Liaison Forum groups for areas in closest proximity to the scheme have been set up with the aim of providing more detailed information about the proposals and giving local residents an opportunity to have their questions about the scheme answered by relevant technical experts. At the Local Liaison Forums detailed drawings of the scheme have been tabled along with further information about how the scheme will affect the local area. Our team of technical experts has been present at each Local Liaison Forum meeting to explain any aspects of the scheme in more detail to attendees. In advance of the planning application being submitted Local Liaison Forum drop-in sessions were held to provide Local Liaison Forum members an early opportunity to view the preferred scheme for which a planning application would be submitted. In addition to the Local Liaison Forums, a series of public exhibitions associated with the Phase 1 and 2 consultations were held in venues across the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road area, to which individuals with an interest in the scheme can go to find out more. For anyone who was unable to attend an event, a dedicated information line and email which people could use to get their questions answered directly was available.</p>	JMCM
-------	--	---	------

15-04	Disruption to the local residents during the construction phase.	The construction works will be managed utilising the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and also the Code of Construction Practice. During the works diversions of footways during construction will be provided. The Council and its contractor will work with local residents to keep them informed of the works and also to minimise disruption. All works on the carriageway and footway will require the Local Highway Authority's Traffic Manager's approval when sections of the highway are affected. The Traffic Manager will take regard for all highway users including Non-Motorised Users (NMUs).	NH
15-05	Accessibility to my property will be restricted during and after completing of the scheme.	Vehicular access will be maintained throughout construction and once the road is completed. There may be short periods of time where access is restricted, but those parties affected will be liaised with to mitigate the impact.	NH
15-06	Limited parking for visitors and restrictions for delivery vehicles.	There are currently waiting and loading restrictions in place at Macclesfield Road. The scheme Traffic Regulation Order is yet to be determined. Consultation will take place locally when these are proposed in order to determine the most appropriate scheme. Waiting and loading restrictions will be determined to manage the safety and capacity of the highway as well as having consideration for visitor parking.	NH

15-07	Increase in traffic noise and pollution	<p>The assessments undertaken relating to traffic-related noise have indicated that an increase in levels of some 4.3 dBA (decibels) is anticipated at the objector's property. This equates to a change which is considered to be discernible but slight in a context where traffic related noise is an established characteristic of the urban environment.</p> <p>The assessments undertaken relating to local air quality have indicated that an increase in levels of 7ugm³ for nitrogen dioxide and just above 1ugm³ for particulates (PM₁₀) are anticipated at the objector's property. The predicted concentrations with the proposed scheme in place are 35.4 and 16.1 ug m³ respectively. Both are within the stipulated national air quality standards which provide an indicator relative to human health. The Environmental Protection (UK) guidance would deem these changes as slight adverse and negligible respectively.</p> <p>Compensation is available for those whose property is injuriously affected by physical factors arising from the use of the works under part 1 LCA1973</p>	PR / PC
15-08	Destroying established greenbelt areas.	It is the case that parts of the proposed scheme will be located in green belt. All three planning authorities have taken this relationship into account when granting planning permission and have clearly concluded the form of development proposed is acceptable in the context of the green belt designation when taking into account the benefits of the proposed scheme.	AH

16: Mr and Mrs Hunt 88 Macclesfield Road, Hazel Grove, Stockport, SK76DT			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
16-01	Objection to both Option 1 and Option 2 of the SEMMMS scheme	<p>The use of junctions integrates the route with the local areas. Not having junctions would make it difficult for the local population to join the route in reaching areas of employment and other desired locations.</p> <p>Local traffic would then continue to be confined to local routes and the predicted reduction in traffic congestion in many areas may not be realised.</p> <p>The junction designs presented within the scheme design are based on a range of considerations including Phase 1 consultation results, engagement with key stakeholders, cost, land take, forecast traffic flows, engineering constraints and environmental impact. The design for the junctions has been developed further as a result of feedback received during the Phase 2 consultation to take into account, where possible, comments and concerns raised by the local community.</p> <p>Based on our analysis, it is considered that an effective solution in terms of noise, visual and traffic impacts can be provided with Option 1, as well as being the most cost effective solution.</p>	JMcM
16-02	Objection to the subsequent SRO order.	<p>The Side Road Order allows the proposed junction to tie in efficiently and safely with the existing highway network. The detailed alignment and vertical levels are yet to be determined. This will be carried out by the Council's appointed contractor following further more detailed topographical surveys prior to construction. The SRO, coupled with this next step of design, ensures that the optimum design is implemented for access on and off the adopted highway.</p>	NH

16-03	Lack of consideration to the Council's residents throughout the planning period.	<p>Throughout the scheme development the Council has endeavoured to provide as much information as possible to the public. During the Phase 1 consultation detailed plans of the scheme and information about how the scheme impacts including noise, air quality and traffic impacts were made publicly available. For the Phase 2 consultation this information was updated based on the emerging preferred scheme and has been supplemented with further details about the scheme, including landscaping and ecology mitigation proposals and photomontages showing how the scheme could look. The Council has engaged directly with local residents living closest to the scheme. To this end, a total of 14 Local Liaison Forum groups for areas in closest proximity to the scheme have been set up with the aim of providing more detailed information about the proposals and giving local residents an opportunity to have their questions about the scheme answered by relevant technical experts. At the Local Liaison Forums detailed drawings of the scheme have been tabled along with further information about how the scheme will affect the local area. Our team of technical experts has been present at each Local Liaison Forum meeting to explain any aspects of the scheme in more detail to attendees. In advance of the planning application being submitted Local Liaison Forum drop-in sessions were held to provide Local Liaison Forum members an early opportunity to view the preferred scheme for which a planning application would be submitted. In addition to the Local Liaison Forums, a series of public exhibitions associated with the Phase 1 and 2 consultations were held in venues across the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road area, to which individuals with an interest in the scheme can go to find out more. For anyone who was unable to attend an event, a dedicated information line and email which people could use to get their questions answered directly was available.</p>	JMCM
-------	--	---	------

16-04	Disruption to the local residents during the construction phase.	The construction works will be managed utilising the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and also the Code of Construction Practice. During the works diversions of footways during construction will be provided. The Council and its contractor will work with local residents to keep them informed of the works and also to minimise disruption. All works on the carriageway and footway will require the Local Highway Authority's Traffic Manager's approval when sections of the highway are affected. The Traffic Manager will take regard for all highway users including Non-Motorised Users (NMUs).	NH
16-05	Accessibility to my property will be restricted during and after completing of the scheme.	Vehicular access will be maintained throughout construction and once the road is completed. There may be short periods of time where access is restricted, but those parties affected will be liaised with to mitigate the impact.	NH
16-06	Limited parking for visitors and restrictions for delivery vehicles.	There are currently waiting and loading restrictions in place at Macclesfield Road. The scheme Traffic Regulation Order is yet to be determined. Consultation will take place locally when these are proposed in order to determine the most appropriate scheme. Waiting and loading restrictions will be determined to manage the safety and capacity of the highway as well as having consideration for visitor parking.	NH

16-07	Increase in traffic noise and pollution	<p>The assessments undertaken relating to traffic-related noise have indicated that an increase in levels of some 2 dBA (decibels) is anticipated at the objector's property. This equates to a change which is considered to be barely discernible in a context where traffic related noise is an established characteristic of the urban environment.</p> <p>The assessments undertaken relating to local air quality have indicated that an increase in levels of 7ugm³ for nitrogen dioxide and just below 1ugm³ for particulates (PM₁₀) are anticipated at the objector's property. The predicted concentrations with the proposed scheme in place are 37.6 and 16.2 ug^m³ respectively. Both are within the stipulated national air quality standards which provide an indicator relative to human health. The Environmental Protection (UK) guidance would deem these changes as slight adverse and negligible respectively.</p> <p>Compensation is available for those whose property is injuriously affected by physical factors arising from the use of the works under part 1 LCA1973.</p>	PR / PC
16-08	Destroying established greenbelt areas.	It is the case that parts of the proposed scheme will be located in green belt. All three planning authorities have taken this relationship into account when granting planning permission and have clearly concluded the form of development proposed is acceptable in the context of the green belt designation when taking into account the benefits of the proposed scheme.	AH

17: Mr and Mrs Burke 90 Macclesfield Road, Hazel Grove, Stockport, SK76DT			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
17-01	We wish to object to the SEMMMS scheme in general but in particular to Option 1 at junction 6 which was pushed through by a Stockport Council meeting by 6 votes to 5 with total disregard to the people's wished who live in the immediate vicinity of the proposed junction 6.	The junction designs presented within the scheme design are based on a range of considerations including Phase 1 consultation results, engagement with key stakeholders, cost, land take, forecast traffic flows, engineering constraints and environmental impact. The design for the junctions has been developed further as a result of feedback received during the Phase 2 consultation to take into account, where possible, comments and concerns raised by the local community. Based on our analysis, it is considered that an effective solution in terms of noise, visual and traffic impacts can be provided with Option 1, as well as being the most cost effective solution.	JMcM
17-02	Why do we need (junction 6 at all) it is only approx. 1 mile to the end of the Relief Road going East.	The use of junctions integrates the route with the local areas. Not having junctions would make it difficult for the local population to join the route in reaching areas of employment and other desired locations.	NM
17-03	There has been a complete lack of consideration to the residents through planning period.	Throughout the scheme development the Council has endeavoured to provide as much information as possible to the public. During the Phase 1 consultation detailed plans of the scheme and information about how the scheme impacts including noise, air quality and traffic impacts were made publicly available. For the Phase 2 consultation this information was updated based on the emerging preferred scheme and has been supplemented with further details about the scheme, including landscaping and ecology mitigation proposals and photomontages showing how the scheme could look. The Council has engaged directly with local residents living closest to the scheme. To this end, a total of 14 Local Liaison Forum groups for areas in closest	JMcM

		<p>proximity to the scheme have been set up with the aim of providing more detailed information about the proposals and giving local residents an opportunity to have their questions about the scheme answered by relevant technical experts. At the Local Liaison Forums detailed drawings of the scheme have been tabled along with further information about how the scheme will affect the local area. Our team of technical experts has been present at each Local Liaison Forum meeting to explain any aspects of the scheme in more detail to attendees. In advance of the planning application being submitted Local Liaison Forum drop-in sessions were held to provide Local Liaison Forum members an early opportunity to view the preferred scheme for which a planning application would be submitted. In addition to the Local Liaison Forums, a series of public exhibitions associated with the Phase 1 and 2 consultations were held in venues across the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road area, to which individuals with an interest in the scheme can go to find out more. For anyone who was unable to attend an event, a dedicated information line and email which people could use to get their questions answered directly was available.</p>	
17-04	<p>Access to our property will be restricted during the construction of the scheme and on completion will make life difficult to enter and leave our property.</p>	<p>Vehicular access will be maintained throughout construction and once the road is completed. There may be short periods of time where access is restricted, but those parties affected will be liaised with to mitigate the impact. On completion of the scheme, the Private Means of Access will be created as per Side Road Order (page 13 PMA 4 and Site Plan 2 Inset A)</p>	NH

17-05	Other problems with the scheme are increase in noise and pollution.	<p>The assessments undertaken relating to traffic-related noise have indicated that an increase in levels of some 2.2 dBA (decibels) is anticipated at the objector's property. This equates to a change which is considered to be barely discernible in a context where traffic related noise is an established characteristic of the urban environment.</p> <p>The assessments undertaken relating to local air quality have indicated that an increase in levels of 7ugm³ for nitrogen dioxide and just below 1ugm³ for particulates (PM₁₀) are anticipated at the objector's property. The predicted concentrations with the proposed scheme in place are 37.6 and 16.2 ug^m³ respectively. Both are within the stipulated national air quality standards which provide an indicator relative to human health. The Environmental Protection (UK) guidance would deem these changes as slight adverse and negligible respectively.</p> <p>Compensation is available for those whose property is injuriously affected by physical factors arising from the use of the works under part 1 LCA1973.</p>	PR / PC
17-06	Green belt area being destroyed.	<p>It is the case that parts of the proposed scheme will be located in green belt. All three planning authorities have taken this relationship into account when granting planning permission and have clearly concluded the form of development proposed is acceptable in the context of the green belt designation when taking into account the benefits of the proposed scheme.</p>	AH

18: Mr Clayton & Mrs Hayward94 Macclesfield Road, Hazel Grove, Stockport, SK76DT			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
18-01	Objection to both Option 1 and Option 2 of the SEMMMS scheme	<p>The use of junctions integrates the route with the local areas. Not having junctions would make it difficult for the local population to join the route in reaching areas of employment and other desired locations.</p> <p>Local traffic would then continue to be confined to local routes and the predicted reduction in traffic congestion in many areas may not be realised.</p> <p>The junction designs presented within the scheme design are based on a range of considerations including Phase 1 consultation results, engagement with key stakeholders, cost, land take, forecast traffic flows, engineering constraints and environmental impact. The design for the junctions has been developed further as a result of feedback received during the Phase 2 consultation to take into account, where possible, comments and concerns raised by the local community.</p> <p>Based on our analysis, it is considered that an effective solution in terms of noise, visual and traffic impacts can be provided with Option 1, as well as being the most cost effective solution.</p>	JMcM
18-02	Objection to the subsequent SRO order.	<p>The Side Road Order allows the proposed junction to tie in efficiently and safely with the existing highway network. The detailed alignment and vertical levels are yet to be determined. This will be carried out by the Council's appointed contractor following further more detailed topographical surveys prior to construction. The SRO, coupled with this next step of design, ensures that the optimum design is implemented for access on and off the adopted highway.</p>	NH

18-03	Lack of consideration to the Council's residents throughout the planning period.	<p>Throughout the scheme development the Council has endeavoured to provide as much information as possible to the public. During the Phase 1 consultation detailed plans of the scheme and information about how the scheme impacts including noise, air quality and traffic impacts were made publicly available. For the Phase 2 consultation this information was updated based on the emerging preferred scheme and has been supplemented with further details about the scheme, including landscaping and ecology mitigation proposals and photomontages showing how the scheme could look. The Council has engaged directly with local residents living closest to the scheme. To this end, a total of 14 Local Liaison Forum groups for areas in closest proximity to the scheme have been set up with the aim of providing more detailed information about the proposals and giving local residents an opportunity to have their questions about the scheme answered by relevant technical experts. At the Local Liaison Forums detailed drawings of the scheme have been tabled along with further information about how the scheme will affect the local area. Our team of technical experts has been present at each Local Liaison Forum meeting to explain any aspects of the scheme in more detail to attendees. In advance of the planning application being submitted Local Liaison Forum drop-in sessions were held to provide Local Liaison Forum members an early opportunity to view the preferred scheme for which a planning application would be submitted. In addition to the Local Liaison Forums, a series of public exhibitions associated with the Phase 1 and 2 consultations were held in venues across the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road area, to which individuals with an interest in the scheme can go to find out more. For anyone who was unable to attend an event, a dedicated information line and email which people could use to get their questions answered directly was available.</p>	JMCM
-------	--	---	------

18-04	Disruption to the local residents during the construction phase.	The construction works will be managed utilising the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and also the Code of Construction Practice. During the works diversions of footways during construction will be provided. The Council and its contractor will work with local residents to keep them informed of the works and also to minimise disruption. All works on the carriageway and footway will require the Local Highway Authority's Traffic Manager's approval when sections of the highway are affected. The Traffic Manager will take regard for all highway users including Non-Motorised Users (NMUs)	NH
18-05	Accessibility to my property will be restricted during and after completing of the scheme.	Vehicular access will be maintained throughout construction and once the road is completed. There may be short periods of time where access is restricted, but those parties affected will be liaised with to mitigate the impact.	NH
18-06	Limited parking for visitors and restrictions for delivery vehicles.	There are currently waiting and loading restrictions in place at Macclesfield Road. The scheme Traffic Regulation Order is yet to be determined. Consultation will take place locally when these are proposed in order to determine the most appropriate scheme. Waiting and loading restrictions will be determined to manage the safety and capacity of the highway as well as having consideration for visitor parking.	NH

18-07	Increase in traffic noise and pollution	<p>The assessments undertaken relating to traffic-related noise have indicated that an increase in levels of some 2.2 dBA (decibels) is anticipated at the objector's property. This equates to a change which is considered to be barely discernible in a context where traffic related noise is an established characteristic of the urban environment.</p> <p>The assessments undertaken relating to local air quality have indicated that an increase in levels of 7ugm³ for nitrogen dioxide and just below 1ugm³ for particulates (PM₁₀) are anticipated at the objector's property. The predicted concentrations with the proposed scheme in place are 37.6 and 16.2 ug^m³ respectively. Both are within the stipulated national air quality standards which provide an indicator relative to human health. The Environmental Protection (UK) guidance would deem these changes as slight adverse and negligible respectively.</p> <p>Compensation is available for those whose property is injuriously affected by physical factors arising from the use of the works under part 1 LCA1973.</p>	PR / PC
18-08	Destroying established greenbelt areas.	<p>It is the case that parts of the proposed scheme will be located in green belt. All three planning authorities have taken this relationship into account when granting planning permission and have clearly concluded the form of development proposed is acceptable in the context of the green belt designation when taking into account the benefits of the proposed scheme.</p>	AH

<p>19: Cartwright/ Norbury Hall Norbury Hall, Macclesfield Road, Hazel Grove, Stockport. SK7 6DT CPO Plots: 2/1 2/1A-2/1F 2/2 3/8 3/8A - 3/8D Agent: Richard Morris Impey and Company Limited, Lower Hillgate, Stockport, SK1 3AL</p>			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
19-01	The line of the proposed road will adversely affect Norbury Hall and the adjacent cottages and will have a serious impact on the building.	The line of the route has been moved as far south as it is possible to do so within the protected route corridor, which is bounded by Norbury Brook. Should a person feel that the value of their land and property has decreased or that they have suffered other losses as a direct consequence of the road scheme, they are entitled to claim compensation under the statutory compensation code and each claim will be determined on its merits. Following discussion with the objector the horizontal alignment of the dual carriageway has been moved further south in order to minimise the land required	HC / NH
19-02	The proposed land included within CPO is excessive and extends beyond the land necessary to create the road link.	The Project Team has developed the design further to the planning application 'design freeze' and the Council has agreed to amend the route line and reduce the bunding to minimise the land take and effect on the objectors' property from that which is indicated within the Compulsory Purchase Order. This commitment has been instructed to the Council's contractor and his respective design team. The realignment plus the reduced earth bunding is outlined within the drawing 'A6MARR-1-W-05-001-DR-007 – Change Event 8 Section 1 Norbury Hall Earthworks'. This has reduced the overall land take by over 4,000m ² . The land owner has requested that a wider passageway is safeguarded to the west of the hall and this has also been achieved as indicated on the same drawing.	NH

19-03	<p>The proposed plans for the junction of the new relief road and the A523 Macclesfield Road is considered dangerous as it impacts on the access road to Norbury Hall cottages and farm land and will create a dangerous junction particularly when taking into account slow moving farm vehicles and trailers which enter the site.</p>	<p>Liaison with the objectors and their engineering consultant has occurred. It has been demonstrated that the proposed tie in to the existing access of Macclesfield Road provides a safe access. Tractor and trailer plus rigid vehicle swept path analysis has shown that the existing access has sufficient widths for these envisaged manoeuvres. Any amendment to the existing access is not considered to be within the A6MARR scheme remit but should be pursued between the land owner and the Local Highway Authority (SMBC) Network Manager / Planning Highway Officer. Should an alternative access be agreed with the Local Highway Authority then the works may in fact be implemented as part of the A6MARR works.</p>	NH
-------	--	---	----

20: Mrs D R Mills
 Barlow Fold Farm, London Road North, Poynton, Cheshire SK12 1BX
 CPO Plots: 3/9 3/9A -3/9H
 Agent:
 Frank Marshall
 Marshall House, Church Hill, Knutsford, Cheshire, WA16 6DH

Richard Morris
 Impey and Company Limited, Lower Hillgate, Stockport, SK1 3AL

Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
20-01	Previously objected to planning application on the grounds that too much of her land is being taken. In our view it is not necessary to take as much land as currently proposed.	The land required for the scheme is the minimum required for permanent operating scheme and also sufficient to construct the works i.e. allows for working room for the Council's appointed contractor. The Design Team has in fact reduced the amount of land that will be acquired within this location by moving the pond to the north side of the road following discussion with the land owner. There may be further scope to reduce land take to the south of the road, but this is dependent upon the topographical conditions that are to be found here and how much land the contractor requires to construct the works. At present it is not possible to reduce the land-take further. The contractor has, as with all extents of the CPO, been requested to reduce the permanent and temporary land take requirements in this location where possible. The objector will be compensated for all land and property lost in accordance with the compensation code.	HC / NH
20-02	The other matter that is of particular concern is the right of way that our client has which goes across the line of the proposed road. It is essential that this right is replaced with as little disruption as possible to a standard that allows vehicles	This right of way will be maintained throughout once the road has been completed. The current design utilises the proposed road bridge over the brook. To create an online bridge or subway would require substantially more land from both this land owner and others. The diverted track would accommodate farm traffic in terms of gradients, widths and	NH

	to gain access underneath the road.	radii. The proposal, by the land owner, to construct an 'online' subway has been considered by the Council's contractor and would require more land and substantial costs expenditure over and above the existing design solution.	
20-03	We are also concerned at the alignment of the proposed road. The line currently shows a bend and in our view the bend is unnecessary and if the road were to be straightened out this would reduce the amount of land from our client and in our view would reduce the cost of constructing the road.	The horizontal alignment of the road is optimum in design terms, is the necessary alignment for the route in this location and is in accordance with current design standards, namely the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (Volume 6 Road Geometry, Section 1 Links, TD 9/93 Highway Link Design). The Council has minimised land take where appropriate, but will consider options to further minimise the land take in this location such as described above. The horizontal and vertical alignment seeks to minimise the land required to construct and operate the relief road whilst meeting the design objectives for safety, capacity, NMU usage etc.	NH

21: Janet Elsie Bourne, Jill Elizabeth Zeiss, Anne Elizabeth Lomas, Hazel Margaret Mort
 Hazel Mort's address: 11 Kingsbury Drive, Regents Park, Wilmslow, SK9 2GU
 CPO Plots: 3/4 3/4A-3/4U
 Agent:
 John Seed
 Brown Rural Partnership, 29 Church Street, Macclesfield, Cheshire, SK11 6LB

Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
21-04	<p>The Objectors believe that the Acquiring Authorities' proposed taking the two parts of the Plots identified on the attached plans for temporary purposes only and contend that there is no power under the CPO to do so. By paragraph 1 the CPO will authorise the acquisition of "land" described in paragraph 2. Paragraph 2 describes the "land" only by reference to the "land" described in Schedule 1 shown coloured pink on the CPO plan. Neither Schedule 1 nor the map describe, in relation to the Plots, that only a temporary possession is required in part of those Plots. If the intention of the Acquiring Authorities is take all parts of the Plots permanently, but then give a written undertaking to return the parts after temporary use, then this is a misuse of powers for it shows that the Acquiring Authorities cannot show a compelling case to acquire permanently the parts of the Plots required only for temporary use. If, contrary to the above, the CPO does not contain powers to take part of the Plots identified above temporarily, then the land</p>	<p>The permanent land take includes land for the new road and its earthworks, essential ecological and social mitigation and landscape bunding. The Acquiring Authority is unable to acquire land on a temporary basis via the CPO process. Once construction of the scheme is completed then the land not required on a permanent basis will be offered back to the original land owner in accordance with the Cichel Down rules . Only the land required for the scheme and its construction has been included within the CPO. The Council will demonstrate that all of this land is required to construct the road. The Council would prefer to reach an agreement with the objector but no agreement has yet been reached. Until such a time as an agreement is reached the land must be retained with the Order.</p>	HC / NH

	in question should not be acquired permanently.		
21-05	No part of the Plots should be used for tipping of permanent spoil which will severely prejudice the future use of said lands for agricultural and development purposes.	Material may be deposited on land that is permanently acquired under the CPO for the purposes of environmental (noise and visual) screening. However, material outside of the current CPO extents will not be deposited on third party land without prior agreement from the landowner.	HC / NH
21-06	The extent of permanent land take to provide for bunding and environmental mitigation works is excessive, severely prejudicing the future use of said lands for agricultural and future development purposes.	<p>Plot, 3/4D, comprises a small severed corner of a field which has been included to enable replacement ponds to be provided for a nearby pond which will be infilled to enable the proposed scheme to be constructed.</p> <p>Should a person feel that the value of their land and property has decreased or that they have suffered other losses as a direct consequence of the road scheme, they are entitled to claim compensation under the statutory compensation code and each claim will be determined on its merits.</p>	HC / PR
21-07	In connection with the proposed new accommodation bridge (structure reference B006), a detailed submission has already been put to the Acquiring Authorities containing the Objectors' proposal to relocate the accommodate bridge to the line taken by the existing Poynton - with - Worth Footpath No. 37, and for the reasons set out in the attached letter dated the 28th June 2013 to the SEMMMS Project Team. No detailed response has been made by the Acquiring Authorities to this submission, or assessment of impact on the land by an agricultural consultant.	<p>The bridge has been located in the optimum position to provide access to the objector's land as well as the adjacent land. In addition, this location allows rationalisation of the number of private and Public Rights of Ways (PRoWs) crossings over the new road as well as reducing land take as much as possible. The location of the bridge also reduces the overall land take for this land owner.</p> <p>Should a person feel that the value of their land and property has decreased or that they have suffered other losses as a direct consequence of the road scheme, they are entitled to claim compensation under the statutory compensation code and each claim will be determined on its merits.</p>	NH

21-08	It is clear from the description of the function of the proposed bridge B006 that farming does not feature highly in terms of priorities. Quite clearly farm vehicles are an existing user, whereas cyclists and equestrians will be introduced to the land.	All users, both existing and future, have been equally considered and the design adopted is suitable for all users. This has rationalised the number of bridges required along the length of the scheme therefore reducing the land and environmental impacts as well as reducing the construction and whole life costs of the scheme.	NH
21-09	It appears that conflict between farm traffic and other users of the bridge has not been fully considered, and we consider that the potential for harm is significant given the need for large agricultural machinery to accelerate up the incline, and the sharp turning circles involved. This potential safety hazard is contrary to one of SEMMMS key objectives, which is to improve the safety of road users, pedestrians and cyclists.	Safety of all users has been at the forefront of all design work. In addition, conflicting movements have been analysed, and will continue to be as the design progresses, to ensure safety is not compromised. This is impartially assessed when various Road Safety Audits are carried out. The safety of all users will be safeguarded via various design measures including through the use of effective signing and safeguarding of sightlines throughout the scheme.	NH
21-10	It is not clear as to whether the bridge design is adequate for the weight and dimensions of modern farm machinery, or the increases in weight and size that will inevitably arise in the future.	The design of the bridge is suitable for modern farm machinery (LM1/LM2/LM4). Weight limits and requirements will be agreed with the Technical Approval Authority (Cheshire East Council Highway Structures Section) and the land owner as the design progresses. The bridge will be fit for purpose for all current and proposed uses.	NH
21-11	The Acquiring Authorities have not carried out any proper consultation with the affected landowners and occupiers as to the siting of the accommodation bridge. The location appears to respond to concerns about impact on residential interests.	Reasonable endeavours have been made to consult all affected parties throughout consultation periods and through direct discussions. The location of the proposed bridge meets the needs of all landowners and minimises the total land take and number of crossings required over the road. This ensures that land take and the impact on the environment are kept to a minimum.	NH / SS
21-12	The proposed route of the accommodation bridge is unacceptable to the Objectors but this part of the objection would be withdrawn if the alternative route proposed by the Objectors is incorporated into the	The bridge design is in the optimum location for the scheme and has approved planning by the local authority. Moving the bridge to the proposed location would mean that other crossing points would be required and this would increase the land take and environmental impact of the scheme.	SS / NH

	scheme.	Should a person feel that the value of their land and property has decreased or that they have suffered other losses as a direct consequence of the road scheme, they are entitled to claim compensation under the statutory compensation code and each claim will be determined on its merits.	
21-13	The Acquiring Authorities have failed to show any compelling case to take land for the purposes of pedestrian and cycle routes and bridleways. These routes are not required for, or critical to, the purpose of constructing the Relief Road and its cuttings and embankments. The land required for these routes should be deleted from Schedule 1 of the CPO.	The shared use cycleway/footways and bridleways are part of the main scheme objectives and aim to increase social benefit and safety in the area. The Council considers that there is a compelling case for them to be included within the scheme and CPO.	SS
21-14	The stopping up or removal of any private means of access is unacceptable and irrational where it is not replaced with an alternative and viable means of access.	All known private means of access and rights of way have been maintained or re-provided. Farm access is provided to retained land via the provision of an accommodation bridge. A new Private Means of Access is indicated within the Side Road Order (Page 20 PMA 4,5 and on Site Plan 3 Inset C). The represent reasonably convenient replacement accesses in the most suitable location.	NH

<p>22: Michael Kingsley Woodleigh, Chester Road, Poynton, Cheshire, SK12 1HG CPO Plots: 3/2 3/2AA-3/2AD 3/2A-3/2Z 4/10 4/10A-4/10G 8/4 8/4A-8/4V 8/4Y 8/4Z 8/4AA</p>			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
22-01	22-01 Objection I have attended meeting after meeting to fully identify our requirements but despite assurances that they would be accommodate, that has not been the case.	Various amendments to the current design have been made following the discussion at these meetings. This includes the kerb lines at Clay Lane, the access width maintained north of the Grange.	NH / HC
22-02	1. Confirmation of the Orders should in any event be denied since the acquiring authority has failed to demonstrate that it has sought to acquire all or any of the land by negotiation but that those negotiations have failed, nor have they demonstrated that any such negotiations as it may have had were likely to fail, or that the Orders are necessary as a last resort.	SMBC has been in discussions to acquire the land by agreement from all landowners, and in meetings has reiterated that the Council is a willing buyer for the land required for scheme. The Council is promoting the CPO in order to gain certainty for the scheme in the absence of being able to acquire all the land by agreement.	HC
22-04	2. The proposed scheme has in any event not been adequately designed to fulfil its intended function, which is to relieve congestion within the area and provide a safe and satisfactory alternative east/west route to Manchester Airport, Airport City, the M56 and on to the M6.	The road has been designed to meet all of the A6 MARR objectives and resides in the optimum horizontal and vertical alignment to do so and the scheme has planning consent for the existing design. Significant studies have been carried out in terms of traffic flow and safety to ensure that the design is correct, and the Council will demonstrate this as required.	SS / NM
22-05	3. In the absence of the contemporaneous addition of the proposed Poynton Bypass link road, the scheme will in fact add to the congestion in Poynton, contrary to its intended function and/or the recommendations of SEMMMS.	The scheme has been designed as a result of significant study into congestion in the local area and will alleviate congestion as per its objective and the Council will demonstrate this. The traffic modelling work, reported in the Transport Assessment Report –at Figure 9.6, confirms that the construction of the A6MARR will lead to a significant reduction in traffic volumes in Poynton and therefore this will reduce rather than add to the congestion in Poynton. The	NM

		A6MARR scheme will benefit Poynton without the addition of the proposed Poynton Relief Road.	
22-06	4. The scheme has not been adequately designed to be future proof in that its design does not make allowances for or take into account traffic which will be generated from anticipated development within the area.	<p>The road will not unlock development land in the area as it runs through protected greenbelt land between settlement boundaries. The Council has conducted studies which have ensured the design will meet the traffic needs of today as well as in the future.</p> <p>The traffic forecasting report and supporting appendices of the scheme Business Case set out the treatment of known future development. All developments that have a firm planning status and expect to be in place by the traffic forecast year, have been included within the traffic models and therefore the impact of traffic generated from these developments is included within the published traffic forecasts. The approach to traffic forecasting is entirely consistent with government guidance as contained in WebTAG (Department for Transport's web-based multimodal guidance on appraising transport projects and proposals). Public investment in transport infrastructure is on the basis of known and committed future developments rather than providing for anticipated future developments that may not materialise.</p>	NM
22-07	5. Its design does not adequately integrate transport with development, as recommended, but is instead designed to inhibit future development.	The road is not designed to inhibit future development and it meets all of the scheme objectives. The land through which the road passes is unlikely to come forward for development as it is in the greenbelt and runs between defined settlement boundaries.	AH / SS
22-08	6. There is limited capacity allowed for in the scheme's design, such that even without any allowance for further development, it will be up to or over its designed capacity upon its opening.	The scheme has been designed in line with the current and future traffic projections and will not be over capacity, as will be demonstrated by the Council.	NM

22-09	7. The western and eastern sections of the scheme will not integrate with the existing central section, since they are intended to be restricted to 50 mph and have traffic light controlled junctions, whilst the central section is grade separated and has a speed limit of 70 mph instead.	The western and eastern sections will integrate with the existing central section. The design has been informed by the topographical and urban constraints as well as the desire to reduce land take where possible. The speed limit of 50mph is in accordance with the objectives of A6MARR and the strategy of SEMMMS and is also required to ensure safety along the new sections of road, which have more traffic entering and exiting than the central section.	NH / NM
22-10	8. The scheme also fails to take into account the proposed extension of the road from the A6 to the M56 at Bredbury or the potential impact thereof and will, in its present form, be unable to accommodate that extension.	There is no evidence that the scheme, as designed, will be unable to accommodate a future extension to the M60. As the mentioned extension does not currently have any planning status or indication of future funding, whilst it remains an aspiration of Stockport Council. The extension has therefore, rightly, not formed any part of scheme assessment or scheme design and this is in compliance with government guidance on scheme assessment and appraisal. The scheme has been designed to incorporate this link in the future although this does not form part of this scheme.	SS / NH
22-11	9. The design provides for traffic light controlled junctions instead of roundabouts, thereby impeding the free flow of traffic and fails to include slip roads to the east at its junction at Woodford Road Bramhall, thereby necessitating adverse traffic flows within the area as a whole.	The traffic controlled junctions are appropriate for this type of scheme and minimise the land take required, which is necessary to reduce the impact on property and the environment. The traffic and safety studies reinforce this. The Woodford Road, Bramhall junction and the oil terminal junction work in effect as an interchange and access for the eastbound traffic movement.	NM
22-12	10. The design is unsafe in that it provides for toucan pedestrian crossings at junctions, instead of overhead walkway bridges and so impedes traffic flow.	The scheme provides a combination of a grade separated and at grade crossings for vulnerable road users. Any at level crossings will be timed to work in phase with the traffic signal timings of the traffic signals and so will have negligible traffic capacity impact.	SS / NH

22-13	11. The design also fails to allow for the addition of the Poynton Bypass and the Order does not include the land within Stockport which is required for it.	The CPO is to construct the A6 MARR and not the Poynton Bypass. The junction where the Poynton bypass could join if it goes ahead is capable of linking this road in, but no land is included within the Order for this scheme as it is separate from the A6 MARR.	JMcM
22-14	12. The design of the proposed junction to Chester Road should not be by a traffic light controlled junction, but should have a roundabout, which would require less land and enable a more free traffic flow.	<p>The design has been approved in the planning application and this junction is more suited to a traffic light controlled junction.</p> <p>A roundabout junction generally requires more land than a traffic signal controlled junction to provide the same junction capacity. A traffic signal controlled junction also provides the ability through signal timings to control traffic movements at the junction and thereby increasing or reducing the attractiveness of a particular route.</p>	NM / NH
22-15	13. The proposal to have a bridge over Woodford Road Poynton instead of connecting Woodford Road into the scheme, adds unnecessarily to the land take and leaves our land without access and completely land-locked.	The scheme design meets the needs of the A6 MARR. Due to the nature of the road it is important to minimise the number of access points to it for safety reasons. All existing accesses will be maintained where possible, however should it not be possible then the objector will be compensated in accordance with the Compensation Code. The option of providing a junction at Woodford Road was considered during scheme development. Providing a junction along Woodford Road would attract additional traffic along Woodford Road seeking to access the A6MARR at the Woodford Road Junction. Woodford Road is not of a suitable standard to accommodate this increased traffic (and the associated environmental impacts) and therefore the decision was made to not provide a junction on Woodford Road. Any land locked land as a result of the Poynton Bypass would be dealt with during the development of that scheme.	HC / JMcM

22-16	14. The design of the crossing for Poynton with Worth footpath 31 fails to adequately accommodate existing rights and thereby takes more land than is necessary as a result of its inadequate and inappropriate design.	All known private means of access and rights of way have been maintained or re-provided in locations that provide a suitable and reasonably convenient access. If this has not been possible then the objector may be compensated for the loss of their right, in accordance with the Compensation Code. The land parcel that this relates to has since been sold by the objector to the Highways Agency. They have not confirmed the requirements to retain any existing rights.	NH / HC
22-17	15. The Order wrongly seeks to acquire rights of drainage from the scheme to a pool to the south of the scheme [3/2L on Plan 3], when the drainage goes from that pool to the north. At the same time, whilst the scheme severs our drainage to the north, no provision is being made for any alternative drain.	Plot 3/2 on plan 3 is now in the ownership of the Highways Agency. The land owned by the HA will be acquired by agreement by the Council.	NH
22-18	16. The order incorrectly describes Clay Lane as a restricted byway [no 87 on Plan 8] when the first 100 metres (or thereabouts) of Clay Lane are in fact adopted. As such, we enjoy unrestricted rights of access along it to the southern leg of the double dumbbell roundabout on the B5358, in common with all others.	Under, Section 228 of the Highway Act 1980, a distance of 51metres from Wilmslow Rd to the access to Beaumont Court on Clay Lane was adopted as highway to be maintained at public expense. (Adoption certificate DVW46 dated 8 May 2009) The remainder of Clay Lane is designated as a restricted byway.Unrestricted access / rights to Wilmslow Rd will continue, as it will for all other residents /users on Clay Lane by way of the proposed link.	NH
22-19	17. In addition, our land fronts up to Clay Lane along that full length and we have absolute rights along it, granted in our title to Grange Farm. We also were given undertakings that Clay Lane would be kept open for our benefit, in accordance with the recommendations of the Inspector in respect of the central part of the scheme, [paragraph 22 (v) of his report of the 3rd	Clay Lane will remain open and will maintain a junction with Wilmslow Road.	NH

	December 1992 refers along with the Secretary of State's views expressed in paragraph 26 (b) (vi) thereof] and as a result, Clay Lane was kept open and remains open, to date.		
22-20	18. Contrary to those undertakings, Clay Lane is proposed to be closed, without providing us with a commensurate access into the scheme.	Clay Lane will remain open and will maintain a junction with Wilmslow Road.	NH
22-21	19. At the same time, the manner in which the slip roads and junction of Clay Lane and the access of adjoining occupiers is proposed to be accommodated is both inadequate within design terms and unsafe.	Sight lines will be safeguarded and signage introduced to the highway arrangement. Further safety audits will be carried out at the Detailed Design Stage and post completion to assess safety aspects of the road layouts.	NH
22-22	20. The currently proposed land take is therefore potentially insufficient for a safe and proper design but excessive for its current design since it takes more land than is necessary for the scheme, thereby severing our access.	The design is sufficient for the proposed road and junction and safety is one of the primary considerations. The safety of all users has been considered and impartially assessed via the Road Safety Audit process.	NH / HC
22-23	21. The land takes proposed at 4/10 on Plan 4 and 8/4L on Plan 8 fail to include all of our land, leaving areas severed, unusable and land locked.	Only the land required for the scheme can be included within the CPO. The Council will look to acquire any land that is severed, and has no alternative access, through agreement.	HC
22-24	22. At the same time, there is no provision made within the scheme (or Orders) for amended drainage from our land, at Clay Lane or elsewhere.	Uncharted land drains will be picked up and re-established as accommodation works, or will be tied into the proposed highway earthworks drainage if appropriate. However, this is not possible at this stage without knowledge of private land drainage.	HC
22-25	In summary therefore, we object to the granting of the Orders because the scheme as currently proposed is neither safe nor fit for purpose, not in line with guidance, takes more (or less) land than	See above responses.	

	necessary, has an unacceptable impact on the environment and specifically on the current and future use of our land.		
22-26	The Orders intend to acquire all interests in the Order Land, including all rights etc. otherwise than expressly stated [par 2.7 of the Statement of Reasons refers] but at the same time does not list or expressly state any. There is accordingly no provision for the protection of our current rights within the scheme.	See above responses.	

<p>23: David Hall Mill Hill Farm, Woodford Road, Poynton, Cheshire, SK12 1EG CPO Plots: 3/3 3/3A-3/3E Agent: John Seed Brown Rural Partnership, 29 Church Street, Macclesfield, Cheshire, SK11 6LB</p>			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
23-01	<p>By paragraph 1 the CPO will authorise the acquisition of "land" described in paragraph 2. Paragraph 2 describes the "land" only by reference to the "land" described in Schedule 1 shown coloured pink on the CPO plan. Neither Schedule 1 nor the map describe, in relation to the Plots, that only a temporary possession is required in part of those Plots. If the intention of the Acquiring Authorities is take all parts of the Plots permanently, but then give a written undertaking to return the parts after temporary use, then this is a misuse of powers for it shows that the Acquiring Authorities cannot show a compelling case to acquire permanently the parts of the Plots required only for temporary use. If, contrary to the above, the CPO does not contain powers to take part of the Plots identified above temporarily, then the land in question should not be acquired permanently.</p>	<p>The Acquiring Authority is unable to acquire land on a temporary basis via the CPO process. Once construction of the scheme is completed then the land not required on a permanent basis will be offered back to the original land owner in accordance with the Criche Down rules. The permanent land take includes land for the new road and its earthworks, essential ecological and social mitigation and landscape bunding. Only the land required for the scheme and its construction has been included within the CPO. The Council will demonstrate that all of this land is required to construct the road. The Council would prefer to reach an agreement with the objector but no agreement has yet been reached. Until such a time as an agreement is reached the land must be retained with the Order.</p>	HC
23-02	<p>No part of the Plots should be used for tipping of permanent spoil which will severely prejudice the future use of said lands for agricultural and development purposes.</p>	<p>Material may be deposited on land that is permanently acquired under the CPO. However, material will not be deposited on third party land without prior agreement from the landowner.</p>	HC

23-03	The extent of permanent land take to provide for bunding and environmental mitigation works is excessive, severely prejudicing the future use of said lands for agricultural and future development purposes.	Plot, 3.3B, has been included to enable a combination of mounding and woodland planting to be established with the objective of mitigating noise and visual impacts for property located along Woodford Road to the north.	PR
23-04	The Acquiring Authorities have failed to show any compelling case to take land for the purposes of pedestrian and cycle routes and bridleways. These routes are not required for, or critical to, the purpose of constructing the Relief Road and its cuttings and embankments. The land required for these routes should be deleted from Schedule 1 of the CPO.	The shared use cycleway/footways and bridleways are part of the main scheme objectives and aim to increase social benefit and safety in the area. The Council considers that there is a compelling case for them to be included within the scheme and CPO.	SS
23-05	The stopping up or removal of any private means of access is unacceptable and irrational where it is not replaced with an alternative and viable means of access.	All known private means of access and rights of way have been maintained or re-provided at reasonably convenient locations. Farm access is provided to retained land off the A6 and Mill Lane and an accommodation bridge (Bridge B003) is provided for the severed land between the relief road and Norbury Brook.	HC / NH

24: Bramhall Golf Club Limited Ladythorn Road, Bramhall, Stockport, SK7 2EYCPO Plots: 4/5 4/5A - 4/5I Agent: AG Bowcock Berrys, 1 Brunel Court, Rudheath Way, Gadbrook Park, Northwich, Cheshire, CW9 7LP			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
24-01	The golf club owns the land with a view to, at some point in the future, extending or rearranging the golf course. They have previously had planning consent (now lapsed) for use of the land in connection with the golf course. The scheme proposals will therefore limit the ability of the golf club to develop the course on an ongoing basis to accommodate members' requirements.	Should a person feel that the value of their land and property has decreased or that they have suffered other losses as a direct consequence of the road scheme, they are entitled to claim compensation under the statutory compensation code and each claim will be determined on its merits. An offer has been made for the acquisition of land by the council's agent which is currently under consideration by the land owner.	HC
24-02	The land is currently let for agricultural use to a local farmer and, in farming terms, provides a single level field which is attractive from an agricultural perspective. The proposal will sever the land leaving two parcels, north and south of the road with a proposed underpass adjacent to the rail line. My client believes this will render the land less appealing to the agricultural tenant. Tenant's ability to use large machinery on land will be severely hampered, grazing by livestock will not be feasible and management will be further complicated by the proposal for the land to be sloped down from the new road.	It is acknowledged the proposed scheme will sever the land to the south of the golf course, however an access track to this land has been provided. Insofar as is currently required by the tenant, returned land will be suitable for existing agricultural purposes, with an access road provided over West Coast Main Line (WCML) Bridge from Woodford Road to both parcels. The proposals for the grading of the embankment slopes provide for slopes which will not preclude the use of machinery of appropriate size or grazing of the areas by livestock.	NH

24-03	Concerns about screening of the road, noise and pollution.	<p>East of the bridge over the West Coast Mainline there will be 3m high roadside mounding which will screen cars and all but the top of high-sided vehicles from view from the golf course and housing on Woodford Road. 1:2.5 to 1:3 embankment slopes which would normally be adopted for the engineering purposes will be relaxed to a minimum of a 1:12 gradient to mitigate the potential severity and prominence of the earthworks. The upper part of the extended slopes will be planted with dense woodland which will complete the screening of high sided vehicles and mask the scale of the earthworks.</p> <p>The assessments undertaken relating to traffic-related noise have indicated there will be an increase in levels of some 8 dBA (decibels) in the vicinity of the golf course holes closest to the proposed scheme. Whilst this equates to a large increase the predicted levels with the proposed scheme in place are anticipated to be in the order of 50 dBA a level which is not out of context with the area to the west and south of Bramhall.</p> <p>The assessments undertaken relating to local air quality have indicated that an increase in levels of 7ugm³ for nitrogen dioxide and just above 1ugm³ for particulates (PM₁₀) are anticipated at the objector's property. The predicted concentrations with the proposed scheme in place are 35.4 and 16.1 ug₃ respectively. Both are within the stipulated national air quality standards which provide an indicator relative to human health. The Environmental Protection (UK) guidance would deem these changes as slight adverse and negligible respectively</p>	PR/ PC
-------	--	--	--------

24-04	Where the road crosses the West Coast Mainline this will be, so I understand it, approximately 8m above ground level. This will present a significant visual intrusion which will be clearly visible from certain holes on the golf course.	See response to 24-07 Should a person feel that the value of their land and property has decreased or that they have suffered other losses as a direct consequence of the road scheme, they are entitled to claim compensation under the statutory compensation code and each claim will be determined on its merits.	HC
24-05	There will undoubtedly be noise pollution from the road. The existing road (Woodford Road) is essentially a country lane which is buffered from the golf course by the agricultural land. The new road will be at a much higher level, will be a much busier road and will be much closer to the golf course.	See response to 24-03 See above.	HC
24-06	Recent wet winters and wet summers have compounded drainage in the area and the golf course has, over many years, spent considerable amounts of money dealing with drainage issues. My Client is seeking confirmation that all highways drainage will be picked up as part of the scheme and not allowed to discharge on their land and that any regarding of the agricultural land is adequately drained away from the golf course.	East to West drainage will be installed at locations and intervals agreed by the Environment Agency. There is no intention for highway (carriageway and earthworks) drainage to enter the golf course. Dependant on the final scale of acquisition at this plot, accommodation drainage may be required which will be designed with liaison with the golf club.	NH
24-07	My client is seeking confirmation that all highways drainage will be picked up as part of the scheme and not allowed to discharge onto their land and that any regarding of agricultural land is adequately drained away from the golf course.	See above.	

24-08	Regards to land take, our client thinks it would be appropriate for the council to acquire a larger area than that simply required for the road on the basis of ongoing management difficulties.	The nature of the CPO means that my client is unable to acquire more than the minimum requirement for their scheme. However in exceptional circumstances we are able to acquire additional land by agreement. This is something the Council would be happy to discuss further.	HC
-------	--	--	----

25: Mr DM Westbrook 203 Chester Road, Poynton, Stockport, Cheshire, SK12 1DS			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
25-01	<p>If my understanding is correct, in the Proposal, the Manchester Airport Relief Road will go under rather than have a junction with Woodford Road which runs between Chester Road and Jacksons Lane. With no junction between Relief Road and this Woodford Road, the volume of traffic coming down this Woodford Road towards Chester Road will not be reduced and therefore the Relief Road proposal does nothing to resolve accident black spot/traffic problems where this Woodford Road meets Chester Road.</p>	<p>A junction along Woodford Road was considered during the scheme development stage. The construction of the A6MARR provides a better alternative route to some of the traffic currently using Woodford Road. The omission of a junction along Woodford Road means that this traffic joins and leaves the A6MARR at the most appropriate junctions east and west of Woodford Road. Providing a junction along Woodford Road would attract additional traffic along Woodford Road seeking to access the A6MARR at the Woodford Road Junction. Woodford Road is not of a suitable standard to accommodate this increased traffic (and the associated environmental impacts) and therefore the decision was made to not provide a junction on Woodford Road.</p> <p>The proposed scheme will result in a significant reduction in traffic flows along Woodford Road without any noticeable change in traffic volume along Chester Road. This will mean that there is significantly reduced conflict at the existing junction and this should improve the safe operation of this junction. The introduction of a traffic signal controlled junction with the proposed Chester Road link will mean that traffic moves in platoons, creating gaps for vehicles at the Chester Road/ Woodford Road junction.</p>	NM

25-02	There is already decelerating and accelerating traffic noise and standing traffic air pollution at this junction	The proposed junction has been located and designed to facilitate and accommodate a future Poynton Relief Road that is a priority scheme for Cheshire East Council. The junction also provides a new access for the Bramhall Oil Terminal as the existing access is severed by the scheme. A junction that would involve a link from Chester Road at its current junction with Woodford Road would likely require property demolition. It would not enable the Poynton Relief Road to tie in with the A6MARR scheme and would require a second junction in the vicinity of the currently proposed junction. The assessments undertaken relating to local air quality have indicated that at properties in the vicinity of the proposed junction there will be a reduction in levels of $3\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ for nitrogen dioxide and just below $1\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ for particulates (PM_{10}). The predicted concentrations with the proposed scheme in place are 24.9 and $14.6\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ respectively. Both are within the stipulated national air quality standards which provide an indicator relative to human health.	NH / PR/PC
25-03	My proposal would be to make this junction a traffic light junction and run the access road to MARR from the junction rather than few hundred yards up the road towards Woodford	See response to 25-01	
25-04	There have been a number of serious accidents at this junction requiring attendance by emergency services. My proposal should reduce the number of accidents at the intersection of this Woodford Road and Chester Road which is surely an aim that the Relief Road Proposal should cover.	The proposed scheme will result in a significant reduction in traffic flows along Woodford Road without any noticeable change in traffic volume along Chester Road. This will mean that there is significantly reduced conflict at the existing junction and this should improve the safe operation of this junction.	NM

25-05	My proposal should also improve general flow of traffic, compared with Relief Road Proposal, by not introducing new junction few hundred yards up Chester Road towards Woodford.	The traffic modelling analysis has indicated satisfactory capacity at the proposed junction in line with the forecasted traffic flows. During the AM Peak period, the Chester Road eastern arm exhibits a maximum MMQ (Mean Maximum Queue) of 8.1 PCU's (46m) and a Degree of Saturation (DOS) of 64%, the western approach arm from Chester Road has a maximum MMQ of 5.4 PCU's (31m) and a DOS of 62.4%, the northern approach to the junction from the Oil Terminal Gyratory has a MMQ of 7.2 PCUs (41m) and a DOS of 64%. During the PM Peak period Chester Road eastern arm exhibits a maximum MMQ of 5.6 PCUs (32m) and a DOS of 53.1%, the western approach arm from Chester Road has a maximum MMQ of 8.5 PCUs (49m), the northern approach to the junction from the Oil Terminal Gyratory has a MMQ of 15.1 PCUs 87m. Analysis of these results during both the AM and PM peak periods indicates that the junction works well within capacity with no real queuing issues at any of the arms of the junction.	NM / NH
25-06	At busy times of day, under the Relief Road Proposal, it is easy to predict that the traffic will build up on Chester Road from the traffic lights with the access to the Relief Road, all the way back to the junction with the Woodford Road to which I am referring, making it very difficult to get out of Woodford Road on to Chester Road.	Our analysis of the Chester Road junction with the A6MARR Link shows that the MMQ on Chester Road Eastern arm is 8.1 PCUs (46m) during the AM Peak period and 5.6 PCUs (32m) during the PM Peak period, indicating that the levels of queuing at the junction will be easily accommodated without blocking back to the junction with Woodford Road.	NM

25-07	The Relief Road proposal introduces traffic lights onto part of Chester Road where the traffic has flowed satisfactorily for many years.	The junction layout is designed to ensure that the scheme does not attract additional traffic through Poynton which would be the case if a more direct access were to be provided from Chester Road to the A6MARR. Secondly, the junction design will enable the proposed Poynton Relief Road to connect with the A6MARR Link. When the Poynton Relief Road is built, it will remove a significant volume of traffic from Chester Road which will become a more lightly trafficked road than at present. The Poynton Relief Road to A6MARR route would then be the major route with Chester Road being the minor arm of the junction. It is predicted that the Poynton Relief Road will reduce the 2-Way traffic flows on Chester Road by about 35% during both the AM and PM peak periods. The proposed junction layout is therefore the most appropriate layout.	NM / NH
25-08	The geography of the Proposal should still give priority to traffic flowing down Chester Road, not the traffic leaving the Relief Road.	See response to 25-07-NM. However, following a meeting with the objector on 9th May 2014, the Council will consider the amendments to the junction that were proposed at the meeting to give priority to Chester Road traffic at the junction. On initial investigation this proposal would require the Acquiring Authority to purchase more private land and would affect the frontages of more residential properties on Chester Road therefore the Council deems that the objector's proposed design is not feasible	NH / NM

25-09	<p>Why introduce should the Relief Road introduce a traffic lighted right angle bend to Chester Road when what is required is road arrangement to slow traffic down leaving Relief Road and gets the traffic used to being on ordinary roads. That is to say any new traffic management should avoid introducing steep bends into Chester Road and retain its integrity as being a main road, even if it is to have traffic lights. My proposals should reduce noise and air pollution.</p>	<p>The proposed arrangement moves the junction away from the houses on Chester Road. The assessments undertaken relating to traffic-related noise have indicated that a decrease in levels of some 3.0 dBA (decibels) is anticipated at your property in the vicinity of the proposed junction. The assessments undertaken relating to local air quality have indicated that at properties in the vicinity of the proposed junction there will be a reduction in levels of approximately 3ugm³ for nitrogen dioxide and 1ugm³ for particulates (PM₁₀). The predicted concentrations with the proposed scheme in place are 24.9 and 14.6 ug^m³ respectively. Both are within the stipulated national air quality standards which provide an indicator relative to human health.</p>	NH / PR / PC
25-10	<p>Certain times of day there are long queues of traffic waiting to come out of Woodford Rd onto Chester Road. This would be the same if the Relief Road Proposal goes ahead as proposed with addition of more stationary traffic a few hundred yards up the road, leading to increased amounts of air and noise pollution.</p>	<p>There will be a significant reduction in traffic volumes along Woodford Road with the completion of the A6MARR.</p> <p>The new traffic signal controlled junction of Chester Road with the A6MARR Link will provide regular breaks in eastbound traffic flow that would enable better opportunities for traffic emerging from Woodford Road to turn onto Chester Road. Traffic modelling shows that delays reduce by over 350 seconds during the AM peak and by almost 100 seconds during the PM peak period for traffic turning out of Woodford Road.</p>	NM / PR / PC
25-11	<p>At same time, my proposal could lead to less overall environmental impact on farmers' fields.</p>	<p>Proposal is not feasible as discussed above.</p>	
25-12	<p>Cheshire East have gone to considerable lengths to remove traffic lights in the centre of Poynton village, but work in this Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council scheme introduces new traffic lights, not far up the road from the centre of Poynton village. This could have been alleviated if scheme stuck to original plan</p>	<p>Design development has determined the most appropriate design for the junction.</p>	NM / JMCM

	on the drawing board 20 years ago, when access to the Relief Road at this point was via a roundabout.		
25-13	Should be noted that my proposal will not increase overall number of traffic lighted junctions in the Relief Road Proposal.	Proposal is not feasible as discussed above.	
25-14	If the Relief Road proposals go ahead as currently planned there appears to be considerable landscaping for noise bunding on access road from Chester Road to the Manchester Airport Relief Road. When the Adlington to Manchester Airport Relief Road scheme goes ahead it appears to go through bunding meaning a significant sum of money is being wasted on nugatory work.	In 2003-2004 we consulted on the 'SEMMMS road schemes' which linked the M60 in north Stockport with Manchester Airport, via Hazel Grove and Poynton, and included the Poynton Relief Road. The current A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road scheme is the first phase of the wider SEMMMS Relief Roads Scheme. Stockport and Cheshire East remain committed to delivery of the whole scheme subject to further funding being identified. The proposed A6MARR/ Chester Road junction has been designed in liaison with Cheshire East Council to accommodate any future tie-in with the Poynton Relief Road.	JMcM
25-15	It appears that there is a lack of co-ordination between the two parties [SMBC and CEC] and it strikes me that to make sure that proper discussion takes place between the two parties, Manchester Airport Relief Road should not go ahead independent of the go ahead of the Adlington to Manchester Airport Relief Road scheme	In 2003-2004 we consulted on the 'SEMMMS road schemes' which linked the M60 in north Stockport with Manchester Airport, via Hazel Grove and Poynton, and included the Poynton Relief Road. The current A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road scheme is the first phase of the wider SEMMMS Relief Roads Scheme. Stockport and Cheshire East remain committed to delivery of the whole scheme subject to further funding being identified. The proposed A6MARR/ Chester Road junction has been designed in liaison with Cheshire East Council to accommodate any future tie-in with the Poynton Relief Road.	JMcM

25-16	<p>Attended meetings and written to both Councils but there has not been response to my points. No attempt has been made to canvass the Public's views on the Relief Road proposals other than to vote on one of 2 options that have been presented for each Relief Road junction. That is to say, there has been no opportunity to build the public concerns into the proposals, such as the accident rates at the junction of Chester Road with Woodford Road.</p>	<p>As part of the Phase 1 consultation on the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road we asked the question there was a specific question that allowed respondents to indicate their preference or otherwise for the scheme: "What is your overall opinion on the proposed A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road?". The Phase 1 consultation demonstrated that 69% of respondents were either in favour or strongly in favour of the scheme. A second phase of consultation was undertaken on the emerging preferred scheme, during which respondents had the opportunity to comment on how the scheme addresses environmental impacts of the scheme including noise, visual, landscaping and ecology impacts. Respondents were also asked how they considered that merging preferred scheme addressed the needs of pedestrians and cyclists, accommodates Public Rights of Way and addresses changes to traffic flows in the local area through complementary and mitigation measures. The Council is aware of the road safety concerns raised during the Phase 1 and 2 consultations on the scheme and responded to these as part of the consultation process. Traffic flows on Chester Road are forecast to reduce as a result of the A6MARR therefore there are no proposals to introduce mitigation measures as part of the scheme. However, The local highway, Cheshire East Council, has been made aware of existing safety concerns on Chester Road.</p>	JMCM
25-17	<p>Access to my property is listed as being affected by the Relief Road proposals but the proposers have not been able to tell me how access to my property will be attained, if proposals go ahead.</p>	<p>The design would ensure that the existing two vehicular accesses are maintained. Vehicular access will be maintained throughout construction and once the road is completed. There may be short periods of time where access is restricted, but those parties affected will be liaised with to mitigate the impact. At the meeting noted above, the Council promised that further details of access would be provided in the form of larger scale plans.</p>	NH

26: Marcus John Quiligotti, Simon Angelo Quiligotti, Bruno Ricardo Quiligotti and Lisa Gabriela Ward
 Bruno Quiligotti & Lisa Ward's address:
 1a Brookside Avenue, Poynton, Stockport, SK12 1PN
 CPO Plots: 4/3 4/3A-4/3G 5/8 5/8A-5/8F
 Agent: John Seed Brown Rural Partnership, 29 Church Street, Macclesfield, Cheshire, SK11 6LB

Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
26-01	<p>No part of road, cutting or embankment is intended to be placed on 2 substantial plots shown edged/ coloured green on the attached plans.</p> <p>Accordingly such parts are not so required for the purpose of the construction of a highway should be deleted from Schedule 1 to the CPO.</p>	<p>Following discussion and negotiation with the objector these areas of land have been redesigned in order to retain the land at its current ground levels. The land will still be required for the purposes of working area i.e. for temporary material storage and for the central contractor compound. The Acquiring Authority is unable to acquire land on a temporary basis via the CPO process. Once construction of the scheme is completed then the land not required on a permanent basis will be offered back to the original land owner in accordance with the Criche Down rules.</p>	NH

26-02	<p>The Acquiring Authorities have failed to show any compelling case to take land for purposes that are not for the purpose of constructing thereon a highway, namely a road, and its cuttings and embankments. No provisions of the CPO authorise the taking of any land for temporary purposes and accordingly such parts of the Plots as are not required for permanent compulsory acquisition should be deleted from Schedule 1 to the CPO. The Objectors believe that the Acquiring Authorities' proposed taking the two parts of the Plots identified on the attached plans for temporary purposes only and contend that there is no power under the CPO to do so. By paragraph 1 the CPO will authorise the acquisition of "land" described in paragraph 2. Paragraph 2 describes the "land" only by reference to the "land" described in Schedule 1 shown coloured pink on the CPO plan. Neither Schedule 1 nor the map describe, in relation to the Plots, that only a temporary possession is required in part of those Plots. If the intention of the Acquiring Authorities is take all parts of the Plots permanently, but then give a written undertaking to return the parts after spoil tipping, then this is a misuse of powers for it shows that the Acquiring Authorities cannot show a compelling case to acquire permanently the parts of the Plots required only for spoil tipping only.</p>	<p>See above response. The permanent land take includes land for the new road and its earthworks, essential ecological and social mitigation and landscape bunding. Only the land required for the scheme and its construction has been included within the CPO. The Council will demonstrate that all of this land is required to construct the road.</p>	HC / NH
-------	---	--	---------

26-03	If, which is not accepted, the CPO contains powers to take parts of the Plots temporarily for the purpose of the deposit of surplus spoil from the carrying out of the road works then the Acquiring Authorities will not have power to permanently change by such deposit and profiling any land which is taken temporarily.	Material will only be deposited on land that is to be acquired permanently.	HC
26-04	If, contrary to the above, the CPO does contain powers to take two parts of the Plots identified above temporarily, then using the same for permanent tipping of spoil is inconsistent with the use of a temporary power of possession.	Plots will be acquired permanently as they are required for the construction on the road and its cuttings.	HC
26-05	No part of the Plots should be used for tipping of permanent spoil which will severely prejudice the future use of said lands for agricultural and development purposes (representations have been made to Stockport MBC Allocations DPD in this connection in March 2012 and December 2013).	Scheme has been redesigned to omit the earthworks bunds that are not required for mitigation purposes on the land. Only mitigation earthworks will remain. Any spoil will only be deposited on land that is permanently acquired. Should a person feel that the value of their land and property has decreased or that they have suffered other losses as a direct consequence of the road scheme, they are entitled to claim compensation under the statutory compensation code and each claim will be determined on its merits.	NH / HC

26-06	The extent of permanent land take to provide for bunding and environmental mitigation works and new foot/ cycle/ equestrian routes is excessive, compromising the future uses of the land.	Five of 15 plots forming part of Mr Quiligotti's land which have been included in the CPO for environmental mitigation purposes - plots 4.3A, 5.8, 5.8C, 5.8D and 5.8F. They have been included to enable a combination of mounding and scrub planting with intermittent trees to be established with the objective of enclosing the extended junction between Bramhall and the west of Poynton, providing noise mitigation where Meadway and Albany Road are located to the north of the proposed junction and screening traffic associated with the dual carriageway from houses in Bramhall and the western part of Poynton.	PR / PC
26-07	The Acquiring Authorities have failed to show any compelling case to take land for the purposes of pedestrian and cycle routes and bridleways. These routes are not required for, or critical to, the purpose of constructing the Relief Road and its cuttings and embankments. The land required for these routes should be deleted from Schedule 1 of the CPO.	The shared use cycleway/footways and bridleways are part of the main scheme objectives and aim to increase social benefit and safety in the area. The Council considers that there is a compelling case for them to be included within the scheme and CPO.	SS

26-08	The stopping up or removal of any private means of access is unacceptable and irrational where it is not replaced with an alternative and viable means of access.	All known private means of access and rights of way have been maintained or re-provided in locations that provide a suitable and reasonably convenient access. If this has not been possible then the objector may be compensated for the loss of their right, in accordance with the Compensation Code and each claim will be determined on its merits.	HC
-------	---	--	----

<p>27: Mr PR Holmes, Moorend Farm, Woodford, Plot 39, Moorend Farm, Plot 38 Woodford Road, Mrs BE Holmes, Moorend Farm, Woodford, Stockport, SK7 1QE CPO Plots: 5/7 5/7A - 5/7G 5/7I - 5/7M Agent: Simon Cook Roger Hannah and Co, Century Buildings, 14 St Mary's Parsonage, Manchester, M3 2DF</p>			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
27-01	Statement of Reasons continually refers to congestion which is currently experienced within the SEMMMS area. The Statement of Reason states in Section 3: Need for Relief Road that "there is no direct east –west transport link through South East Greater Manchester and East Cheshire" which is contributing "to congestion on a number of major and minor roads" resulting in an "overwhelming case to reduce congestion" .	The transport assessment provides details of the congestion experienced in the area and the anticipate scheme benefits.	NM / JMCM

27-02	<p>It is stated in paragraph 19.1 that a "robust , detailed and extensive modelling of the scheme" has been undertaken which "has identified a reduction in the level of traffic in most areas." No further information is provided to quantify this traffic reduction. As reducing congestion is one of the key justifications of the scheme, this is a critical point. We request further information as to the areas which will not benefit from traffic reduction as a result of scheme and confirmation that these areas will not be adversely affected. It is also noted in paragraph 21.8 that in some instances "driver stress would increase along certain sections of the strategic network due to high traffic flow and reduced speed resulting in delays." This increase in traffic conflicts with one of the overarching objectives of the scheme to "reduce congestion" (Paragraph 4). Paragraph 21.8 also states that local traffic in some area would experience an increase of driver stress. Our clients are greatly concerned that this could lead to an increase in road traffic accidents. Information is request to demonstrate the Council have given this due consideration including measures which will be put in place to prevent accidents.</p>	<p>The scheme has been through a rigorous optioneering process which has confirmed that the overall result will lead to a net reduction in congestion. Information relating to changes in traffic flows is presented 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. Our assessment of road safety indicates that over the 60 year scheme appraisal period, building the A6MARR will lead to a reduction of over 1,000 personal injury accidents. The Stage 1 Road Safety Audit undertaken for the scheme was submitted within the Transport Assessment as part of the planning application.</p>	NM
-------	---	---	----

27-03	In Section 4: Relief Road Objectives of the Statement of Reasons it is stated that an objective of the relief road is to "increase employment and generate economic growth" through improved connectivity from and between Manchester Airport, local, town and district centre, and key areas of development and regeneration (e.g. Manchester Airport Enterprise Zone).	The role of the A6MARR is to provide the improved connectivity that will in turn facilitate economic growth by reducing travel costs and journey times as well as making the journeys more reliable through reduced traffic congestion. This opens up access to employment opportunities over a wider area than is the case with a constrained transport network. It is not an objective of the scheme to change the way Enterprise Zones operate or perform.	JMCM / AH
27-04	Concern relates to widespread criticisms which Enterprise Zones have attracted including being "ineffective at stimulating sustainable economic growth in depressed areas." (Work Foundation, February 2011). One of the Key weaknesses of Enterprise Zones is that they do "very little to promote lasting economic prosperity" (Work Foundation, February 2011).	The Airport City was approved as an Enterprise Zone by central government. It is not appropriate for us to comment on this. Information about Enterprise Zones can be found on HM government's website http://enterprisezones.communities.gov.uk/ . Greater Manchester and Cheshire and Warrington Local Enterprise Partnerships have produced growth plans in 2013 which provide further details of their economic strategies.	JMCM
27-05	One of the key issues relating to the successful long term economic growth of the area is the challenge of both attracting and retaining new businesses. Enterprise Zones can stimulate rapid short term investment but there is evidence to suggest this is followed by "a long term reversal back into depression" (The Work Foundation, February 2011)	See above response.	JMCM

	Request further information from the authority demonstrating how they intend to ensure economic growth of wider area with due consideration been given to the general criticisms which enterprise zones have attracted.	See above response.	JMcM
27-06	We would request further information from the Local Authority demonstrating how they intend to ensure the economic growth of the wider area , with due consideration to the general criticisms which Enterprise Zones in particular have attracted. The Local Authority should also demonstrate what else they intend to do to both attract and, of critical importance, retain new business within this area.	See above response.	JMcM
27-07	The Relief Road also has the objective to “promote fairness through job creation and the regeneration of local communities” by “ reducing severance and improving accessibility to, from and between key centres of economic and social activity" (paragraph 4).	See above response.	JMcM

27-08	<p>With regards to Enterprise Zones specifically, I has been criticised in that most jobs they create are displaced from other areas – "evidence from previous Enterprise Zones suggest that up to 80% of the jobs they create are taken from other places" *(The Work Foundation, February 2011).</p>	<p>There is some evidence to suggest that the earlier round of EZs led to displacement of jobs. However, the Govt. prospectus on EZs suggest: Minimising displacement. Competition is healthy. Competition for business between cities and other centres of growth should lead to an improved environment for business across the country. Competition to attract foreign inward investment will be most highly valued of all. We are however keen to avoid much more localised competition, resulting in local displacement to little benefit for the areas overall. Local enterprise partnerships will have a vital role in targeting the business growth that is genuinely additional in the area, including by identifying the priority sectors to be targeted.</p>	JMCM / NM
27-09	<p>In order to successfully regenerate the area as a whole it is of paramount importance that the Local Authority take steps to ensure this does not happen. It is important that the Local Authority also have measures in place to ensure that jobs created are not simply absorbed by non-locals.</p>	<p>The three promoting authorities are actively engaged in the Local Growth Plans.</p>	JMCM

27-10	<p>It is noted that "the Environmental Impact (EIA) has demonstrated that there would be an increase in traffic related noise at the majority of sensitive receptors" (Paragraph 22.1). Paragraph 22.2 states that there are 55 residential properties that would potentially need insulation in accordance with the Noise insulation Regulations 1975. Further information is requested regarding these properties that will be affected by an increase in traffic related noise and confirmation that there is a scheme in place to provide any insulation required.</p>	<p>The figures provide relating to properties which may qualify for measures under the Noise Insulation Regulations are indicative only. They do not form part of the formal assessment.</p> <p>Qualification under the regulations is a matter which is considered once a major road scheme has been constructed and is based on measured levels once the scheme has been operational for up to 12months. To qualify for assistance the property must be a dwelling or other buildings used for residential purposes which will be not more than 300 metres from the nearest point on the carriageway of the highway after the construction of the highway . The relevant noise level must also be greater by at least 1dB(A) than the prevailing noise level and not less than 65 dB(A) . The noise caused by traffic using the highway must also make an effective contribution to the relevant noise level of at least 1dB(A). Taking into account the 300m criteria referred to above some 22 properties may qualify. The location of these is indicated on Figures 24 and 25 contained within Appendix B of Proof of Evidence – Volume 4.1.</p>	PR / PC
27-11	<p>Paragraph 3.2 of the Statement of Reasons states that the lack of direct East-West transport link through South East Greater Manchester and East Cheshire is contributing to congestion on a number of major and minor roads which in turn affects air quality. Despite the aim of the relief road to decrease these emissions paragraph 23.2 states that an assessment has demonstrated that the relief road is expected to result in a small increase in regional emissions. In fact paragraph 23.3 states that "overall the relief road impact on air quality is significant".</p>	<p>It is anticipated the proposed scheme will result in a small increase in regional emissions. It is, however, local air quality which is of importance in the context of congestion. It is acknowledged that paragraph 23.3 of the Statement of Reasons states there will be a significant impact on overall air quality. It is important to note, however, that the impact is noted as being significantly beneficial. The Environmental Statement for the scheme provides further details.</p>	PR / JMcM/ PC

27-12	The decrease in air quality across certain area is a concern as it will be damaging to the local environment and residents in these areas. Please provide details of which sensitive receptors will experience "significant adverse air quality impacts" (Paragraph 23.3).	See above responses..	
27-13	"The Relief Road corridor comprises open space and broader countryside. The land use pattern is mainly agricultural land with recreational and sports areas, institutional grounds, residential and industrial and commercial land uses" (Paragraph 20.5). It is a concern that the Relief Road will have a great impact upon Open Space within the area.	The proposed development would generally integrate into the receiving landscape. However the EIA acknowledges that there would be significant local impacts to landscape character in the long term. These would occur north of Norbury Brook, Ladybrook Valley, Woodford oil terminal and the crossing of the WCML. Other impacts of a lesser magnitude would occur at the western end of the proposed development. The Environmental Statement for the scheme provides further details.	JMCM / PR
27-14	This decrease in countryside and increase of emissions will be damaging to the local environment. It is also a concern that the Relief Road affects a number of recreational grounds, such as Moorend Golf Course, Styal Golf Course and Woodford Recreation Ground. Our client feel that it is not in the public's interest to decrease the amount of open space and recreational amenities within the area.	The ES has demonstrated that implementation of the proposed scheme is expected to result in a small increase in regional emissions associated with increased vehicular use of the road network but significantly beneficial relative to local air quality . New areas of open space have been provided in exchange for land taken by the proposed scheme at Styal Golf Course and a revised layout has been agreed with the golf club. A Section 19 legal process has commenced for the purpose of securing replacement open space for land taken at Woodford Recreation Ground.	PR / JMCM/ PC
27-15	Our client considers that an excessive land take has been proposed by the local authority over and above their requirement for the scheme. If the Compulsory Purchase Order is confirmed request that land take is altered to remove land to the north and south of the road line. By amending the land take my client has a better prospect of presenting the golf	The land take has been extensively reviewed and is the minimum amount considered necessary to build the road.	HC

	course albeit a significantly reduced course.		
27-16	The Statement of Reasons summarised breakdown of costs and funding for the relief road in 24.1 is outdated. The cost analysis that has been undertaken is based on Q2 2010 prices which are nearly 4 years out of date. They also exclude allowances for inflation and risk. This is a concern as newer research has not been undertaken to quantify cost taking into account present day pricing. Further details are required to provide comfort that the Local Authority has factored in present day pricing and has sufficient funding in place for this scheme to be authorised.	Budget allocations for the scheme are regularly reviewed and monitored. Budget allocations include allowances for risk, inflation and optimism bias.	JMcM
27-17	As referred to in Paragraph 28.22, the ODPM 06/2004 advises that a Compulsory Purchase Order should only be made where compelling case in the Public Interest to do so.	The Council considers that it can make a compelling case for the acquisition of the land for the construction of the road.	HC
27-18	We would question whether it is actually in the public's interest for this scheme to be authorised.	The promoting authorities believe there is a compelling case for the scheme it supports the SEMMM Strategy and local growth plan aspirations and it is included in the National Infrastructure Plan as a priority for delivery.	JMcM / AH

27-19	We would also argue that approaches to date (30/1/14) have been insufficient to justify the makings of the Compulsory Purchase Order. The use of Compulsory Purchase Order powers in all cases should be position of last resort. This has not been demonstrated in respect to our client's interest.	The Council considers that it can make a compelling case for the acquisition of the land for the construction of the road.	HC
-------	---	--	----

28: TSB Business Banking, Louise Allan 1st Floor, Excel House, 30 Semple Street, Edinburgh, EH3 8BL CPO Plots: 5/7 5/7A - 5/7G 5/7I - 5/7M			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
28-01	TSB hold a registered charge over this property. We are aware a letter was sent to Lloyds Bank initially on 10th December 2013 and therefore there was some delays in the Order reaching TSB. Therefore, due to the lack of time TSB have had to assess the documentation, we would wish to register an objection against this Order. Would you at all be able to advise on the impact that the new relief road will have on this property / land?	Land is required for the purpose of construction of the relief road and associated environmental mitigation and drainage ponds. Further information with respect of this objection is being provided to the objector.	HC

<p>29: Mr and Mrs Simumba 17 Melford Grove, Oldham, Lancs, OL4 3HH CPO Plots: 5/18 5/18A 5/23 5/23A Agent: Peter Cunliffe Chartered Surveyor, 5 Green Lane, Sale, Manchester, M33 5PN</p>			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
29-01	<p>The scheme is not needed as the existing roads are adequate for the purpose and the proposed road would cause traffic blockage at the A6 and Woodford Road.</p>	<p>The new road will bring congestion relief to the surrounding road infrastructure, which is currently heavily burdened. Significant traffic studies have been conducted and there will not be any notable negative impact at the junction that the objector mentions as a result of the scheme. The Council will demonstrate that the scheme is needed for the area.</p> <p>There has been a long-standing recognition of the need for the scheme.</p> <p>The SEMMMS study was commissioned in 1999 because the following three road schemes were removed from the trunk roads programme along with the de-trunking of the A6 and the A523:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The A6(M) Stockport North South Bypass; • The A555 Manchester Airport Link Road West (MAELR West); and • The A555/A523 Poynton Bypass <p>The SEMMMS Study recommended the construction of all three roads schemes but to a reduced standard than had been originally proposed by the Highways Agency.</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</p>	JMCM / NM

		<p>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.</p> <p>The new road will lead to an increase in traffic along the A6 to the east of the scheme and the new junction with the A6MARR is designed to cater for this traffic. The scheme will result in a significant reduction in traffic along the A6 to the west and north of the scheme. Similarly, the scheme will lead to traffic flow reductions along Woodford Road. It is not therefore correct to say that the scheme will cause traffic blockage along these roads.</p>	
29-02	If the scheme is needed, then the previous site for the scheme, which avoided taking these two plots was perfectly adequate and the former plans should be reverted to.	The design has been selected after considering all options available and the chosen alignment is the optimum design, minimising land take and impact on the surroundings.	JMcM

29-03	<p>This proposed road, being so close to the houses on Albany Road, will create an unacceptable degrees of noise, vibration, artificial light, smell, smoke and fumes and discharge onto their sites of solids and fluids and for this reason alone the scheme should be moved further from this residential area.</p>	<p>The route has been carefully designed in this location in minimise the impact on all properties. In addition, there is significant environmental and social (noise/light) mitigation proposed to minimise the impact of the scheme on its surroundings. The assessments undertaken relating to traffic-related noise have indicated there will be an increase in levels taking into account proposed mitigation. The assessments undertaken relating to local air quality have indicated there will be an increase in levels of NO₂ and PM₁₀ in the vicinity of Albany Road although both are within the stipulated national air quality standards which provide an indicator relative to human health. It is recognised that there will be no risk relative to vibration where a road scheme has been constructed to required modern standards. This will be the case with the proposed scheme. There will be no discharge of solids or fluids onto property in the vicinity of the proposed scheme. The relief road in this vicinity will be lit on both sides of the carriageway.</p>	PR/PC
-------	--	---	-------

30: Lisa Michelle Lawson
 The Shippon, 177 Woodford Road, Woodford, Stockport. SK7 1QE
 CPO Plots: 5/11 5/11A
 Agent:
 John Seed
 Brown Rural Partnership, 29 Church Street, Macclesfield, Cheshire, SK11 6LB

Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
30-01	<p>No part of road, cutting or embankment is intended to be placed on 2 substantial plots shown edged/ coloured green on the attached plans.</p> <p>Accordingly such parts are not so required for the purpose of the construction of a highway should be deleted from Schedule 1 to the CPO. The Acquiring Authorities have failed to show any compelling case to take land for purposes that are not for the purpose of constructing thereon a highway, namely a road, and its cuttings and embankments.</p>	<p>The areas which the objector refers to are required for the road and its cuttings.</p>	NH
30-02	<p>No provisions of the CPO authorise the taking of any land for temporary purposes and accordingly such parts of the Plots as are not required for permanent compulsory acquisition should be deleted from Schedule 1 to the CPO. The Objectors believe that the Acquiring Authorities' proposed taking the two parts of the Plots identified on the attached plans for temporary purposes only and contend that there is no power under the CPO to do so.</p>	<p>The Acquiring Authority is unable to acquire land on a temporary basis via the CPO process. Once construction of the scheme is completed then the land not required on a permanent basis will be offered back to the original land owner in accordance with the Crichel Down rules. Only the land required for the scheme and its construction has been included within the CPO. The Council would prefer to reach an agreement with the objector but no agreement has yet been reached. Until such a time as an agreement is reached the land must be retained with the Order.</p>	HC

30-03	<p>By paragraph 1 the CPO will authorise the acquisition of "land" described in paragraph 2. Paragraph 2 describes the "land" only by reference to the "land" described in Schedule 1 shown coloured pink on the CPO plan. Neither Schedule 1 nor the map describe, in relation to the Plots, that only a temporary possession is required in part of those Plots. If the intention of the Acquiring Authorities is take all parts of the Plots permanently, but then give a written undertaking to return the parts after spoil tipping, then this is a misuse of powers for it shows that the Acquiring Authorities cannot show a compelling case to acquire permanently the parts of the Plots required only for temporary use. If, contrary to the above, the CPO does contain powers to take part of the Plots identified above temporarily, then the land in question should not be acquired permanently.</p>	<p>The Acquiring Authority is unable to acquire land on a temporary basis via the CPO process. Once construction of the scheme is completed then the land not required on a permanent basis will be offered back to the original land owner in accordance with the Criche Down rules. The permanent land take includes land for the new road and its earthworks, essential ecological and social mitigation and landscape bunding. Only the land required for the scheme and its construction has been included within the CPO. The Council will demonstrate that all of this land is required to construct the road. Material will only be deposited on land that is to be acquired permanently.</p>	HC
30-04	<p>No part of the Plots should be used for tipping of permanent spoil which will severely prejudice the future use of the said lands for equestrian, agricultural and development purposes.</p>	<p>Material will only be deposited on land that is to be acquired permanently.</p>	HC

30-05	<p>The extent of permanent land take to provide for bunding and environmental mitigation works and new foot/ cycle/ equestrian routes is excessive, severely prejudicing the future uses of the land. The land area available to service the existing equestrian unit on the property is already at a minimum and according any reduction in the land area through land take will have critical consequences in terms of the number of horses the property will service. In turn the consequences of the land take area for the value of the property as a whole, in a competitive equestrian property market will also be an issue which cannot be resolved through compensation only for the land to be taken.</p>	<p>The scheme design incorporates the requirements for environmental mitigation as well as screening the road from built up areas. This forms part of the road scheme and therefore this land is required as part of the CPO. The scheme has been designed to minimise land take, but there are certain environmental and social conditions that have needed to be met. The proposed roadside mounding will have the effect of reducing traffic related noise. In addition, low noise surfacing is proposed along the new section of dual carriageway. The assessment of traffic-related noise has also identified a number of locations where it has been concluded additional mitigation to that which will be provided by the mounding should be included and locations where mounding is not proposed but noise mitigation is to be provided. In these locations the proposals provide for the noise barriers. Should a person feel that the value of their land and property has decreased or that they have suffered other losses as a direct consequence of the road scheme, they are entitled to claim compensation under the statutory compensation code and each claim will be determined on its merits.</p>	HC
30-06	<p>The Acquiring Authorities have failed to show any compelling case to take land for the purposes of pedestrian and cycle routes and bridleways. These routes are not required for, or critical to, the purpose of constructing the Relief Road and its cuttings and embankments. The land required for these routes should be deleted from Schedule 1 of the CPO.</p>	<p>The shared use cycleway/footways and bridleways are part of the main scheme objectives and aim to increase social benefit and safety in the area. The Council considers that there is a compelling case for them to be included within the scheme and CPO.</p>	SS
30-07	<p>The stopping up or removal of any private means of access is unacceptable and irrational where it is not replaced with an alternative and viable means of access.</p>	<p>All known private means of access and rights of way have been maintained or re-provided in locations that provide a suitable and reasonably convenient access. If this has not been possible then the objector may be compensated for the loss of their right, in accordance with the Compensation Code</p>	HC

		and each claim will be determined on its merits.	
--	--	--	--

31: Adrian and Margaret Romagnoli 73 Albany Road, Bramhall, Stockport, SK7 1NE			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
31-01	Pollution especially effecting the children at our local school on Albany Road	The assessments undertaken relating to local air quality and Queensgate School have indicated that there will be an increases in levels between 3.5 $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ for nitrogen dioxide (NO_2) close to the school buildings and 9.5 $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ at the boundary nearest to the proposed scheme. In relation to particulates (PM_{10}) they have indicated increases of 1.5 $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ and 1.8 $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ in these two locations. The predicted concentrations with the proposed scheme in place for the two locations are 24.8 and 31.3 $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ for NO_2 and 14.8 and 15.9 $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ for PM_{10} . All of the results are well within the stipulated national air quality standards which provide an indicator relative to human health. The Environmental Protection (UK) guidance would deem these changes as negligible at the school and slight adverse at the site boundary.	PR / PC
31-02	Noise	There will be an increase in traffic-related noise at the objector's property as a result of the alignment of the proposed dual carriageway and proposed junction with Chester Road to the south. There a number of factors which will serve to reduce the potential increase in levels. The dual carriageway will be in deep cutting where it passes south of the objector's property. Two forms of mitigation have also been proposed in light of the potential for high levels of increase. Low noise surfacing is to be used on the new carriageways and an environmental barrier will be introduced at the top of the cutting slopes to further reduce levels. Notwithstanding the location in cutting and the measures proposed, the assessments have indicated an anticipated increase in noise levels in the order of 6 dBA (decibels) at the property. The predicted long-term noise level is in the order of 56 dBA (decibels).	PR / PC

31-03	Congestion of Bramhall Village and surrounding areas.	<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.</p> <p>It can be seen from this figure that the A6MARR is forecast to lead to a reduction in traffic through Bramhall. It shows traffic flow reductions along Bramhall Lane South, Bridge Lane and Ack Lane East, the three key routes through the village.</p> <p>It is not correct to say that the relief road will lead to congestion in Bramhall as it will actually reduce traffic volumes through the area.</p>	NM
31-04	Loss of green belt effecting wild life.	<p>It is the case that parts of the proposed scheme will be located in green belt. The planning authorities have taken this relationship into account when granting planning permission and have clearly concluded the form of development proposed is acceptable in the context of the green belt designation when taking into account the benefits of the proposed scheme. With regard to wildlife, the assessments undertaken and reported in the Environmental Statement for the proposed scheme denitrified predicted impacts and committed to relevant mitigation measures which have been taken into account by the planning authorities prior to their approval of the applications.</p>	AH / PR

31-05	Our health due to dust and pollution.	<p>The ES for the proposed scheme identifies a range of mitigation measures focused on the control of dust during construction. They are measures which are routinely adopted for the construction of major road schemes and which recognise the nature of the principal activities associated with the generation of dust. The planning consents for the project include conditions requiring the implementation of the commitments made in the ES. It will be a requirement of the contracts for the construction of the proposed scheme that the measures are formalised in a project specific Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).</p> <p>Dust will not be an issue once the proposed scheme is in operation. The assessments undertaken relating to local air quality have indicated that an increase in levels of 4.5ugm³ for nitrogen dioxide and just under 1ugm³ for particulates (PM₁₀) are anticipated at the objector's property. The predicted concentrations with the proposed scheme in place are 23.8 and 14.7 ug m³ respectively. Both are within the stipulated national air quality standards which provide an indicator relative to human health. The Environmental Protection (UK) guidance would deem these changes as negligible.</p>	PR / PC
31-06	Valuation of all properties in the immediate area will decrease significantly.	Information about compensation is available on the SEMMMS website and has been provided at exhibitions and local liaison forums.	HC

<p>32: Mr and Mrs Freedman 86 Albany Road, Bramhall, Stockport, SK7 1NE CPO Plots: 5/24 5/24A 5/24B Agent: John Seed Brown Rural Partnership, 29 Church Street, Macclesfield, Cheshire, SK11 6LB</p>			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
32-01	The ownership of the Plots is incorrectly described in the CPO; the land is owned by the Mr and Mrs Freedman, and not Fairhold (Briardene) Ltd. Accordingly the CPO is defective.	The Land Referencing exercise was undertaken and was based on the information returned from the Land Registry at the time. Should to ownerships prove to be incorrect then notice will be served on the correct party once more clarity is gained. The council has investigated this issue and can confirm that Mr and Mrs Freedman own a long leasehold interest. The freehold is owned by Fairhold (Briardene) Ltd.	HC
32-02	No part of road, cutting or embankment is intended to be placed on 2 substantial plots shown edged/ coloured green on the attached plans. Accordingly such parts are not so required for the purpose of the construction of a highway should be deleted from Schedule 1 to the CPO. The Acquiring Authorities have failed to show any compelling case to take land for purposes that are not for the purpose of constructing thereon a highway, namely a road, and its cuttings and embankments.	The areas which the objectors refer to are required for the cycleway link between the relief road and Albany Road. Following consultation and part of the A6MARR objectives this link between the shared use footway/cycleway adjacent to the relief road and the residential estate has been determined to be required and therefore the land is required to provide this link.	SS
	The Plot cannot be used for additional pedestrian, cycling or equestrian use for the following reasons:		

32-03	Mr and Mrs Freedman's property stands at the end of an existing cul-de-sac, and there is currently no route through the highway onto the land to the south for pedestrian, cyclists and equestrian users.	This is a scheme objective and will increase social benefit and safety in the area. The Council considers that there is a compelling case for them to be included within the scheme and CPO.	SS
32-04	It appears that the proposed new shared use footway/ cycle way (and possible bridleway) takes the line immediately in front of their existing vehicular access from the highway which gives rise to potential safety hazards.	All perceived safety hazards will be considered and the design carried out to negate or mitigate this. Safe passage will be ensured through detailed junction design, signing and visibility safeguarding.	NH
32-05	There is an existing access available to the land immediately to the east of the proposed access, which could be used for the proposed new route. The proposal to create an additional access in the Plot appears wholly irrational and unreasonable.	The access chosen is considered optimal for the scheme. Moving the access simply means this affects another landholder and the preferred route is considered preferential for the scheme.	SS / NH
32-06	The stopping up or removal of any private means of access is unacceptable and irrational where it is not replaced with an alternative and viable means of access.	All known private means of access and rights of way have been maintained or re-provided in locations that provide a suitable and reasonably convenient access. If this has not been possible then the objector may be compensated for the loss of their right, in accordance with the Compensation Code and each claim will be determined on its merits.	HC

33: Mr A Worthington and Mrs H Broadhead
 Baguley Fold Farm, Pinfold Lane, Marthall, Knutsford, Cheshire, WA16 7SQ
 CPO Plots: 5/2 5/2A 5/2B
 Agent:
 AG Bowcock
 Berrys, 1 Brunel Court, Rudheath Way, Gadbrook Park, Northwich, Cheshire, CW9 7LP

Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
33-01	<p>Our clients do not object to the principle of the scheme and is appreciative of the need of the revision to the road in the locality of their land. However, our clients do wish to object on the basis that they have not reached agreement for the sale of their land to Stockport Council for inclusion in the scheme, and despite negotiations going back more than 12 months still believe they have inadequate information regarding certain aspects. Most notable they are seeking clarification on land drainage, tree planting and screening and temporary use of the land during construction works.</p>	<p>The Council's agent has been instructed by the Council to acquire land and property. This can be either unconditionally or conditional on a trigger point of the objector's choosing, and can be now or at a set point in the future. However, as public money is being used to fund the scheme the Council has a duty to negotiate a fair price for each and every acquisition and cannot pay an amount in excess of the open market value of the objector's property.</p> <p>The council's agent is happy to discuss all of the above factors with the objectors and would like to gain an understanding of how the objectors want to proceed on each item during construction and once the road is finished. All land included within the CPO will be acquired permanently as it is needed for the road and its construction. However, for some of the areas required for construction only the Council would prefer to gain a licence for the temporary use of the land for this purpose. Until such a licence is agreed the land must be kept within the Order.</p>	HC
33-02	<p>Although land used for agriculture, our client's long term aim is to develop the site for residential use, given the inherently residential nature of the area. Whilst they accept the land is not currently zoned for development they would not dispose of the land in the "no scheme world" unless they could achieve an uplift</p>	<p>Should a person feel that the value of their land and property has decreased or that they have suffered other losses as a direct consequence of the road scheme, they are entitled to claim compensation under the statutory compensation code and each claim will be determined on its merits.</p>	HC

	in value to reflect the potential development and/ or sell subject to overall provisions.		
--	---	--	--

<p>34: Paul Gavin Darnell and Melanie Jane Darnell Melanie Darnell's Address: 5 Marina Close, Handforth. SK9 5JP Paul Darnell's Address: 20a Hylton Drive, Cheadle Hulme, Cheadle, SK8 7DH CPO Plots: 6/4 6/4A - 6/4D Agent: John Seed Brown Rural Partnership, 29 Church Street, Macclesfield, Cheshire, SK11 6LB</p>			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
34-01	No part of road, cutting or embankment is intended to be placed on 2 substantial plots shown edged/ coloured green on the attached plans. Accordingly such parts are not so required for the purpose of the construction of a highway should be deleted from Schedule 1 to the CPO.	The areas which are referred to are required for the road and its cuttings and therefore are included within the CPO.	NH
34-02	The Acquiring Authorities have failed to show any compelling case to take land for the purposes of pedestrian and cycle routes and bridleways. These routes are not required for, or critical to, the purpose of constructing the Relief Road and its cuttings and embankments. the land required for these routes should be deleted from Schedule 1 of the CPO.	The areas which are refer to are required for the road and its cuttings and therefore are included within the CPO.	NH
34-03	There is a significant network of existing footpaths in the locality, and unfortunately too many people are walking of the line of existing footpaths and into private land.	This is not a scheme issue. All new tracks will be clearly signposted and marked.	SS
34-04	The stopping up or removal of any private means of access is unacceptable and irrational where it is not replaced with an alternative and viable means of access.	All known private means of access and rights of way have been maintained or re-provided in locations that provide a suitable and reasonably convenient access. If this has not been possible then the objector may be compensated for the	HC

		loss of their right, in accordance with the Compensation Code and each claim will be determined on its merits.	
--	--	--	--

<p>36: David Charles Jones and Richard Anthony Jones Longfield Poultry Farm, Hall Moss Lane, Bramhall, Stockport, SK7 1RB CPO Plots: 6/2 Agent: John Seed Brown Rural Partnership, 29 Church Street, Macclesfield, Cheshire, SK11 6LB</p>			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
36-01	The permanent land take removed the only vehicular access to the Objector's land, and there is no provision in the CPO to maintain the existing right of way along the track to the west of the land holding to Hall Moss Lane. In these circumstances, the Objectors land is landlocked.	The current rights of the land owner will be retained therefore ensuring that the land will not become land locked.	HC / NH
36-02	In the event that it is intended that existing rights of way down the access track are maintained, the Plot cannot be used for additional equestrian, cycling or pedestrian use for the following reasons:	The pedestrian , cycle and bridleway improvements are part of the scheme and their implementation supports the scheme and SEMMM Strategy objectives.	SS
36-03	The access way in question is the only access to the Objectors' land and this private means of access was created as a result of the construction of the existing A555 Road through the Objectors' land holding.	The pedestrian , cycle and bridleway improvements are part of the scheme and their implementation supports the scheme and SEMMM Strategy objectives. The access way will remain; it will just also be used for the above uses. Should a person feel that the value of their land and property has decreased or that they have suffered other losses as a direct consequence of the road scheme, they are entitled to claim compensation under the statutory compensation code and each claim will be determined on its merits.	NH / SS

36-04	The existing access way is already too narrow for modern farm machinery; the land served by the existing access way is mown. There is insufficient space for other users to pass by farm machinery.	The design will ensure that there is sufficient room for all users to pass in a safe manner. This may require signage and will require safeguarding of visibility sight lines. Further discussions have occurred on site to work with the land owners and tenants to determine the optimum design solution when considering all users, frequency of users and land available.	NH
36-05	The proposal therefore works against one of the objectives of the scheme which is to improve the safety of road users, pedestrians and cyclists.	The health and safety of all users has been considered throughout the design. This work will continue to develop to ensure safety is not compromised. See above regarding the safety assessment of all users of the route.	NH
36-06	Insufficient consideration given to the needs of existing users.	SMBC has and are continuing to, actively engage with landowners to reduce the impact on their landholdings wherever possible. Discussions have been on-going to determine the optimum design solution catering for all users.	NH
36-07	There is a significant network of existing footpaths in the locality , and unfortunately too many people are walking off the line of the existing paths into private land.	This is not a scheme issue. All new tracks will be clearly signposted and marked.	SS
36-08	No part of the proposed Road, cutting or embankments is intended to be placed on the land listed in Schedule 1 to the CPO. Accordingly such parts as are not so required for the purpose of the construction of a highway should be deleted from Schedule 1 to the CPO. The Acquiring Authorities have failed to show any compelling case to take land for purpose that are not for the purpose of constructing thereon a highway, namely the Road and its cuttings and embankments.	The areas which the objectors refer to are required for the new bridleway therefore are included within the CPO. The proposal for the bridleway forms part of the SEMMMS objectives to increase NMU usage along the length of the route including along the existing A55.	NH

36-09	The extent of permanent land take to provide for bunding and environmental mitigation is excessive, severely prejudicing the future use of the said lands for agricultural and future development purposes.	The plot has not been included in the CPO on environmental grounds. Environmental measures, including planting have, however, been introduced onto the plot by virtue of it becoming available as part of the land take for engineering the road or associated paths, cycleways and bridleways.	NH / PR
36-10	The Acquiring Authorities have failed to show any compelling case to take land for the purposes of pedestrian and cycle routes and bridleways; these routes are not required for, or critical to, the purpose of constructing the Relief Road and its cuttings and embankments. The land required for these routes should be deleted from Schedule 1 of the CPO.	The shared use cycleway/footways and bridleways are part of the main scheme objectives and aim to increase social benefit and safety in the area. The Council considers that there is a compelling case for them to be included within the scheme and CPO.	SS
36-11	The stopping up or removal of any private means of access is unacceptable and irrational where it is not replaced with an alternative and viable means of access.	All known private means of access and rights of way have been maintained or re-provided in locations that provide a suitable and reasonably convenient access. If this has not been possible then the objector may be compensated for the loss of their right, in accordance with the Compensation Code and each claim will be determined on its merits.	HC

<p>37: James Fielding CPO Plots: 6/5C Agent: John Seed Brown Rural Partnership, 29 Church Street, Macclesfield, Cheshire, SK11 6LB</p>			
Element of objection	Objection		Expert Witness
37-01	The ownership of the Plot is incorrectly described in the CPO. The land is owned by the Objector and not Cheshire East Borough Council. Accordingly the CPO is defective.	The Land Referencing exercise was undertaken and was based on the information returned from the Land Registry at the time. Should to ownerships prove to be incorrect then notice will be served on the correct party once more clarity is gained. Land Registry information indicates that the objector does not own any land directly affected by the scheme.	HC
37-02	No part of the proposed Road, cuttings or embankments is intended to be placed on the land listed in Schedule 1 to the CPO. Accordingly such parts are not so required for the purpose of the construction of a highway and should be deleted from Schedule 1 to the CPO. The Acquiring Authorities have failed to show any compelling case to take land for purposes that are not for the purpose of constructing thereon a highway, namely the Road, and its cuttings and embankments.	The areas which are referred to are required on a permanent basis for the proposed bridleway route and thus are included within the CPO. The bridleway forms part of the SEMMMS objectives to increase NMU usage along the length of the scheme including at the existing A555.	NH

37-03	<p>No provisions of the CPO authorise the taking of any land for temporary purposes and accordingly such parts of the Plots as are not required for permanent compulsory acquisition should be deleted from Schedule 1 to the CPO. By paragraph 1 the CPO will authorise the acquisition of "land" described in paragraph 2. Paragraph 2 describes the "land" only by reference to the "land" described in Schedule 1 shown coloured pink on the CPO map. Neither Schedule 1 nor the map describe, in relation to the Plot, that only an easement is required. If the intention of the acquiring authority is to take the Plot permanently, but then give a written undertaking to return the Plot subject to an easement, then this is a misuse of powers for it shows that the Acquiring Authorities cannot show a compelling case to acquire permanently the parts of the Plots required only for an easement. If, contrary to the above, the CPO does contain powers to take part of the Plots identified above for an easement, then the land in question should not be acquired permanently.</p>	See above response.	HC
37-04	<p>The access way in question is the only access to the Objectors' land and this private means of access was created as a result of the construction of the existing A555 Road through the Objectors' land holding.</p>	<p>The access way will remain; it will just also be used for the above uses. Should a person feel that the value of their land and property has decreased or that they have suffered other losses as a direct consequence of the road scheme, they are entitled to claim compensation under the statutory compensation code and each claim will be determined on its merits.</p>	HC

37-05	The existing access way is already too narrow for modern farm machinery; the land served by the existing access way is mown. There is insufficient space for other users to pass by farm machinery.	All perceived safety hazards will be considered and the design carried out to negate or mitigate this. Passing places / signage will be considered as necessary. Further discussions have occurred on site to work with the land owners and tenants to determine the optimum design solution when considering all users, frequency of users and land available.	NH
37-06	The proposal therefore works against one of the objectives of the scheme which is to improve the safety of road users, pedestrians and cyclists.	The health and safety of all users has been considered throughout the design. This work will continue to develop to ensure safety is not compromised. See above regarding the safety assessment of all users of the route.	NH
37-07	Insufficient consideration given to the needs of existing users.	The Council has and is continuing to, actively engage with landowners to reduce the impact on their landholdings where possible.	HC
37-08	There is a significant network of existing footpaths in the locality , and unfortunately too many people are walking off the line of the existing paths into private land.	This is not a scheme issue. All new tracks will be clearly signposted and marked.	SS
37-09	The Acquiring Authorities have failed to show any compelling case to take land for the purposes of pedestrian and cycle routes and bridleways. These routes are not required for, or critical to, the purpose of constructing the Relief Road and its cuttings and embankments. The land required for these routes should be deleted from Schedule 1 of the CPO.	The shared use cycleway/footways and bridleways are part of the main scheme objectives and aim to increase social benefit and safety in the area. The Council considers that there is a compelling case for them to be included within the scheme and CPO.	SS
37-10	The stopping up or removal of any private means of access is unacceptable and irrational where it is not replaced with an alternative and viable means of access.	All known private means of access and rights of way have been maintained or re-provided in locations that provide a suitable and reasonably convenient access. If this has not been possible then the objector may be compensated for the loss of their right, in accordance with the Compensation Code and each claim will be determined on its merits.	HC

38: Christopher W Shenton
 Bridge Farm, Wilmslow Road, Handforth, SK9 3EN
 CPO Plots: 7/4 7/4A-7/4H
 Agent:
 John Seed
 Brown Rural Partnership, 29 Church Street, Macclesfield, Cheshire, SK11 6LB

Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
38-01	No part of road, cutting or embankment is intended to be placed on substantial plots shown edged/ coloured in green on the attached plans. Accordingly such parts are not so required for the purpose of the construction of a highway should be deleted from Schedule 1 of CPO. The Acquiring Authorities have failed to show any compelling case to take land for purposes that are not for the purpose of constructing thereon a highway, namely a road, and its cuttings and embankments.	The areas referred to are required for the proposed shared sue cycleway / footway which forms part of the scheme proposals. These proposals will seek to achieve the objectives of the SEMMMS by increasing NMU usage along the length of the scheme including adjacent to the existing A555.	NH

38-02	<p>No provisions of the CPO authorise the taking of any land for temporary purposes and accordingly such parts of the Plots as are not required for permanent compulsory acquisition should be deleted from Schedule 1 to the CPO. The Objectors believe that the Acquiring Authorities' proposed taking the two parts of the Plots identified on the attached plans for temporary purposes only and contend that there is no power under the CPO to do so. By paragraph 1 the CPO will authorise the acquisition of "land" described in paragraph 2. Paragraph 2 describes the "land" only by reference to the "land" described in Schedule 1 shown coloured pink on the CPO map. Neither Schedule 1 nor the map describe, in relation to the Plots, that only a temporary possession is required in part of those Plots. If the intention of the Acquiring Authorities is take all parts of the Plots permanently, but then give a written undertaking to return the parts after temporary use, then this is a misuse of powers for it shows that the Acquiring Authorities cannot show a compelling case to acquire permanently the parts of the Plots required only for temporary use. If, contrary to the above, the CPO does not contain powers to take part of the Plots identified above temporarily, then the land in question should not be acquired permanently.</p>	<p>The Acquiring Authority is unable to acquire land on a temporary basis via the CPO process. Once construction of the scheme is completed then the land not required on a permanent basis will be offered back to the original land owner in accordance with the Crichel Down rules. The permanent land take includes land for the new road and its earthworks, essential ecological and social mitigation and landscape bunding. Only the land required for the scheme and its construction has been included within the CPO. The Council will demonstrate that all of this land is required for the purposes of the scheme.</p>	HC
-------	---	---	----

38-03	No part of the Plots should be used for tipping of permanent spoil which will severely prejudice the future use of the said lands for agricultural purposes.	. The land acquired will be used in accordance with the planning permission. Insofar as land is acquired then handed back the value implications will be reflected in price paid.	HC
38-04	The extent of permanent land take to provide for bunding and environmental mitigation works is excessive, severely prejudicing the future use of said lands for agricultural and future development purposes.	The scheme design incorporates the requirements for environmental mitigation as well as screening the road from built up areas. This forms part of the road scheme and therefore this land is required as part of the CPO. The scheme has been designed to minimise land take, but there are certain environmental and social conditions that have needed to be met. The proposed roadside mounding will have the effect of reducing traffic related noise. In addition, low noise surfacing is proposed along the new section of dual carriageway. The assessment of traffic-related noise has also identified a number of locations where it has been concluded additional mitigation to that which will be provided by the mounding should be included and locations where mounding is not proposed but noise mitigation is to be provided. In these locations the proposals provide for the noise barriers.	HC
38-05	The Acquiring Authorities have failed to show any compelling case to taken land for the purposes of pedestrian and cycle route and bridleways; these routes are not required for, or are critical to, the purpose of constructing the Relief Road and its cuttings and embankment. The land required for these routes should be deleted from Schedule 1 of the CPO. If, contrary to the above, the CPO does contain powers to take part of the Plots identified above temporarily, and the land take for the purpose of pedestrian and cycle routes and bridleways, the following issues must be resolved:	The shared use cycleway/footways and bridleways are part of the main scheme objectives and aim to increase social benefit and safety in the area. The Council considers that there is a compelling case for them to be included within the scheme and CPO.	SS

38-06	The loss of field for a compound (Plots 7/4A and 7/4B) will have a serious impact on what is a substantial farm business in the locality, as that field is used as an isolation field for cattle under a high health scheme. Insufficient consideration has been given to the impact of the scheme on existing agricultural users.	The Council has considered all local residents and businesses affected by the scheme. Should a person feel that the value of their land and property has decreased or that they have suffered other losses as a direct consequence of the road scheme, they are entitled to claim compensation under the statutory compensation code and each claim will be determined on its merits.	HC
38-07	The currently proposals close off the existing access to Plots 7/4A and 7/4B.	Discussions have been had with the tenant of the field and their agent. A reduction of the land requirements has been proposed here during the construction works. Alterations to the fence lines and gate locations will ensure that the access is maintained. These changes will provide access to the plots noted.	NH
38-08	There will be conflict between existing agricultural traffic with proposed bridleway/ cycle way traffic on the existing accommodation bridge over the A555. A tractor coming over the bridge from the northern side will have to accelerate to get up the bank, without having sight of who or what might be on the bridge. This safety hazard is in conflict with one of the scheme key objectives, which is to improve the safety of road users, pedestrians and cyclists.	Safety of all users has been at the forefront of all design work. In addition, conflicting movements have been analysed, and will continue to be as the design progresses, to ensure safety is not compromised. This will be done through effective signing and safeguarding of sightlines throughout the scheme.	NH
38-09	There is an existing problem of gates to footpaths being left open and consequential stock escape, quite often onto the A555 and/ or the A34.	This is not an issue with the scheme design or the CPO. Appropriate gates will be installed at all relevant locations in accordance with standard details, the Specification for Highway Works and liaison with the users including the farmer	NH
38-10	It is essential that the junction of the southerly end of Spath Lane (to south of A555 bridge) with the new pedestrian/ cycle route coming from the east is properly gated to prevent stock running on	Agreed, see above. This will be considered as part of the detailed design process.	NH

	to the new access way.		
38-11	Land take as a result of the new footpath to the north of Beech Farm (Plots 7/4C and 7/4D) can be avoided by relocating the footpath into the existing land take area. A better route for FP No.81 would be along the western perimeter of the field, obviating the need for stile/ kissing gates etc. This would help to mitigate some of the effects of the permanent land take.	The land acquisition required north of these two plots is as a result of the area required to construct the widened west bound diverge slip road. A straight fenceline line has been proposed for ease of agricultural activities. The diversion of the footpath is not currently part of the A6MARR proposals. Only the land required for the construction and operation of relief road. Any land remaining following the erection of the adopted highway extents will be returned to the original land owner.	NH
38-12	The connection between Wilmslow FP No. 81 and Cheadle and Gatley FP No. 38 involves crossing the A555/ A34 junction at seven places which is unsafe. Consequently FP No. 81 should be extinguished.	SMBC understand that the objector is referring to the connection between FP81 which is SE of the A555/A34 roundabout and the FP38A which is NW of the A555/A34 roundabout. This connection is linked using controlled pedestrian crossing points (puffin crossings) at stop lines for the general vehicular traffic. This has been reviewed via a Road Safety Audit and has not been regarded as unsafe. The consultation with the Vulnerable Road User Groups (VRUG) has not suggested that this link be extinguished on grounds of safety or other.	NH
38-13	Existing drainage problems with the ditches adjoining and under the existing A555 have yet to be resolved, causing the land drainage of much of the adjoining land to fail.	This has been investigated and Stockport Council has written to the objector explaining the outcomes of these site and desk top investigations. No remedial action was proposed nor carried out that could be carried out within the adopted highway extents. The A6MARR will encounter private land drains and seek to divert if required into the original discharging watercourse/sewer or into the earthworks drainage.	NH
38-14	The stopping up or removal of any private means of access is unacceptable and irrational where it is not replaced with an alternative and viable means of access.	All known private means of access and rights of way have been maintained or re-provided in locations that provide a suitable and reasonably convenient access. If this has not been possible then the objector may be compensated for the	HC

		loss of their right, in accordance with the Compensation Code and each claim will be determined on its merits.	
--	--	--	--

<p>39: Andrew De Coninck 65 Longdown Road, Congleton, Cheshire, CW12 4QH CPO Plots: 7/7</p>			
Element of objection	Objection		Expert Witness
39-01	The land you wish to acquire from me is woodland which is not only aesthetically pleasing but it fuels my heating. There are many oak trees that would have considerable value if felled for commercial use. I believe it would be difficult to purchase an alternative wood in a suitable area.	The objector may be compensated for the value of their woodland in accordance with the compensation code.	HC
39-02	The Compulsory Purchase Order I have had sight of would completely annihilate my woodland.	This land is required should the need arise to construct a replacement bridge in lieu of the existing Spath Lane bridge over the existing A555. The current traffic modelling indicates that prescribed highway layouts (in accordance with DMRB Section 2 Junctions TD 22/06 Layout of Grade Separated Junctions) would require demolition of the existing bridge and construction of a substitute bridge, within the land, to reinstate the private means of access. Upon finalisation of the traffic model the final layout can be determined.	NH
39-03	I feel there are alternatives to the proposed scheme, including the accommodation bridge, as there is a bridge in situ that can still be utilised. I believe every possibility should be looked into as the proposed land take is excessive. I would suggest that there is an alternative route from A34 that would not require the building of a bridge.	See above.	

<p>40: British Overseas Bank & WGTC Nominees Will Cotmore, PRUPIM, Oakwell Holme Lane, New Mill, Holmfirth. HD9 7NQ CPO Plots: 7/3 7/3A Agent: Andy Guest Cheetham & Mortimer, 86 Deansgate, Manchester, M3 2ER</p>			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
40-01	<p>British Overseas Bank Nominees Ltd and WGTC Nominees Ltd (the owners) recognise the fact that the roundabout at the junction of the A34 and Stanley Road is currently congested during the morning and evening peak periods and at weekends. We understand that following the completion of the A555 and associated improvement to the roundabout , traffic flows on the A34 are likely to increase, and that the roundabout is forecast to continue to operate close to capacity during peak periods. The owners therefore recognise the need to improve traffic flows at the junction of the Stanley Road and A34. The owners do not consider proposals to alleviate congestion is best option available. The owners' proposal is that a new entrance lane from the roundabout should be provided onto land to the rear of the B&Q retail warehouse unit. This would reduce congestion and help avoid queuing traffic back onto the A34.</p>	<p>It is recognised that Stanley Green Roundabout is already subject to peak hour congestion and that there will be an increase in traffic flows at this junction with the completion of the A6MARR. Because of this, improvements to the Stanley Green roundabout are proposed as an integral part of the A6MARR scheme. With these improvements, the junction will operate significantly better than the current junction. The aspirations within the curtilage of the site are may be developed by the landowner and to follow the planning process. This is not part of the A6MARR scheme remit and the CPO can only include land that is required for the scheme and its joining to the adopted highway, rather than providing new access to privately owned land. The landowner will retain his existing access and it will be no worse than the one that exists today.</p>	NH

40-02	The land within the ownership of British Overseas Bank Nominees Ltd & WGTC Nominees Ltd is currently identified within the saved policies of Stockport Unitary Development Plan (2006) as being for employment use. The Authority's current proposal does not provide for access concerned and therefore makes it impossible to bring the land forward for employment.	This is a planning issue and the scheme has planning consent for the format included in the CPO plans. However, this land will still have access through the private road network that will remain in the objector's ownership at the site and therefore there is no obligation to provide a new or improved access to the land that is mentioned. Should a person feel that the value of their land and property has decreased or that they have suffered other losses as a direct consequence of the road scheme, they are entitled to claim compensation under the statutory compensation code and each claim will be determined on its merits.	AH / HC
40-03	The Authority's scheme is in direct contravention of the saved policies of the Stockport UDP as it will preclude the use of the land for the purposes identified in the UDP. The alternative proposal suggested by the owners in ground 1 above addresses this issue.	Delivery of the scheme is supported and enshrined within the Development Plans for the three LPAs and the Greater Manchester and Cheshire East Transport Plans. In particular, the route of the A6MARR is safeguarded by: Policy ST2.2 (Protection for Major Road Schemes of the Stockport UDP (May 2006); and Policy T7 (Safeguarded Routes) of the Macclesfield Local Plan. The need for the proposed development of the road scheme is also identified within the Manchester Core Strategy.	AH
40-04	British Overseas Bank Nominees Ltd & WGTC Nominees Ltd currently holds a planning consent for refurbishment of the retail park including the erection of a totem pole identifying the retailers trading on the retail park. This totem pole is to be located in the area identified for compulsory acquisition. The acquisition of the land deprives the owner of the opportunity to carry out the development for which they have planning permission and has a material impact upon the ownership retained.	The current process does not prevent the objector from carrying out its development works, including the erection of the totem in the area defined in the planning consent as the CPO has not been confirmed at this time. Alternatively, if the objector were to apply for an amendment to the consent to move the totem out of the zone to be acquired then the Council would cover the reasonable costs of the objector doing so. As far as it can be established no part of the scheme prevents the objector from refurbishing the retail park.	AH

40-05	<p>British Overseas Bank Nominees Ltd & WGTC Nominees Ltd has had some discussions with the acquiring Authority in order to seek clarification of the exact land area to be acquired. The owner has requested further detail in the form of detailed scale plans and exact identification of the site boundary. At the time of writing this information has not been provided to our satisfaction and thus the owner objects on the basis of the fact that land to be acquired has not been properly identified or the impact on the land retained properly assessed.</p>	<p>Subsequent to the receipt of the objection the council and its agent have met on site to clarify the scheme details. Discussion has continued between the objector's traffic modelling team and the Council's Planning Highway Officer. The Project Team has provided data to enable further modelling and discussions to progress.</p>	HC / NH
-------	---	--	---------

41: Ms R			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
41-01	I would like to know when the work is intended to be carried out on the roundabout at the junction of A34/ Stanley Road as indicated on Site Plan A, Schedule 7. I would also like to know how long this work will take place and the meaning of 'Stopped up'. Will I have access to my property during this period? Will it be short-term or long-term?	The main objective when undertaking works is to maintain access to properties permanently. The works may mean that there is a requirement for shuttle working on Stanley Road and there may be delays to journeys while works are undertaken on the roundabout but access would not be prevented entirely. There may be a requirement to resurface part of Bowery Avenue so that the levels of the road tie in with the resurfaced section of Stanley Road. In order to ensure that levels are appropriate for drainage, works may be needed on individual driveways to ensure that water is able to drain appropriately. Should works be required on individual driveways the contractor would consult directly with local residents to arrange the most convenient time for the works to take place. The contractor would ensure that emergency vehicles can access properties off Bowery Avenue while works take place. At this stage we do not have the detail in terms of the construction programme to be able to state when this would be happening however, the contractor would ensure that local residents would be kept informed once further information about the construction programme is known.	NH

41-02	<p>This area how now been cleared leaving is an eyesore, as it looks like a waste ground that has been left neglected and caused a rampage of rats in my garden, which I had to report to the council several times. It is not only unsightly but as increased the amount of noise pollution, which if imagine will increase when the construction work is carried out, and will increase furthermore when the roads are altered/ widened.</p>	<p>The cleared area the objector refers to is private land and not part of the A6MARR scheme. With regards to the construction impact of the A6MARR scheme, the Environmental Statement (ES) for the proposed scheme identifies a range of mitigation measures focused on the control of dust and noise during construction. They are measures which are routinely adopted for the construction of major road schemes and which recognise the nature of the principal activities associated with the generation of dust and construction related noise. The planning consents for the project include conditions requiring the implementation of the commitments made in the ES. It will be a requirement of the contracts for the construction of the proposed scheme that the measures are formalised in a project specific Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).</p>	NH
41-03	<p>I also write on behalf of my neighbour next door who will be 90 years old in March 2014. She is unfortunately house-bound and your letter has caused her an enormous amount of distress and confusion. I do hope that any 'stopping up' will not affect any carers or emergency services attending the address or having access to Bowery Avenue for anyone for that matter.</p>	<p>Access for emergency services will be maintained at all times. All other access will be maintained as far as practicable and consultation will be carried out in advance of any potential disruption during construction to minimise the impact on affected residents. Following completion of the scheme a new Private Means of access is shown within the Side Road Order (Page 39 PMA 2 and Site Plan 7 Inset A) (see Core Document 1004).</p>	NH
41-04	<p>It is unknown how long this work will take and whether the impact on my travel and property will be a short one or a long one.</p>	<p>Between now and March 2015 the contractor would be working on the construction programme. Once this is finalised it would be made available on the SEMMMS website. Construction works are programmed from March 2015 until summer 2017. The contractor would also be direct contact with local residents living in the vicinity of the works once the detail of the construction programme is known.</p>	NH

41-05	There is also that fear that there will be any unexpected power cuts or soiled water, which appears to happen every time work is carried out in this area. I am unable to comprehend the impact this will have on me and my property in the long-term, I hope I am compensated appropriately.	The council and its contractor continue to engage with the statutory undertakers to ensure that all services are maintained throughout the works. This includes the companies responsible for the electricity and the sewers (Electricity North West Ltd and United Utilities plc. respectively). The diversion works will look to ensure that services are not interrupted during the works.	NH
-------	---	---	----

<p>42: Alan Walker and Veronica Ann Walker 233 Wilmslow Road, Handforth, Wilmslow, SK9 3JZ CPO Plots: 8/8 Agent: John Seed Brown Rural Partnership, 29 Church Street, Macclesfield, Cheshire, SK11 6LB</p>			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
42-01	The permanent land take involves the loss of part of the playing fields/ area at Little Acorns Day Nursery, which is critical to the functioning and viability of the Nursery business which employs 57 people. There is no alternative land available on the property to replace the part of the playing fields/area in question, and this loss cannot be dealt with by compensation alone.	Should a person feel that the value of their land and property has decreased or that they have suffered other losses as a direct consequence of the road scheme, they are entitled to claim compensation under the statutory compensation code and each claim will be determined on its merits.	HC
42-02	The extent of land take is exacerbated by the provision of a new footway/ cycle way, which could be relocated elsewhere.	To footway and cycleway form part of the scheme objectives and their location has been decided upon after carefully considering the engineering options in the area, with the intention to minimise land take.	NH
42-03	The Acquiring Authorities have failed to show any compelling case to take land for the purposes of pedestrian and cycle routes and bridleways; these routes are not required for, or critical to, the purpose of constructing the Relief Road. The land required for these routes should be deleted from Schedule 1 of the CPO.	The shared use cycleway/footways and bridleways are part of the main scheme objectives and aim to increase social benefit and safety in the area. The Council considers that there is a compelling case for them to be included within the scheme and CPO.	SS
42-04	The stopping up or removal of any private means of access is unacceptable and irrational where it is not replaced with an alternative and viable means of access.	All known private means of access and rights of way have been maintained or re-provided in locations that provide a suitable and reasonably convenient access. If this has not been possible then the objector may be compensated for the	HC

		loss of their right, in accordance with the Compensation Code and each claim will be determined on its merits.	
--	--	--	--

<p>43: Mr Robert Hankinson and Mrs Christina Hankinson Beech Farm, Hollin Lane, Styal, SK9 4LD CPO Plots: 9/7A 9/7B 8/1 8/1A-8/1C 9/9 9/9A 9/9D 9/9E 9/9F 9/9G 9/9H 9/9I 9/9J Agent: DWF LLP 1 Scott Place, 2 Hardman Street, Manchester, M3 3AA</p>			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
43-01	Order includes land within ownership which is proposed to be built on under the proposed scheme or alternatively used for temporary measures to aid the construction of the SEMMMS Scheme road and/or bridges.	All land included within the CPO will be acquired permanently as there is no provision to acquire temporarily. However, for the land the objectors references the Council would prefer to negotiate a licence or lease over the land for the period that it is required – subject to agreeable terms being reached. If this cannot be reached then the Council will acquire the land under the CPO and then will hand it back to the objectors in accordance with the Criche! Down rules.	HC
43-02	We are disheartened that the conversations and correspondence with the respective councils to date have been largely unhelpful. Our clients have, on numerous occasions, raised a number of issues with the proposed road and has received a plethora of alternate and contradictory answers.	SMBC has endeavoured to provide clear and concise information to the land owner about the requirements for the land required for the scheme, the engineering rationale and the timescales for the works. This has been relayed to both the land owner and the various agents acting on their behalf.	HC/ NH
43-03	Our clients have been effectively held in abeyance since 1950's without knowing exactly what proposed and if, or when, development will come forward. Not only has this had an impact on value of our clients' land but it has left our client feeling like they have been manipulated in order to serve the needs of others.	The scheme has been developed in accordance with the SEMMM Strategy. A route for the proposed scheme was identified by the Highways Agency who protected it prior to the development of the SEMMM Strategy.	JMcM

43-04	<p>In the 1950s land was compulsorily purchased from our clients' family for the development of the substation and the road envisaged at the time.</p> <p>Subsequently, route has moved reasons our client has not always understood; one proposal about 10 years ago being only yards away from their farm buildings. Our clients have never been able to determine if the moving of the routes was determined by cost or whether it has more to do with the maximisation of land holding values in certain areas for interested parties or to accommodate the requirement or the requirements of adjoining landowners.</p>	<p>The scheme has been developed in accordance with the SEMMM Strategy.</p>	JMCM
-------	--	---	------

43-05	<p>It is our clients' view that the determination by the Acquiring Authorities of which route option for the SEMMMS Scheme is the "preferred" option is based upon flawed and bogus information. It has been stated by the Acquiring Authorities that the relief road has to take a certain line to avoid impact upon a woodland of local significance, located to the north of the substation. It is, however, clear to anyone within the locality that this woodland is little more than a piece of wasteland, which has neither character nor importance to the local community; it is of only minor ecological value, being a relatively new monoculture of non-native poplars.</p>	<p>The woodland is one of a small number of environmental considerations which along with engineering, operational and cost-related considerations informed the selection of the preferred option. It was not a determining factor in this instance. In order to engage with the most directly affected local residents, Local Liaison Forums have been set up in areas in close proximity to the scheme. Meetings for the Local Liaison Forum Groups have been held as part of both the Phase 1 and 2 consultations and prior to the planning application being submitted. The Local Liaison Forums have provided an opportunity for local residents to have direct dialogue with the Council and help shape the scheme design. Local Liaison Forums will continue to be held as the scheme develops. As the objectors have stated, the chosen route has gone through many iterations. This has led to a scheme design that has the optimum horizontal and vertical alignment to meet the scheme objectives whilst minimising the overall impact on the surrounding area. If the objectors could provide the information that is described as 'flawed and bogus' this will be taken into consideration, but the Council will prove that the scheme has been effectively designed taking into account all necessary considerations.</p>	JMCM / PR
43-06	<p>During the CPO and planning application consultation process, it is our client's view that the opinion of the local people should have carried significant weight and it is apparent that this has not been the case; the local people view this piece of land as an area of trash rather than woodland of local significance.</p>	<p>In order to engage with the most directly affected local residents, Local Liaison Forums have been set up in areas in close proximity to the scheme. Meetings for the Local Liaison Forum Groups have been held as part of both the Phase 1 and 2 consultations and prior to the planning application being submitted. The Local Liaison Forums have provided an opportunity for local residents to have direct dialogue with the Council and help shape the scheme design. Local Liaison Forums will continue to be held as the scheme develops.</p>	JMCM

43-07	Our clients have also never received a copy of the costs v benefits analysis that was undertaken and it is right that the same should be given if a full picture of the consultation process in determining the preferred route is to be transparent to members of the public.	The Committee Reports and Consultation reports on the junction options are available to the public on the local authority and SEMMMS websites. The business case for the scheme is also on the website since it was submitted in 2013.	JMCM
43-08	The proposed road scheme cuts directly through our clients' land from the north west corner in a south easterly direction, until it hits the golf course land. Our clients currently access their land to the east of the railway line across a bridge within the ownership of Network Rail.	The objector's current access arrangements are noted. Should a person feel that the value of their land and property has decreased or that they have suffered other losses as a direct consequence of the road scheme, they are entitled to claim compensation under the statutory compensation code and each claim will be determined on its merits.	HC
43-09	The line of this bridge incorporates a public footpath (FP7), which is to be diverted as part of the proposals. The footpath, once it has crossed the bridge, turn to the left and runs up the side of our clients' land before it then turns to the right and crosses our clients' field in a south-easterly direction. The proposed scheme diverts this footpath under the relief road via a pedestrian subway constructed as part of the proposed rail bridge and then links the same back to its original line.	The diversion of PRoWs has been determined following consultation with the Vulnerable Road Users Groups (VRUG) which includes representatives of the walking, cycling and equestrian groups as well as officers of all three local authorities. The diversions that have been proposed also consider the existing environmental and that and the constraints that the scheme will bring. The scheme has therefore designed the diversion of FP7 through the subway. Access that the objectors currently enjoy will not be cut off, however it may be necessary to re-route accesses temporarily or permanently as a result of the scheme. Should a person feel that the value of their land and property has decreased or that they have suffered other losses as a direct consequence of the road scheme, they are entitled to claim compensation under the statutory compensation code and each claim will be determined on its merits.	SS

43-10	<p>Our clients currently access the northern part of their land along the line of the footpath (FP7) as it currently lie, continuing northwards where the footpath then turns to the south-east. As part of the scheme proposals, it is understood that our clients will not be able to access the severed part of their land with vehicles along this line and, instead, have to take a convoluted route of access. Likewise, the Vodafone mast which is located in this severed part of the land also has to be accessed for maintenance purposes along the new road access. The scheme proposes to take plots 9/9, 9/9A and also 9/10 and 9/10A from the adjoining owner W Nixon & Sons Limited. It is not clear how our clients will be able to access this severed land because the scheme will also be taking plots 9/9D, 9/9E, 9/9F, 9/9G, 9/9H, 9/9I and 9/9J during the construction period and permanently once the scheme has been constructed. Furthermore, there have been no provisions made for how Vodafone will access by vehicle their mast on the severed parcel of land adjacent to plot numbers 9/9, 9/9A and 9/10, during or post construction. This is both unacceptable and highly prejudicial to our clients.</p>	<p>Access will be provided off the A6MARR and via a new Private Means of Access. This has been explained to the land owner's agents. The road vertical alignment has been lowered as far as practicable in this location. A direct access underneath the relief road on the line of the subway would in fact result in the relief road levels having to be raised in this vicinity which the land owner is averse to.</p>	NH
-------	--	---	----

43-11	As plot 9/9D is coloured pink and is listed under Schedule 1 Table 1 of the CPO Order, this indicates that it will be acquired permanently; no reference is made to it being acquired temporarily. However, the attached plan indicates that the plot will be acquired for temporary purposes. Our clients therefore question the justification for including plot 9/9/D in the CPO for permanent acquisition. This plot should therefore be deleted from the Order and made the subject of the temporary access order on a license on terms to be negotiated.	The Acquiring Authority is unable to acquire land on a temporary basis via the CPO process. Once construction of the scheme is completed then the land not required on a permanent basis will be offered back to the original land owner in accordance with the Crichton Down rules. All land included within the CPO will be acquired permanently as there is no provision to acquire temporarily. However, for the land the objectors reference the Council would prefer to negotiate a licence or lease over the land for the period that it is required – subject to agreeable terms being reached. If this cannot be reached then the Council will acquire the land under the CPO and then will hand it back to the previous owners in accordance with the Crichton Down rules.	HC
43-12	We understand that as part of the proposals, land will be required to be taken from our clients on a temporary basis to the south of the proposed road line. Our clients have been attempting to ascertain for some time what the extent of this land will be, how long it will be required for and what is required for. Our conversations with Naz Huda of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council finally confirmed some answers in that the land is required for a compound for the construction materials for the adjacent rail bridge and not for the construction of the road, as had previously been advised to our clients. No detailed Heads of Terms have been provided for discussion.	The Acquiring Authority is unable to acquire land on a temporary basis via the CPO process. Once construction of the scheme is completed then the land not required on a permanent basis will be offered back to the original land owner in accordance with the Crichton Down rules. The land required on a temporary basis will be required for the duration of the construction contract to facilitate the construction of the road over rail bridge. The bridge construction programme and methodology is dependent upon network rail stipulations.	HC / NH
43-13	Unfortunately, the extent of the land to be taken is still unclear to our clients, as is the time frame for which it will be required.	See above response.	

43-14	<p>Naz Huda advised that the bridges will be constructed during Easter and Christmas periods and that the land could be required for "two Christmases" meaning that the land could be outside of our clients' control and unable to be utilised for farming for anywhere between 13 and 35 months. It is not acceptable to state that this will be finally determined by the subcontractor once the contract for the construction works is let. We, therefore, object on the basis of the uncertainty of the proposals and the detrimental impact on the amenity of our clients' enjoyment and commercial use of their land.</p>	<p>The construction methodology for the rail bridge is currently being agreed with Network Rail. This will dictate the duration of time required for the land which could be required for the duration of the A6MARR construction contract. Should a person feel that the value of their land and property has decreased or that they have suffered other losses as a direct consequence of the road scheme, they are entitled to claim compensation under the statutory compensation code and each claim will be determined on its merits.</p>	NH / HC
43-15	<p>Our clients object vehemently to the height of the railway bridge proposed to be constructed adjacent to the north west corner of their land on the basis that it is, in fact, over 3 metres higher than is necessary and no plausible explanation has been provided by the Acquiring Authorities as to why this is.</p>	<p>The current topographical surveys have indicated level heights for the electrical infrastructure. The road vertical alignment, including the associated earthworks, is bound by these levels and Network Rail stipulations in terms of vertical clearances. The standards provided to the Council by Network Rail have dictated the height that the bridge must be above the railway and the Council cannot compromise on these standards due to safety reasons. The Styal Road Bridge is likely to have been built at a time when different standards were imposed by Network Rail and this does not set the precedent for the design requirements that the A6MARR should be built currently. It is in the interest of the scheme to maintain the road as low as possible over the railway line and its infrastructure which has been surveyed at track level and this has been carried out to date within the current design. The Council has written to the land owner's engineering consultant to explain the design levels of the relief road on 11th January 2013.</p> <p>The Council's contractor has reviewed the design of the bridge and has since lowered the vertical road alignment by approximately 900mm by developing the bridge deck thickness</p>	NH

		and reviewing the highway alignment.	
43-16	The height of the bridge is an issue for our clients as the higher it is, the more of our clients' land is required to be taken under the related CPO. Obviously, the higher the bridge, the higher the road descending from the bridge and the more adjacent land is needed to enable the incline to be accommodated. There is also very little information as to how the inclines shown from the road will be landscaped and this is fundamental in order to protect our clients' amenity and to protect livestock.	See above. Stock fencing will be provided as required. With regards to landscaping, the proposed measures are indicated in Figure 5.42 of the ES and indicate that woodland planting will be introduced onto the bunds.	NH / PR
43-17	The land upon which the proposed bridge to be constructed lies at 70.5m above sea level. Under bridge design guidance, deemed acceptable on the current Styal Road bridge, it is considered that 4.8m clearance from the track to bottom of bridge soffit and a further 1.9m to deck is appropriate. Theoretically, therefore, on the basis of these calculations, the deck of proposed rail bridge could be 77.2m above sea level; a 3.9m disparity from proposed height of bridge which currently stands at 80.5m. Our clients, therefore, consider the current design takes much green belt than is actually necessary leading them to question whether prospective cost is more important to this proposed scheme than the retention of green belt land. The bridge height affects plots 9/9E, 9/9F, 9/9G, 9/9H. If the bridge and the line are lowered, this would affect the justification	See above regarding vertical clearances. The current design is required to adhere to current Network Rail regulations regardless of existing nearby situations.	NH

	of the size of these plots, therefore, there must be scope for reducing the size of the plots that need to be taken.		
43-19	Part of the proposals result in the severance of an area of our clients' land from the remainder of their land ownership. This will be a triangular portion of land to the north side of the proposed relief road. This is farmed land used of the grazing of livestock and also containing a Vodafone telephone mast. This severance will cause a permanent post-construction issue for our clients.	Access that the objectors currently enjoy will not be cut off, however it may be necessary to re-route accesses temporarily or permanently as a result of the scheme. Should a person feel that the value of their land and property has decreased or that they have suffered other losses as a direct consequence of the road scheme, they are entitled to claim compensation under the statutory compensation code and each claim will be determined on its merits. Access has been maintained via a Private Means of Access, as detailed within response to 43-10.	HC
43-21	The scheme proposes a left-hand turn from the relief road across our clients' neighbouring land, turning back on itself to run into our clients' land. We understand from conversations with Naz Huda, that is unclear whether this road will be an adopted highway, maintained at the public expense or a private right of way. There are a number of issues with this element of the proposals: first in the event that the road is an adopted highway, this will result in area of our clients' land being permanently taken when the road could, in fact, remain within our clients' ownership as the road is solely to access our clients property.	The combination of the legal effect of the Compulsory Purchase Order and the Side Roads Order will permit the Council, as Acquiring Authority to acquire all the land needed to provide a new and alternative means of access serving both properties and to grant such rights of way that are needed to be granted with the owners of the properties being served by the private means of access sufficient to meet their individual needs. It is envisaged that future maintenance of the private means of access will fall on the owners of the adjoining properties having the benefit of the access which will remain as a private means of access and not public highway.	NH

43-22	<p>Our clients are farmers and need to be able to access this land with a tractor. The tractors which are currently utilised are not to the standard of specifications required for use on a public highway and so our clients would, effectively, be precluded from accessing the land with a tractor unless they were able to purchase a "roadworthy" vehicle, at a significant cost. Second, in the event that the road is not adopted highway, the turn off from the road is within the ownership of our clients' neighbour and so our clients would have to negotiate private rights of way over the same with the adjoining landowner. This would result in significant negotiations and could result in a commercially disadvantaged position for our clients. We would submit that the proposals for this turn off from the relief road need to be properly considered, taking into account our clients' interests and also the current ownerships and we, therefore, object on the basis of such uncertainty. It should be noted that the status of the route is unclear; our clients have not been told whether the route provided will be a private or public access, both of which have distinct, but equally impactful effects on our clients' enjoyment of their property. No detailed discussions have been had with regard to terms.</p>	<p>All known private means of access and rights of way have been maintained or re-provided in locations that provide a suitable and reasonably convenient access. If this has not been possible then the objector may be compensated for the loss of their right, in accordance with the Compensation Code and each claim will be determined on its merits.</p>	NH / HC
-------	--	---	---------

43-23	The effect of taking plots 9/9, 9/9/A and also the clients' neighbouring plots, 9/10 and 9/10A, is that our clients and Vodafone will be unable to access the plot upon which the mast is situated by a vehicle.	Access will be retained via a reasonably convenient new Private Means of Access as outlined within the Side Roads Order Schedule 9 and Plan 9.	NH
43-24	As it currently stands, the land drains to the north-west and the proposals result in the situation where the drainage will flow to the south-east, on our client's land, and also results in the proposed road sitting higher in the landscape than it necessarily need be in order to take the flow of water against its natural course. Our clients' land naturally drains to the north-west and will continue to do so; however, there is a possibility that the proposed land by acquiring plot numbers 9/9, 9/9A and 9/9D could sever our clients' drainage outlet and our clients would then be left with water-logged land. There has been a general failure to provide information on this point to our clients.	The scheme drainage design considers highway and earthworks drainage. All uncharted private drainage will be diverted back to the original discharge point at the local water course or sewer. If the scheme is unable to do this then the uncharted private field drains will be diverted into the A6MARR earthworks drainage.	NH

	SRO Objection 30/01/14		
43-25	<p>Page 46 of the Stopping Up Order indicates that Wilmslow Footpath Number 7 is to be stopped up from a point 417 metres north east of its junction with the north eastern highway boundary of Hollin Lane eastwards for distance of about 126 metres. The attached Site Plan 9 and Inset C do not indicate where the starting point for 417 metres is located, nor identify the location of the 126 metres which is to be stopped up. According to the Plan Folio key this should be shown by thick hatching. This notation does not appear on Site Plan 9 or Inset C. For this reason we are submitting that the Stopping UP Order is unclear because it does not identify on the site plan the length of highway to be stopped up.</p>	<p>It is the Acquiring Authority's intention is to divert Wilmslow Footpath No 7 underneath the adopted highway across the width of the relief road via the new subway. The diverted footpath will also travel on the same alignment as Private Means of Access No.9 as described within the Side Roads Orders Page 46 without the Acquiring Authority acquiring the freehold for this section. The stopping up of Wilmslow Footpath No 7 is accurately described within the schedule.. The Site Plan will be modified to reflect this.</p>	NH
43-26	<p>Furthermore, whilst a length of replacement footpath is shown on Site Plan 9 between points D, E and F, it is unclear whether that follows the notation shown on the Plan Folio key for a route of a new means of access. Neither the length of FP7 to be closed nor the diversion route are shown to a larger scale on Inset C so that the proposals are clear.</p>	<p>See response to 43-25.</p>	

43-27	Our clients object to the diversion of along the route D, E and F. This appears to be a footpath passing through a subway adjacent to the bridge over the railway. It is not clear whether this will be wide enough to take service vehicles which need access to the Vodafone mast during the construction period and following construction and to take our clients' tractors to gain access to the field marked on the attached plan.	Access to the Vodafone mast will be via the new Private Means of Access directly off the relief road.	NH
43-28	If the diverted FP7 is not to be used for these purposes, the Stopping Up Order does not contain proposals to indicate how access is to be obtained during construction and permanently following construction of the road to the severed field and to the Vodafone mast. The position is unclear. In particular, it is not indicated whether the routes shown 8,9 and 10 or Inset C to Site Plan 9 is intended to serve this purpose. If so, it is unclear whether that is intended to be a route of a new highway or a route of a new means of access and how precisely access will be afforded from that route to the severed field order the Vodafone mast.	Access to the Vodafone mast will be via the new Private Means of Access directly off the relief road.	NH

<p>44: W Nixon and Sons c/o Mrs Joan Nixon Outwood Farm, Bolshaw Road, Heald Green, Cheadle. SK8 3PE CPO Plots: 9/10 9/10A 9/10B Agent: Steer Ethelston Rural Ltd Estate Office, Deer Park Farm, Kermincham, Crewe, Cheshire, CW4 8DX</p>			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
44-01	<p>The draft CPO for the above highway scheme seeks to purchase land from my clients in the southwest part of the farm, removing agricultural land used in conjunction with the farming business. The proposal removes land for the actual construction of the highway and in addition for landscaping, the detail of the latter which has not been discussed with the acquiring authority representatives. The CPO should seek to take as little land as absolutely necessary for the scheme and the landscaping proposed is beyond what my clients feel is reasonable for the scheme.</p>	<p>None of the plots referred to have been taken for environmental purposes. Environmental measures, including planting have, however, been introduced onto the plots by virtue of it becoming available as part of the land take for engineering the road or associated paths, cycleways and bridleways.</p>	HC / PR

44-02	<p>The main access to the farm as detailed above is from Heald Green along Bolshaw Road. The road calming measures which include ramps above the road surface together with the residential nature of the area makes it difficult for customers and suppliers to easily reach the premises. The proposed road scheme represents an opportunity to provide an access from the same into our client's property which has been discussed with the acquiring authority representatives. The proposals for the road include a vehicular road access from the east bound carriageway for neighbouring landowners to reach their land immediately adjoining the southern edge of our client's land. Unfortunately the latest proposals do not make such a provision for our clients. This seems inequitable as other adjoining land owners will be provided with an access off the proposed highway in the vicinity that my clients are requesting the same. In addition, in view of Stockport Council's desire to promote local food culture (please find attached the details of Stockport's membership of the Sustainable Food Cities Network 2013) together with their stated support for local businesses this would therefore seem to represent an opportunity to help our clients maintain their business and service to the public in a more sustainable fashion with the resulting benefits to the local residents and road users.</p>	<p>The current access will remain as it is not being removed. Only access to severed land can be provided onto the new road itself as it is important to minimise the number of accesses for safety reasons and in addition the provision of an access as it is suggested would not be deemed necessary and so cannot be included in the CPO. Should a person feel that the value of their land and property has decreased or that they have suffered other losses as a direct consequence of the road scheme, they are entitled to claim compensation under the statutory compensation code and each claim will be determined on its merits.</p>	HC / PR
-------	--	---	---------

45: Messrs B and K Dumville
 Primrose Cottage Nursery and Garden Centre, Ringway Road, Moss Nook, Wythenshawe, Manchester, M22 5WF
 CPO Plots: 9/1E 9/1F
 Agent:
 Steer Ethelston Rural Ltd
 Estate Office, Deer Park Farm, Kermincham, Crewe, Cheshire, CW4 8DX

Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
45-01	My clients have held the tenancy since 1958 and are now the only nursery left in Moss Nook. The draft CPO includes the main greenhouses, plant bed, vegetable growing area, potting and compost area car parking and heavy good vehicle turning area with amounts to 0.52 hectare. This will remove almost half of total area making it very difficult to operate indeed. It will also be detrimental to horticultural activities as a result of dust from road and during construction and afterwards. The nursery has already been substantially reduced in size a result of the construction of the Airport rail spur some years ago.	The objectors may be compensated for the land and property that is acquired for the scheme in accordance with the Compensation Code.	HC
45-02	The proposals in connection with the above road scheme are to make Ringway Road a service road only and this both potential and existing customers will be discouraged from using the services of the nursery and as a result the land take it will be also difficult for heavy goods vehicles to turn within the premises. Our	The objectors will still have access onto Ringway Road, which will remain an adopted highway. Due to the nature of the new road the number of access points must be limited for safety reasons. It is therefore not possible to provide private access point when an existing access to the highway network is maintained.	NH

	<p>clients would this like to request an access off the new proposed road in order to help mitigate the devastating effects of these proposals on their livelihood.</p>		
--	---	--	--

46: Julie Waddicor 17 Mill Hill Hollow, Poynton, Cheshire, SK12 1EQ			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
46-01	The fundamental purpose of constructing this expensive stretch of dual carriageway, largely through greenbelt - has not been established. Still referred to as SEMMMS, it was supposed to be one of a number of measures intended to ease local traffic congestion. Originally it was supposed to bypass Hazel Grove and connect the M60 and M56 motorways. Now it stops at the A6 in Hazel Grove, causing more problems than it solves. The additional traffic generated by the scheme, particularly in High Lane and Disley, will according to the traffic model, make traffic considerably worse (as much as a 30% increase using official figures). Similar issues exist on the A34, contradicting the claim that this road will ease local congestion.	There is currently no direct east-west transport link through south east Greater Manchester and Cheshire East. The lack of this connection is contributing to congestion on major and minor roads. This means that people and goods cannot move easily, directly and efficiently. The congestion being created is constraining the local economy, affecting air quality in local areas and reducing access to key destinations. These problems will become significantly worse in the future if no action is taken. 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. 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. 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 we are now forecasting an increase in traffic of 11- 16% in	NM

		<p>2017. It is acknowledged that there is predicted to be an increase in traffic along the A34 as a result of the scheme. The A34 Handforth / Wilmslow Bypass is a high capacity road built to modern standards and it is right that traffic uses this road rather than the more minor local roads.</p>	
46-02	<p>The SEMMMS strategy was always intended to be a multi modal scheme of transport measures, only one of which was a road, and this was by no means a very popular option according to a public consultation in 2004 on the full scheme.</p>	<p>The broad route for the Relief Road has been well established in local plans since the 1990s. 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. In 2003-2004 we consulted 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. 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. 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. 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. Furthermore, with reference to the Business Case submission submitted to Department for Transport in November 2012 (see http://www.semmms.info/a6/reportsandbusinesscase/businesscase) we would confirm that the economic case for the proposed scheme is for the A6 to Manchester Relief Road.</p>	JMcM

46-03	<p>Stockport Council is repeatedly claiming overwhelming public support for this road but this is simply not true. Previous consultations were on the original road and the road was not the most popular option. People preferred improvements to public transport. The consultations of 2013 were fundamentally flawed in that they assumed support for the road (which was out of date and for an entirely different scheme) and presented the public with no other options, merely choices of preferred junctions.</p>	<p>As part of the Phase 1 consultation on the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road we asked the question there was a specific question that allowed respondents to indicate their preference or otherwise for the scheme: "What is your overall opinion on the proposed A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road?". The Phase 1 consultation demonstrated that 69% of respondents were either in favour or strongly in favour of the scheme.</p>	JMCM
-------	--	--	------

46-04	<p>Carr Wood - an ancient bluebell Wood registered on the nation inventory and therefore legally protected - was misrepresented as a mere SBI, despite notification by Friends of the Earth its protected status well over a year before. SMBC investigated an alternative, simpler and cheaper route which would have avoided the woodland and a significant number of residential properties close by, but this was withheld from the public's knowledge.</p>	<p>The SEMMMS team has always been aware of the location of the ancient woodland and has taken it into account in the developing design of the road. The Environmental Scoping report identified that the proposed road would pass through a designated Site of Biological Importance (SBI) at Norbury Brook Wood. It did not state that 2.4 ha of the 22.2 ha Norbury Brook Wood is listed as Ancient Woodland but this was identified in the more detailed business case appraisal. The Environmental Scoping report was sent to both Natural England and the Woodland Trust for comment. The Environmental Statement makes due recognition of the Ancient Woodland in its assessment of the environmental impact of the scheme. We have continued to engage with Woodland Trust and Natural England in developing the scheme, with both groups being invited to the Environmental Forum which has been set up specifically for the scheme. The alternative route was an interpretation of that 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 our view that it is not deliverable for a number of reasons, which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative A6/SEMMMS junction location does not provide future proofing for a continuous route to Jct25 of M60 Motorway; • Alternative A6/SEMMMS junction located immediately adjacent to residential properties; • Under the alternative alignment, a continuous line to the M60 would require the demolition of residential properties and an underground reservoir. It would also severely impact Hazel Grove Golf Course. 	JMCM / PR
-------	---	---	-----------

46-05	<p>Secondly, this scheme in its current form is in breach of the Air Quality Directive by 1) causing increased levels of pollutants to be introduced in an established Air Quality Managed Area at High Lane and Disley and 2) tipping air pollutant readings over the legal threshold along much of the route. Stockport Council is currently rushing through a set of "mitigation measures" to combat this - the main one being to reduce the speed limit along the A6 to 30 miles an hour. As most of the A6 already has a 30 mph speed restriction, it is implausible that this will reduce increased traffic brought about by the road from 30% to 15%. And if it were to be so effective in reducing traffic volumes, why not do it do immediate effect?!</p>	<p>The Air Quality Directive places an obligation on national authorities to implement a regime whereby areas which are recognised as being in exceedance of relevant concentrations for specific pollutants are identified and requires the establishment of plans focused on the reduction in concentrations to bring them into line with the standards. The requirements are implemented through the Air Quality Regulations in the UK. An increase at a single or small number of receptors which results in an exceedance of a standard does not constitute a breach under the Directive or Regulations. The assessments for the proposed scheme have demonstrated that a total of 780 receptors in AQMAs will be removed from exceedance for NO₂ with the scheme in place whilst 3 receptors in the Disley AQMA will be brought into exceedance by less than 1ug/m³. As the objector notes, relevant mitigation measures are being established with Cheshire East to ensure these three receptors are not brought into exceedance. The agreement of these measures has been made the subject of a planning condition. In light of the above we do not consider that it is reasonable to represent the predicted outcomes as ones which constitute a breach of the Directive but rather one that is in keeping with its objectives.</p>	PR / PC
46-06	<p>By rushing through the CPO without properly addressing these legal issues and giving the public the opportunity to understand the potentially very serious impacts on their health and wellbeing locally, and which could very easily cause the road to fail at a public inquiry, is, if strongly believe, an appalling waste of money. I believe that until all these facts have been gathered and presented properly before the public to allow them to make an informed decision.</p>	<p>See above responses.</p>	

47: Paul Summerton Squirrels Run, Coppice Avenue, Disley, Cheshire, SK12 2LS			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
47-01	Friend of the Earth and other groups have drawn attention to illegalities regarding this road scheme proposal. It would be misconduct in public office and an offence under the Fraud Act 2006 (to deliberately act to cause someone a loss) to purchase 178 parcels of land with the associated legal and compensation costs if the scheme is unable to go ahead, which seems likely.	The council is unaware of any illegalities in association with the scheme. It believes it has undertaken all the required assessments in accordance with the guidance WebTAG and DMRB for assessing and developing a scheme. The scheme has also been submitted as a planning application to the three Local Planning Authorities who have assessed the scheme in accordance with their policies and granted approval.	JMcM

48: Mr and Mrs Hufton South View, Lower Park Road, Poynton, Cheshire, SK12 1EE			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
48-01	We are residents of Poynton and care very deeply about protecting the unique, peaceful, rural character of this area, currently classed as green belt land. It is the narrowest stretch of greenbelt land anywhere around the Greater Manchester conurbation and as such is vitally important in the preservation of a separate identity for the village of Poynton and in its role as a "green lung".	In relation to green belt, it is the case that parts of the proposed scheme will be located in green belt. The planning authorities have taken this relationship into account when granting planning permission and have concluded the form of development proposed is acceptable in the context of the green belt designation when taking into account the benefits of the proposed scheme.	AH
48-02	It is an area that has long provided recreation and open space for walkers, cyclists and rider.	The local Public Rights of Way where affected by the scheme have been diverted to maintain the integrity of the network. The scheme includes a new shared use cycle/ foot way, increasing connectivity in the area. The package of complementary measures includes funding to improve pedestrian, cyclist and equestrian facilities in the area.	SS
48-03	We live on a restricted byway (an ancient track way predating metalled roads) in the affected area and can personally testify the intense use of area. The current plans will also cut off the most ancient hamlet in Poynton, Dog Hill Green, from the rest of the village.	See above response.	
48-04	We have attended the local consultation meetings held by the SEMMMS team and found it incredibly frustrating to try and get sound factual information about the effects of and reasons for the current plans.	Throughout the scheme development the Council has endeavoured to provide as much information as possible to the public. During the Phase 1 consultation detailed plans of the scheme and information about how the scheme impacts including noise, air quality and traffic impacts were made publicly available. For the Phase 2 consultation this information was updated based on the emerging preferred scheme and	JMcM

		<p>has been supplemented with further details about the scheme, including landscaping and ecology mitigation proposals and photomontages showing how the scheme could look. The Council has engaged directly with local residents living closest to the scheme. To this end, a total of 14 Local Liaison Forum groups for areas in closest proximity to the scheme have been set up with the aim of providing more detailed information about the proposals and giving local residents an opportunity to have their questions about the scheme answered by relevant technical experts. At the Local Liaison Forums detailed drawings of the scheme have been tabled along with further information about how the scheme will affect the local area. Our team of technical experts has been present at each Local Liaison Forum meeting to explain any aspects of the scheme in more detail to attendees. In advance of the planning application being submitted Local Liaison Forum drop-in sessions were held to provide Local Liaison Forum members an early opportunity to view the preferred scheme for which a planning application would be submitted. In addition to the Local Liaison Forums, a series of public exhibitions associated with the Phase 1 and 2 consultations were held in venues across the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road area, to which individuals with an interest in the scheme can go to find out more. For anyone who was unable to attend an event, a dedicated information line and email which people could use to get their questions answered directly was available. The assessment undertaken for traffic related noise has indicated that levels at the objectors' property will increase by some 7.3 DB(A) (decibels) from 44.3 dB(A) without the scheme to 51.5 dB(A) with the scheme. The assessment takes into account mitigation in the form of low noise surfacing and an environmental barrier running along the crest of the cutting slope where the proposed scheme is aligned to the north of the objectors' property.</p>	
--	--	---	--

48-05	Direct requests for information led to being referred to a web site that was a labyrinthine in nature and where the graphic were of such poor quality it was impossible to understand them.	See above response.	JMcM
48-06	Despite asking, we are no wiser on noise or even whether vehicles will be seen from where we live .	See above response.	JMcM
48-07	Even more basic and frustrating were conflicting pronouncements about the purpose and nature of the planned road. Originally the SEMMMS proposals were to allow for different transport proposals to aid local journeys. Consultation showed that road development was the least popular method proposed to solve local transport issues.	The South East Manchester Multi-Modal Strategy is a 20 year strategy covering an area to the south east of Manchester including parts of Cheshire East, Derbyshire, Stockport and Tameside local authority areas. In Spring 2001 the South East Manchester Multi-Modal Strategy (SEMMMS) was accepted by the Government. Since then the Local Authorities within the SEMMMS area – Cheshire East, Derbyshire, Manchester, Stockport and Tameside, together with Transport for Greater Manchester, have been working hard to deliver the various elements of the strategy. The 20 year strategy was developed to deal with existing and predicted transport problems in the area and aims to: •Improve public transport •Improve the use of road space •Encourage transport change •Encourage urban regeneration •Improve highwaysAppendix L of the published scheme business case gives a summary of progress against the SEMMMS study recommendations Over the last ten years since the completion of the SEMMMS study, approximately £63 million has been spent on SEMMMS projects. As part of the Phase 1 consultation on the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road we asked the question there was a specific question that allowed respondents to indicate their preference or otherwise for the scheme: “What is your overall opinion on the proposed A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road?”. The Phase 1 consultation demonstrated that 69% of respondents were either in favour or strongly in favour of the scheme.	JMcM

48-08	<p>The area is a commuter belt and inevitably people were looking for convenient but environmentally sound proposals such as good rail links, an extension to Greater Manchester's tram routes, development of cycle paths etc. as a means to avoiding greater congestion and preserving the nature of the area they live in.</p>	<p>As part of the Phase 1 consultation on the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road we asked the question there was a specific question that allowed respondents to indicate their preference or otherwise for the scheme: "What is your overall opinion on the proposed A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road?". The Phase 1 consultation demonstrated that 69% of respondents were either in favour or strongly in favour of the scheme.</p>	JMCM
48-09	<p>The only road in the original consultation was to bypass Hazel Grove and link into the M60 and M56 motorways. The only transport proposals we have seen is for a substantially different road. The current proposals stop at the A6 where, according to official estimates, will increase traffic by 30 % in an area already subject to air quality management because of emissions.</p>	<p>The South East Manchester Multi-Modal Strategy is a 20 year strategy covering an area to the south east of Manchester including parts of Cheshire East, Derbyshire, Stockport and Tameside local authority areas. In Spring 2001 the South East Manchester Multi-Modal Strategy (SEMMMS) was accepted by the Government. Since then the Local Authorities within the SEMMMS area – Cheshire East, Derbyshire, Manchester, Stockport and Tameside, together with Transport for Greater Manchester, have been working to deliver the various elements of the strategy. The original scheme included a new road from the Airport to the A6 and a bypass of Hazel Grove to the M60 motorway. Subsequently the government said that the whole scheme was not affordable as a single scheme and that delivery in phases should be considered. The current A6MARR is the scheme developed as a result of this. Initial traffic modelling indicated that the scheme could result in up to a 30% increase in traffic along the A6 to the east of the scheme. However, the current proposals include for mitigation measures along the A6 that would limit any increase in traffic as a result of the scheme to about 11-16%. The assessments for the proposed scheme have demonstrated that a total of 780 receptors in AQMAs will be taken below the 40ugm³ exceedance for NO₂ with the scheme in place whilst 3 receptors in the Disley AQMA will be potentially subject to increases, resulting in them being taken above the exceedance level by less than 1ugm³. As the objector notes, relevant</p>	JMCM / NM

		mitigation measures are being established with Cheshire East which will ensure the threshold is not exceeded at the three receptors. The agreement of these measures has been made the subject of a planning condition. In light of the above it is our view the proposed scheme will prove beneficial relative to the objectives of AQMAs.	
48-10	The knock-on effect of this on the Peak District does not seem to have been calculated.	Analyses show that the predicted increase in traffic along the A6 is mostly a result of traffic diverting from other less suitable roads rather than any material increase in traffic through the Peak District National Park.	NM / JMcM
48-11	The proposals will also increase traffic on A34 by estimated 22% and this appears to be without an estimated 1800 house development proposed by Cheshire East. And yet SEMMMS only consulted on what the preference was for junctions and not on the substantially changed scheme itself, let alone properly addressed the fundamental point that it was supposed to ease local journeys, not make them worse.	The traffic forecasting report and supporting appendices of the scheme Business Case set out the treatment of known future development. All developments that have a firm planning status and expect to be in place by the traffic forecast year, have been included within the traffic models. The proposed Handforth East development does not have any firm planning status at present and hence it is rightly not included within the traffic forecasts. It is acknowledged that there is predicted to be an increase in traffic along the A34 as a result of the scheme. The A34 Handforth / Wilmslow Bypass is a high capacity road built to modern standards and it is right that traffic uses this road rather than the more minor local roads.	NM / JMcM
48-12	Information was not available to the public for consultation that did take place. For example, it was not until after the Information Commissioner ordered the publication of what was proposed for drainage that the SEMMMS team agreed to release it.	The three authorities have been committed providing information to the public at the appropriate stage in the scheme's development and have, where possible, responded to requests for additional information. The Council did not wish to publish a draft report which they considered would be amended before the final scheme, however, the report was released in accordance with the Information Commissioner request. The final report was included in the planning application.	JMcM

48-13	<p>The importance of ancient woodland (of the highest grade) which will be largely destroyed by the proposals was misrepresented. The existence of an alternative route which would avoid the felling of this woodland an bypass many residential properties was not made public at the consultation .</p>	<p>The proposed scheme involves the loss of 0.08ha of a total of 2.3ha of ancient woodland at Carr Wood.The SEMMMS team has always been aware of the location of the ancient woodland and has taken it into account in the developing design of the road. The Environmental Scoping report identified that the proposed road would pass through a designated Site of Biological Importance (SBI) at Norbury Brook Wood. It did not state that 2.4 ha of the 22.2 ha Norbury Brook Wood is listed as Ancient Woodland but this was identified in the more detailed business case appraisal. The Environmental Scoping report was sent to both Natural England and the Woodland Trust for comment. The Environmental Statement makes due recognition of the Ancient Woodland in its assessment of the environmental impact of the scheme. We have continued to engage with Woodland Trust and Natural England in developing the scheme, with both groups being invited to the Environmental Forum which has been set up specifically for the scheme. The alternative route was an interpretation of that 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 our view that it is not deliverable for a number of reasons, which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative A6/SEMMMS junction location does not provide future proofing for a continuous route to Jct25 of M60 Motorway; • Alternative A6/SEMMMS junction located immediately adjacent to residential properties; • Under the alternative alignment, a continuous line to the M60 would require the demolition of residential properties and an underground reservoir. It would also severely impact Hazel Grove Golf Course. 	PR / JMcM
-------	---	--	-----------

48-14	<p>The issue of air quality is of direct importance to us. It appears that current scheme on the published material will, if implemented, breach the EU Air Quality Directive 2008/50/EC. This is because Disley is already an air quality management area and the scheme increasing substantially traffic through the area and reduce air quality, contrary to the requirements in the directive.</p>	<p>The Air Quality Directive places an obligation on national authorities to implement a regime whereby areas which are recognised as being in exceedance of relevant concentrations for specific pollutants are identified and requires the establishment of plans focused on the reduction in concentrations to bring them into line with the standards. The requirements are implemented through the Air Quality Regulations in the UK. An increase at a single or small number of receptors which results in exceedance of a standard does not constitute a breach under the Directive or Regulations. In light of the above and taking into account our response concerning AQMAs above, we do not consider that it is reasonable to represent the predicted outcomes as ones which constitute a breach of the Directive but rather one that is in keeping with its objectives.</p>	PR / PC
48-15	<p>Apparently the SEMMMS team - well after the publication- has just proposed a mitigation measure of a traffic limit of 30 mph to reduce the traffic going along the A6. But, a. this will still reduce air quality b. the scheme was supposed to ease local traffic, and in any event the A6 through Disley is already 30mph in the most part! It is simply not a credible proposal and, if it were, it should already have been implemented to assist Disley's air quality management now.</p>	<p>The proposals for a 30mph speed limit was included within the transport assessment for the scheme which was submitted as part of the planning application. Initial traffic modelling indicated that the scheme could result in up to a 30% increase in traffic along the A6 to the east of the scheme. However, the current proposals include for mitigation measures along the A6 that would limit any increase in traffic as a result of the scheme to about 11-16%. The increase in traffic is not due to new journeys but is mainly a result of traffic re-routing from other more minor roads to the A6 as it becomes a more attractive and quicker route. The mitigation measures would seek to reduce this speed advantage of the A6 through interventions that will increase journey times along the A6 by about two to three minutes. The traffic model indicates that this will reduce the diversion of traffic to the A6 and thus limit any traffic increase to about 11-16%. See also response to 48-09-SS and 48-14-PR.</p>	NM

48-16	The road will increase air pollution along most of its length - and significantly runs right by the playground of Queensgate Primary School, Bramhall.	There will be an increase in NO ₂ and PM ₁₀ levels in the vicinity of the proposed scheme. However, there will four times as many receptors who will be subject to a reduction NO ₂ concentrations and three times as many who will be subject to a reduction in PM ₁₀ concentrations compared to those who will be subject to an increase for the two pollutants within the overall network affected by the proposed scheme. The assessments undertaken relating to local air quality and Queensgate School have indicated that there will be an increases in levels between 3.5 ugm ₃ for nitrogen dioxide (NO ₂) close to the school buildings and 9.5 ugm ₃ at the boundary nearest to the proposed scheme. In relation to particulates (PM ₁₀) they have indicated increases of 1.5 ugm ₃ and 1.8 ugm ₃ in these two locations. The predicted concentrations with the proposed scheme in place for the two locations are 24.8 and 31.3 ugm ₃ for NO ₂ and 14.8 and 15.9 ugm ₃ for PM ₁₀ . All of the results are well within the stipulated national air quality standards which provide an indicator relative to human health. The Environmental Protection (UK) guidance would deem these changes as negligible at the school and slight adverse at the site boundary.	PR / PC / JMcM
48-17	There are substantial legal and public interest issues that need to be properly and transparently addressed before even more public money is wasted, These may well cause the scheme to fail at a public inquiry. We do not consider that, in these circumstances, compulsory purchase orders should be granted given that they may well lead, for example, to the premature felling of ancient woodland, before planning permission is obtained. This seems on basic democratic principles to be quite wrong.	The scheme has been developed in accordance with the democratic procedures of the three local authorities promoting the scheme and government business case assessment guidance (WebTAG) and has been assessed in planning terms by the three Local Planning Authorities. The scheme is supported by robust consultation and assessment, the outcome of which are considered through the democratic and planning process.	JMcM

49: Sheila Oliver 8 Howard Close, Romiley, Stockport, Cheshire, SK6 3BH			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
49-01	I wish to object to the above mentioned COPs [sic] on the grounds that there are serious illegalities with the road scheme proposals, not least it being in breach of the EU Air Quality directives, which means the entire road scheme could fail at public inquiry, It would be insanity unsurpassed so far by Stockport Council to purchase 178 pieces of land with the resulting compensation and legal costs for a road which won't pass planning process due to being in serious breach of EU law.	The three local planning authorities have considered the proposals for the scheme and its potential environmental impacts have been considered as part of that process. The Air Quality Directive places an obligation on national authorities to implement a regime whereby areas which are recognised as being in exceedance of relevant concentrations for specific pollutants are identified and requires the establishment of plans focused on the reduction in concentrations to bring them into line with the standards. The requirements are implemented through the Air Quality Regulations in the UK. An increase for a single receptor of small number of receptors which results in exceedance of a standard does not constitute a breach under the Directive or Regulations. In light of the above and taking into account our response concerning AQMAs above, we do not consider that it is reasonable to represent the predicted outcomes as ones which constitute a breach of the Directive but rather one that is in keeping with its objectives. The assessments for the proposed scheme have demonstrated that a total of 780 receptors in AQMAs will be removed from exceedance of the NO ₂ objective with the scheme in place whilst 3 receptors in the Disley AQMA will be subject to exceedance level by less than 1ugm ³ . In light of the above it is our view the proposed scheme will prove beneficial relative to the objectives of AQMAs.	PR / PC

50: Steve Houston (PAULA) 218 Chester Road, Poynton, Cheshire, SK12 1HP			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
50-01	Carr Wood is established included in the Ancient Woodland Inventory and is protected as such in the NPPF. The current plans show that the carriageway, let alone flanking earthworks, overlay the ancient woodland. Experts say that the zone of a road's influence extends 100s of metre through ancient woodland. Carr Wood is about 300m wide. It is therefore likely that most of the woodland will be adversely affected by the road.	The proposed scheme involves the loss of 0.08ha of a total of 2.3ha of ancient woodland at Carr Wood. The National Planning Policy Framework notes that: 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; 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 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. We are not able to comment on the objectors' reference to experts and their view relating to a roads influence as the sources are not identified. The proposed scheme and its implications relating to the ancient woodland has, however been subject to scrutiny through the planning process and has involved independent consideration by Natural England, The Greater Manchester Ecological Unit and Cheshire East Nature Conservation Officer. There were no objections lodged by any party, including other organisations with a potential interest, such as the Woodland Trust during the consultation period prior to determination of the application.	PR / AH
	We contend that the Council (SMBC):		

50-02	Incorrectly identified Carr Wood as a Site of Biological Interest despite MCC correctly identifying it as AW before SMBC took leadership of the project in 2000.	The status of Carr Wood as ancient woodland is fully recognised in the ES. The implications for the wood have been appropriately taken into consideration as part of the planning process.	PR
50-03	Supplied potential consultees with maps that omitted Carr Wood ancient woodland but which did show other neighbouring areas of ancient woodland.	The SEMMMS Project Team has always been aware of the location of the ancient woodland and has taken it into account in the developing design of the road. Plans provided during the Phase 1 and 2 consultation on the scheme showed the ancient woodland.	PR / NH
50-04	Did not consult recognised experts regarding suitable mitigation	As indicated in the ES and readily acknowledged by all parties with an interest in the value of ancient woodland as a landscape and nature conservation component within the environment, it is not possible to recreate ancient woodland. Proposed measures for new woodland planting described in the Environmental Statement have been developed by the project ecologists and have been subject to review and consideration by Natural England, The Greater Manchester Ecological Unit and Cheshire East's Nature Conservation Officer. There were no objections or further recommendations lodged by any party, including other organisations with a potential interest, such as the Woodland Trust during the consultation period prior to determination of the application.	PR
50-05	Only produced alternative road alignment that mitigated the impact on the ancient woodland in Sept 2013 under pressure from NGO's and local residents.	The alternative route was an interpretation of that 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 our view that it is not deliverable for a number of reasons, which include: alternative A6/SEMMMS junction location does not provide future proofing for a continuous route to Jct25 of M60 Motorway; alternative A6/SEMMMS junction located immediately adjacent to residential properties; under the alternative alignment, a continuous line to the M60 would require the demolition of residential properties and an underground reservoir. It would	NH / JMcM

		also severely impact Hazel Grove Golf Course.	
50-06	We fear that allowing the ownership of land to be transferred to the council might result in damaging preparatory works being carried out before the road alignment and appropriate mitigation has been fully investigated.	Relevant mitigation measures have been proposed and will be implemented in the appropriate timescales.	AH / JMcM
50-07	There are many instances of damaging preparatory works preceding cancellations of this road scheme which dates back to the 1930s. In this area alone cottages were demolished following compulsory purchase, just downstream of Carr Wood in the 1990s even though today's alignment would probably not have required their elimination.	The scheme is proceeding through the relevant legal processes in accordance with the projected programme.	JMcM

51: Greg Willman 36 Cromley Road, High Lane, Stockport, SK6 8BP			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
51-01	I have challenged the applicant to provide important information, integral to this application, that has neither been disclosed to the Councillors that voted on this application or the public despite my written requests to the applicant going back to 2013 and I would be obliged if my objection to the application be registered with regard to my request that this matter be referred to Public Inquiry.	This information was included in the original transport assessment included with the planning application and officers have discussed this with Mr Willman, provided links to the information and copied and pasted it into responses to Mr Willman. In addition, Mr Willman recently asked for “the computerate data” which the Council has interpreted as the source SATURN computer software output used to derive the information contained in the transport assessment and this has been sent to Mr Willman as part of the recent Freedom of Information request in April 2014.	JMcM
51-02	I would wish to make the below request for the below referred to traffic modelling data which will show that the application, and Scheme deriving from it, is not fit for purpose and should not proceed without consideration by a Public Inquiry, especially, as the applicant is refusing to respond to the below referred to correspondence in order clarify my reasonable request on a matter that will cost millions of pounds of public money and will, in my opinion, if built, destroy the south of Manchester through which it will travel as well as the Peak District National Park through which commercial traffic from the continent will be sucked as a short cut to Manchester airport as opposed to using the present motorways presently facilitated for commercial traffic	See response to 51-01 above. It has been demonstrated that the increase in traffic along the A6 is due to that route becoming more attractive in combination with the A6MARR to existing traffic making that east-west journey. The A6MARR scheme does not attract any significant new traffic through the Peak District National Park. The Peak District National Park Authority has confirmed that they do not object to the scheme.	JMcM / NM

	of such volume.		
51-03	This application is not for the benefit of the public it is a duplicitous fraud that will destroy an area of outstanding natural beauty if allowed to proceed without consideration by Public Inquiry.	The scheme proposals have been considered by the three local planning authorities.	JMcM

52: Charlotte Valek Oakwood Cottage, 4 Old Mill Lane, Hazel Grove, Stockport, Cheshire, SK7 6DP			
Element of objection	Objection	Response	Expert Witness
52-01	It will increase traffic through the already near grid locked Hazel Grove as cars get to the new road in High Lane.	Traffic modelling shows that there will be a reduction in traffic flows on the A6 through Hazel Grove therefore complementary and mitigation measures in the form of a potential opportunity for reallocation of road space to improve facilities for pedestrians, cyclists and bus passengers are proposed.	NM
52-02	It will destroy irreplaceable ancient woodland.	The proposed scheme involves the loss of 0.08ha of a total of 2.3ha of ancient woodland at Carr Wood. The National Planning Policy Framework notes that: 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; 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 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. The proposed scheme and its implications relating to the ancient woodland has, however been subject to scrutiny through the planning process and has involved independent consideration by Natural England, The Greater Manchester Ecological Unit and Cheshire East Nature Conservation Officer.	PR / AH

52-03	It will destroy green areas irreversibly changing the area.	In relation to green belt, it is the case that parts of the proposed scheme will be located in green belt. The planning authorities have taken this relationship into account when granting planning permission and have concluded the form of development proposed is acceptable in the context of the green belt designation when taking into account the benefits of the proposed scheme.	AH
52-04	It will increase pollution along its entire route.	There will be an increase in NO ₂ and PM ₁₀ levels in the vicinity of the proposed scheme. However, there will four times as many receptors who will be subject to a reduction NO ₂ concentrations and three times as many who will be subject to a reduction in PM ₁₀ concentrations compared to those who will be subject to an increase for the two pollutants within the overall network affected by the proposed scheme.	PR / PC
52-05	It is not difficult to get to the airport now from this area so a new road is not even required.	There is currently no direct east-west transport link through south east Greater Manchester and Cheshire East. The lack of this connection is contributing to congestion on major and minor roads. This means that people and goods cannot move easily, directly and efficiently. The congestion being created is constraining the local economy, affecting air quality in local areas and reducing access to key destinations. These problems will become significantly worse in the future if no action is taken.	JMcM

<p>53: Linzi Louise Wood and Perry Simon Wood Coppice End, Mill Hill Hollow, Poynton, SK12 1EJ CPO Plots: 3/6 and 3/6A Agent: John Seed Brown Rural Partnership, 29 Church Street, Macclesfield, Cheshire, SK11 6LB</p>			
53-01	<p>The nearest edge of the carriageway is approximately 45 metres distant from Mr and Mrs Wood's dwelling house, Coppice End. The carriageway will be raised over the valley at this location. A number of existing mature trees would be removed as part of the works which otherwise would have offered screening to the road. The resultant visual and noise impact will be significant for a residential property that currently enjoys a high degree of privacy and peace and quiet. Insufficient mitigation measures are being adopted to respond to these concerns, and indeed sufficient mitigation measures may not be available.</p>	<p>The landscape proposals provide for the introduction of new tree planting between the proposed balancing pond and Coppice End and dense woodland on the embankment slopes where the dual carriageway crosses the valley east of your property. The proposals also provide for the use of low noise surfacing on the new carriageways and an environmental barrier at the top of the embankment slopes to mitigate traffic-related noise. As a result, views of traffic using the road will be limited to the tops of high-sided vehicles upon opening of the relief road. These views will be closed as the tree planting and woodland establishes and matures. With regard to noise, the mitigation measures will serve to reduce the impact of the presence of the traffic on the dual carriageway. However, as identified within the Environmental Statement, there will still be a major increase in traffic-related noise in the order of 12dB(A) decibels.</p>	PR/ NH
53-02	<p>The removal of the trees will also open up a view to the proposed new balancing pond; currently the view to the northeast of the property is well screened.</p>	<p>The pond is deep therefore will require security fencing. The type of fencing and surrounding landscape screening (existing and proposed) will be considered during detailed design in order to minimise the visual impact.</p>	NH

53-03	The property currently enjoys a very secure position given that their Property stands at the end of the access road. The presence of the road, diverted footpaths, new cycle way and the bridge servicing access will severely compromise the level of security currently enjoyed.	The scheme has undergone a brief Design for Security review. This has provided general advice on the matter of security and following our previous discussions with you, we identified your concerns here. The review advises to carry out practical measures in terms of landscaping, visibility sights lines etc. in order safeguard personal safety. The vehicular right of way will be provided for authorised users only. The Public Right of Way is to be diverted but does currently existing within your property boundary. Again the previous works and your comments will feed into the detailed design stage in order to mitigate your concerns.	NH
53-04	The extent of the land take is exacerbated by the provision of a new footway/cycle way, which could be relocated elsewhere.	The shared use cycleway/footways and bridleways are part of the main scheme objectives and aim to increase social benefit and safety in the area. The Council considers that there is a compelling case for them to be included within the scheme and CPO.	SS
53-05	The Acquiring Authorities have failed to show any compelling case to take land for the purposes of pedestrian and cycle routes and bridleways; these routes are not required for, or critical to, the purpose of the constructing the Relief Road and its cuttings and embankments. The land required for these routes should be deleted from Schedule 1 of the CPO.	The shared use cycleway/footways and bridleways are part of the main scheme objectives and aim to increase social benefit and safety in the area. The Council considers that there is a compelling case for them to be included within the scheme and CPO.	NH

53-06	The stopping up or removal of any private means of access is unacceptable and irrational where it is not replaced with an alternative and viable means of access.	All known private means of access and rights of way have been maintained or re-provided in locations that provide a suitable and reasonably convenient access. If this has not been possible then the objector may be compensated for the loss of their right, in accordance with the Compensation Code and each claim will be determined on its merits.	HC
-------	---	--	----