OBJ/56/01

10.09.14

To Jayne Hallam , Programme Officer at A555 CPO Inquiry

Dear Jayne,

I understand you may not have me on a list of Formal Objectors to Orders as this participation form was passed to me by an associate, rather than sent to me directly.

However this was because my participation/right to formally Object **was hindered by the promoters not keeping me informed** as any developments and processes for the road proposal , **despite my specific request** that they should do so, and the subsequent pledge in their answer *"The consultation has been supported by an communications strategy, intended to ensure that individuals with an interest in the scheme have been made aware that the consultation is taking place".*

I therefore attach my written submission of Objection (2) to my Participation Form (1) which will form my testimony at the Inquiry . Within this at outset I explain how my Formal Objection and Participation in the Inquiry has been hindered as described above and I also attach the relevant email exchange (3) and (4) to confirm.

I have forwarded the Objection also to the DfT In Newcastle.

I look forward to hearing

Yours sincerely

Peter Simon

PERSONA
RECEIVED
15 SEP 2014
NO 176
REF 2548
NAME JH.

cc. Secretary of State for Transport
Department of Transport
National Transport Casework Team
Tyneside House
Skinnerburn Road
Newcastle Business Park
Newcastle Upon Tyne NE4 7AR
DfTransport, Newcastle Upon Tyne)

OBJ/56/01

11.09.2014

Peter Simon
48 Post Street
Padfield
Glossop
Derbyshire
SK13 1EF

Secretary of State for Transport
Department of Transport
ational Transport Casework Team
Tyneside House
Skinnerburn Road
Newcastle Business Park
Newcastle Upon Tyne NE4 7AR

A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road Consultation – Objection

I object to all the orders, namely the side road order 2013, the CPO Order2013 (and if applicable the Exchange Land Certificate), as may be appropriate with respect to the text of Objection.

I also wish to submit this testimony orally to the Inquiry.

Introduction

My position as regards this project remains unchanged from 2013, when I filed an Objection to the Initial Consultation. I do not live in the immediate locality, but I value the green spaces around South East Manchester very highly, almost to the same degree as the immediate vicinity of my own home slightly further to the North East.

A procedural point.

- When filing my Objection I requested an acknowledgement (which I did receive first by auto reply, and subsequently in a letter from Sue Stevenson of Stockport Council both of which I attach here) .
- I advised that I would not be amenable to the scheme irrespective of junction arrangements and therefore by implication would not be participating in the 2nd consultation dealing with specifics of the scheme as my Objection was of a general nature.
- **I did however specifically asked to be kept informed as to the Project writing**:- *"I would be grateful to receive an acknowledgement of my Objection as filed, and wish to request I am mailed in the future with regard to developments within the development and consultation process of this proposal should it proceed.- "*
- This the Promoters signally failed to do despite the acknowledgement, and their comment to the following effect *"The consultation has been supported by an communications strategy, intended to ensure that individuals with an interest in the scheme have been made aware that the consultation is taking place".*

I must therefore ask this Inquiry to note that this has hindered my Objection unfairly, as I could reasonably assume that silence meant the project had not been taken forward. I only learnt about the advanced stage of development when further consultation stages had passed, of which I had been kept ignorant and I was not made aware of the opportunity to formally comment on the Orders or submit evidence to the CPO Inquiry as an Objector. In view of this I send this submission now to the Inquiry Programming Officer and for the Promoter of the scheme for their consideration.

General comments in Objection

Having considered the plans and walked the entire route as proposed at either end of the A555, I wish to object unequivocally to the road proposal. I could not support it irrespective of any junction option arrangements, and advocate its immediate abandonment.

I submit my objection on the following points as referenced.

a. Query upon procedural failing on part of promoter.
b. Query of Context Description within the original case.
c. Related contextual ethical concerns over the proposal : energy and climate
d. Unacceptable environmental impact
e. Over optimistic economic projections outweighed by detriment to community and environment
f. Questions over the scheme's stated objectives.
g. Cost/Funding issues.
h. Objection summary

A. Procedural Failing of Promoter.

Had I been kept informed as required by a fair and reasonable consultation process my Objection would have been in much greater depth and I would have taken greater steps to campaign vigorously. I have therefore to ask this inquiry to consider whether the promoting Councils can be said to have fulfilled the legal requirements for consultation in my case.

I would have in particular wanted to argue strenuously to the relevant Secretary of State, whether for Transport or for Local Government/Communities that a full rather than a Local CPO Inquiry should have been commissioned for a road which is a part-build proposal of a much greater scheme, encircling most of South Manchester, and thus ranking as significant national road infrastructure.

B. **Context Description.**

It was stated in the original case for the road that it would make good the current shortfall of major lateral arterial roads between East Cheshire and South Manchester. There is a substantial east/west lateral road in the shape of the M60 that lies at the heart of an already huge conurbation so this description misrepresents. Since 2013 when I wrote this public announcements it is no longer a secret that this road is being considered by Local Authorities as part of a wider 2nd orbital road for much of Southern Manchester, of which it appears to have been part of a construction plan by stealth. It is no longer right or reasonable for this road to be considered on its own merits alone therefore , its case as a link to a wider project needs to be considered by decision makers. http://www.civicr.com/a/poynton-hazel-grove-bypass/forum/lib-dems-pushing-m60-to-a6-quot-part-2-quot-please-share-t4228-p1.html

In summary here it is self- evident that before this Inquiry is simply the original SEMMMs Southern Part-Orbital scheme in a fledgling form, and it should therefore be considered in its entirety, not in a piecemeal fashion if its merits or defects are to be properly understood. It may be appropriate in part to assess this road purely for itself, but clearly no assessment could be considered complete or sound if the wider context is not understood and weighed. This Inquiry should not allow the wool to be pulled over its eyes, nor over those who have concerns about wider road building impacts on their community and environment.

A second orbital road echoing the line of the M60 in South East and South West Manchester either side of the Airport should not be built by stealth. If that is the road on the promoters private drawing board, as the press context and history suggests, the merits or not of such a road, and all that it implies should be considered now at outset. Converting Manchester into something like Los Angeles in respect of road infrastructure and traffic volumes should not be taken so lightly . It is not right for this road to be considered in isolation if its true context and implications are so much wider. As I point out at A above, there is an overwhelming case here for this road to be considered as a national infrastructure road proposal that requires a full Government Inquiry to have been undertaken before it can be seen as validly examined and fit or not fit to proceed to construction.

C. Related contextual ethical concerns over the proposal : energy and climate

This country is in the heart of a huge and problematic energy debate in the media and before our law courts on a daily basis , where many experts are questioning if the UK can service its current energy demands , or whether controversial last ditch unconventional extraction underground in the UK is necessary to" keep the lights on."

Experts also sound alarms about the danger of us being energy dependent on unreliable international sources. Accommodating and encouraging further energy intensive transport is therefore a perverse direction to take which cannot be sustained and departs severely from the pressing need to start developing a less energy intense planning system.

Amidst this clearly critical situation what are the Councils doing here? - promoting yet another road, accommodating further the demand for diminishing fossil fuels and energy. This is therefore a reckless and indefensible step in the wrong direction ethically, that claims a social intent as regards of job creation but is in fact oblivious to the serious social detriment of a legacy of energy depletion facing future generations now being born and growing up.

We also have grave concerns about the warming of our planet (the only one that we know of hosting life in the entire cosmos) the melting of its icecaps North and South and an overwhelming scientific consensus that we cannot go on with our current prodigal

expenditure of fossil based energy without threating global catastrophe. Proposing a new mega road system for Manchester, which is the acknowledged reality of the so called A555 Relief Road is logically about as wrong as it can get in the current energy and climate crisis. I urge the Inquiry while there is time to pull back from what appears a giant step in so obviously the wrong direction. We need sustainable planning proposals, not "more business as usual", which has brought us to the brink of a national energy crisis, and a probable global climate crisis.

D. Unacceptable environmental impact

The proposal will both intersect and consume a precious fragile Green Belt area around a dense conurbation and "exceptional circumstances" will need to be demonstrated for this to be allowed. I do not believe such "exceptional circumstances" exist or have been shown to exist within the proposal case documentation. Similarly violation of a heavily protected ancient wood will require more justification than has currently been presented .

More locally the project represents planning folly in the sense that it covers an area of open countryside around Bramhall, Poynton and Hazel Grove, thus destroying one of the keys to the popularity and social well-being of these residential districts. Again a casual almost unthinking degradation of existing social assets is being contemplated where the human and social need of amenity is simply disregarded.

At least one if not 2 golf courses will presumably be sacrificed or affected by the proposal. Whilst I do not play myself I think this sums up the unthinking unbalanced approach of the road promoters failing to recognize substantial recreational needs of a large city population on its outskirts.

The extent of wildlife habitat destruction and impact on important and threatened species in the open pastures and woodland does not bear thinking about, in an already highly urbanised area. I would imagine that the EIA has had to be commissioned, and will make worrying reading. Hopefully there will be expert evidence in Objection on this matter at Inquiry.

E. **The economic rationale** for the scheme seems to be of a general nature, and lack substance or certainty. Using such general terms I believe it could equally be argued that the substantial contribution of Manchester made to the national and regional economy (50% in the NW according to Atkins' business case) is due to the particular semi- rural environment surrounding South Manchester - as well as Manchester as a whole - which complements and eases the industrial heartland of the city. The scheme which is classic urban sprawl threatens the classic identity of the city and thus its financial wellbeing . The road will inevitably lead to infill between South Manchester at Poynton and Woodford - note the proposed Woodford (Aerodrome) Village development proposal - redrawing the boundary of the built up area to start to fatally merge Macclesfield and the South of the City. The end result will be an amorphous graceless

excessive urban mass rather than the critically important environment as now. The greed of the Manchester and nearby Councils involved in this project is in danger of yet again making the classic mistakes that gave us areas of industrial wasteland in other cities in the North East and the Midlands. Having lived in these areas I can testify that Manchester has something unique in its green circumference, but this is now put under the most serious of threats by this proposal. The councils should learn from history and abandon their short- termist mistake.

An overbuilt conurbation will not as proposed attract international business or glamorous culture and celebrities, it will deter all of these. Celebrities that act as an advertisement for Manchester currently settle in spots such as Prestbury and Alderley, and extending the city out into the Greenbelt towards Macclesfield will strike the wrong note with these personages, and endanger the image and prosperity of the City. It is the lack of balance that is worrying, Manchester already has plenty of roads and developments, which are replaceable but its special green qualities will not be reclaimable. Once gone the landscape and natural habitat legacy of centuries will be lost effectively for ever.

Manchester's premier sport/entertainment and business status in the North, currently well justified, will start to dwindle. The attractions and reputation that brought the national profile of the BBC to the City would be eroded. I would argue that rather than bring prosperity the road will upset the balance between the built and non-built environment, currently finely poised, with resulting catastrophic effect for the long term economic and social future of the city. I doubt on the other hand that it will make Manchester an international business travel goal as claimed or bring long term prosperity. Quite the reverse it will introduce more areas of social deprivation just like the ones such as Wythenshawe it now purports to help. This is hugely counterproductive.

To reiterate - Manchester's unique character currently attracts business and business people to reside in the city, and help it achieve wealth and status, with its lush green surrounds particularly to the South of the City. These are virtually unique in the urban UK in mitigating the harsh industrial and commercial centre. So to remove a vast tract of environmental assets in one sweep is an proposal as imprudent economically as it is in terms of heritage and ecology. The proposal catastrophically under-estimates the financial contribution the critical balancing rural fringe environment has made to Manchester's recent prestige and success and the loss losing this threatens .

In summary any economic and related social benefits will have to demonstrably outweigh substantial environmental and social harm, which I do not believe can be shown as possible.

F. Questions over the scheme's stated objectives.

(i) **The question of improved airport passenger connectivity.**

One of the chief arguments / objectives flagged in favour of the proposal is increased airport connectivity . However Atkins themselves acknowledge that there is almost in place a completely modern popular Metrolink across South Manchester to the Airport (early completion expected by 2014) as well as an overground rail system to the City Centre. By 2017 the metrolink will duplicate the rail system by offering a direct route into Manchester. This is quite sufficient to service the airport as it currently stands, as long as travel to and from is directed in a sustainable way. This can meet the demands of sustainable future growth. SEMMS study of 2001 apparently agrees that with the metrolinks in place the need for this road no longer exists.

(ii) **The question of Commercial growth against the need for congestion relief.**

I feel this is a "catch 22" situation, because were there to be a surge in demand for Manchester as an airport freight centre any congestion reliefs that the road might aspire to would be negated. The current road cannot absorb commuter traffic from current congestion hotspots and expect this to share new road space with significant new freight traffic as might be generated by an enhanced role for the Airport. The claim for suburban traffic relief therefore collapses within the positive economic scenario envisaged, should this considerable gamble even pay off!. Without being able to promise both economic success and local congestion relief the road loses the sight of its total objectives and thus its justification.

(i) Hopes of providing local jobs through expansion may be one side of the argument, but the current noise levels for South West Manchester residents are already close to intolerable, so another consultation question arises. Can local residents and businesses absorb further noise pollution from even more flights? There is a little sustainable argument for improving passenger connectivity by road, against the social and environmental cost incurred.

G. **Funding**

(i)The "business case" waves a "magic wand over the projected cost to reduce it by one third (£100million), citing factors like inflation as fixed when of course these indices are variables . At best a realistic cost would be the original one of £300M, but a cautious estimate would probably rise to ½ Billion (£500M) I believe the projected cost within the business cost is more sleight of hand to mask a lack of funds, than a plausible estimate . **Budgetary diligence** requires dropping the proposal as the funding in full may not be there, if costs rise.

(ii) To the North of Poynton between the A6 and the oil refinery the road would traverse a flood plain so that particularly costly engineering measures would be required in construction, such as raising or lowering of the road at considerable extra

expense. These do not appear to be costed, strengthening the case for a cost projection actually rising way above the original £300m, to around **½ Billion** which seems a realistic rather than cautious estimate. If there is any risk of the project exceeding budget it should not be considered, in view of the severity of UK debt.

H. **In summary therefore** - On the basis therefore of all my points as laid out , environmental, economic and social, I object to the road, and argue that the proposal should be withdrawn immediately.

Yours sincerely

Peter Simon

(48 Post Street, Padfield, Glossop, SK13 1EF)

Cc. Jayne Hallam, Programming Officer for the Inquiry into the A555 Airport Relief Road.

----- Original Message -----
From: SEMMMS Relief.Road
To: Peter Simon
Sent: Monday, January 21, 2013 10:22 PM
Subject: Automatic reply: A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road Consultation - Objection to the Road Proposal

Thank you for your email. Your views are important to us. Any comments will be reported on at the end of the current phase of the consultation. We will try to respond to any questions or requests for information within 10 to 15 working days.

In the meantime there are other ways to find out more about the scheme or to contact us:

Online: www.semmms.info

By telephone: 0161 474 2055

SEMMMS Project Team

Find out whether you could save money on your energy bills and register for the Greater Manchester Energy Switch scheme by 29 January 2013 at www.gmfairenergy.com

Peter Simon

From: Peter Simon
Sent: 11 September 2014 11:27
To: Peter Simon
Subject: Re: Fw: A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road Consultation - Objection to the Road Proposal

On Tue, Sep 9, 2014 at 9:39 AM, Peter Simon <Peter.Simon@btinternet.com> wrote:

----- Original Message -----
From: SEMMMS.Relief.Road
To: Peter.Simon@btinternet.com
Sent: Tuesday, January 29, 2013 4:08 PM
Subject: RE: A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road Consultation - Objection to the Road Proposal

Dear Mr Simon,

Thank you for your email regarding the proposed A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road. We have taken on board your comments and will ensure that they are given due consideration as part of this first phase of consultation for the scheme. Our response to your enquiry is set out below.

Why the scheme is needed

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. Throughout each stage of the SEMMMS scheme, detailed assessments have been undertaken to analysis the need for the proposed Relief Road. Results identified the following main reasons for the development of the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road:

- Relieve existing traffic congestion and address poor connectivity which constrains the economy through lengthening journey times. Current congestion reduces labour market catchments and business-to-business activity as well as creating delays on designated freight routes (e.g. the A6) which, in turn, generates productivity losses for businesses;

- Address the current poor access to/from the east to Manchester Airport which acts as a barrier for economic growth and regeneration;

- Improve the existing poor transport links in communities throughout south Manchester in particular relating to the east-west highway network;

- Relieve current congestion on current roads, where average peak time vehicle speeds of less than 10mph have been recorded on many parts. This congestion has led to journey times that are longer than all other 'large' urban areas across the UK, including those in London;

- Reduce existing trips using residential streets as well as passing through local centres which will in turn reduce levels of pollution, road traffic incidents and journey times;

- Relieve current congestion problems along the A6 and in local centres including Gatley, Bramhall, Heald Green, Hazel Grove, Poynton, Wilmslow, Handforth and Cheadle Hulme which currently affect accessibility and lead to delays;

- Improve existing poor environmental conditions in local communities caused by the high volumes of traffic passing through the areas to reach other destinations; and

- Relieve currently congested conditions for pedestrians and cyclists which results in non-motorised transport users facing problems of safely accessing education, employment and leisure facilities.

For more detailed information about the scheme benefits and any adverse impacts of the scheme please see the scheme's business case a document submitted to the government for the consideration by Ministers when making a decision on major investments. The business case includes evidence supporting why the Scheme is needed and an appraisal of the benefits and any adverse impacts of the Scheme. The business case can be found via the following link www.semmms.info/a6/reportsandbusinesscase/businesscase.

The business case for the Scheme was submitted to the Department for Transport in November 2012.

It is important to note that the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road is part of the wider South East Manchester Multi-Modal Strategy (SEMMMS), which covers all modes of transport.

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 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. As a result of SEMMMS, working alongside partners, we have already improved rail , bus, pedestrian and cycle facilities and invested in local and district centres.

For further information about SEMMMS strategy please visit the website http://www.semmms.info/strategy1/?view=Standard.

Environmental Considerations

A wide variety of environmental features have been studied throughout the development of the proposal including the potential impact on people, wildlife, plants and the landscape. This has been both within the scheme area and its surroundings for the construction phases and opening of the scheme. The environmental analysis undertaken, and information gathered, has then been used to inform decision making and the scheme design.

This is an on-going process that will continue as the proposals develop to ensure that potential environmental impacts that may be associated with the proposals are identified and assessed. From this, mitigation measures to avoid, reduce or compensate impacts will be identified and evaluated. These include, for example, low noise surfacing on the road to minimise the impacts of road and construction traffic noise. The process also provides an opportunity for improvements to the local environment to be included within the scheme design, for example landscaping or wildlife habitats. The environmental scoping report is available on the SEMMMS website and the "Environmental Reports" section and using the following link http://www.semmms.info/a6/envreports. The final detailed Environmental Impact Assessment will report the findings in a document known as an Environmental Statement next year.

Consultation Period

We are consulting on the road scheme in two phases. This first phase of consultation on the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road will be open between 22nd October 2012 and 25th January 2013. Stockport, Manchester City and Cheshire East Councils are committed to ensuring that anyone with an interest in the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road has an opportunity to comment on the proposals. In this first phase we are asking for views on options for the scheme to help determine a preferred scheme. A second phase will follow where we will seek your views on the preferred scheme, prior to a planning application for the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road. This second phase of consultation will begin in Spring 2013.

During the consultation period, interested parties have been provided with a number of ways to find out more about the scheme and provide us with their comments, including exhibitions, website, phoneline and email. We have also held a number of local liaison forums, for residents living in close proximity to the scheme in this area, with the aim of taking on board the comments and suggestions of local residents.

The consultation has been supported by an communications strategy, intended to ensure that individuals with an interest in the scheme have been made aware the that consultation is taking place.

Running alongside our engagement with the general public, ongoing stakeholder engagement has taken place. This has included consulting the neighbouring authorities including Derbyshire and the Peak Park Authority and this will be documented in the consultation report when it is published.

I hope this email provides the information that you require, however, should you require any further details about the scheme, there are a number of ways you can find out more:

Online: www.semmms.info

By email: semmms.relief.road@stockport.gov.uk
By telephone: 0161 474 2055
By post: SEMMMS Project Team, Stopford House
(Fred Perry House), Stockport, SK1 3YQ
Follow us on twitter: @SEMMMSA555

Kind regards

Sue Stevenson

Transport Policy, Programmes, GIS and Technical Support Manager
Stockport Council
1st Floor, Fred Perry House
Stockport,
SK1 3XE
Tel: 0161 474 2055
www.stockport.gov.uk
semmms.relief.road@stockport.gov.uk

From: Peter Simon [mailto:Peter.Simon@btinternet.com]
Sent: 22 January 2013 09:20
To: SEMMMS Relief.Road
Subject: A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road Consultation - Objection to the Road Proposal

Dear Sirs,

Please find as attached

"A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road Consultation – Objection to the Road Proposal".

As stated within my response, I would be grateful for an acknowledgement of receipt of this.

Yours sincerely

Peter Simon