

**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 SEMMMS IMPLEMENTATION,  
CONSULTATION, WALKING AND CYCLING aspect of the  
A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road**

**-of-**

**Susan Mary Stevenson**

**BA (Hons) Environmental Sciences**

**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 – PROOF**

**Local Public Inquiry – 30<sup>th</sup> September 2014**

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction
2. Development of the SEMMM Strategy
3. Objectives of the SEMMM Strategy
4. The SEMMM Strategy proposals
5. Implementation of the SEMMM Strategy
6. General Policy Context of SEMMMS
7. Consultation process for the A6 to Manchester Airport Scheme
8. General Response to Consultation
9. Strategic Background
10. Proposed Pedestrian & Cycle Facilities for the Scheme
11. Consultation Process for the Walking & Cycling Elements of the Scheme
12. Consultation Outcomes on the pedestrian, Cycle and Rights of Way Elements of the Scheme
13. Complementary Measures
14. Conclusion

### 1. Introduction

- 1.1. My name is Susan Mary Stevenson. I am the Investing in Growth Manager supporting the Place Management and Regeneration Directorate of Stockport Council.
- 1.2. I hold a BSc in Environmental Sciences and I have over 15 years' experience working as a Transport Policy and Programmes Manager.
- 1.3. I am giving evidence on behalf of the Metropolitan Borough Council of Stockport on its behalf and on behalf of Manchester City Council and Cheshire East Borough Council by virtue of an Agreement entered into between the three partnering Authorities pursuant to Section 8 of the Highways Act 1980 (<sup>1</sup>Core Document 1009). I have read the Statement of Case; I am therefore aware of the broad case advanced to promote the aforementioned Orders, including details relating to: the need, background and details of the scheme, the impact of the scheme and its implications for economic growth,

---

<sup>1</sup> A6MARR Delivery Agreement 1009

traffic including rights of way, noise, air quality, landscape and ecology, planning and land acquisition issues. This evidence is given in support of that case.

1.4. In my evidence I shall set out the Council's case in relation to the following: the history and objectives of the South East Manchester Multi-Modal Strategy (SEMMMS) (<sup>2</sup>Core Document 5002), the progress with implementing the strategy, the consultation process for the scheme, the facilities for pedestrians and cyclists proposed for the scheme, the consultation on these types of facilities and the response to the consultation in determining the final scheme proposals.

1.5. My evidence should be read alongside the evidence of:

- Jim McMahon Director Major Projects, SMBC
- Naz Huda Client Design Manager, SMBC
- Nasar Malik Director, Atkins Limited.
- Paul Reid Technical Director, Mouchel Infrastructure Services.
- Paul Colclough Air Quality Team Leader, Mouchel Limited
- Jamie Bardot Principal Environmental Advisor, Morgan Sindall plc
- Alan Houghton Head of Planning & Regeneration North, URS Infrastructure & Environment UK Limited (URS)
- Henry Church Senior Director, CBRE Ltd

which I am familiar with. I consider that this evidence, together with my evidence, provides a compelling case, in the public interest, to confirm the Orders.

## **2. Development of the SEMMM Strategy**

2.1. In July 1998 the Government published A New Deal for Trunk Roads in England (<sup>3</sup>Core Document 4016), following a strategic review of the roads programme undertaken in association with the development of its new Transport Policy. The report established a Targeted Programme of Improvements to the trunk road network to be taken forward by the Highways Agency. The report also proposed

---

<sup>2</sup> SEMMMS Final Report 2001 5002

<sup>3</sup> A new deal for trunk roads in England 1998 4016

a series of 'multi-modal' studies to address problems on the strategic trunk road network not covered by the short term Targeted Programme of Improvements (<sup>4</sup>Core Document 4016).

- 2.2. The SEMMMS Study (<sup>5</sup>Core Document 5002) was one of these studies. The Government recognized that the transport problems and their solutions were not just limited to the trunk road network and therefore the studies considered all modes of transport across the area.
- 2.3. The SEMMMS study first identified the area to be covered by the study and it then consulted stakeholders and the public on the perceived transportation issues in the area. The strategy objectives were identified and consulted upon and then a number of activity areas including road, bus, rail and freight were identified with associated types of activities at varying levels of interventions.
- 2.4. These elements were developed and tested as six separate strategy options in order to arrive at a preferred strategy of interventions. The six options identified included a variety of scenarios including the full remitted road schemes,<sup>6</sup> public transport only schemes, a smaller road package without public transport improvements and a mixture of schemes.
- 2.5. The study was undertaken in accordance with the Guidance on the Methodology for Multi-Modal Studies (GOMMMS) (<sup>7</sup>Core Document 4015) methodology and the appraisal process considered economic, social and environmental impacts of the schemes.
- 2.6. The scenarios were modelled and tested and the Strategy Steering Group considered the results of the analysis and developed a final strategy which was subject to further consultation before it was approved. The final report was supported by the local authorities, the Association of Greater Manchester Authorities (AGMA), the North West Regional Bodies and the Government.

---

<sup>4</sup> A new deal for trunk roads in England: Targeted Programme of Improvements 1998 4016/7.4

<sup>5</sup> SEMMMS Final Report Sept 2001 5002

<sup>6</sup> That is, the A6(M) Stockport North South Bypass, the A555 Manchester Airport Link Road West and the A555/A523 Poynton Bypass.

<sup>7</sup> Guidance on Multi-Modal Studies (GOMMS) 1999 4015

### **3. Objectives of the SEMMM Strategy**

3.1. The SEMMMS objectives are;

- Promote environmentally sustainable economic growth:
  - Improve transport network efficiency;
  - Promote economic growth; and
  - Protect the environment.
- Promote urban regeneration:
  - Improve access to principal regeneration sites outside the Core Study Area;
  - Improve access to brownfield/renewal sites within the Core Study Area; and
  - Improve levels of employment.
- Improve amenity, safety and health:
  - Minimise accidents;
  - Improve security and reduce crime;
  - Reduce noise levels;
  - Improve air quality; and
  - Promote the use of healthier transport modes.
- Enhance “centres” at all levels and the Airport:
  - Reduce the impact of road traffic;
  - Improve public transport accessibility, reliability and punctuality to centres from the study area;
  - Provide for access to the Regional Centre from local centres;
  - Achieve mode split and traffic level targets for Airport related traffic; and
  - Improve road journey time reliability to the Airport.
- Encourage community, cultural life and social inclusion:
  - Improve access to health, educational and leisure facilities;

- Provide accessible transport to the mobility impaired, elderly and families;
- Improve cycling and pedestrian facilities in residential areas;
- Minimise the impact of traffic on local communities; and improve transport access to/from areas of local deprivation.

#### 4. The SEMMM Strategy Proposals

4.1. An implementation plan identifying areas of activities - road, rail, metrolink, buses, use of road space, freight, transport change and interchange - was developed to deliver the SEMMM Strategy. This plan was developed using an option appraisal process to identify the types of activities that would deliver the strategic objectives and it identified a multi-modal package of measures that should be implemented in the area over a twenty year period.

4.2. The following sections describe the strategy that was approved in 2002.

4.3. The strategy included a number of measures within each area of activity. The type and range of measures are described below however the SEMMM Strategy (<sup>8</sup>Core Document 5002) includes the detailed proposed actions.

- **Roads** - the strategy recommended that the remitted highway schemes were constructed as a reduced scheme to meet local rather than strategic needs. The strategy also supported the building of the A34 bypass at Alderley Edge and improvements to Denton Interchange on the M60.
- **Metrolink** - recommendation for Metrolink to be extended to Stockport and that the feasibility of extending it to Marple should be assessed including considering interoperability of heavy and light rail . Also consider Marple - Manchester and Stockport - Airport links.
- **Bus** - implementation of a Quality Bus Network on key routes across the area and consideration of Quality Partnerships.

---

<sup>8</sup> SEMMMS Final Report Sept 2001 5002

Improved local services to the Airport, improved bus stops and bus stations and improved information.

- **Rail** - supported the Manchester (now Northern) Hub proposals, improved local services and rail stations, consider Western and Eastern links from the West Coast line to the Airport and new stations proposals to see if justified.
- **Use of Road Space** - introduce area wide traffic calming and Home Zones, area wide cycle network, promote walking and cycling in existing centres and improve maintenance and signing of existing highway network.
- **Freight** - establish a freight quality partnership with freight operators and improve freight signing.
- **Transport Change** - measures were identified in the following three categories:
  - **Behavioural Change** - area wide approach to encouraging use of public transport, walking and cycling, development of travel plans and school travel plans and safer routes to school schemes.
  - **Land Use Policy** - appropriate land use policies should be developed to support SEMMM Strategy
  - **Urban Regeneration** - improvements to existing local, district and town centres and encourage sustainable access to centres.
- **Interchange** - improve condition of and potential for interchange between modes. Review opportunities for smart ticketing and real time information.

## **5. Implementation of the SEMMM Strategy**

- 5.1. Following the approval of the SEMMM Strategy by Government in 2002 the local authorities, Cheshire (now Cheshire East) Derbyshire, Manchester, Stockport and Tameside and Transport for Greater Manchester, in the SEMMMS area, commenced working together to deliver the various elements of the strategy. The following sections briefly describe the progress within each area of activity.

5.2. Approximately £63 million has been spent on SEMMMS projects since 2001/02. Many of the smaller scale initiatives were implemented between 2002 and 2010 and various reports have been written to accompany the Local Transport Plan Progress Reports documenting this. (<sup>9</sup>Core Documents 5026, 5024 and 5025)

5.3. **Roads** - A business case was developed for the SEMMMS Relief Road as recommended however Government advice was to consider delivering it in stages. The A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road is the first phase to be progressed and Stockport Council and Cheshire East remain committed to delivering the whole scheme. The A34 Alderley Edge bypass has been delivered and the Highways Agency has undertaken some improvements to the Denton Interchange.

Cheshire East Council has commenced development of the Poynton Relief Road and has recently consulted on route options following the closure of the Woodford factory and runway. They have requested funding to deliver this scheme from the Cheshire and Warrington Local Enterprise Council Growth Plan (<sup>10</sup>Core Document 3021) and this has been allocated by the recent Government responses to the Growth Plan.

5.4. **Metrolink** - A number of feasibility studies have been undertaken to consider metrolink and tram train options for the Stockport area. The latest work undertaken by Transport for Greater Manchester is the identification of a tram train strategy which identifies a number of potential schemes for delivery including Marple - Manchester, Hazel Grove - Manchester and Stockport - Altrincham. The development of the tram train proposals is awaiting the outcome of the government sponsored trial on the Penistone line. A metrolink line from Manchester to Stockport has also been considered and a potential route identified.

---

<sup>9</sup> 2<sup>nd</sup> Local Transport Progress Report 2008 5026;  
GMLTP Annual Progress Report 2004, pg 41-44 2004 5024;  
GMLTP 2005 Annual Progress Report, pg 44-46 2005 5025

<sup>10</sup> Cheshire and Warrington Matters 2014 3021



- 5.5. **Bus** - Funding was obtained to implement the SEMMMS Major Scheme Quality Bus Corridors/ Integrated Transport Corridors (QBCs/ITCs) scheme (<sup>11</sup>Core Document 5020). This included eleven main corridors plus a network of routes to serve the Airport. The improvements were designed to reduce journey time, improve reliability and increase comfort and convenience to all users.
- 5.6. The eleven main corridors in the SEMMMS programme were:
- Manchester – Hyde (A57);
  - Stockport – Hyde (A560/A627);
  - Stockport – Brinnington;
  - Stockport – Marple (A626);
  - Stockport – Cheadle Hulme;
  - Stockport – Cheadle (A560);
  - Stockport – Urmston (A5145);
  - Manchester – East Didsbury (A34);
  - Manchester – Northenden (A6010/B5167);
  - Withington – Didsbury (B5093); and
  - Stockport – Reddish (B6167).
- 5.7. The schemes included providing accessible bus stops, renewing traffic signals and utilising technology to make them smarter, providing bus lanes and bus priority schemes along the routes, improving lighting and pedestrian crossings and providing laybys for local residents and shops.
- 5.8. The schemes delivered improvements to journey time and more reliable bus services along the corridors encouraging greater public confidence in their reliability.
- 5.9. Other Public Transport improvements have included:
- accessibility improvements to bus stops on other bus routes
  - improvements to accessibility for a number of transport interchanges and railway stations in the SEMMMS area;

---

<sup>11</sup> SEMMMS QBC Programme Report 5020

- the provision of a computerised booking and scheduling system for flexible transport providers such as Ring and Ride and Local Links;
  - the provision of yellow buses to improve school journeys by reducing anti-social behaviour and so increasing use of public transport for school journeys.
- 5.10. The A6 Quality Bus Corridor scheme was completed and an A6 Quality Partnership has been agreed and implemented with the relevant bus operators and local authorities.
- 5.11. **Rail** - A rail station improvement programme has commenced across Tameside, Stockport, Manchester, Derbyshire and Cheshire East. The rail station improvement schemes have included improved car and cycle parking, help points and information screens, rail station travel plans and improved pedestrian and cycle access to stations.
- 5.12. A number of these stations now have “Friends of” groups and are part of Community Rail Partnerships including the Crewe and Manchester, High Peak and Hope Valley and South East Manchester Community Rail Partnerships.
- 5.13. Delivery of new rail stations has not yet progressed although aspirations remain for their delivery.
- 5.14. The Manchester Hub now Northern Hub rail improvement package has been approved, funding identified for its implementation and work has commenced on key schemes within the programme. This package includes infrastructure and service improvements e.g. the Ordsall Curve and new platforms at Piccadilly. The additional rail network capacity will allow enhanced services in the area.
- 5.15. The Western and Eastern link routes to the airport have been assessed and Network Rail has informed us it does not want to progress the Eastern Link. The High Speed Rail HS2 proposals identify a different route to the airport and work around this is progressing at a national level.

- 5.16. **Use of Road Space-** A number of area wide traffic calming schemes and Home Zones have been introduced across the SEMMMS area where requested by local residents. 20mph zones have also been implemented adjacent to schools.
- 5.17. Highway maintenance and street lighting improvement schemes have been undertaken across the area with improved signing schemes being implemented on key routes.
- 5.18. Cycle networks have been identified and new on and off highway cycle routes have been implemented across the area. These include the Stockport element of the Trans Pennine Trail, the Connect To scheme in Marple, improvements to the off-road canal and old railway routes in Marple and local cycle networks in Reddish and Hazel Grove.
- 5.19. A number of initiatives to encourage cycling including the development of paper and web based cycle maps and adult and child cycle training have been implemented.
- 5.20. **Freight** - A Greater Manchester Freight Quality Partnership has been created and a number of initiatives have been undertaken by this group including development of a freight map, enhanced signing of low bridges and freight routes.
- 5.21. **Transport Change including Behavioural Change, Urban Regeneration and Land Use Policy** - A behavioural change programme to accompany the minor works programme was developed and elements of this work continue to be implemented. The minor works programme included pedestrian and cycle routes, small scale bus priority, bus stop and access to rail stations improvement programmes, Home Zone and 20mph zones schemes and the centre improvement schemes described in the following paragraphs.
- 5.22. The behavioural change programme included personalised travel planning schemes in Hazel Grove and the Heatons, development of travel plans by key employers and destinations and continuing publicity and initiatives to encourage the use of public transport and active travel i.e. walking and cycling.

- 5.23. Planning policies in the area reflect the national approach to sustainability.
- 5.24. Improvements to local, district and town centres to encourage sustainable means of access and to improve their viability have been undertaken across the area. Centre improvement programmes have included public realm schemes, cycle parking, accessible bus stops and improved connectivity with local rail stations.
- 5.25. All the eight district centres in Stockport - Bramhall, Cheadle, Romiley, Edgeley, Cheadle Hulme, Reddish, Hazel Grove and Marple - have had substantial improvement schemes including improvements to the public realm, lighting and car parking, provision of accessible bus stops and cycle parking.
- 5.26. Improvement schemes have also been undertaken in Wythenshawe, Wilmslow, Poynton and Handforth centres and in High Lane, Davenport, Heaton Moor, Woodley, Gatley and Heald Green local centres.
- 5.27. Considerable work has been undertaken with local schools and colleges encouraging the development of school travel plans with associated activities including bike and walk to school weeks as recurring yearly events, bike it officers and projects, pedestrian and cycle training and safer routes to school highway improvement schemes.
- 5.28. Local organisations including the Councils and hospitals have developed travel plans and travel plan officers were employed to encourage businesses to develop individual or area based travel plans. Residential travel plans have been developed for new areas of housing
- 5.29. Community based travel studies, consultations and plans were developed to encourage the use of more sustainable forms of transport in residential areas.
- 5.30. **Interchange** - improvements have been undertaken to rail and bus stations across the area with Manchester Airport Rail station having additional platforms created to improve rail access to the Airport. There are plans to replace the existing bus stations at Altrincham,

Wythenshawe, Ashton and Stockport with the first two commencing on site and the others having funding committed to allow the schemes to commence via the Greater Manchester Growth Plan.

## **6. General Policy Context of SEMMMS**

- 6.1. The adopted SEMMM Strategy (<sup>12</sup>Core Document 5002) has been incorporated into the Local Transport Plans within Cheshire, Derbyshire and Greater Manchester and individual key elements of the strategy have been incorporated into the local broader strategic documents e.g. Local Development Framework documents such as the Council's Core Strategy (<sup>13</sup>Core Document 3001) and the Greater Manchester Strategy (<sup>14</sup>Core Document 3008).
- 6.2. The multi-modal approach to resolving transport problems was a different approach to considering network capacity and congestion issues. Traditionally roads were built utilising "a predict and provide method". The new multi-modal approach and the encouragement of more sustainable forms of transport as part of a package of measures that include roads, public transport, pedestrian and cycle facilities and behavioural change techniques has now become part of national transport policy. This approach is included in the Local Transport Plans developed by local transport authorities who develop multi-modal strategies and implementation plans to support their local areas (<sup>15</sup>Core Documents 3019, 3009 and 3007).
- 6.3. The Greater Manchester and Cheshire East Local Transport Plans both incorporate this multi-modal strategic approach and contain implementation plans that seek to support local economic, environmental and social aspirations.
- 6.4. Funding for the Local Transport Plans and their key major scheme priorities have been incorporated into the local economic and growth strategies (<sup>16</sup>Core Documents 3002, 3020 and 3021).

---

<sup>12</sup> SEMMMS Final Report Sept 2001 5002

<sup>13</sup> SMBC Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011 3001

<sup>14</sup> MCC Local Development Framework Core Strategy 11<sup>th</sup> July 2012 3008

<sup>15</sup> Greater Manchester Final Transport Plan 2006 3019;

Greater Manchester Transport Plan 2011 3009;

Cheshire East Borough Council Local Transport Plan Final Strategy 2011 3007

<sup>16</sup> Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council Economic Development Strategy 2012-2017 2012 3002;  
Greater Manchester Growth and Reform Plan 2014 and annexes 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2014 3020;

- 6.5. The SEMMMS Relief Road and its first phase A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road has been identified as a key scheme in national e.g. National Infrastructure Plan 2011 and 2013 (<sup>17</sup>Core Document 4020) and local documents e.g. Greater Manchester Strategy 2013 (<sup>18</sup>Core Document 3022).

## **7. Consultation process for the A6 to Manchester Airport scheme.**

- 7.1. Consultation on the original SEMMMS Relief Road Scheme was undertaken in 2003 and 2004 and this focused on support for the Scheme, potential junction locations and design concepts and the road alignment. This information informed the ongoing development of the Scheme. The stakeholders identified in this consultation informed the identification of stakeholders for the more recent consultation in 2012/13.
- 7.2. A Vulnerable Road User Group (VRUG) and Environmental Forum was initially created to support the Scheme development in 2003/4 from local interest groups and these were recreated in 2012 to provide a similar opportunity for local groups to engage in the consultation process regarding their specific interests.
- 7.3. The Statement of Community Involvement (<sup>19</sup>Core Document 2078) and the Phase 1 and Phase 2 Consultation Reports (<sup>20</sup>Core Documents 5005 and 5006) provide a detailed report on the consultation process and its outcomes and individual elements of the consultation process and responses are referred to where appropriate by the other members of the project team. The following sections provide an overview of the consultation undertaken for the Scheme.
- 7.4. **Approach to consultation on the A6MARR (2012-2013)**
- 7.4.1. Since the 2003/2004 consultation was undertaken there have been a number of changes to the Scheme, including changes in relation to the extent and alignment of the route of the road

---

Cheshire and Warrington Matters 2014 3021

<sup>17</sup> National Infrastructure Plan – 2011 and 2013 29<sup>th</sup> Nov 2011 and 31<sup>st</sup> March 2014 4020

<sup>18</sup> Stronger Together – Greater Manchester Strategy 2013 3022

<sup>19</sup> Statement of Community Involvement Oct 2013 2078

<sup>20</sup> Phase 1 Consultation Report March 2013 5005:  
Phase 2 Consultation Report Sept 2013 5006

and its funding rationale, as well as changes in demographic trends. In addition, a number of years had passed since the original consultation was completed and it was therefore considered necessary to undertake a further comprehensive consultation exercise on the current proposals.

7.4.2. The communications and consultation programme was designed to be flexible to meet the needs of the project as it developed and responded to public feedback. The consultation programme has informed the Project Team's understanding of the views of the public and other stakeholders on both the general concept and specific elements of the Scheme.

7.4.3. The pre-application consultation process has focused on obtaining views in relation to:

- Overall opinion of the A6MARR;
- Consideration of junction options;
- The proposed mitigation measures;
- Any other views.

7.4.4. The pre-application consultation programme has been undertaken in two distinct phases. Phase 1 asked broader questions about the proposed development in order to gauge overall support and preferences on the layout of six junctions along the proposed route. In addition, the consultation captured the profile of respondents by asking questions about their gender, age, ethnicity and postcode, in order to demonstrate that the consultation has been inclusive.

7.4.5. Phase 2 of the consultation provided feedback on the results of Phase 1 and sought views on the proposed development after taking on board the comments given in Phase 1. Phase 2 also provided feedback on proposed mitigation measures and highlighted the interventions that have taken place to amend the Scheme in response to the feedback received, or where a change has not been possible, why this is the case.

Both phases have used similar methodologies and means of communication.

## 7.5. **A6MARR Communications/Consultation Strategy and objectives**

7.5.1. In November 2012 a Communications Strategy (<sup>21</sup>Core Document 5031) was prepared and agreed by the promoting authorities, as a framework for consultation activities to be undertaken on the proposed revised Scheme. The aim of the Strategy was to achieve meaningful consultation, capturing the views of those wanting to express a view on the Scheme.

7.5.2. The stated objectives of the Communications Strategy were to focus on achieving good quality consultation and an understanding of the Scheme so as to support its delivery and subsequent wider benefits to the South East Manchester area. The objectives of the Strategy were divided into communications objectives and consultation objectives and were defined as follows:

### *Communications Objectives*

- To raise awareness and inform stakeholders, road users and residents about the A6MARR;
- Promote the public consultation to ensure everyone who wants to have their say has the opportunity to do so;
- To engage all stakeholders, road users and residents with an interest in the Scheme;
- To minimise and refute ill-informed, misleading and inaccurate comments and complaints, achieving understanding and communicating the three Councils' and their partners' position on the Scheme; and
- Ensure consistency of message across the Greater Manchester Combined Authority

### *Consultation Objectives*

---

<sup>21</sup> A6MARR Communications Strategy November 2012 5031



- To demonstrate what the key issues are, and enable stakeholders to maintain an accurate understanding of the Scheme;
- Provide feedback to all taking part, evidencing impact of consultation outcomes on the revised Scheme;
- Conduct meaningful consultation with all stakeholders and the public and ensure all audiences have an opportunity to have their say;
- Demonstrate that the consultation can help inform decision making;
- To ensure consultation activity complies with all relevant legislation.

7.5.3. The Strategy provided the overarching framework for the detailed engagement and consultation activities that followed. There were two phases of consultation undertaken in 2012 and 2013.

7.5.4. The first phase of consultation on the proposed A6MARR took place from 22nd October 2012 to 25th January 2013. The first phase of the consultation asked broader questions about the proposed development to gauge overall opinion of the proposal and preferences on the layout of six junctions along the proposed route.

7.5.5. The second phase of consultation began on 3rd June 2013 and closed on 19th July 2013 and provided feedback on the first phase of consultation, details of the emerging preferred Scheme and significant changes since the Phase 1 Consultation. Questions focused on the key concerns identified in the first phase of consultation and whether people believed the Scheme now addressed these issues adequately. The issues included noise, landscape mitigation, pedestrian and cycle facilities and traffic impacts.

## 7.6. **Consultation Methods for Phases 1 and 2.**

- 7.6.1. A variety of communication methods were used to ensure people were aware of the proposals and could respond to the consultation. These included leaflets (<sup>22</sup>Core Document 5013) sent to 85,000 properties, exhibitions in the local area along the route – exhibitions were held open during the day and evenings from 10.00am until 8.00 pm and Saturdays from 10.00am – 4.00pm, letters to key stakeholders, website, use of social media including Facebook and Twitter.
- 7.6.2. The exhibitions and website were publicised in the local press and radio, with information highlighting the consultation and website on road signs and posters across the area.
- 7.6.3. Local Liaison Forums were created for those living adjacent to the route and approximately 1200 properties were invited to an evening meeting.
- 7.6.4. The first phase of the consultation process ran from 22nd October 2012 to 25th January 2013. The consultation process included the delivery of two leaflets, a general awareness raising leaflet and the second a more detailed scheme options and questionnaire to approximately 85,000 properties (see appendix 1 for Leaflet Drop Zone Map), 17 days of exhibitions, a dedicated website, phone line, use of social media, specific interest group forums, Local Liaison Forums for people adjacent to the Scheme and letters, meetings and presentations to key stakeholder groups.
- 7.6.5. The consultation and ways to become involved were advertised using a variety of media including newspaper adverts, radio and bus advertising, road signs across the area and information on the three local authority websites.
- 7.6.6. The consultation documents gave people information about the Scheme and asked their views about overall support for the Scheme and specific junction options at six locations

---

<sup>22</sup> Phase 1 and 2 Consultation Leaflets 2011-2012 5013

along the route. A general comments box was also provided for people to comment on any aspect of the Scheme.

7.6.7. People also used email, the dedicated phone line, the interactive map and social media to raise issues, queries or comment on the Scheme. Wherever possible those queries were answered within 10 – 15 working days.

7.6.8. A detailed report on the consultation process and its results was compiled and was published on the [semmms.info](http://semmms.info) website (<sup>23</sup>Core Document 5005).

7.6.9. The questionnaire sent out with the second leaflet was also available on-line and at the exhibitions. In total 8,737 response forms were received, 1,544 online and 7,193 postal responses. In addition 294 other responses were received so a total of 9,031 responses were analysed.

7.6.10. Members of the public also contacted the project team via email, dedicated phone line, letter, interactive map Facebook and Twitter and there were 10,783 unique visits to the website.

7.6.11. Seventeen days of exhibitions were held at various locations and 1,887 people signed attendance sheets. It is estimated that approximately 20% of people visiting the exhibitions did not sign in so overall attendance could be approximately 2,250 people.

7.6.12. Local Liaison Forums (LLFs) were held at various locations and local residents and businesses closest to the scheme were invited. The invitations to attend were posted to approximately 1,200 properties and over 290 people attended the various events. A Local Liaison Forum was also held at Queensgate Primary School. It is intended that these LLFs will continue to be held during the development and implementation of the Scheme.

---

<sup>23</sup> Phase 1 Consultation Report March 2013 5005

7.6.13. Local Liaison Forums - A number of LLF were established in those areas considered to be most affected by the proposals. Membership included businesses, land owners and local residents affected by the Scheme. The areas are listed below:

- LLF 1. Hazel Grove - Buxton Road Area;
- LLF 2. Hazel Grove - Mill Lane Area;
- LLF 3. Hazel Grove - Norbury Hall Area;
- LLF 4. Poynton - London Road South Area;
- LLF 5. Poynton - Mill Hill Farm Area;
- LLF 6. Poynton - Glastonbury Drive Area;
- LLF 7. Poynton - Woodford Rd / Chester Road Area;
- LLF 8. Bramhall - Woodford Road Area;
- LLF 9. Bramhall - Albany Road Area;
- LLF 10. Heald Green - Bolshaw Road Area;
- LLF 11. Handforth - Clay Lane Area;
- LLF 12. Moss Nook - Styal Road Area; and
- Queensgate Primary School.

The LLF meetings were a vital channel for a two-way dialogue between the local community and the Local Authorities and will be continued during construction to provide a consultation avenue for the appointed contractor.

7.6.13. The LLFs provided insight into local attitudes, raised awareness of the consultation and generated interest in participation amongst the wider community. The Forums provided invited residents and businesses with the opportunity to comment on proposals, make suggestions on improvements to the design of junctions and the overall Scheme as well as direct any questions regarding the Scheme to members of the project team.

7.6.14. The questionnaire included a number of equality related questions which have been analysed and the results of this

report will be used to inform the equalities impact assessment (<sup>24</sup>Core Document 2088) being undertaken for the Scheme.

## 7.7. **Phase one Consultation Results**

7.7.1. The following sections consider the key outcomes of the first phase consultation process based on the analysis of 9,031 responses and comments received via other consultation methods including emails, the exhibitions, Local Liaison Forums and other stakeholder events.

7.7.2. As part of the consultation process there was an opportunity to raise any other concerns or queries regarding the Scheme. A synopsis of the comments received and officer recommended responses to them was developed and placed on the Scheme website.

7.7.3. Whilst a number of these comments were fairly general a number highlighted specific or detailed issues and these are being considered by the relevant specialists as part of the development of the emerging preferred Scheme.

## 7.8. **Overall opinion of the Scheme**

7.8.1. People were asked their overall opinion of the Scheme and were offered five options ranging from strongly in favour to definitely not in favour.

7.8.2. The results were: Overall opinion of the Scheme No. & % of All Respondents;

- Strongly in favour 4,506 49.9%
- In favour 1,707 18.9%
- No feeling either way 370 4.1%
- Not in favour 280 3.1%
- Definitely not in favour 849 9.4%
- Don't know 72 0.8%
- No response 1,246 13.8%
- All respondents 9,031 100%

## 7.9. **Junction options**

---

<sup>24</sup> Equalities Impact Assessment Oct 2013 2088

7.9.1. The consultation questionnaire identified six locations at which junction options were offered and respondents were asked to state their preference. Opportunities for additional comments on the junction design were available on the questionnaire, at exhibitions, on the interactive map, via email and at the Local Liaison Forums.

7.9.2. A number of general comments were made about the junction options proposed and these were addressed as part of the comments that were collated in the synopsis of responses. Amongst the comments received the following were made by a number of people; roundabouts were preferred to traffic lights, and grade separated junctions and continuous facilities for cyclists were requested.

7.9.3. Considerable feedback was provided on specific design issues from 1,141 people (13%); covering a wide range of topics. The main issues raised on design features were as follows:

- Should include a Poynton by-pass (247, 3%);
- Too many traffic lights (243, 3%);
- Preference for slip roads/bridges, etc. rather than junctions (210, 2%);
- Focus on free flowing traffic (209, 2%);
- Need cycle lanes/improved cyclist provision (154, 2%);
- Need more roundabouts (145, 2%);
- Need public footpaths/improved pedestrian access (138,2%); and
- Need fewer/minimal junctions (117, 1%).

7.9.4. These comments and concerns were addressed in a number of ways including dialogue with the stakeholders who raised these issues, development and publication of the final Environmental Assessment (<sup>25</sup>Core Document 2092), Health

---

<sup>25</sup> Environmental Statement and Associated Appendices Oct 2013 2092

Impact Assessment (<sup>26</sup>Core Document 2084), Transport Assessment (<sup>27</sup>Core Document 2079) and Construction Code of Practice (<sup>28</sup>Core Document 2091) and the on-going delivery of all elements of the SEMMM Strategy.

- 7.10. **Landowner Liaison** - Officers contacted all the known landowners affected by the Scheme and invited them to a preview of the exhibition. Discussions then commenced with individual owners over how the Scheme's impacts can be minimised and the identification of the land required.

## 8. Summary of Phase 2 consultation activities

### 8.1. Phase 2 consultation (the emerging preferred Scheme)

8.1.1. The Phase 2 consultation began on 3rd June 2013 and closed on 19th July 2013.

8.1.2. A full media schedule was prepared and timely news releases were issued throughout the consultation to local, regional and national media as appropriate. A range of public information materials to raise awareness of the consultation were created. These primarily signposted people to the website and, where possible, other ways in which the public could provide their views. The range included:

- Road Signs;
- Radio Advertisements;
- Bus Advertisements;
- Press Advertisement; and
- QR Codes (Signpost to the semmms.info website).

8.2. A range of consultation methods were applied throughout the Phase 2 consultation. These included:

8.2.1. **Leaflet and Response Form** – a leaflet and response form was distributed to properties within the area surrounding the proposed development. The postal distribution of the leaflets was to an area of approximately 85,000 properties, including

---

<sup>26</sup> Health Impact Assessment 2084

<sup>27</sup> Transport Assessment 2079

<sup>28</sup> Construction Code of Conduct 2091

residential and business properties. 4,898 postal response forms were received up to and including 26th July (a week's "grace-period" following the consultation closing date was given to postal responses).

8.2.2. **Website** – Information about the consultation was provided on the website [www.semmms.info](http://www.semmms.info). The website contains further information about the consultation, as well as about how the A6MARR Scheme fits within the context of the SEMMM Strategy.

8.2.3. **Exhibitions** – A total of nine exhibitions were held between 13th June and 4th July 2013. Approximately 870 people attended the exhibition events. The primary purpose of the exhibitions was to provide attendees with an opportunity to find out more about the feedback from the Phase 1 consultation and find out more about the emerging preferred Scheme, through the information provided.

8.2.4. **Other Stakeholder Engagement** – Through a combination of written correspondence and meetings, the project team has sought the views of key groups, including residents, road users, interest groups and local businesses, affected by the A6MARR. Meetings were held for members of the Environmental Forum and the VRUG.

8.3. Two additional meetings were organized to discuss specific concerns in August and September raised by cyclists and the High Lane Residents' Association. Meetings also continued into the autumn with neighbouring authorities and other key stakeholders e.g. Network Rail and the Environment Agency.

8.4. Local Liaison Forums were held with invites going out to the original invitees to the first forum and additional local residents who had requested an invitation to attend. An additional Local Access Forum was created for residents in the Stanley Green area at their request. A third forum was held for residents in the Macclesfield Road area to address their concerns about the junction option that was included



within the emerging preferred Scheme. Approximately 270 people attended the Local Liaison Forums.

- 8.5. Responses to the consultation included within the analysed data set were received from 5,481 respondents via the following channels:
  - Paper response form: 4,898 responses
  - Online response form: 471 responses
  - Other response mechanisms (phone, email, letter): 112 responses
  - In addition, a total of 11 comments were received via the interactive map.
- 8.6. The consultation asked whether respondents believed various environmental aspects of the Scheme were being addressed including visual, noise, landscaping and ecological impacts.
- 8.7. The results indicated that the majority of respondents agreed that the environmental impacts of the Scheme were being addressed. Approximately four to five times as many respondents strongly agreed / agreed that the environmental impacts were being addressed when compared to those respondents that disagreed / strongly disagreed.
- 8.8. Respondents were most in agreement that the landscaping impacts were being addressed by the Scheme. Noise impacts were of greatest concern among respondents, with respondents most likely to disagree that this impact was being addressed by the Scheme.
- 8.9. Respondents were least likely to agree that the ecological impacts were being addressed by the Scheme. In addition, respondents were most likely to have neither agreed nor disagreed or said don't know about the proposals to address the impact on ecology.
- 8.10. The questionnaire also requested views on whether the Scheme addressed the needs of pedestrians and cyclists, accommodated public rights of way and addressed changes to traffic flows in the local area through complementary and mitigation measures.
- 8.11. The results indicate that the majority of respondents agreed that access / traffic issues were being addressed by the Scheme.

Approximately four to five times as many respondents strongly agreed / agreed that the access / traffic issues were being addressed when compared to those respondents that disagreed / strongly disagreed.

- 8.12. Respondents had the greatest strength of feeling regarding the proposals to address changes to traffic flows in the local area through complementary and mitigation measures. The results showed that of the four access / traffic issues under consideration, whilst respondents were most likely to have agreed that the Scheme will address changes to traffic flows, conversely, they were also most likely to have disagreed that this is the case. This was considered a likely outcome because it reflected both the positive and negative changes to traffic flows within the consultation area as a result of the Scheme. This was exemplified by the high levels of agreement in the Heald Green and Cheadle areas contrasted with a notable strength of disagreement in High Lane.
- 8.13. Analysis of the open response feedback highlighted key comments that were made through the consultation. When the top 10 response themes were considered, the results showed that the most common open response related to general support for the Scheme. The open responses demonstrate that there was clear interest in the walking/ cycling aspects of the Scheme and the traffic impact of the Scheme. It was evident that there was also interest in concerns about environmental aspects of the Scheme with comments relating to noise, overall environment and ecology/ wildlife / flora all falling within the top 10 comment themes. A comments log was produced which summarised all of the comments made by respondents to the consultation to enable the project team to consider the issues raised and responses were included when this log was published.
- 8.14. The consultation response indicated that the majority of respondents were satisfied with the environment and access / traffic aspects of the Scheme under consideration. In addition, support for the Scheme was clearly stated in the comments received during the Phase 2 consultation.

8.15. However, a number of issues have been highlighted during the consultation. The key issues have been identified as follows:

- Concern about visual, noise, air quality and ecological impacts, with requests for these impacts to be mitigated as far as possible;
- Concern about the traffic impact of the Scheme on High Lane and Disley;
- Local preference in the Hazel Grove area to the north of the proposed Scheme for option 2 at Macclesfield Road, Hazel Grove which was presented during the Phase 1 consultation;
- Concern about the impact of the scheme on local Public Rights of Way;
- Concern about changes to traffic flows in areas local to the Scheme and in the wider area;
- Poynton Relief Road should be implemented at the same time as the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road;
- Concern about flooding issues as a result of the Scheme;
- Some general opposition to the Scheme due to the view that it will not bring about forecast benefits, the environmental impacts, the loss of green belt and that the money should be spent on sustainable modes of travel;
- Concern from cyclists that the Scheme does not provide adequate facilities for cyclists, in particular through the provision of at-grade crossing facilities; and
- Concern about the impact of the Scheme on Queensgate Primary School, Bramhall.

8.16. The consultation responses and concerns raised during the second phase of the consultation were considered by the project team as part of the on-going Scheme development and the development of the assessment documents including the Environmental Assessment, the Health Impact Assessment and Transport Assessment.

## **9. Strategic Background to the new pedestrian and cycle facilities**

- 9.1. The integration of new pedestrian and cycle facilities in the Scheme has always been a fundamental part of the Scheme development because of the recognized importance of encouraging more sustainable modes of transport.
- 9.2. The Scheme includes a shared use pedestrian and cycle path along its length including retrofitting this to the existing A555, crossing facilities at junctions and links into the existing network and with the adjacent communities to allow access to the new path facility.
- 9.3. Opportunities have been identified as part of the proposed Complementary and Mitigation Measures Package (<sup>29</sup>Core Document 2079) to improve existing Rights of Way by altering their status e.g. footpath to bridleway or cycleway and improving surfacing.
- 9.4. The proposed relief road has been developed in accordance with the SEMMM Strategy which includes objectives to promote the use of healthier transport modes and develop an area wide cycle network.
- 9.5. The relevant Scheme objectives include:
  - Support lower carbon travel: reallocate road space and seek other opportunities to provide improved facilities for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport.
  - Improve the safety of road users, pedestrians and cyclists: reduce the volume of through-traffic from residential areas and retail centres.
- 9.6. These objectives also support the Greater Manchester Strategy (<sup>30</sup>Core Document 3022) and Greater Manchester Local Transport Plan (<sup>31</sup>Core Document 3009) objectives regarding encouraging Active Travel.

---

<sup>29</sup> Transport Assessment Appendix C Oct 2013 2079

<sup>30</sup> Stronger Together – Greater Manchester Strategy 2013 3022

<sup>31</sup> Greater Manchester Local Transport Plan 3 2011 3009

- 9.7. There is an extensive network of Non Motorised User (NMU) routes (including on road and traffic-free routes), and roads adjacent to the Scheme and in the surrounding area. The proposed Scheme involves severance of local roads and of public rights of way comprising footpaths, bridleways, cycletracks and other NMU routes with consequent potential impacts on access and amenity value on local residents, ramblers, equestrians and cyclists. The proposals provide for diversion of severed Public Rights of Way (PRoWs) and the introduction of a combined cycletrack and footpath along the entire length of the proposed dual carriageway corridor.
- 9.8. The Environmental Statement includes an assessment of anticipated impacts on NMUs of the existing footpath, PRoW and road network relative to impacts on accessibility and the amenity value of the parts of the network affected. NMUs include pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians.
- 9.9. The Environmental Statement has assessed accessibility and amenity value, has involved consideration of new severance associated with the alignment of the proposed dual carriageway and relief of severance associated with reductions in traffic flows on existing roads in the surrounding network. The assessment for both has been focused on impacts in the opening year of the proposed Scheme.
- 9.10. The study area for the assessment of accessibility and amenity value has been based on the network of NMU routes in the vicinity of and along the proposed Scheme. These include:
- PRoW;
  - cycletracks;
  - footways;
  - minor roads; and
  - local roads and cycle routes.
- 9.11. The assessment has involved:

- identification of the existing network of PRow and local roads, likely to be affected by the implementation of the proposed Scheme;
- evaluation of the levels of current use of the identified network with particular emphasis on those sections which will be crossed by the proposed Scheme or in close proximity to the proposed Scheme (the baseline environment);
- estimation of changes in distance travelled for users of the existing network, where the proposed Scheme provides for the stopping up, partial stopping up and diversion of existing PRow and the provision of new footpaths, cycletracks and bridleways;
- evaluation of the order of increased or reduced severance for users of the existing network; and
- description of the impacts and the predicted effects on NMUs and motorists using PRow and local roads taking into account severance, increased accessibility and changes in amenity value.

9.12. PRow and local roads which have been included in the assessment were identified from the following sources:

- OS mapping;
- the Definitive Maps held by SMBC, MCC and CEC;
- 2009 base year traffic data;
- non statutory consultees;
- Cheshire East and Stockport Local Access Forums;
- North West Transport Activists Round Table;
- Local user groups; and
- Sustrans

9.13. NMU routes were included in the assessment if they will be physically altered and levels of use associated with them could be likely to change as a result of the implementation of the proposed Scheme.

9.14. A survey of NMU on the identified routes was undertaken by Greater Manchester Transportation Unit to establish indicative levels of use

for each route. Each route was surveyed on a single Friday, Saturday and Sunday from 07:00 to 21:00 in June and July 2010.

- 9.15. Consultation with local residents and user groups and the surveys indicated that the existing routes on and off highway were used by pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders for a variety of purposes including utilitarian access to local facilities etc. and recreational purposes.
- 9.16. Consultation on the Scheme and the Rights of Way Improvement Plans with the Vulnerable Road User Groups and the local authority PRow officers indicated a desire for more routes in the area including bridleways, cycle routes and improved links for pedestrians. The various consultation meetings were held with these groups between March 2012 and July 2013. The outcome from these meetings was fully considered by the A6MARR project team and informed the development of the design for the purposes of the planning application in November 2013.

## **10. Proposed Pedestrian and Cycle Facilities for the Scheme**

- 10.1. The Scheme includes new cycle and pedestrian routes along its length. It will be integrated with the existing local cycle and pedestrian network to maximise access to the new route and therefore the benefits associated with the Scheme. A shared cycleway / footway will also be introduced adjacent to the existing A555 to provide a continuous route along the A6MARR.
- 10.2. A number of PRowS, including footpaths and bridleways, will be severed by the construction of the Scheme. PRow proposals to reconnect the severed network along the length of the Scheme will therefore form an integral part of the Scheme;
- 10.3. The designers have carried out preliminary meetings with VRUGs at various milestones of the Scheme design. The VRUG included representatives of local walking, cycling and equestrian groups as well as PRow and cycling officers of the three local authorities. The inputs were then translated into the design of the routing of the diverted PRowS and the new NMU infrastructure proposed.

- 10.4. There was also a focus on value engineering such as routing cyclists away from the new road enabling new works to be 'scoped out' and refining junction layouts to provide more efficient routing for cyclists. An independent Concise Pedestrian and Cycle Audit COPECAT (<sup>32</sup>Core Document 5505) was also commissioned which became a design input especially around new or modified junction arrangements. This is available within the Transport Assessment (<sup>33</sup>Core Document 2079).
- 10.5. The Scheme will provide a 2.50m wide shared cycleway / footway for the full length of the Scheme, including adjacent to the existing A555 and safe crossing features such as Puffin/Toucan/Pegasus crossing points. Bridge facilities have also been provided for the required movement in terms of spans and widths. At the western end of the Scheme a 3.00m wide shared use cycleway / footway will be provided in an area of a more urban nature near to Manchester Airport.
- 10.6. The meetings with the VRUG have identified additional opportunities to improve the local public footpath and cycleway networks along the route of the Scheme and also to link the new infrastructure with existing routes.
- 10.7. There are a number of cycle paths, footpaths and bridleways improvements proposed in addition to the combined cycletrack and footpath which will run adjacent to the dual carriageway for the length of the proposed Scheme corridor and these will be developed as part of the Complementary and Mitigation Measures Package (<sup>34</sup>Core Document 2079).
- 10.8. There are also a number of sections of existing PRowS which will be stopped up where the alignment severs them and which will be diverted via new sections of footpath, bridleway or cycle path to maintain the rights of way network.

---

<sup>32</sup> COPECAT Review Sept 2013 5505

<sup>33</sup> Transport Assessment Appendix C Oct 2013 2079

<sup>34</sup> Transport Assessment/Section 9, pgs 157-174 Oct 2013 2079



- 10.9. Footpath diversions and the proposed enhancements to the footpath network are described below and plans are included at appendix 2.
- 10.10. Footpath (FP) 109 Hazel Grove and Bramhall (HGB) will be partly stopped up at the southern end of Old Mill Lane. A new section of path will be provided involving a 350m long diversion crossing over the dual carriageway via the proposed Mill Lane Bridge and tying into the existing footpath south of the dual carriageway at its junction with Poynton with Worth (PW) FP62. There will also be a short diversion on the initial section of PW FP62 travelling south which will cross the realigned Norbury Brook via the proposed Mill Lane Pedestrian / Cycle Bridge – Over Norbury Brook. A spur off the diversion north of the dual carriageway will provide access onto the proposed new cycle path along the length of the proposed Scheme (appendix 2 – figure 1).
- 10.11. PW FP3, which also forms part of the Ladybrook Interest Trail, will be partly stopped up at the end of Mill Hill Hollow. Continued access will be provided by a 255m long new section of path which will be available for use by pedestrians and cyclists. The path will run east from Mill Hill Hollow descending to pass beneath the proposed dual carriageway along the western margin of the Lady Brook via the proposed Mill Hill Hollow Bridge and then climbing to re-join the existing footpath to the west (appendix 2 - figure 2).
- 10.12. A new section of footpath will be provided along the south side of the dual carriageway between PW FP3 and Woodford Road at the southern end of the modified Woodford Road at Lower Park. The new footpath will be routed along the top of the roadside cutting slopes and onto the approach embankments to the Hill Green accommodation bridge. It will provide for continued access across the line of the dual carriageway for users of PW FP31, FP37 and FP21, in the first two instances via the accommodation bridge and, in the latter case, along the re-aligned Woodford Road (appendix 2 – figure 3).
- 10.13. FP19 HGB will be partly stopped up between the proposed Scheme and Woodford Road. A new section of footpath, some 445m, will run

parallel with the proposed Scheme at the bottom of the northern embankment slope before crossing, via an underpass, adjacent to the West Coast Mainline and connecting back into FP19 HGB along the bottom of the southern embankment slope (appendix 2 – figure 4).

- 10.14. At the Bramhall Oil Terminal, to the north of the proposed scheme, FP14a HGB, FP15 HGB and FP16 HGB will be partly stopped up at varying points along their length. Toucan crossings are proposed to allow NMU to cross the new junction safely and re-join the footpaths on the southern side of the proposed scheme to access Poynton (appendix 2 – figure 5).
- 10.15. There is minimal severance of footpaths along the length of the existing A555 but the proposed cycleway and footpath will link with the existing footpath network. Where the A34 crosses them, footpaths WFP38A and WFP81 will be slightly re-aligned to tie into the modified junction and the crossing facilities for NMUs will be upgraded (appendix 2 – figure 6).
- 10.16. Yew Tree Footbridge will increase the length of WFP119 by 327m and cross the proposed Scheme just east of Styal Golf Course. WFP7 which forms part of this will be partly stopped up and a new footpath passing under the proposed Scheme via the new road over rail bridge crossing the Styal Rail Line will increase its length by 241m (appendix 2 – figure 7).
- 10.17. A new section of footpath will extend MCC FP253 by some 170m and will run south on the eastern side of Styal Road before crossing the Styal Road and the northern slip roads of the proposed Scheme via a Toucan crossing. The footway and cycle track along the Styal Road will be severed by the proposed Scheme. Users of this section of road will cross the proposed Scheme via the same crossing as those that use MCC FP253 (appendix 2 – figure 8).
- 10.18. The Side Road Order including proposed modifications to it provides the detail of the proposed changes to the PROWs. A schedule of these changes is included as appendix 3 which demonstrates in

each case that the statutory requirement for the provision of a reasonably convenient alternative route has been met

- 10.19. The Complementary Measures Package (<sup>35</sup>Core Document 2079) includes a package of measures to improve connectivity with the existing network by improving and upgrading some existing footpaths to bridleways following requests as part of the consultation with the VRUG.
- 10.20. A new bridge to be used by buses, equestrians, cyclists and pedestrians will be built on the line of the existing A6 Buxton Road over the proposed A555 which will retain the connectivity of the local highway network and communities.
- 10.21. Additional pedestrian and cycle links have been developed to improve links to local communities in Bramhall and around Norbury/ Mill Hill Hollow to link into the Ladybrook Valley Trail and an additional bridleway has been created in the Poynton / Woodford area to link existing off road routes and address concerns regarding the lack of off road provision for equestrians and cyclists in the area.
- 10.22. An independent Concise Pedestrian and Cycle Audit (COPECAT) (<sup>36</sup>Core Document 5505) was undertaken to review the pedestrian and cycle facilities proposed for the scheme.
- 10.23. Mr Huda will provide more information regarding the design and proposed standards for these facilities and the COPECAT as part of his evidence.
- 10.24. Details of NMU route closure / diversion during construction are currently not available. The impacts will be temporary and short-term. The contractor will be required to develop and agree a Traffic Management Plan with the appropriate local authority for the duration of the contract. The plan will identify proposals for the principal phases of the works and individual construction activities to address disruption to existing NMU movements in specific locations along the construction corridor.

---

<sup>35</sup> Transport Assessment Appendix C Oct 2013 2079

<sup>36</sup> COPECAT Sept 2013 5505

## **11. Consultation Process for the Walking and Cycling Elements of the A6 to Manchester Airport Scheme**

- 11.1. The Statement of Community Involvement (<sup>37</sup>Core Document 2078) and the Phase 1 (<sup>38</sup>Core Document 5005) and Phase 2 Consultation Reports (<sup>39</sup>Core Document 5006) provide detailed reports on the consultation process and its outcomes and individual elements of the consultation process and responses are referred to where appropriate by the other members of the project team. The following sections provide an overview of the consultation undertaken for the walking and cycling elements of this scheme.
- 11.2. In November 2012 a Communications Strategy (<sup>40</sup>Core Document 5031) was prepared and agreed by the promoting authorities as a framework for consultation activities to be undertaken on the proposed revised Scheme. The aim of the Strategy was to achieve meaningful consultation, capturing the views of those wanting to express a view on the Scheme.
- 11.3. The Strategy provided the overarching framework for the detailed engagement and consultation activities that followed. The first phase of consultation on the proposed A6MARR took place from 22nd October 2012 to 25th January 2013. The Phase 1 Consultation asked broader questions about the proposed development to gauge overall opinion of the proposal and preferences on the layout of six junctions along the proposed route (?).
- 11.4. Vulnerable Road Users Group (VRUG) – This group was set up specifically for the original SEMMMS Relief Road Scheme some 10 years ago and has continued to meet ever since in order to discuss and gather feedback on pedestrian, cycle and equestrian facilities, provision for mobility impaired people and PROWS as part of the development of the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road.

---

<sup>37</sup> Statement of Community Involvement 2078

<sup>38</sup> Phase 1 Consultation Report March 2013 5005

<sup>39</sup> Phase 2 Consultation Report Sept 2013 5005

<sup>40</sup> A6MARR Communications Strategy Nov 2012 5031

- 11.5. In addition the Local Access Forums and individual walking, cycling and horse riding groups were consulted as part of the overall consultation process.
- 11.6. The Phase 2 consultation process asked specific questions regarding the proposed walking and cycling facilities.

## **12. Consultation Outcomes on the Pedestrian, Cycle and Rights of Way Elements of the Scheme.**

- 12.1. **Phase 1 consultation feedback** - Considerable feedback was provided on specific design issues from 1,141 people (13%); covering a wide range of topics.
- 12.2. The main issues raised on cycle and pedestrian design features were as follows:
- Need cycle lanes/improved cyclist provision (154, 2%);
  - Need public footpaths/improved pedestrian access (138, 2%);
- 12.3. **Exhibition feedback** - Comments were made during the exhibitions that the Phase 1 Scheme design provided no continuity for cyclists, especially at junctions as a result of proposed traffic lights and the need to cross the road with the assistance of traffic islands. The view was held that the stop-starts that would be created by the junctions would ultimately tempt cyclists to just utilise the main carriageway rather than the designated cycle lane.
- 12.4. **Stakeholder Feedback** - A summary of the feedback received regarding cycling, walking and PROWs is provided below:
- Pedestrians, Cyclists and PROWs:*
- Insufficient attention has been paid to the needs of cyclists and pedestrians. Underpasses or bridges should be introduced at junctions. If at-grade crossings are necessary, signal timings should prioritise pedestrians and cyclists;
  - The Scheme should be used as an opportunity for wider improvements for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians in the local area;
  - The proposals need to accommodate the needs of commuter cyclists in terms of the surfacing of cycle lanes;

- Concerns about the impact of the Scheme on PROWs, such as the Ladybrook Valley Trail; and
- Suggestions for improvements to proposals for pedestrians, cyclists and PROWs.

12.5. Cycle Group comments included:

- Each of the cycle groups who provided comments on the consultation welcomed the proposed cycle / pedestrian path that will run alongside the carriageway but stressed the need to ensure that it is a continuous, well-lit link with easy to navigate junctions for cyclists.
- The groups also identified the importance of ensuring that the new cycle path is easily accessible to the wider network of on-road and traffic-free routes. A number of new cycle routes were also proposed within a number of responses, such as a route linking Disley and Poynton;

12.6. Changes made after Phase 1 consultation:

- Yew Tree Bridge - The structure was moved west to reduce the visual impact on residents.
- A6 Buxton Road Cycling Ramp was realigned and steps introduced to link the existing A6 with the proposed parallel shared used footway/cycleway.
- Oil Terminal Junction - steps have been introduced to connect the existing PRoW to the new footways around the junction.
- Oil Terminal to Woodford Road - A shared use cycleway / footway has been provided in lieu of a bridleway taking into account safety of equestrians at the Woodford Road junction.
- Longsight Lane to be promoted as a bridleway to provide better links for equestrians away from the busy A34. This also reduces the requirements for construction on the A34.

12.7. The Phase 2 consultation sought to understand the opinion of the local community on the emerging preferred Scheme proposals for pedestrians, cyclists, PROWs and Complementary and Mitigation

Measures (<sup>41</sup>Core Document 2079) to address changes to traffic flows in the local area. To this end, the consultation response form posed the question: *“To what extent do you agree or disagree that the emerging preferred scheme for the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road:*

- *Addresses the needs of pedestrians;*
- *Addresses the needs of cyclists;*
- *Accommodates public rights of way; and*
- *Addresses changes to traffic flows in the local area through complementary and mitigation measures.”*

12.8. The results indicate that the majority of respondents agreed that access / traffic issues are being addressed by the Scheme.

12.9. Respondents were asked to state the extent to which they agreed or disagreed that the emerging preferred Scheme addressed the needs of pedestrians. The results demonstrate that:

- More than half of respondents (58%) agreed or strongly agreed that the Scheme addressed the needs of pedestrians;
- 12% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that the Scheme addressed the needs of pedestrians; and
- Just over one quarter of respondents (27%) had no clear opinion with 20% of respondents who neither agreed nor disagreed and 7% who did not know.

12.10. Respondents were asked to state the extent to which they agreed or disagreed that the emerging preferred Scheme addressed the needs of cyclists. The results demonstrate that:

- More than half of respondents (59%) agreed or strongly agreed that the needs of cyclists were being addressed by the Scheme;
- 12% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that the needs of cyclists were being addressed by the Scheme; and
- Just over one quarter of respondents (26%) had no clear opinion with 18% who neither agreed nor disagreed and 8% who did not know.

---

<sup>41</sup> Transport Assessment/Section 9, pgs 157-174 Oct 2013 2079

12.11. Respondents were asked to state the extent to which they agreed or disagreed that the emerging preferred Scheme accommodated PROWs. The results demonstrate that:

- More than half of respondents (58%) agreed or strongly agreed that the proposals accommodated PROWs;
- 10% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that the scheme accommodated PROWs; and
- A notable proportion of respondents (29%) neither agreed nor disagreed or did not know, indicating that there was no clear opinion among a notable proportion of respondents on the impact of the proposals on PROWs.

12.12. A range of other comments were made relating to access/traffic. Respondents commented that there is a need to accommodate the needs of and provide access for cyclists and pedestrians.

12.13. Particular comments included the need to provide bridges/underpasses to allow pedestrians and cyclists to cross junctions, provide a separate cycle lane and suggestions for wider upgrades to the cycle network.

12.14. Respondents also commented that there is a need to ensure that the scheme links into the wider pedestrian/cycle/bridleway network.

12.15. Concerns were raised about the impact of the proposals on PROWs and respondents expressed a desire to ensure that all PROWs were maintained.

12.16. In the autumn of 2013 a group of cyclists raised further concerns regarding the Scheme and a meeting was held to discuss the draft COPECAT report (<sup>42</sup>Core Document 5505). The cyclists' main concern was the lack of underpasses or bridges for cyclists at key junctions along the route. They felt that the proposed controlled crossings at these junctions created delay for cyclists and that the provision of bridges/ underpasses should be considered. The design team explained that the additional cost was not justified and the

---

<sup>42</sup> COPECAT Review Sept 2013 5505



controlled crossings integrated into the signal timings at junctions would minimise delay and were a reasonable provision.

### 13. Complementary Measures

- 13.1. The Scheme proposals contain a package of complementary measures that could be implemented to enhance the Scheme’s benefits. These measures are detailed in the Complementary and Mitigation Measures Report (<sup>43</sup>Core Document 2079) and include a number of enhancements to the PROW network in the area surrounding the Scheme which are identified in the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road Public Rights of Way Report (<sup>44</sup>Core Document 2055). A funding allocation has been identified to implement these proposals.
- 13.2. The proposals include upgrading a number of PROWS from footpath to bridleway status. These proposals allow improved access to the shared use path for cyclists and enhance the network available for equestrians in the area.
- 13.3. The list of potential upgrades has been developed in consultation with local user groups and landowners and further consultation will be required to finalise a confirmed list of proposals for implementation.
- 13.4. It is intended to develop these complementary measures as the A6MARR scheme progresses using Dedication and Creation Orders as appropriate.
- 13.5. PROW routes it is proposed to upgrade in this way are as follows.

Footpath No.	Extents	Current Status	Proposed Status
Poynton with-Worth FP3/1 SE	Scheme to London Road North	Footpath	Bridleway
Hazel Grove & Bramhall 19HGB	From Woodford Road to Scheme	Footpath	Bridleway
Hazel Grove & Bramhall 17HGB	16HGB to Adelaide Road including the link to corner of Meadway.	Footpath	Bridleway

<sup>43</sup> Transport Assessment / Chapter 9 (pgs 157 – 174) Oct 2013 2079

<sup>44</sup> Existing and Proposed Public Rights of Way – Sheets 1 to 5 2055

Footpath No.	Extents	Current Status	Proposed Status
Cheadle and Gatley 16CG	From Moor Lane to Highfield Parkway	Footpath	Bridleway
Poynton-with-Worth FP80	From 42(a)CG to Marthall Way	Footpath	Bridleway
Cheadle and Gatley 33CG	From FP143 to Stanley Road	Footpath	Bridleway
Hazel Grove & Bramhall 16HGB	From Scheme to 17HGB	Footpath	Bridleway
Cheadle and Gatley 42(a)CG	From FP140/1 to 42CG	Footpath - Access Road	Bridleway
Cheadle and Gatley 42CG	From 42(a)CG to 38CG	Footpath- Access Road	Bridleway
Longsight Lane	Stanley Road to FP38CG	Private Road	Bridleway
Wilmslow FP119	From Clay Lane RB87 to CEBC/SMBC boundary and in to SMBC	Footpath	Bridleway
Cheadle and Gatley 38CG	From 42CG to Longsight Lane	Footpath	Bridleway
Poynton-with-Worth FP37/1 S	Scheme to Woodford Road/Lower Park Road	Footpath	Bridleway
Poynton-with-Worth FP31 N	Scheme to Woodford Road	Footpath	Bridleway
Wilmslow FP143	From Tatton Road to 33CG	Footpath	Bridleway
Hazel Grove & Bramhall 77HGB	From Sandown Road to 65HGB	Footpath	Bridleway
Hazel Grove & Bramhall 65HGB	Hazel Grove Golf Course to A6	Footpath - Access Road	Bridleway

13.6. Preliminary analysis through the continued liaison with the VRUG led to the identification of further options to improve connectivity in the Cheadle Hulme area of Stockport by promoting a new bridleway along Longsight Lane between Stanley Road and Spath Lane. These proposed options are of equivalent to those listed in the table above in terms of being potential upgrades.

13.7. Other potential upgrades to improve the linkages for sustainable modes include:

- An on-highway (A6) link to the Middlewood Way to complete a cycle route from Manchester Airport on the new cycle route to

Marple and other urban areas accessed by the Middlewood Way.

- An off-carriageway connection to Towers Road from the Macclesfield Road Junction to complete the link from Hazel Grove to Poynton for Cyclists.
- Wider Ladybrook Valley improvements to further support the usefulness of the network improvements in the area.
- Improved off-carriageway linkage on Chester Road to give connection for residential area to proposed bridleway 'spur' on Chester Road Junction. Most likely option to be an uncontrolled crossing island suitable for cyclists and pedestrians.
- Improved off or on road cycle linkages between Woodford Road Junction and Jenny Lane which is a quieter route for less experienced cyclists.
- Improved highway connection for St James' Secondary between Longsight Lane and A34 pedestrian and cyclist improvements.
- Possible link from Disley through Lyme Park to High Lane and potentially the Middlewood Way, Macclesfield Canal and Poynton.
- New link from path in to Albany Road Bramhall towards Queensgate School.

## **14. Conclusion**

14.1. I believe that the evidence I have given combined with that of my fellow witnesses regarding the original SEMMMS Strategy, its implementation and the consultation process and outcomes of the consultation on the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road Scheme supports the case for the delivery of the scheme.

I Susan Stevenson believe the matters set out in my evidence to be true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Signed.....  
| Susan M. Stevenson

Dated 05 September 2014