

| No. | Organisation   | Date Contacted                  | Summary of Comments   |
|-----|--|---------------------------------|---|
| 1   | <b>Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council (SMBC)</b> | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | No formal reply received – SMBC to be consulted formally on issue of the Scoping Report.  |
| 2   | <b>Cheshire East Council</b>                         | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | No formal reply received – Mouchel have attempted direct contact via email on 07.12.09.   |
| 3   | <b>Manchester City Council</b>                       | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | Received correspondence via email between 14 <sup>th</sup> and 17 <sup>th</sup> December 2009 – MCC Planning Department have the previous Stage 3 Environmental Assessment Report (2003). DL has queried what the site area of the Manchester section of the road is ("site-edged red" plan) indicating the size of the planning application's site. The Head of Planning is keen to know the planning fees. Mouchel did not have this information at the time. |
| 4   | <b>Natural England</b>                               | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | Full response received by email on 29.10.09 with letter of advice attached detailing method of assessment and appropriate guidance. There are no statutory sites for nature conservation within the area of search.   |
| 5   | <b>Environment Agency</b>                            | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | Full response received by post on 02.11.09 containing advice for the assessment for drainage, flooding, environmental management & ecology.   |
| 6   | <b>English Heritage</b>                              | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | Interim response received by email on 27.10.09 - Advises to contact local archaeology groups for data. EH will comment on scheme post ES submission.  |
| 7   | <b>North West Regional Assembly (4NW)</b>            | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | Response gained via telephone on 03.12.09 – 4NW confirmed receipt of letter, but have no comments to make at present.   |
| 8   | <b>North West Regional Development Agency</b>        | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | Interim response received via telephone on 03.12.09. The only comment at present is that the scheme is important strategically to increase growth of Manchester Airport – SEMMMS is mentioned in the Regional Economic Strategy (Page 40).  |
| 9   | <b>Government Offices North West</b>                 | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | Brief telephone conversation with Planning department on 03.12.09 revealed that they have no comments to make at present. Contact in the Natural Environment department currently on leave.   |
| 10  | <b>Ringway Parish Council</b>                        | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | No formal reply received – No telephone number or email address available online.   |
| 11  | <b>Poynton-with-Worth Parish Council</b>             | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | The Council discussed the scheme during their monthly meeting on 09.11.09. A full response was received on 12.11.09 regarding the potential for the scheme to reduce congestion & improve air quality in certain areas. They also provided suggestions for complementary measures.  |
| 12  | <b>Cheshire Wildlife Trust</b>                       | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | Data request – email correspondence received regarding local sites on 13.10.09, data available for a fee. Maps and citations for Sites of Biological Interest (SBIs) received on 05.11.09.  |
| 13  | <b>Wildlife Trust for Lancs, Manc &amp; Mersey</b>   | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | Response received via telephone on 29.09.09 – the scheme does not fall in their area.   |
| 14  | <b>rECOrd</b>  | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | Data request – email correspondence received on 28/09/09. Mouchel provided a GIS shapefile for the scheme for the data search to be undertaken. Local species records received on 14.10.09.   |

| No. | Organisation   | Date Contacted                  | Summary of Comments  |
|-----|--|---------------------------------|--|
| 15  | <b>Lancs &amp; Cheshire Entomology Society</b>                 | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | No formal reply received – Mouchel have attempted contact via telephone on 03.12.09.   |
| 16  | <b>Chester &amp; District Ornithological Society</b>           | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | Email received 28.09.09 to confirm that the group does not hold any information on the SEMMMS study area – this group covers Chester not Cheshire.   |
| 17  | <b>North West Fungus Group</b>                                 | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | No formal reply received – Mouchel have attempted contact via telephone on 03.12.09.   |
| 18  | <b>Dragonfly Association for Cheshire &amp; GM</b>             | 29 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | No postal address or telephone number is available for this group – the data is available through rECOrd (see number 14).  |
| 19  | <b>Cheshire &amp; Wirral Amphibian and Reptile Group</b>       | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | No formal reply received – Mouchel have attempted contact via email on 03.12.09.   |
| 20  | <b>Wirral &amp; Cheshire Badger Group</b>                      | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | No formal reply received – Mouchel have attempted contact via telephone on 03.12.09.   |
| 21  | <b>Cheshire Mammal Group</b>                                   | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | No formal reply received – Mouchel have attempted contact via telephone on 03.12.09.   |
| 22  | <b>Mammal Review (Manchester University)</b>                   | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | Formal response received by email 06/10/09 containing useful local information.  |
| 23  | <b>Cheshire Bat Group</b>                                      | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | No formal reply received – Mouchel have attempted contact via telephone on 03.12.09.   |
| 24  | <b>The Pondlife Project (Liverpool John Moores University)</b> | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | No telephone number or email addresses have been made available for this scheme.   |
| 25  | <b>Cheshire &amp; Wirral Ornithological Society</b>            | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | No formal reply received – Mouchel have attempted contact via email on 03.12.09 (no telephone number has been made available).   |
| 26  | <b>Manchester Museum (Manchester University)</b>               | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | No formal reply received – Mouchel have attempted direct contact via email on 03.12.09.  |
| 27  | <b>Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit (GMAU)</b>           | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | GMAU issued with previous reports. Formal response received on 18.11.09. GMAU happy with mitigation measures outlined in the 2007 report, they have no further information to share providing the design does not alter. Mouchel have informed GMAU of slight alterations to the design.   |
| 28  | <b>Greater Manchester Geological Unit</b>                      | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | No formal reply received – Mouchel have attempted contact via email on 03.12.09 (telephone number provided no longer works).   |
| 29  | <b>Cheshire RIGS Group</b>                                     | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | Formal response received by email on 14.10.09 confirming that there are no RIGS in the Cheshire area covered by the scheme.  |
| 30  | <b>Greater Manchester RIGS Group</b>                           | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | No formal reply received – Mouchel have attempted direct contact via email on 03.12.09 (No telephone number has been made available).  |
| 31  | <b>Cycle Stockport</b>   | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | Mouchel re-contacted Mr Bradshaw on 03.12.09 via telephone. He explained that they went into some depth in previous assessments when the route had been confirmed. There is a need to consider in depth designs and how cycleways link into the highway. He is concerned that the highway design will just consider cyclepaths as leisure routes and not adequately consider cyclists as road users. |
| 32  | <b>Peak &amp; Northern Footpaths</b>                           | 25 <sup>th</sup> September      | No formal reply received – Mouchel have attempted direct contact via telephone on  |

| No. | Organisation                                      | Date Contacted                  | Summary of Comments   |
|-----|---|---------------------------------|---|
|     | <b>Society</b>                                    | 2009                            | 02.09.09 (left message) and 16.09.09 (no answer).   |
| 33  | <b>Ramblers Association</b>                       | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | Formal responses have been received from representatives of the Greater Manchester and Cheshire areas. On 12.10.09 JC provided useful information on the local area in relation to walkers and landscape and how the scheme would be detrimental to the existing environment. On 10.10.09 NC requested that we continue liaising with them, especially regarding over-bridge designs. Mouchel have explained that specific pedestrian crossings are still undergoing design review. |
| 34  | <b>Bridleways Association (Manchester)</b>        | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | No formal reply received – unable to chase up as there is no telephone number or email address provided on the website.   |
| 35  | <b>Disability Stockport</b>                       | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | No formal reply received – Mouchel have attempted direct contact via telephone on 17.09.09 but the call went to voicemail.  |
| 36  | <b>Manchester Friends of the Earth</b>            | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | No formal reply received – Mouchel have attempted direct contact via email on 07.12.09.   |
| 37  | <b>Stockport Primary Care Trust</b>               | 10 <sup>th</sup> October 2009   | No formal reply received – Mouchel have attempted direct contact via email on 07.12.09.   |
| 38  | <b>Greater Manchester Transport Resource Unit</b> | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | The interests and members of this group overlap with No. 39 below – please see response from Lillian Burns.   |
| 39  | <b>NW Transport Activists Round Table</b>         | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | A full response was received on 28.10.09. The group would like to be informed throughout the design and environmental assessment process.   |
| 40  | <b>Manchester Airport</b>                         | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | Formal letter of response received on 16.10.09. Previous information provided in 2004 is still largely relevant. Letter outlines some issues with regard to landscape and ecology, esp. bird hazards and proximity of the road to a runway. MIA is a key stakeholder and they wish to be kept informed regularly.   |
| 41  | <b>Highways Agency (A One)</b>                    | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | Interim response received on 26.10.09. A One has enquired about the level of response required for the consultation. They are HA agents and may make additional comments / advise the HA on their response.   |
| 42  | <b>DEFRA</b>                                      | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | No formal reply received – Mouchel have attempted direct contact via email on 07.12.09.   |
| 43  | <b>CTC National Cyclists Organisation</b>         | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | See response for number 31.   |
| 44  | <b>British Horse Society (BHS)</b>                | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | No formal reply received – Mouchel attempted direct contact with Karen via email on 07.12.09. Karen has been re-issued with a copy of the letter and will chase up the response.  |
| 45  | <b>CPRE</b>                                       | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | A full response was received on 28.10.09. The group would like to be informed throughout the design and environmental assessment process.   |
| 46  | <b>RSPB</b>                                       | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | Interim response received on 07.12.09 – advise that we contact the BTO & local bird clubs to obtain up-to-date bird data, as the RSPB do not hold any bird data themselves. Areas around Manchester support important arable & wetland bird assemblages & so any loss of hedgerows, trees & other semi-natural habitat maybe an issue. They will comment on the full application in summer 2010 and will look in more detail at potential impacts on birds at that stage            |

| No. | Organisation                                      | Date Contacted                  | Summary of Comments  |
|-----|---|---------------------------------|--|
| 47  | <b>The National Trust</b>                         | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | Full response received by post on 30.11.09 - Two NT properties are located in the vicinity of the scheme (>1km) and the Styal Conservation Area is within 0.9km. Some key issues are outlined to take into account during the assessment.                  |
| 48  | <b>The Open Spaces Society</b>                    | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | No formal reply received – Mouchel attempted direct contact with Ruth via email on 07.12.09. Ruth has said that they may not have commented as it is not something they would get involved with.   |
| 49  | <b>National Farmers Union (NFU)</b>               | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | No formal reply received – Mouchel have attempted direct contact via email on 07.12.09.  |
| 50  | <b>Country Land and Business Association</b>      | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | Formal response received on 16.10.09. A number of CLA members will be affected by the proposals so it is important that the group are kept in touch throughout the project.  |
| 51  | <b>The Woodland Trust</b>                         | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | No formal reply received – Mouchel have attempted direct contact via email on 07.12.09.  |
| 52  | <b>British Geological Society (BGS)</b>           | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | No formal reply received – Mouchel have attempted direct contact via email on 07.12.09.  |
| 53  | <b>SUSTRANS</b>                                   | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | Formal response received on 02.11.09. The scheme will be a significant physical barrier to local journeys by bicycle or on foot on a north-south axis. The response suggests a number of points to address in the ES.                                      |
| 54  | <b>Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council</b>      | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | Consultee not in Phase 1 area – no requirement to chase up response.   |
| 55  | <b>Bollington Town Council</b>                    | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | Consultee not in Phase 1 area – no requirement to chase up response.   |
| 56  | <b>Adlington Parish Council</b>                   | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | Formal response received on 23.10.09 with no comments.   |
| 57  | <b>Disley Parish Council</b>                      | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | Consultee not in Phase 1 area – no requirement to chase up response.   |
| 58  | <b>Offerton Parish Council</b>                    | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | Consultee not in Phase 1 area – no requirement to chase up response.   |
| 59  | <b>Prestbury Parish Council</b>                   | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | Consultee not in Phase 1 area – no requirement to chase up response.   |
| 60  | <b>Pott Shrigley Parish Council</b>               | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | Consultee not in Phase 1 area – no requirement to chase up response.   |
| 61  | <b>Tameside Area Health Authority</b>             | 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | Consultee not in Phase 1 area – no requirement to chase up response.   |
| 62  | <b>Cheshire and Warrington Local Access Forum</b> | 29 <sup>th</sup> September 2009 | Responses received in October contain local footpath information, requesting for the provision of under and overbridges to reduce severance of communities, and requesting that CLAF be retained as a consultee on the scheme.                             |
| 63  | <b>Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (GMEU)</b>     | 28 <sup>th</sup> October 2009   | Response received by email on 02.11.09 with a number of concerns regarding the ecological assessment for the scheme. GMEU can also provide data records for local sites & species and have provided a list of information which is available for purchase. |