



1. Petitioner information

In the box below, give the name and address of each individual, business or organisation submitting the petition. Please note that addresses here will be provided to the Bill's promoter, but will be redacted in the version of the petition published on the Parliamentary Website.

Trafford Council
 Talbot Road
 Stretford
 M32 0TH
 Care of BDB Pitmans, Parliamentary Agents, One Bartholomew Close EC1A 7BL

In the box below, give a description of the petitioners. For example, "We are the owners/tenants of the addresses above"; "My company has offices at the address above"; "Our organisation represents the interests of..."; "We are the parish council of...".

- 1. Petitioner Information**
- 1.1.1. The Petitioner is Trafford Borough Council ("TC"), the Local Authority for the Borough of Trafford in Greater Manchester.
- 1.1.2. TC is a local planning authority and is, therefore, responsible for general planning and preparation of local plans. It is also the local highway authority and the education authority and has other powers and duties in relation to activities of public concern including housing, public health, recreation, civic welfare and amenity and the economic wellbeing of the area. As such, TC is responsible for the protection of its property, rights, security and interests and those of the citizens, inhabitants and ratepayers of Trafford as a whole.
- 1.1.3. TC also owns or has an interest in land that is subject to compulsory acquisition or use under AP2.
- 1.1.4. TC and its rights, interests and property are injuriously affected by AP2, to which TC objects for the reasons amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

2. Objections to the Second Additional Provision to the Bill

In the box below, write your objections to the Second Additional Provision to the Bill and why your property or other interests are **directly and specially affected**. Please number each paragraph.

Only objections outlined in this petition can be presented when giving evidence to the Committee. You will not be entitled to be heard by the Committee on new matters not included in your written petition.

2. Introduction and Summary

2.1. Introduction

2.1.1. Trafford Council (TC) remains supportive, in principle, of the proposals to construct a new High-Speed railway between Crewe and Manchester ("Phase 2b") as promoted by HS2 Ltd.

2.1.2. However, TC is unable to support the Bill in its current form, or as proposed to be amended by AP2, and objects to AP2 for the reasons, among others, set out below.

2.1.3. Except where this petition states otherwise, TC stands by the issues and asks set out in its petition against the Bill ('the Bill Petition'). AP2 has not satisfactorily addressed TC's concerns and in a number of instances exacerbates them. Rather than repeat the asks in the Bill Petition where they still stand, a cross reference is made to the relevant paragraphs. This petition only references those changes proposed in AP2.

2.1.4. TC supports the petitions against AP2 of the Greater Manchester Combined Authority ("GMCA"), Manchester City Council ("MCC") and Transport for Greater Manchester ("TfGM"). Collectively these organisations are referred to as the GM Partners.

2.1.5. TC remains hopeful that a large number of its concerns will be met by agreement with the Promoter but is concerned that no binding commitments have yet been agreed with the Promoter. Despite regular requests by TC and GM Partners, many of the details that are needed to inform such an agreement have not yet been supplied by the Promoter.

2.1.6. Communication and collaboration with the Promoter is seen as key to TC particularly with regards to the proposed works and the programme for those works which remain a concern.

2.1.7. Rather than complete section 4 of the petition template, TC has listed its requests in this section under each objection.

2.1.8. For ease and brevity, TCs' concerns with AP2 can be summarised as follows:

i. Places for Everyone (PfE) Joint Development Plan Document

- a. Non-Inclusion of PfE and Specifically Timperley Wedge Allocation within AP2 Proposals
- b. Integration with PfE - Timperley Wedge Strategic Allocation

ii. Metrolink

- a. Connection of Metrolink to Manchester Airport High-Speed Station
- b. Metro/Tram-Train from Manchester Airport to the west and southwest

iii. Traffic Impacts – Construction and Operational

- a. Wholly Inappropriate Construction Routes and Impacts on Local Communities
- b. Highway Diversions and Closures
- c. Significant Adverse Residual Effects – Congestion at Junctions
- d. Movement of Spoil and Materials
- e. Adverse Noise Effects from Construction Traffic
- f. Impacts on Physical and Mental Health and Well-Being of Communities
- g. Highway and Other Infrastructure Degradation

- h. Impact on Bus Journey Times
- i. Thorley Lane / Runger Lane Junction
- iv. Relocated and Re-Designed M56 Junction 6**
 - a. Limits of Deviation (LoD)
 - b. Noise and Vibration Impacts during Construction
 - c. Permanent Significant Adverse Noise Impacts
 - d. Landscape and Visual Impact
 - e. M56 East Satellite Compound and Stockpile Site
 - f. Air Quality
- v. Manchester Airport High-Speed Station Design and Access**
 - a. Proposed Height of the Airport Station and Depth of Cutting
 - b. Inappropriate Access Design
- vi. Access to Future Development Land Parcels at Manchester High-Speed Airport Station**
- vii. Impacts on Heritage Assets**
- viii. Impacts on Public Rights of Way**
 - a. Footpath Hale 10
 - b. Other Public Rights of Way (PRoW)
- ix. River Bollin Cycle Trail**
- x. Environmental Impact Issues**
 - a. Increased Adverse Sound, Noise and Vibration Impacts during Construction and Operation
 - b. Permanent Loss of Woodland SBIs and Impact on Ancient Woodland
 - c. Air Quality and Greater Manchester's Clean Air Plan
 - d. Carbon
 - e. Incomplete Ecological and Biodiversity Surveys
 - f. Exacerbated Impacts on Timperley Brook
 - g. Major Accidents and Disasters
 - h. Waste and Material Resources
- xi. Traffic and Transport Data**
 - a. Transport Assessments
 - b. Traffic Counts
- xii. Realignment of 11kv Scottish Power, Power Line**
- xiii. Utility Diversion Delays**
- xiv. Maintenance Access Road off Bankside**

3. Policy Context

- 3.1.1. TC's concerns should be seen in the context of both national policies to promote levelling up, decarbonisation and clean air and the HS2 Phase 2b SOBC, as well as TC's and GM's strategic initiatives and policies to maximise sustainable and inclusive economic growth and environmental change, which TC has shared with the Promoter over a number of years.
- 3.1.2. The Proposed Scheme must be designed and delivered in line with national and local strategies and policies in order to realise regeneration opportunities and provide the right scheme for users and the future.
- 3.1.3. Since the submission of the Bill Petition, there have been changes to the relevant policy context for Trafford in particular, principally including (but not limited to) Places for Everyone (PfE), the long-term joint Local Plan for nine Greater

	<p>Manchester districts (Bolton, Bury, Manchester, Oldham, Rochdale, Salford, Tameside, Trafford and Wigan) for jobs, new homes, and sustainable growth.</p>
3.1.4.	<p>This strategic framework sets out a plan to manage growth so that Greater Manchester is a better place to live, work and visit by (among other things): 1) providing the right homes, in the right places, for people across the city-region; and 2) creating jobs and improving infrastructure to ensure the future prosperity of Greater Manchester.</p>
3.1.5.	<p>The public hearings of Examination in Public (EiP) of the PfE plan by a panel of three independent Inspectors began in November 2022 and concluded in early July 2023.</p>
3.1.6.	<p>On 11 August 2023, the Inspectors issued their initial findings on the PfE plan, which provides a clear steer as to the wording required to make the plan sound, and requiring the 9 Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) to prepare amendments to the plan to make it 'sound' and/or legally compliant.</p>
3.1.7.	<p>Given the significantly advanced stage of the PfE plan in its examination and the clear steer from the Inspectors, the plan and of particular relevance to AP2, Policy JP Allocation 3.1 – Timperley Wedge, must now be given substantial weight.</p>
3.1.8.	<p>Moreover, it is consequently appropriate to consider the very real possibility that PfE will be an adopted Development Plan document prior to the High-Speed Rail (Crewe – Manchester) Bill receiving Royal Assent in late 2025; possibly as early as Spring 2024.</p>
4.	Places for Everyone (PfE) Joint Development Plan Document
4.1.	Non-Inclusion of PfE and Specifically Timperley Wedge Allocation within AP2 Proposals
4.1.1.	<p>TC remains concerned that the Proposed Scheme as proposed to be amended by AP2 still does not consistently take full account of the proposed allocations contained within the (now) examined PfE plan, and that these future developments remain 'un-committed'.</p>
4.1.2.	<p>As set out above, the plan is at a significantly advanced stage, with all scheduled hearing sessions concluded and a clear steer from the Inspectors that the vast majority of the plan (including the immediately adjacent allocation at Timperley Wedge) is capable of being made 'sound'.</p>
4.1.3.	<p>Moreover, there is a very real possibility that the plan will be adopted prior to the Bill receiving Royal Assent, at which point the allocations in the plan must be considered committed schemes.</p>
4.1.4.	<p>Notwithstanding the transport modelling, which does not include any local detail for PfE underpinning the proposed amendments advocated under AP2, TC is perplexed by the Promoter's ability to use the proposals contained within PfE in certain circumstances, to lessen the impact(s) of the Proposed Scheme.</p>
4.1.5.	<p>For example, in Volume 5: Appendix LV-001-0MA06, the Promoter cites that the development of the Timperley Wedge allocation will have a negative visual impact on the local landscape and uses Timperley Wedge's assumed adverse impact to lessen the significance of the AP2 impact.</p>

- 4.1.6. By contrast, PfE and the Timperley Wedge allocation are not considered in the traffic modelling, local transport assessments and scheme operational assessments for the Proposed Scheme, including AP2. This may result in unsatisfactory performance of the Proposed Scheme and adversely impact the local and strategic road networks. The underlying assessments are therefore inadequate.
- 4.1.7. Plot 1 of the 'un-committed' Timperley Wedge allocation received outline planning permission earlier this year for 116 homes. It is expected that c.1,000 dwellings will be constructed by 2031/32 and c.2,500 dwellings by 2042/43. It is essential therefore that with similar construction and completion timescales, the Promoter consistently takes full account of PfE in its traffic modelling and assessments to ensure that the local and strategic road networks have sufficient capacity and adequate infrastructure to cope with the increased network demands associated with the Proposed Scheme and Timperley Wedge during both construction and operational phases.
- 4.1.8. Inclusion of PfE within the Proposed Scheme's model is likely to decrease the efficiency of traffic movements for the Proposed Scheme, Timperley Wedge and the local community, despite PfE mitigation measures being included on the wider highway network.

Request:

- 4.1.9. TC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking that he will:
- a) Include the PfE allocations (particularly Timperley Wedge and MediPark) as 'committed' schemes in all traffic modelling, local transport assessments and scheme operational assessments for the Proposed Scheme;
 - b) Undertake transport assessment sensitivity tests, with several future year 'uncertainty' scenarios, with PfE site-specific trip movements and network mitigation(s) (e.g., MediPark and Timperley Wedge) added to GM SATURN (highway) model and GM Public Transport Model in collaboration with TC and GM Partners;
 - c) Test the operational performance of the proposed M56 J6 layout (Option TB10) with additional traffic associated with the committed development at PfE allocations (3.1 MediPark and 3.2 Timperley Wedge) in collaboration with TC and GM Partners; and
 - d) Agree adequate and appropriate mitigation, and the mechanism for securing such mitigation for potential unsatisfactory junction operation in 2039 and 2051 with the Proposed Scheme fully operational in collaboration with TC and GM Partners when PfE is fully accounted for.

4.2. Integration with PfE - Timperley Wedge Strategic Allocation

- 4.2.1. TC welcomes the inclusion of the connection of Metrolink to the Manchester Airport High-Speed Station in AP2. The ability to complete the Metrolink 'loop' to Manchester Airport from both the east and west and capture the significant growth plans for Timperley Wedge, provides a unique opportunity to facilitate the creation of a new highly sustainable community from the outset, delivering significant social and economic benefits to new and existing local communities.

- 4.2.2. Notwithstanding this significant improvement to the Proposed Scheme, TC is concerned that the powers sought under AP2-006-022 for the future construction of the Metrolink stop, viaduct west and east approaches have not fully taken into account the development requirements for the adjacent 2,500 home Timperley Wedge strategic allocation.
- 4.2.3. AP2 includes Roaring Gate Lane embankment, a 330m section of embankment and retaining wall. This would be constructed on land included within the Timperley Wedge site boundary. As proposed, the Roaring Gate Lane embankment would directly reduce the amount of developable land and may potentially stymie development of additional land parcels in close proximity to the embankment and retaining wall structures.
- 4.2.4. The Timperley Wedge spine road required to support the delivery of the allocation also includes a Southern connection with the existing Thorley Lane (near M56 J5). Again, this development requirement for Timperley Wedge has not been considered within the AP2 proposals. Failure to appropriately consider the highway infrastructure necessary for the allocation, where it is adjacent to the Proposed Scheme may result in unintended delays to the delivery of the spine road, and consequently delay delivery of a significant number of planned homes and commercial floorspace within Trafford.
- 4.2.5. TC appreciates the design of Metrolink and the constraints that the alignment responds to. In particular, TC notes that Metrolink is grade separated from the highway at the crossing of Thorley Lane (on the western side of the High-Speed Station).
- 4.2.6. However, TC would highlight to the Promoter the opportunity to optimise the Metrolink design further, through the inclusion of the Timperley Wedge spine road within the AP2 proposals, which would reduce the impact on the Timperley Wedge allocation and surrounding environment.
- 4.2.7. TC is also concerned that it is not clear whether the proposed realigned Thorley Lane Overbridge and the western access roads to the High-Speed Station will be accessible to general vehicular traffic during the operational phase of the Proposed Scheme. The western access roads to the High-Speed Station are stated as being restricted to taxi, bus and emergency vehicles only. It is not clear as to how far this restriction applies.

Request:

- 4.2.8. TC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking he will:
- a) Construct a section of the Timperley Wedge spine road through the Main South Tunnel Portal Compound to use as an alternative construction route, directing traffic away from Roaring Gate Lane / Thorley Lane junction, as early as reasonably practicable after Royal Assent is granted and share and agree the detailed timetable for construction with TC; so as not to sterilise or delay the delivery of Timperley Wedge development. The detailed design of the spine road must be developed in collaboration with TC, TfGM, relevant landowners/developers and other GM Partners as necessary;
 - b) On completion of the spine road, ensure that Thorley Lane is closed to through traffic (stopped up) and reduce the extent and/or remove the Roaring Gate Lane embankment and retaining wall. Removing the conflict between Metrolink and

vehicles at Thorley Lane/ Roaring Gate Lane junction will enable the Metrolink line to follow a steeper gradient, reaching ground level quicker. This in turn would allow for optimisation of the Metrolink design;

- c) Ensure that the realigned Thorley Lane Overbridge and western access roads to the High-Speed Station are kept open to general traffic and not restricted to taxi, bus and emergency vehicles; and
- d) Promote any amendments needed to the Bill and supporting documents to support the above changes.

5. Metrolink

5.1. Connection of Metrolink to Manchester Airport High-Speed Station

- 5.1.1. TC welcomes the inclusion of the connection of Metrolink to Manchester Airport High-Speed Station in AP2, but further clarity on the proposed programme is needed for these works to ensure that Metrolink Western leg can be delivered into service as soon as practicable.
- 5.1.2. TC reaffirms that it supports TfGM's intentions for Metrolink to be operational no later than the first day of operation of HS2 services but that it may commence operation in advance of that date (running through but not stopping at Manchester Airport HS2 Station) if it is in a position to do so.
- 5.1.3. To facilitate TfGM's forward programming of the Metrolink extension, it will need to understand the detailed dependencies during the design, construction and testing/commissioning phases of HS2, and would welcome further detailed discussion and information sharing between all relevant parties.
- 5.1.4. TC welcomes the inclusion of Work No. 2/18F to provide access in the vicinity of Keepers Cottage but notes its concern that the proposed design for the relocation of the access to Keepers Cottage may not be feasible due to the topography of the site. TC together with TfGM is therefore concerned that the AP2 limits are not wide enough to enable the necessary realignment of the entrance to the driveway of Keepers Cottage.

Request:

- 5.1.5. TC repeats its request at 4.1.8 of the Bill Petition and requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking that he will agree with TfGM an integrated delivery strategy that will enable Metrolink to be delivered into service as early as is practicable, possibly in advance of High-Speed operations and no later than day one of High-Speed operations. This integrated delivery strategy shall encompass the agreement of delivery responsibilities, ensure that the necessary worksites and access for Metrolink construction are provided in a timely manner and that interfaces between elements of the programme are managed to mitigate risk.
- 5.1.6. TC requests that the Bill limits be extended to ensure adequate realignment of the driveway to Keeper's cottage to ensure continued and appropriate access to the property.

5.2. Metro/Tram-Train from Manchester Airport to the west and southwest

- 5.2.1. TC notes that Work No. 2/16A provides for a junction to the immediate west of the proposed tram stop to enable a future Metro/tram-train link route to the

southwest. This is welcome. However, TC is concerned that design solutions for a route to the south-west (particularly those running north of the M56) are now constrained due to the amended design in AP2 for M56 Junction 6.

- 5.2.2. The ability for TfGM to deliver a link to the southwest is essential to support GM's 2040 Transport Strategy which will also serve to ensure that the benefits of the Proposed Scheme are widely disseminated across Greater Manchester and beyond. The amendments to the design of M56 Junction 6 introduce new constraints to the identified route options which may impact TfGM's ability to deliver a solution which delivers the 2040 Strategy objectives whilst representing optimum value for money.

Request:

- 5.2.3. TC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking to work collaboratively with TC, TfGM and other relevant parties including National Highways to agree and make provision for a future South-West Metro/tram-train alignment within the design of M56 Junction 6 which minimises the cost and complexity impacts of the M56 Junction 6 design on a future south-west Metro/tram-train route.

6. Traffic Impacts – Construction and Operational

6.1. Wholly Inappropriate Construction Routes and Impacts on Local Communities

- 6.1.1. TC is hugely concerned that the amendments to construction routes and associated junctions, severances, diversions, disruptions and congestion proposed by AP2 will result in major adverse effects to the adjacent and local communities of Trafford, in particular Warburton Green, Davenport Green and Hale Barns for a minimum period of at least six years.

- 6.1.2. The durations of use proposed by the Promoter for the construction routes are exceptionally long, presented in yearly quarters rather than weeks or months. These extensive periods of time are classified as 'temporary' by the Promoter as they do not form part of the completed and Operational Scheme.

- 6.1.3. Whilst this classification is technically accurate, TC considers that minimum periods of five years' of significant adverse construction traffic and effects will not feel 'temporary' to local residents, businesses and communities. Consequently, TC believes that such long lasting effects must be considered and mitigated for appropriately, regardless of their eventual cessation.

- 6.1.4. The wholly inappropriate construction routes proposed as a result of AP2 fall into two categories:

- a) New Significantly Adversely Affected Construction Routes and Junctions
- b) Worsened Existing Construction Routes and Junctions as a result of AP2

- 6.1.5. For ease, each category is dealt with in turn.

New Significantly Adversely Affected Construction Routes and Junctions

- 6.1.6. To accommodate the AP2 proposals, a number of new construction routes/junctions have been identified, all of which will suffer direct significant adverse

long-term 'temporary' impacts in the form of 'major traffic congestion' and/or 'major traffic severance for non-motorised users', including but not limited to:

- a) Roaring Gate Lane;
- b) Shay Lane;
- c) Hale Road/ High Elm Road Junction;
- d) Chapel Lane;
- e) Hale Road;
- f) Longsides Road;
- g) High Elm Road; and
- h) Sunbank Lane/ Sunbank Lane Overbridge.

6.1.7. Whilst some of these routes were already identified in the Proposed Scheme, AP2 identifies new effects and/or new locations along these routes, such as Hale Road.

6.1.8. A number of new routes/ junctions have also been identified as suffering from indirect moderate adverse long-term 'temporary' impacts in the form of 'moderate traffic severance for non-motorised users,' including but not limited to:

- a) Chapel Lane off Wicker Lane Roundabout; and
- b) Wicker Lane/ Chapel Lane.

6.1.9. These construction routes and associated junctions are (in the main) either quiet sub-urban residential roads lined by residential properties, primary schools and local businesses or single lane country roads which will receive hundreds of HGV, LGV and other significant traffic movements every day (including weekends) arising as a result of the AP2 design over a significant period of time.

Worsened 'Existing' Construction Routes and Junctions

6.1.10. To accommodate the AP2 proposals, a number of existing construction routes/ junctions already identified in the Bill proposals will receive significant additional impacts resulting in direct significant adverse long-term 'temporary' impacts in the form of 'major traffic congestion' and/or 'major traffic severance for non-motorised users', including but not limited to:

- a) Roaring Gate Lane/ Whitecarr Lane Junction;
- b) Thorley Lane;
- c) Thorley Lane Overbridge;
- d) Hale Four Seasons Roundabout and associated connections such as M56 Junction 6 off and on slips and Wilmslow Road;
- e) Hale Road; and
- f) Sunbank Lane/ Sunbank Lane Overbridge.

6.1.11. The following existing routes/ junctions have also been identified as suffering from additional indirect significant or moderate adverse long-term 'temporary'

impacts in the form of 'major traffic congestion', 'moderate traffic congestion' and/or 'major traffic severance for non-motorised users', including but not limited to:

- a) Tithebarn Road/ Hale Road junction;
 - b) Elmridge Drive/ Hale Road junction;
 - c) Carwood/ Chapel Lane junction;
 - d) High Elm Road/ Elmridge Drive; and
 - e) Greengate.
- 6.1.12. The AP2 proposed construction routes are shown in Volume 5: Map Book Traffic and Transport (TR-01, TR-03, TR-04, TR-08). TC notes particularly drawing TR-08-311 which illustrates the prolonged and substantial daily impacts from car, LGV and HGV construction traffic for the Proposed Scheme, associated with works compounds.
- 6.1.13. All the new and/or worsened effects resulting from AP2 within MA06 are summarised in Volume 2: Community Area report MA06 Hulseheath to Manchester Airport.
- 6.1.14. Despite the findings of the SES2 and AP2 ES, paragraph 7.3.43 of Volume 2: Community Area report MA06 Hulseheath to Manchester Airport, states that no further traffic and transport mitigation measures have been identified.
- 6.1.15. This is not acceptable to TC.
- 6.1.16. The increase in major adverse effects as a result of AP2 are due to:
- a) Concurrent construction phases associated with three significant components of the Proposed Scheme; namely the M56 J6 gyratory, realignment of the M56 and Manchester Airport High-Speed Station;
 - b) Amended construction routes and diverted PRow;
 - c) Access to/from and location of satellite compounds and stockpiling to the west of the M56;
 - d) Severance and long-term temporary closure of non-motorised routes (such as the Greater Bollin Trail); and
 - e) Significant increases in volumes and frequency of vehicular, workforce, LGV and HGV traffic.

Effects of New and/or Worsened Construction Routes and Junctions

- 6.1.17. AP2 increases all traffic movements in a major adverse way.
- 6.1.18. However, most notably HGV movements are increased by c.30% and LGV movements by c.15% on both the Local and Strategic Road Networks from the Proposed Scheme in the Bill as submitted. These significant increases in traffic movements result in (among other things):
- a) significant congestion;
 - b) degradation of the network; and

c) a reduction in the lifespan of the carriageway.

6.1.19. Moreover, TC notes specifically that the significant adverse increases in traffic movements (inclusive of HGV movements) from the Proposed Scheme as amended under AP2 are in addition to general increases in traffic forecasts.

6.1.20. To this effect, SES2 and AP2 ES Volume 2: Community Area reports MA06: Hulseheath to Manchester Airport, poignantly summarise the effects of the new and/or worsened construction routes and junctions on the local community. The latter part of which (underlined for ease of reference) is repeated several times throughout the document in relation to other impacts on the community:

“7.7.11 Changes to construction traffic flows will result in a new adverse neighbourhood quality effect for residents of Arthog Road, Bankhall Lane, Hawley Lane, Broad Lane, Chapel Lane, High Elm Road and Elmridge Drive. New traffic noise effects are to be noticeable along these roads. As a result of the changes to the sound, noise and vibration assessment, there will be a new adverse neighbourhood quality effect for residents at these properties along these roads. People in this community are likely to experience these effects as changing the quality of the neighbourhood and to regard that change as adverse, diminishing the amenity of the settlement”. (Our emphasis)

Request:

6.1.21. TC repeats its requests set out in paragraphs 6.1.9, 6.2.4, 15.3.4 – 15.3.6 of the Bill Petition insofar as they relate to the AP2 proposals.

6.1.22. TC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking to:

- a) Remove Chapel Lane, High Elm Road and Longsides Road, Sunbank Lane Overbridge as construction traffic routes; and
- b) Identify, fully implement and fund in a timely manner alternative construction traffic routes to support construction of the Proposed Scheme. The alternative routes must be capable of fully accommodating the volume of traffic movements generated by AP2 and be agreed in collaboration with TC, TfGM and GM Partners.

6.1.23. TC further requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking to ensure that the handling, hauling and movement of imported, exported and reused earthworks associated with the AP2 proposals (particularly at the M56 J6 gyratory and HS2 Airport Station and associated temporary works) uses the strategic network or temporary structures and haul routes as a priority to facilitate plant and haulage movements rather than the local road network. Such measures must be agreed with TC, TfGM, GM Partners and National Highways.

6.2. Highway Diversions and Closures

6.2.1. The AP2 revised scheme proposes to close additional roads during its construction phases over and above those noted in the main Bill. TC is concerned about the volume and density of roads to be closed, and the resultant impact on residential properties and the ability of businesses to function. TC is concerned about how these roads will be closed and the management of diversion routes

and more importantly how these road closures will be managed in the case of emergencies.

Request:

6.2.2. TC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking that he will agree an appropriate Local Traffic Management Plan with TC, TfGM and the relevant highway authorities, which must include a forward detailed programme of works, and that the agreed plan is in place prior to commencing construction of Phase 2b.

6.2.3. TC also requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking that road closures are kept to a minimum with engagement and agreement with the GM Partners.

6.3. Significant Adverse Residual Effects – Congestion at Junctions

6.3.1. The SES2 and AP2 ES reports that several junctions within Greater Manchester would be subject to significant adverse effects arising from increased congestion and delays during construction and operation of the Proposed Scheme. These effects are spread across Greater Manchester.

6.3.2. TC finds the Promoter's approach of not committing to any mitigation measures for these significant adverse effects in the Environmental Statement totally unacceptable.

Request:

6.3.3. TC repeats its request in paragraph 15.4.3 of the Bill Petition.

6.4. Movement of Spoil and Materials

6.4.1. The AP2 design will lead to additional spoil and materials movements on the local road network to access the strategic road network at junction 6 of the M56. This will lead to an increase in congestion at nearby road junctions and the adverse traffic related severance effects along road links.

6.4.2. Paragraph 7.3.24 of the SES and AP2 ES MA06 Community Area Report describes the assessment of impacts on traffic during the construction phase, but the SES2 and AP2 ES does not present details of the impacts, nor does it present information on mitigation measures to be implemented on these routes aside from high level measures noted in the CoCP.

6.4.3. As noted in the Bill Petition, the addition of significant numbers of HGVs and other construction vehicles on the wider local road network in MA06 and the Airport area during the planned construction period of circa 10 years will worsen congestion in this area, reduce the accessibility of Manchester Airport and the surrounding area with negative impacts on the local economy, amenity and environment. It will also adversely impact on freight journeys using the roads around Manchester Airport.

6.4.4. It is therefore now more essential that more appropriate methods of moving spoil and construction materials in MA06 and Manchester Airport area are adopted.

6.4.5. The highways modelling used in SES2 and AP2 ES assumes the Rainbow Works would have been delivered before construction of Phase 2b highway works commences and that the road between Manchester Airport's Terminal 2 and M56

J6 would be used as a construction route. The Rainbow Works is currently not a committed development/scheme and the Bill proposals are placing reliance on road infrastructure that may not be in place. The road between Manchester Airport's Terminal 2 and M56 J6 is not appropriate for construction traffic in its current state, even with proposed AP2 modifications at the Runger Lane/Avro Way and Runger Lane/Thorley Lane junctions. This is evidenced by HS2's SES and AP2 ES transport assessment which still predicts significant adverse traffic effects along the road between Manchester Airport's Terminal 2 and M56 J6 during construction. These include traffic congestion and delays to vehicle occupants, traffic severance on non-motorised users and public transport delay.

- 6.4.6. With the Manchester Tunnel South Portal, Manchester Airport High-Speed Station site and M56 J6 being a continuous construction area, the use of a haul route through the Airport station site connecting the tunnel site and M56 J6 would help reduce construction traffic movements on the local highway network and help to avoid the majority of the predicted significant adverse construction effects.
- 6.4.7. With the increased construction vehicle movements associated with spoil and material movement, the case for a conveyor and railhead system connecting to the mid-Cheshire line / Ashley railhead should be explored further.

Request:

- 6.4.8. TC repeats its request in paragraphs 6.1.7 to 6.1.9 of the Bill Petition.
- 6.4.9. TC also requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking that he will:
- a) Utilise internal haul routes between construction compounds for inter-spoil compound vehicle movements, and minimise the impact on local roads and local residents;
 - b) Minimise land take for additional spoil storage identified in AP2; and
 - c) Commit to returning land for development to TC as soon as it is no longer required for construction.

6.5. Adverse Noise Effects from Construction Traffic

- 6.5.1. As a result of the amendments to the Proposed Scheme advocated under AP2, construction traffic is predicted to cause adverse noise effects on residential receptors along:
- a) Arthog Road between the B5162 Park Road and Bankhall Lane;
 - b) Bankhall Lane between Arthog Road and Hill Top;
 - c) Bankhall Lane between Hill Top and Broad Lane;
 - d) Broad Lane between Hale Road and Bankhall Lane;
 - e) Broad Lane/Hawley Lane between Bankhall Lane and Chapel Lane;
 - f) Chapel Lane between Hawley Lane and High Elm Road;
 - g) High Elm Road/Elmridge Drive between Chapel Lane and the A538 Hale Road; and
 - h) High Elm Road between Greengate and the A538 Hale Road.

6.5.2. As a result of AP2, approximately 260 dwellings located along these roads are predicted to experience an increase in road traffic noise levels of around 7dB LpAeq,0700-2300 during peak months. This equates to 5.32 times louder than the existing baseline.

Request:

6.5.3. TC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking to upgrade road surfaces (noted in AP2 and the wider network and associations with further mitigation requirements) to achieve UKPMS green condition under current UK standards (as amended and/or superseded by any subsequent replacement) and to ensure that all associated highway infrastructure is in a good condition, to be agreed with TC, and to maintain them thereafter during the construction phase. All road surfaces and associated highway infrastructure should be guaranteed to be at UKPMS green condition at HS2 operational phase.

6.5.4. TC repeats its requests at 6.9.3 and 6.9.4 of the Bill Petition.

6.5.5. In addition to the request in 6.9.3 of the Bill Petition for the Promoter to mitigate all adverse sound, noise and vibration effects, TC also requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking that he will also compensate such effects. Further, any mitigation and/or compensation measures should be in addition to the standard mitigation and compensatory measures proposed by the Promoter and used in earlier phases of the HS2 Scheme.

6.6. Impacts on Physical and Mental Health and Well-Being of Communities

6.6.1. The communities of Hale Barns and Warburton Green are likely to suffer from the most significant adverse effects arising from the construction of the Proposed Scheme which will be exacerbated by AP2. The proposed construction routes, in particular, will adversely affect schools, access to public services, residential amenity, people's quality of life, businesses, community spirit and purpose and lifestyles of local residents for a significant period of time.

6.6.2. The scale and length of the cumulative adverse effects that these two communities are likely to endure due to the AP2 changes during construction are likely to be unparalleled to other communities elsewhere along the HS2 Phase 2b route.

6.6.3. TC is therefore concerned that the increased construction traffic from AP2 will have a greater impact on the physical and mental health of local residents, teachers and students at local schools.

6.6.4. Of particular concern is the AP2 construction route along Hale Road, High Elm Road, Longsides Road and Chapel Lane, which will impact a significant number of people. There are three schools within a 1.5km radius of the route, including Elmbridge Primary School; Saint Ambrose Prep School and Saint Ambrose College.

6.6.5. Elmbridge Primary School is located directly on the construction route and the journey to/from school for pupils, parents and teachers will be significantly impacted, for both motorised and non-motorised journeys.

- 6.6.6. Moreover, the use of the route by hundreds of daily HGV and LGV movements over several years, will have a significant impact on local air quality, safety and sound and noise disturbance.

Request:

- 6.6.7. TC repeats its requests at 6.9.3, 6.9.4, 15.5.2, 16.2.6, 16.2.7, 16.2.8 and 16.2.9 of the Bill Petition.

6.7. Highway and Other Infrastructure Degradation

- 6.7.1. TC is concerned that the wider local highway network will be significantly adversely impacted as a direct result of the changes within AP2. The realignment of the M56 Junction 6, in particular, will result in a prolonged and substantial increase in the number of both construction and associated worker vehicles using the wider local highway network within Trafford, due to the increase in size and complexity of the changes and the concurrent working between the M56 J6 gyratory and HS2 Station and Portal works. This will exacerbate the concerns regarding road maintenance as set out within paragraphs 6.3.1 to 6.3.5 of the Bill Petition.

Request:

- 6.7.2. TC repeats its requests at 6.3.7 – 6.3.9 of the Bill Petition in relation to the additional infrastructure assets that will be affected by AP2.

- 6.7.3. TC also requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking to:

- a) Maintain new/alterd highways for a period of 12 months (or more if adoption is not concluded) from the opening of such highways for public use. The highway will not be maintainable at public expense unless highway adaptation has been agreed with the local highway authority (LHA);
- b) Carry out pre-dilapidation surveys where traffic diversions are planned (for all road classes), in addition to UKPMS inspections & surveys (as amended and/or superseded by any subsequent replacement). Post construction repairs identified through further inspections and surveys should be agreed with the LHA;
- c) Reinstate all works to the highway to be a permanent reinstatement to allow LHA to apply New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 rules and current standards for the purpose of warranty periods;
- d) Ensure that all highway maintenance works are undertaken to Local UKPMS standards, policies and procedures;
- e) If reactive maintenance becomes more onerous (time, quality and/or frequency) due to HS2 and/or its associated construction traffic, HS2 will be required to undertake this work; and
- f) All works are to be undertaken in collaboration and agreement with the LHA and in a timely and effective manner.

- 6.7.4. TC also requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking to fund 1no. full-time Street Works Manager for the duration of the construction phase.

6.8. Impact on Bus Journey Times

- 6.8.1. TC is concerned that during the construction phase, the changes in AP2, mainly summarised in AP2-006-014, will result in a general worsening of bus journey times within Community Area MA06.
- 6.8.2. The additional HGV movements and intrusive works to deliver the new M56 Junction 6 proposals, under AP2-006-014, will also have a detrimental impact on a number of local bus services.
- 6.8.3. It is a further concern to TC that when bus stops are temporarily closed due to traffic management measures during construction, the impacts of doing so are not adequately considered and some assessments of journey time on route sections do not seem to accord with the traffic management measures proposed.
- 6.8.4. Whilst there has been some change to the significant adverse residual effects on delays to public transport, all the bus routes identified in the original ES continue to experience unacceptable and unmitigated adverse effects at some point during construction or operation of the Proposed Scheme.

Request:

- 6.8.5. TC repeats its request at 6.6.2 to 6.6.3 of the Bill Petition.

6.9. Thorley Lane / Runger Lane Junction

- 6.9.1. The Promoter has updated its assessment since the submission of the Bill to address the fact that Runger Lane will not be a dual carriageway before the commencement of construction of the Proposed Scheme.
- 6.9.2. However, TC remains concerned that the Promoter continues to assume that Runger Lane will be upgraded, by the Manchester Airport Group (MAG), as part of their Rainbow Works condition, from a single to a dual carriageway, during the operational phase of the Proposed Scheme.
- 6.9.3. The Rainbow Works is currently not a committed development/scheme and the Bill proposals are placing reliance on road infrastructure that may not be in place during its operation. This presents a risk in terms of inadequate junction design and inappropriate mitigation.

Request:

- 6.9.4. TC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking to work collaboratively with TC, TfGM, MCC, relevant GM Partners and MAG to identify and deliver appropriate mitigation for any significant adverse traffic, or other effect caused by the Proposed Scheme in the instance that Runger Lane is not a dual carriageway by 2038, as assumed.
- 6.9.5. TC requests that the Promoter agrees this mitigation with the stakeholders mentioned above and promote any amendments to the Bill and supporting documents that may be necessary to deliver this mitigation in the event it is required.

7. Relocated and Re-Designed M56 Junction 6

7.1. Limits of Deviation (LoD)

7.1.1. TC is hugely concerned that the Proposed Scheme as amended by AP2 will be able to 'deviate slightly from the centre line of the works as may be required for reasons of engineering practicability following detailed design' (Volume 5: Appendix CT-006-0000 Wider Effects report, Paragraph 1.1.6).

7.1.2. This 'slight deviation' in respect of the realigned and reconfigured M56 Junction 6 (AP2-006-014) is set out at paragraph 2.2.7 of the above report and states:

"There is scope to move the horizontal alignment of parts of M56 Junction 6 to the north-west within the limits of deviation by a further 45m and to raise the vertical alignment by up to 3m".

7.1.3. Whilst TC accepts that some deviation must be built into the Proposed Scheme to enable its successful delivery, it takes significant issue with the horizontal LoD of 45m to the north-west as this would effectively eliminate any buffer/ gap between the rear boundaries of residential properties in Warburton Green; particularly those on Hale Road, Burnside, Marlfield Road, Greengate, Warburton Close, Warburton Drive and Bankside.

7.1.4. It would also significantly reduce and/or eliminate the ability of the Proposed Scheme to provide any landscaping and visual screening or acoustic mitigations, resulting in a significantly increased major adverse impact on those properties and their occupants (paragraphs 2.2.10 and 2.2.11).

Request:

7.1.5. TC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking that:

- a) In the event that any variation to the highway alignment becomes necessary, he will agree a mechanism and governance process with TC by which the Promoter and TC develop and agree an appropriate detailed design for the location and highway alignment of M56 Junction 6;
- b) In the event of any proposed variation to the highway alignment, further detailed noise modelling will be undertaken to confirm whether new significant effects are likely to occur;
- c) He will work collaboratively with TC to design, agree and deliver such appropriate and coordinated mitigation for any additional adverse impacts that are predicted to arise as a result of the works being moved closer to the affected residential properties;
- d) The agreed mitigations will be fully funded and implemented by the Promoter prior to the impacts materialising;
- e) In the event of any proposed variation to the highway alignment, appropriately mature planting together with all other reasonable landscape and visual mitigation measures will be agreed with TC, and that the Promoter at the earliest opportunity, will provide a suitable screening benefit to residents; and
- f) If such mitigation is not available, affected landowners will be entitled to make a claim in line with the compensation code.

7.2. Noise and Vibration Impacts during Construction

- 7.2.1. TC is significantly concerned that the new construction areas associated with the reconfiguration of M56 Junction 6 in AP2 will create long term adverse noise and vibration impacts.
- 7.2.2. The updated noise assessment for MA06 has identified a significant adverse construction noise and vibration effect at approximately 85 dwellings in the vicinity of Hale Road, Burnside, Warburton Close and Warburton Drive, Chapel Lane, Bankside and Ridge Avenue for a duration of up to four years and eleven months.
- 7.2.3. The updated noise assessment for MA06 also identifies a significant adverse construction noise effect at a residential community of approximately 30 dwellings in Hale Barns in the vicinity of the A538 Hale Road and Hasty Lane for a duration of up to four years and ten months.

Request:

- 7.2.4. TC repeats its requests at 6.9.3 and 6.9.4 of the Bill Petition.
- 7.2.5. In addition to the request in 6.9.3 of the Bill Petition for the Promoter to mitigate all adverse sound, noise and vibration effects, TC also requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking that he will also compensate such effects. Further, any mitigation and/or compensation measures should be in addition to the standard mitigation and compensatory measures proposed by the Promoter and used in earlier phases of the HS2 Scheme.

7.3. Permanent Significant Adverse Noise Impacts

- 7.3.1. TC is concerned that the relocation of Junction 6 of the M56 motorway will create a permanent significant adverse noise impact at sensitive receptors within Warburton Green, Hale Barns and Hale.
- 7.3.2. The Motorway realignment results in residential properties being significantly closer to the M56 with potential to increase exposure to operational vehicle noise. This will permanently and detrimentally affect the residential amenity of affected receptors.
- 7.3.3. SES2 and AP2 ES do not indicate any significant impact at residential properties. However, they confirm that a noise barrier comprising a 221m long and 3m high fence located on the top of engineering earthworks between the realigned Sunbank Lane and the M56 junction 6 northbound exit slip road, is required to provide acoustic screening for properties in Warburton Green from operational highway noise.

Request:

- 7.3.4. TC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking that he will provide a dedicated road traffic noise assessment, which shall be undertaken to current UK Standards, for the operational phase of the realignment of the M56 motorway around Junction 6.
- 7.3.5. TC also repeats its requests at 6.9.3 of the Bill Petition, to be informed by the road traffic noise assessment referred to at 7.3.4 above. In addition to the request in 6.9.3 of the Bill Petition for the Promoter to mitigate all adverse sound, noise

and vibration effects, TC also requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking that he will also compensate such effects. Further, any mitigation and/or compensation measures should be in addition to the standard mitigation and compensatory measures proposed by the Promoter and used in earlier phases of the HS2 Scheme.

- 7.3.6. TC also requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking to fully implement and fund any mitigation measures in a timely manner.

7.4. Landscape and Visual Impact

- 7.4.1. TC is concerned that the additional land required to facilitate the reconfigured M56 Junction 6 (AP2-006-014) will result in significant detrimental changes to the landscape.

- 7.4.2. The proposed additional land requirement results in significant additional infrastructure and highway paraphernalia within an existing open landscape between an existing motorway and residential properties. New significant landscape and visual effects have been identified within the SES2 and AP2 for the construction and operational works associated with AP2-006-014. The construction and operational phases will have a major adverse effect on many identified viewpoints. The amendments to the Proposed Scheme advocated under AP2 would result in:

- a) New roads within close proximity to residential boundaries. The M56 northbound slip road will be located within 50m of the rear boundaries of residential properties on Warburton Close and Warburton Drive, and the new Chapel Lane link to the Sunbank Lane overbridge will be located within 30m of the rear of residential properties on Bankside;
- b) A raised motorway gyratory approximately 10m above the proposed M56 road surface, with associated earth works;
- c) Manchester Airport HS2 Station Cutting Retaining Walls South increased in length. The length of the retaining walls will be increased from 348m to 434m;
- d) Two additional overbridges: 1) M56 Junction 6 Hale Road Link Overbridge (1m below ground level and 12m above track level) and 2) A538 Hale Road Station Link Overbridge (3m above ground level);
- e) Noise barriers adjacent to properties at Warburton Green which would be 3m above engineering earth works, and approximately 9m above existing ground levels near the gyratory; and
- f) Landscape earthworks which appear to be in the form of raised bunds on figures 5 & 6 within SES2 and AP2 ES, Volume 2 Community Area MA06. The precise form and heights of these raised earthworks are not clear from the AP2 documents.

- 7.4.3. The cumulative result of the above works would be highly dominant and incongruous, harmful to the landscape character and to visual amenity. This impact would be most severely experienced from nearby residential properties within Warburton Green and in the wider area.

- 7.4.4. The SES2 and AP2 ES sets out that the landscape and visual impact is considered to have major adverse harm in the construction period and moderate

adverse harm in operation, on the Altrincham and Hale Urban Fringe Farmland LCA.

- 7.4.5. Major adverse impacts are identified on new viewpoints South of Chapel Lane (332-02-009) and southeast from Bankside (332-02-010), along with other views which would be adversely affected. TC considers that there is insufficient information to fully understand the impact of these changes on the landscape and is concerned about the long-term impacts and the level of mitigation proposed.

Request:

- 7.4.6. TC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking that he will:

- a) Provide more detailed information to TC and GM Partners, including sections indicating the height of (among other things) the new landscape features, cuttings, raised bunds, overbridges, and retaining walls along with the new motorway junction, to allow an appropriate assessment of the landscape and visual impacts of the works and the proposed mitigation, as soon as possible and prior to the detailed design phase for the M56 Junction 6 re-configuration, to enable meaningful collaboration and input; and
- b) Work with TC and GM Partners to agree a mechanism and governance process by which the Promoter, TC and the GM Partners will develop and agree an appropriate detailed design for the M56 Junction 6 re-configuration.

7.5. M56 East Satellite Compound and Stockpile Site

- 7.5.1. TC is concerned that Community Area Map Book MA06 does not make clear how the M56 East Satellite Compound and Stockpile site will be accessed in Map Number CT-05-356.

- 7.5.2. The M56 East Satellite Compound and Stockpile site is located in extremely close proximity to existing residential communities, who would already be impacted by the Proposed Scheme. Map Numbers CT-05-356 Construction Phase and CT-06-356 Proposed Scheme both included an access to the M56 East Satellite Compound and Stockpile site off the A538 Hale Road Realignment.

- 7.5.3. AP2-006-014 removes the access roads off Hale Road. Community Area Map Book MA06 Map Numbers CT-05-356 (Construction Phase SES2 and AP2 ES). However, it does not indicate how the M56 East Satellite Compound and Stockpile site will be accessed in light of the above amendment.

Request:

- 7.5.4. TC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking that:

- a) The M56 East Satellite Compound and Stockpile site will be accessed and egressed solely from the strategic road network and the detailed design will be agreed in collaboration with TC, TfGM, other GM Partners and National Highways; and
- b) The following roads will not be used to access the M56 East Satellite Compound and Stockpile site: Burnside; Marlfield Road; and Greengate.

- 7.5.5. TC also repeats its request at 17.4.3 of the Bill Petition insofar as it relates to the changes proposed under AP2.

7.6. Air Quality

- 7.6.1. TC is concerned the new construction areas associated with the reconfiguration of M56 Junction 6 will create a long-term adverse impact on air quality at sensitive receptors.
- 7.6.2. The construction process for the reconfiguration of the M56 Junction 6 would be expected to take a significant period of time and sensitive receptors are confirmed as being located within 20m of demolition, earthworks, construction and trackout activities. Construction and demolition activities can create significant levels of dust and particulates (PM10 & PM2.5) through the preparation of the land (e.g., demolition, land clearing, and earth moving), and during construction. Sources of emissions will include vehicles, site plant and equipment, stockpiles and vehicle movements over temporary roads and open ground.
- 7.6.3. The SES2 and AP2 ES contains a dust impact assessment which confirms that construction activity within the Hale area presents a high risk of dust nuisances being caused to residents. The statement also confirms that there is a medium risk of adverse impacts to human health from dust generated during the construction phases.
- 7.6.4. Emissions from vehicles may be significant due to the proximity of sensitive receptors and the AP2 amendment confirms that construction vehicles, HGV's and LGV's, will use Chapel Lane and pass through Hale Barns, a residential area, to reach Hale Road and the motorway network.

Request:

- 7.6.5. TC repeats the requests made at paragraphs 16.2.7.a) and 16.2.8 of the Bill Petition.
- 7.6.6. TC further requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking that he will:
- a) Implement a construction air quality monitoring and mitigation plan, to be agreed with TC prior to works commencing; and
 - b) Carry out continuous automatic monitoring of airborne dust and set a relevant site action level (defined as a measurement threshold above which investigation will be required) at locations previously agreed with the local authority.

8. Manchester Airport High-Speed Station Design and Access**8.1. Proposed Height of the Airport Station and Depth of Cutting**

- 8.1.1. The proposed changes in AP2 do not fully address the deficiencies identified in the Bill Petition regarding the height of the proposed Airport Station and the depth of the cutting of the High-Speed line.
- 8.1.2. Therefore, TC's concerns regarding the cumulative landscape and visual impacts of the height, scale and length of the Airport Station, associated structures and consequential design of the Metrolink assets as a result of the shallow cut option, set out at 3.5 of the Bill Petition, remain.

Request:

8.1.3. TC repeats its requests set out at paragraphs 3.5.8 to 3.5.11 of the Bill Petition insofar as they relate to the AP2 proposals.

8.2. Inappropriate Access Design

8.2.1. The proposed changes in AP2 do not fully address the deficiencies identified in the Bill Petition regarding the access design for the proposed Manchester Airport High-Speed station. The Bill proposals still fail to properly connect into the surrounding areas or prioritise access via sustainable transport modes, instead they promote use of private cars. This conflicts with the Government's Transport Decarbonisation Strategy which seeks to prioritise low/no carbon and active travel modes and Greater Manchester's Right Mix strategy.

Sustainable Mode Access

8.2.2. Paragraphs 16.5.16 and 16.5.17 of the Transport Assessment Part 3 Addendum Report 8 of 12, SES2 and AP2 ES Volume 5, Appendix: TR-003-00006 notes that the onward mode share reported in the main Transport assessment remains unchanged for the future assessment years - 2039 and 2051 despite the inclusion of Metrolink at the Manchester Airport High-Speed Station.

8.2.3. As a result of the AP2 proposals for access to the Manchester Airport High-Speed Station, permanent traffic congestion and delays are predicted at many of the junctions close to the Airport Station. Non-motorised users using surrounding roads would also be subject to permanent traffic related severance. The Proposed Scheme as amended by AP2, offer no location specific interventions to mitigate these impacts.

8.2.4. TC finds this unacceptable.

8.2.5. This is further compounded by limited provision for alternative transport modes, such as active travel (including adequate cycling infrastructure in the Airport area to cater for the active travel mode share expected for the Manchester Airport High-Speed Station station) and a failure to consider bus facilities within the Airport area.

Request:

8.2.6. TC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking to:

- a) Work collaboratively with TC, TfGM, National Highways, relevant highway authorities and GM Partners to collaborate and agree an appropriate highways access design that takes account of the mode share of Metrolink proposals and other public transport proposals that may impact on the proposed Manchester Airport High-Speed Station; and
- b) Fully implement and fund the agreed appropriate highways access design in a timely manner.

8.2.7. TC also requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking to Work collaboratively with TC, TfGM, National Highways and relevant highway authorities and GM Partners, including Manchester City Council, Cheshire East Council, Stockport MBC and Manchester Airports Group, to develop and agree an appropriate and effective station access design and multi modal access

strategy for the Manchester Airport High-Speed Station and to bring forward proposed amendments to the Bill and supporting documents for a design that:

- a) mitigates the predicted significant adverse impacts of the Bill proposals on the local highways network;
- b) supports active travel in line with national and local guidance, including the provision of appropriate pedestrian and cycling infrastructure; and
- c) increases cycle parking provision to at least 20% of the car parking provisions in line with the 2040 Transport Strategy.

8.2.8. TC repeats its requests at 6.1.9 and 15.4.3 of the Bill petition.

8.2.9. TC also requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking that road closures are kept to a minimum with engagement and agreement with TC and the GM Partners.

Inadequate Active Travel Access

8.2.10. The AP2 Revised Scheme now takes account of demand from NPR passengers in the access design to the Manchester Airport High-Speed Station. TC believes the percentage of daily passenger numbers walking, cycling and wheeling to and from the Manchester Airport High-Speed Station will increase with NPR's operation.

8.2.11. However, AP2 no longer includes the proposal for a M56/A538 Wilmslow Road Offline non-motorised user underpass. TC is concerned that the currently proposed Manchester Airport High-Speed Station active travel infrastructure is insufficient for the projected number of HS2 and NPR passengers who would be walking, cycling and wheeling to and from the station.

Request:

8.2.12. TC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking that he will:

- a) Work collaboratively with TC, TfGM, MCC and MAG to agree adequate and appropriate active travel connections from the Manchester Airport High-Speed Station to residential and employment areas around the station including Manchester Airport;
- b) Fully implement and fund the agreed active travel connections in a timely manner, so that such connections are available on the first day of operation of HS2 services; and
- c) Make the necessary amendments to the Bill to enable delivery of these connections in a way that is integrated and complementary to Greater Manchester's Active Travel network.

8.2.13. TC also requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking to provide high quality cycle infrastructure on the full extent of the station's eastern access road.

8.2.14. TC also requests that the Promoter takes a holistic view of the HS2 and NPR active travel requirements and build them once and build them right – maximising benefits and minimising disruption in the longer term.

8.2.15. TC repeats its requests at 5.1.15 of the Bill petition insofar as they are relevant to the matters set out above.

Car Parking Provision

8.2.16. AP2 would increase the overall height of the car parks at the Airport Station by 2.3m with car parking proposed on the open roof of the buildings (SES2-006-002). This would result in additional visual and landscape impacts, amounting to poor design, with the potential for additional light spill at night.

8.2.17. The amendments are considered to add further to the already significant landscape and visual impact created by the station and further highlight TC's concerns raised within the Bill Petition at section 3.4. The car parks should be fully enclosed and of high-quality design which integrate well into the existing landscape, taking into account the context.

8.2.18. The additional 200 car parking spaces on the roof areas of the car parks also amplifies previous concerns in relation to the Right Mix Vision/modal shift as set out in the Bill Petition at paragraphs 5.1.11 to 5.1.14.

8.2.19. The AP2 revised scheme proposes to increase the number of car parking spaces at the proposed Manchester Airport High-Speed station to 3992.

8.2.20. TC is concerned that within the design for AP2 the Promoter includes car parking spaces on the roof areas of the car parks at the Manchester Airport High-Speed Station. TC remains concerned that the proposed number of car parking spaces at the Manchester Airport High-Speed Station is out of line with Greater Manchester's 2040 Transport Strategy and its aspirations to reduce car travel in favour of other modes of transport.

8.2.21. The station needs to be designed from the outset with wider connectivity by active travel, public transport and shared mobility in preference to access/egress by car.

Request:

8.2.22. TC repeats the requests as set out at paragraphs 3.4.4 a) and b), and 5.1.15 – 5.1.18 of the Bill Petition insofar as they relate to the AP2 proposals.

9. Access to Future Development Land Parcels at Manchester High-Speed Airport Station

9.1.1. AP2 includes a revised access alignment to the south of the Airport Station from Hale Road. The Hale Road Station Link Road proposed in AP2 dissects two parcels of land, which are identified as being returned to suitable development use. Access is only shown to the larger of these parcels on SES2 and AP2 ES Vol.2: Community Area Map Book MA06, Map Number CT-06-356.

9.1.2. AP2 also includes the addition of earthworks along various boundaries of two further future development land parcels north of Hasty Lane. The inclusion of such earthworks both reduces the amount of land available for future suitable development and also makes access to these parcels more onerous.

9.1.3. The Proposed Scheme also includes two future development land parcels to the north of the Station concourse. The access to these again is not clear, particularly as the western access road to the Airport Station is stated within the ES as being restricted to taxi, bus and emergency vehicles only.

9.1.4. TC is therefore concerned that as proposed AP2 and the Proposed Scheme has the unintended ability to sterilise and/or restrict the development potential of a number of identified suitable development land parcels around the Station.

Request:

9.1.5. TC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking to:

- a) Work collaboratively with TC to develop and agree the design (to appropriate DMRB standards) of the development parcel access roads within the immediate vicinity of the Manchester Airport High-Speed Station;
- b) Fully implement and fund the agreed designs in a timely manner; and
- c) Ensure that the access to/from and use of such roads will be unrestricted in perpetuity, so as not to hinder, delay or deter any future development/ use deemed appropriate by TC as local planning authority.

9.1.6. TC also requests that the Promoter be required to provide an undertaking that he will produce and agree with TC, a mechanism and governance process by which the Promoter will produce delivery mechanisms for any development activity within Trafford, including land safeguarded for future development.

10. Impacts on Heritage Assets

10.1. Increased Impacts on Listed Buildings and other Heritage Assets

10.1.1. TC is concerned with the increased visual impact, noise and/or vibration from the significant changes proposed under AP2, notably AP2-006-006; AP2-006-014; AP2-006-016; AP2-006-017; AP2-006-018 and AP2-006-022, within the setting of a number of designated heritage assets and non-designated heritage assets (including but not limited to):

- a) Watch Hill (Schedule Ancient Monument);
- b) Davenport Green Hall (GII LB);
- c) Davenport green Farm (3 GII LB, including Davenportgreen Farm, Paddy's Hut and Barn);
- d) West Bank Farmhouse (GII LB);
- e) Bow Green Farmhouse (GII LB);
- f) Bollington Mill (GII LB);
- g) Dunham Massey Farm buildings (4 GII LBs, including Farm Buildings Quadrangle, Home Farm; Home Farm Dovecote; Dunham Massey Lodge; and Aviary adjoining Dunham Massey Lodge);
- h) Roaring Gate Farm and Tyleyard Cottage on Roaring Gate Lane; and Davenport Green Cottage and Rose Cottage on Shay Lane (NDHAs), as identified in the Historic Environment Assessment for Timperley Wedge); and
- i) Pool Bank Farm and Watlingford (NDHAs).

10.1.2. Specifically, TC is concerned that the amendments to the utility diversion (AP2-006-006), which will result in an additional 5 pylons approximately 500m from

Bowgreen Farmhouse, will increase the permanent effect on the setting of heritage assets at Bollington, Dunham and south of Bowdon: north of River Bollin and junction 8. In addition, TC is concerned that the noise and vibration impacts associated with the construction traffic will permanently affect the condition and stability of listed buildings.

10.1.3. TC is particularly concerned with the potential impacts on the following designated and non-designated heritage assets, which are not assessed in the SES2 and AP2 ES (including but not limited to):

- a) Scheduled Ancient Monument: Watch Hill;
- b) Listed Buildings: West Bank Farmhouse, Bow Green Farmhouse, Bollington Mill, Dunham Massey Farm; and
- c) Non-Designated Heritage Assets: Pool Bank Farm and Watlingford.

10.1.4. TC is concerned that the Metrolink provisions (AP2-006-022), including height and length of the Metrolink stop, viaducts and bridges, in conjunction with the new access road, and buildings alongside Roaring Gate Lane, will permanently increase the visual, noise and vibration impacts on the setting of designated heritage assets and non-designated heritage assets in Davenport Green, as listed above, due to the shallow cut design option.

10.1.5. Furthermore, TC is concerned that the significant increase in land required to accommodate the extension of Metrolink provisions (AP2-006-022), in conjunction with the changes to the Manchester Tunnel South Portal Main and Satellite Compounds will increase the visual, noise and vibration impacts on the setting of a number of designated heritage assets and non-designated heritage assets in Davenport Green, as listed above.

10.1.6. The AP2 changes result in temporary material stockpile being located closer to Davenportgreen Farm, Barn and Paddy's Hut, whilst the land east of Davenport Green Hall will be used as a satellite compound.

10.1.7. Furthermore, significant increase in land is required for construction phase of AP2 006 014; AP2 006 016; AP2 006 017; AP2 006 018, and AP2-006-022, which include: overhead power lines, reconfigured M56 J6, construction compounds; material stockpile; and provision of new access.

10.1.8. A material stockpile and a new access road are located adjacent to Roaring Gate Lane and an area of land is retained for material stockpile to the east of Davenport Green Hall, which are in close proximity to numerous listed buildings. Additional land required extends to the curtilage of Roaring Gate Farm, a NDHA.

Request:

10.1.9. TC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking that he will:

- a) Undertake a thorough and detailed review of the baseline of designated and non-designated heritage assets affected in the SES2 and AP2 ES;
- b) Undertake further assessment of the temporary and permanent effects of the Proposed Scheme as amended by AP2 on all affected designated and non-designated heritage assets; and

- c) Agree a mechanism and governance process with TC by which the Promoter and TC develop and agree appropriate alternative locations for the temporary stockpiles, which are not within the setting(s) of designated and non-designated heritage assets.

10.1.10. TC repeats and extends its request set out at 3.5.9, 3.5.11, 10.3.3 (b and c) and 10.4.2 of the Bill Petition, insofar as they relate to the heritage aspects of the AP2 proposals.

11. Impacts on Public Rights of Way

11.1.1. The AP2 Proposals continue to have a detrimental impact on active travel infrastructure and Public Rights of Way (PRoW) within Trafford. TC is still concerned about the number of proposed closures and diversions of PRoWs, and other effects on the overall active travel network in Trafford, particularly during the construction phase.

11.2. Footpath Hale 10

11.2.1. The AP2 proposals will result in the temporary closure of Footpath Hale 10 for a duration of up to five years and five months, with no alternative route being deemed as viable. Footpath Hale 10 is not only a definitive footpath which provides traffic free access from Trafford to Manchester under the M56, the path also forms part of the Greater Bollin Trail (a 25 mile recreational path from Macclesfield to Partington).

Request:

11.2.2. TC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking to provide a public footpath along the Greater Bollin Trail throughout the construction period, and that the existing Footpath Hale 10 remains open until such time as a realigned route is available for public use.

11.3. Other Public Rights of Way (PRoW)

11.3.1. TC is concerned that the AP2 proposals will result in the closure of a number of PRoWs during the construction phase. Potentially impacted routes include Footpaths Hale 10, 12 and 13 and Ringway 7 and 9, as well as the Hasty Lane underpass. Whilst further active travel provisions are being proposed as part of the highways access to the station, TC feels that the provisions are still not sufficient for the numbers of people anticipated to access the station by foot or cycle.

Request:

11.3.2. TC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking that identified footpath diversion routes will be open and available to the public prior to the closure of any existing footpaths.

11.3.3. TC repeats its request of 6.11.4 of the TC Petition.

12. River Bollin Cycle Trail

12.1.1. The River Bollin Cycle Trail is a proposed high-quality, flagship multi-use trail which will transform opportunities for residents and visitors alike to access the Cheshire countryside and connect with Greater Manchester by walking, wheeling, and cycling. The trail is proposed to provide much-needed east-west

connectivity between the Trans Pennine Trail and Bridgewater Way in the west and Middlewood Way and the Gritstone Trail in the east. It will also connect the key centres of Knutsford, Wilmslow, Handforth, Macclesfield, Poynton, and South Manchester/Stockport. It is proposed that this trail will be an attraction in its own right.

- 12.1.2. Predicted significant conflict resulting from construction of HS2 will delay TC's ability to progress the plan for the Bollin Cycle Trail (within the Trafford Borough boundary) and could restrict its potential, as well as delay its benefits. Delivery of sections of this proposed cycle route which coincides with construction areas and routes or are near the HS2 scheme presents HS2 with an opportunity to mitigate its adverse impacts of local severance and increased traffic related severance associated with increased construction traffic volume during construction.

Request:

- 12.1.3. TC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking to ensure that HS2 infrastructure is delivered in a way that is compatible with the end-stage Bollin Cycle Trail ambitions and commit to providing development and delivery funding to enable TC and Partners to accelerate project plans with a view to accelerating key sections that will provide the most mitigation against HS2 works / benefit HS2 delivery.

- 12.1.4. TC also requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking to develop designs for the sections of the proposed Bollin Cycle Trail which are within its construction areas, along its designated construction routes or near to them to ensure these sections are designed to current standard and guidance. Such designs should be submitted to, and approved by TC, TfGM and the relevant Local Authorities. The Promoter should also promote any amendments needed to the Bill to deliver these approved designs.

13. Environmental Impact Issues

13.1. Increased Adverse Sound, Noise and Vibration Impacts during Construction and Operation

- 13.1.1. TC is concerned that properties in the vicinity of the Proposed Scheme as amended by AP2 will be subject to adverse sound, noise and vibration impacts during construction and operation.

- 13.1.2. For example, Shay Lane, Davenport Green will be subject to adverse night time noise impacts from operational road traffic from those assessed in the main Environmental Statement as a result of the update to traffic information since the main ES and SES1.

- 13.1.3. As set out in the AP2 ES, the change proposed under AP2 will result in a new adverse in-combination effect on 26 properties. The changes are as a result of the update of traffic information since the main ES and SES1. It is unclear whether additional mitigation is proposed (outside of the embedded mitigation incorporated into the design).

Request:

- 13.1.4. TC repeats its requests at paragraphs 6.9.3 and 6.9.4 of the Bill Petition, insofar as they relate to the AP2 proposals.

13.2. Permanent Loss of Woodland SBIs and Impact on Ancient Woodland

- 13.2.1. TC is concerned with the permanent loss of woodland at Rossmill SBI and Davenport Green Wood SBI as well as the potential impact upon the Ancient Woodland Inventory Sites (AWIS) and surrounding countryside during the construction phase, resulting from reconfiguration of M56 J6 (AP2-006-014).
- 13.2.2. The reconfiguration of M56 J6 (AP2-006-014) involves the addition of a slip road to the west of M56, which takes 0.36ha (6%) of woodland at Rossmill SBI, and involves significant engineering earthworks.
- 13.2.3. Whilst the SES2 and AP2 ES highlights the significant adverse effect at Rossmill SBI, an assessment of the impact on the AWIS has not been carried out and therefore clarification is required on this impact. TC is concerned that the Ancient Woodland Strategy has not been updated.
- 13.2.4. TC is concerned with the new and additional loss of 400m² of semi-natural broadleaved woodland at Davenport Green Wood (220m² of which within SBI), which is because of more than one AP2 amendment. as well as the potential impact upon the Ancient Woodland Inventory Site (AWIS).

Request:

- 13.2.5. TC repeats the requests made at paragraphs 16.7.5. a) to h) of the Bill Petition.

13.3. Air Quality and Greater Manchester's Clean Air Plan

- 13.3.1. TC raised concerns in the Bill Petition regarding air quality. These concerns remain and are exacerbated as a result of AP2. Further, the Environmental Targets (Fine Particulate Matter) (England) Regulations 2023 have set interim targets for PM_{2.5} (down to 12 µ/m³ by 2028 and 10 µ /m³ by 2040) and population exposure, which the Bill proposals and AP2 will preclude the GM Partners from reaching.
- 13.3.2. TC's concerns in relation to air quality verification modelling also remains as there are significant underpredictions at a number of verification sites assessed within AP2 ES. Similarly, TC is concerned that the latest verification process has not been undertaken in accordance with best practise.

Request:

- 13.3.3. TC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking that any subsequent air quality assessments will include an assessment of: the potential effects of PM_{2.5} in accordance with the latest Environmental Targets (Fine Particulate Matter) (England) Regulations 2023, specifically at the receptors identified in the SES2 and AP2 ES as being at risk of significant adverse effects (including 31 receptors in Community Area MA06); and of the impact that both construction and operation of HS2 will have on meeting both the annual mean concentration target and population exposure reduction target.
- 13.3.4. In addition, TC repeats the requests made in paragraphs 16.3.3 to 16.3.8 of the Bill Petition.

13.4. Carbon

- 13.4.1. TC is concerned that the apparent reduction to sequestration benefits has not been reported and therefore the difference in outcomes is unclear. SES2 and

AP2 ES Volume 5, Appendix: CL-003-00000 - identifies a reduction in carbon sequestration benefits, from -20,440 tCO₂e reported in the AP1 revised scheme to -13,684. The AP2 revised assessment presented in Volumes 3 and 5 does not report on the potential reduction to sequestration benefits therefore the difference in outcomes is not clear. As requested in the TC ES Consultation Response paragraph 5.7.11, details of a planting strategy for sequestration purposes should be agreed with the local authorities and GMCA.

Request:

13.4.2. TC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking to produce, in collaboration and agreement with TC, a tree planting strategy for carbon offsetting, specifically in relation to the location, timescales, species type and management of the selected areas. The strategy will include locations, which will be identified based on the proximity principles of affected areas and within the boundaries of GM. The strategy / management plan should include detail regarding how local communities impacted by the proposal can benefit from the proposed Green Infrastructure (GI) provided should the locations be chosen within the Trafford area and how these areas align with the BNG requirements for the scheme.

13.5. Incomplete Ecological and Biodiversity Surveys

13.5.1. AP2 has required additional land, which includes a number of new water bodies that have not been previously considered. These water bodies were not included in the February scoping exercise and have not yet been surveyed but have been given a provisional scoping requirement to allow their inclusion in the assessment.

13.5.2. Furthermore, whilst bats, great crested newts, birds and invertebrates were reported, some other protected species were not. Given the loss of additional land, Ancient Woodland and Local Wildlife Site, including compounds adjacent to waterways, it is considered that there would be some data available regarding other protected species surveys i.e., water vole and otter – noting that badger survey data is confidential.

Request:

13.5.3. TC repeats its request at paragraph 16.7.5 of the Bill Petition.

13.6. Exacerbated Impacts on Timperley Brook

13.6.1. TC is concerned that the AP2-006-020 (provision of replacement culvert) may impact upon the source of Timperley Brook 1. The background information and data accompanying SES 2 and AP2 ES: MA06 Water resources assessment baseline data (S116) states that additional surveys have found that the Tributary of Timperley Brook is a spring fed watercourse This highlights the concern located on page 451 of TC's ES consultation response.

Request:

13.6.2. TC repeats its request at paragraph 6.10.3, 6.10.4 and 16.7.3 of the Bill Petition, insofar as they relate to AP2.

13.7. Major Accidents and Disasters

13.7.1. TC notes that the design of The Hollies Vent Shaft has been tested for the 1 in 100-year event and 1 in 100 year + climate change event and that the additional loss of floodplain storage would result in increases in flood risk and associated effects on major accidents and disasters. TC is concerned that the AP2 works could increase the peak flow in the River Mersey, downstream of Princess Road and within the borough of Trafford, as set out in the SES2 and AP2 ES. The AP2 ES and Flood Risk Assessment indicates that further work will be required to further assess and quantify the risk of flooding and provide flood resilience measures to properties that are impacted.

Request:

13.7.2. TC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking that he will:

- a) Work with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) to complete the additional modelling works and parameters that further reduce the impacts of the current design and provide adequate mitigation measures in accordance with the measures proposed in the climate resilience section of the original ES (Volume 5: Appendix CL-002-00000). Specifically, this requires that: “Where tunnel shafts are required, the risk of flooding will be managed in accordance with the HS2 Ltd Technical Standards, which require the level of shaft entrances to be raised above the current 1 in 1,000 (0.1%) annual probability design event plus 300mm freeboard and/or additional risk reduction measures such as appropriate sealing, flood barriers, sump pump arrangement and appropriate drainage.”
- b) Consult Greater Manchester Resilience Unit and the relevant local authorities regarding the development of incident management plans and tunnel evacuation procedures should any additional risks arise during the detailed stage; and
- c) Fully implement and fund any agreed mitigation measures in a timely manner.

13.8. Waste and Material Resources

13.8.1. TC is concerned that waste and materials resources have been considered a route wide effect volume 3) in the ES with no consideration given to individual area effects or adverse impacts. Waste Planning Authorities have a statutory responsibility to make provision for sufficient waste infrastructure capacity and there is a risk that TC would not be able to comply effectively with its duties due to the impacts of the Proposed Scheme.

13.8.2. AP2 ES indicates that there is an anticipated increase of 11% in the quantity of excavated material, demolition material and construction waste than reported for the AP1 revised scheme. However, this is offset against the assumption that 35% of excavated material, demolition material and construction waste would be diverted from landfill. As such, in comparison to the main ES, there is a projected 17% decrease in the volume of waste which is being sent to landfill as a result to changes in AP2. While this reduction in landfill is welcomed, TC remains concerned that the surplus excavated material for off-site disposal will represent an equivalent 62% reduction in North West’s inert waste landfill capacity.

13.8.3. There is no proposed mitigation against this significant reduction in capacity with the assessment putting the onus on local authorities noting in AP2 ES and SES2 Volume 3: Route-wide Effects report Para 20.2.22 that “Waste planning authorities have a statutory responsibility to make provision for sufficient waste

infrastructure capacity, and is therefore likely that the respective authorities will continue to plan for new inert waste landfill sites and/or to identify other suitable placement locations to enable continued capacity to be available as landfill void space is occupied". Further Schedule 32, as proposed to be inserted by AP2, potentially exacerbates this problem, by enabling the promoter to close existing landfill sites within the Bill limits.

13.8.4. The current GM Joint Waste Development Plan, adopted in 2012, covers the plan period 2012 to 2027 and does not account for HS2's waste disposal requirement. Allocation of landfill sites through Local Plans and approval of planning applications for landfill sites is a difficult and time-consuming process. Producing a new joint waste plan or including sites within existing plans could take about 6 years. As this process is yet to commence, 2029/2030 is the earliest possible time for a new joint waste plan. HS2 have assumed that the generation of surplus excavated material will take place primarily over a four-year period (2028 – 2032) during the construction of the AP2 revised scheme. TC is concerned that this may also result in a situation where there is insufficient capacity to dispose of waste generated in GM's Waste plan period (particularly given the complexities involved in allocating or obtaining planning permission for landfill sites).

13.8.5. In addition, TC is concerned that waste management of the Proposed Scheme during operation could cause amenity issues to its residents, businesses and local communities.

Request:

13.8.6. TC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking that he will:

- a) Engage with TC, GMCA and the relevant Waste Local Planning Authorities on several waste matters including HS2's utilisation of spare planned-for landfill capacity and further HS2 landfill needs so that these may be catered for in Greater Manchester's next Joint Waste Development Plan;
- b) Produce and agree with TC, GMCA and other relevant stakeholders a detailed and robust strategy, including monitoring, for Waste Management of the Proposed Scheme during operation; and
- c) Not exercise its powers under Schedule 32 until this engagement has taken place.

14. Traffic and Transport Data

14.1. Transport Assessments

14.1.1. TC is concerned that no additional transport surveys have been undertaken over and above those set out in the main TA Background Information and Data (BID) report.

14.1.2. The AP2 revised scheme sets out significant additional highways works and associated adverse impacts within Community Area MA06, by virtue of the additional land required permanently to reconfigure M56 Junction 6 (AP2-006-014). The AP2 amendments need to be suitably assessed to ensure that the detrimental impacts of the revised scheme are appropriately assessed and, where necessary, appropriately mitigated.

Request:

14.1.3. TC repeats its request at paragraph 6.13.3 of the Bill Petition.

14.2. Traffic Counts

- 14.2.1. TC is concerned that the additional traffic information used for the updated AP2 revised scheme baseline models, as detailed in Table 4-17.1 and Figure 3-6 of BID TR-004-00001, is not sufficient.
- 14.2.2. The location used for the only Junction count taken was Wilmslow Road / Sunbank Lane. This location is not considered reflective of the current traffic conditions at Hale Road and the existing M56 Junction 6, and is outside the administrative boundary of Trafford Council, the Local Highway Authority. No additional traffic counts have been undertaken within Trafford.
- 14.2.3. The survey date for both of the above count locations was summer 2018. This data therefore represents pre-Covid traffic volumes and is already 5 years old. DFT's Transport Analysis Guidance (2018) states "Present year validation if the model is more than 5 years old." This requires the accuracy of a base year transport model, which is older than 5 years, should be checked against current travel patterns.

Request:

- 14.2.4. TC repeats its request at 6.13.3 of the Bill Petition.

15. Realignment of 11kv Scottish Power, Power Line

- 15.1.1. TC is concerned that the additional land permanently required for the realignment of an 11kv underground power line diversion along, and within the highway boundary of the A538 Hale Road and Shay Lane (AP2-006-016) would result in significant disruption to the local highway network and unnecessary detrimental impacts to local residents and community facilities.
- 15.1.2. This will also impact several designated and non-designated heritage assets along Hale Road, particularly with respect to noise and vibration. This list includes Hale Barn and Ringway War Memorial (GII); Hale Chapel Sunday School and Schoolmaster's House (GII); as well as Church of the Holy Angels and buildings on Wicker Lane.
- 15.1.3. AP2-006-016 re-routes the overhead power line to avoid the use of the private road, Brooks Drive, and diverts it underground for 2.8km in length west along the A538 Hale Road and Shay Lane.
- 15.1.4. SES2 and AP2 ES Volume 5, Appendix: CT-003-00000 Alternatives Report states that the amendment, identified under Option 1, would avoid temporary landscape and visual impacts on residential properties located on Brooks Drive during construction. It also states however, that it will have greater temporary impacts on a greater number of properties along Shay Lane and the A538 Hale Road. The works would also impact Hale Barns local centre, religious venues and community venues.
- 15.1.5. Table 5 of the Alternatives Report considers the local alternative for the realignment of the underground power line. It identified that when compared to the Baseline Option i.e., using Brooks Drive, greater adverse temporary impacts relating to air quality, noise and vibration impacts would be experienced by residential properties on Shay Lane and the A538 Hale Road, and community facilities such as: Halecroft Grange care home facility, St Ambrose Preparatory

School, St. Ambrose College and Hale Chapel Sunday School and Schoolmaster's House.

- 15.1.6. The amendment proposed is also identified within the Alternatives Report (Table 5) as having slightly longer, and higher construction costs in comparison to the Baseline Option using Brooks Drive.

Request:

- 15.1.7. TC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking to divert the 11kv underground power line in accordance with the Baseline Option.

- 15.1.8. In the event that the Promoter does not divert the underground power line in accordance with the Baseline Option, TC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking that he will:

- a) Work collaboratively with TC to agree a suitable alternative route for the diversion of the underground power line which shall avoid and minimise as far as practicable the impacts of the route proposed under AP2; and
- b) promote any amendments to the Bill and supporting documents that may be necessary to deliver the alternative diversion route.

16. Utility Diversion Delays

- 16.1.1. TC is concerned that works in adjoining boroughs will have significant impacts on the local highway network within Trafford.

- 16.1.2. The A56 Bowden roundabout and A538 will both experience significant adverse impacts throughout the duration of the Proposed Scheme and the change associated with AP2-006-006 (drawing CT-05-352-L1). The use of the A56 Lymm Road as a construction and diversion route will result in significant traffic delays along Lymm Road, Bowden roundabout and subsequently the A56 Dunham Road and the B5160 (Charcoal Road and Park Road).

Request:

- 16.1.3. TC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking that he will:

- a) Involve TC, relevant GM Partners and adjacent local authorities simultaneously at an appropriately early stage to discuss how these delays can be managed and reduced in order to ensure that all works are fully coordinated with other works across the Trafford highway network. Such delays could be reduced at Bowden roundabout and across the rest of the network by multiple utility companies working collaboratively; and
- b) Fully fund a dedicated street works manager for the duration of the construction of the Proposed Scheme.

17. Maintenance Access Road off Bankside

- 17.1.1. TC is concerned that the access road to the proposed balancing / attenuation pond located off Bankside, as part of AP2-006-014 would cause unnecessary disruption to local residents.

- 17.1.2. AP2-006-014 provides an access road to the pond at the end of Bankside, which is a small (7 dwelling) residential cul-de-sac with a narrow existing access. This route appears to be a convoluted solution (which passes residential properties).

Request:

- 17.1.3. TC requires that the Promoter provide an undertaking to work collaboratively with TC to agree the route and design of the maintenance access to avoid unnecessary and detrimental impacts on the residents of Bankside.

What do you want to be done in response?

In the box below, tell us what you think should be done in response to your objections to the Second Additional Provision to the Bill. You do not have to complete this box if you do not want to.

You can include this information in your response to section 3 'Objections to the Second Additional Provision to the Bill' if you prefer. Please number each paragraph.

TC seeks binding commitments from the Promoter and/or amendments to the current proposals in the Bill and supporting documents (as amended by AP2) in respect of the matters set out above.