

6: TRANSPORTATION AND ACCESS

POLICY T 1

Highway Improvement and Traffic Management

NAME OF ORGANISATION OR INDIVIDUAL	OBJ'R	OBJ NO	O or S	C WDR
Mr M Goodall	325	266	O	
Cllr Oldham, on behalf of Longdendale Ward Councillors	874	626	O	
English Nature	277	202	S	
Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Executive	339	364	S	

OBJ NO	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION
266	Greater prominence should be assigned to non-motorised travel in integrating land use and transport.
626	Development requiring substantial infrastructure should not commence until those works are completed
202	The theme of sustainable development is well presented in this policy.
364	Support the policy, especially criteria (b), (c), (d) and (h).

Main Issue

6.1.1 Whether the policy properly reflects the sustainable principles of the plan.

Conclusions

- 6.1.2 Policy T1 is essentially concerned with highway improvements and traffic management in general. It sets out a list of criteria that will be taken into account when highway construction/improvement or traffic management schemes are considered. To my mind the criteria reflect the aims of national policy contained in PPG13 which seek, through the integration of planning and transport, to reduce reliance on the private car and give greater accessibility to jobs and other facilities by promoting more sustainable transport choices.
- 6.1.3 The reasoned justification to policy T1 says explicitly that any highway schemes brought forward will be considered in the context of the overall land use and transport strategy in both the UDP and the GMLTP. Moreover the Council in part I of the plan under the heading Themes and Objectives state quite categorically that sustainable development is the single most important principle of the plan.
- 6.1.4 To add the extra wording suggested by Mr Goodall, that is, *the Council is fully committed to non motorised travel in the integration of land use planning and transport management*, either under policy T1 or the heading Sustainable Development in part 1 is to my mind unnecessary. It adds nothing of substance which is not to be found in other policies throughout the plan.
- 6.1.5 The UDP is only one of a number of documents which seek to guide future development and it must be read in conjunction with other published strategies. The GMLTP contains complementary objectives to the UDP. It also sets out transport targets and performance indicators which are used to assess whether the plan is delivering its objectives. An annual report monitors progress. To my mind it would be

unnecessary duplication for the UDP to include specific transport indicators to be monitored as part of the assessment of the performance of the UDP.

- 6.1.6 Councillor Oldham's concerns, whilst submitted under policy T1, are that development should not proceed until infrastructure required by a proposal is in place. Policy T1 is not concerned with the timing of new road proposals, that to my mind is a function of the development control process which can be addressed by the local planning authority as and when individual planning applications arise. However I note here that policy T13 is concerned with transport investment and says that where development proposals require additional road/transport improvements the funding of those works should be at the expense of the developer. It is implicit in this policy and its reasoned justification that development will not be permitted where it would overburden existing infrastructure.

Recommendation

- 6.1.7 I recommend no modification to the plan as a result of these objections.

POLICY T 2

Trunk Road Developments

NAME OF ORGANISATION OR INDIVIDUAL	OBJ'R	OBJ NO	O or S	C WDR
Alternative Proposals on Transport	270	183	O	
Glossop Friends of the Earth	323	261	O	
Dr M E N Haque	363	374	O	
Highways Agency	392	390	O	
Peak District National Park Authority	597	506	O	
Anne Robinson	654	548	O	
Peter Simon	694	564	O	
Derbyshire County Council	239	160	S	
Trustees of Mrs E Bissill's Fund & Staley Developments Ltd	807	89	S	

OBJ NO	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION
183	It has not been determined if the bypass is the most sustainable solution to local transport problems.
261	It has not been determined if the bypass is the most sustainable solution to local transport problems.
374	The traffic problems could be solved by restricting large vehicles passing through Mottram village.
390	The safeguarded land should include land required for environmental mitigation measures.
506	The supporting text should refer to SPITS and the reappraisal under the NATA process by the Highways Agency.
548	It has not been determined if the bypass is the most sustainable solution to local transport problems.
564	The bypass is currently the subject of Government appraisal and alternatives should be considered.
160	Development of the bypass should on balance be beneficial to Derbyshire.
89	The policy is supported. However, amendments to the design might be considered in light of E1(3).

Main Issues

- 6.2.1 i) Whether it is reasonable to protect the route of the Mottram to Tintwistle bypass in the UDP.
 ii) Whether the plan needs to safeguard more land than on the proposals map.

Conclusions

- 6.2.2 The objection by the Peak Park National Planning Authority whilst not formally withdrawn has effectively been met by alterations to the text of the reasoned justification at the revised deposit stage.
- 6.2.3 **The first issue.** The bypass is a HA trunk road scheme from the M67/A57 junction at Hattersley to the Derbyshire border and beyond. The Council are not therefore responsible for the scheme and ultimately its route, design and construction are outside their control. In some form or other the bypass has been promoted by various agencies since the 1980s and in 1993 the then Department of Transport announced the preferred route for the bypass which is included in the adopted UDP.
- 6.2.4 More recently in 1998 in *A New Deal for Transport: Better for Everyone* the Government identified the M67/A57/A628/A616 route across the Pennines as part of the core trunk road network and said in their trunk road review, *A New Deal for Trunk Roads in England* that preparation work for the bypass should continue, although with the caveats that the views of the regional planning body should be obtained and that there should be a full reappraisal of the scheme.
- 6.2.5 The bypass has now been designated a Long Distance Strategic Route in the emerging RPG (incorporating the Secretary of State's proposed changes). Policy T10 of that document identifies the bypass as a Regionally Significant Transport Proposal to be delivered by 2007 as a matter of priority. The part of the bypass which lies within Derbyshire is also endorsed by East Midlands Regional Planning Guidance. Further the bypass is supported by the Peak Park National Authority and is an integral component in the South Pennines Integrated Transport Strategy. At the present time there is therefore backing for the bypass, in principle, at national, regional and local level.
- 6.2.6 Separate from the UDP process the HA are at present carrying out a reappraisal of the bypass proposals using the NATA approach in accordance with advice in *Guidance on the Methodology for Multi-Modal Studies* and the DTER and HA document *Applying the Multi-modal New Approach to Highway Schemes*. This approach accepts that new road construction should only be considered once a thorough examination of all possible solutions to a particular problem have been evaluated. It requires a fundamental review of the concept of the bypass and amongst other things, necessitates an evaluation of the bypass scheme against alternative strategies for addressing the problems caused by traffic in Longdendale. This should include looking at induced traffic, re-routing heavy goods traffic etc. It will also take account of the costs and benefits to the environment in terms of noise, pollution, impact on the countryside, wildlife and the like.
- 6.2.7 It is inevitable that any road passing through open countryside be it green belt, nature conservation area or national park will result in some adverse impacts, but any disbenefits will be assessed as part of the on-going NATA study and later if the scheme goes ahead as part of EIA work. Therefore the apparent conflicts with other policies in the plan such as OL16 must ultimately be viewed in the light of the findings of these studies. The development process is on-going and it would in my view be overly restrictive for policies to be frozen in time just because the outcome of the study is not yet known. It remains open to the Council to review their position if the results of the study find against the bypass. On the information available it would to my mind be premature and pre-empt the findings of the study to delete the safeguarded line at this stage.

- 6.2.8 I agree that there is some merit in the argument that previous studies for the road do not appear to have taken full account of the impacts on the area, particularly the national park. Further it cannot be disputed that the Environment Act 1995 at Section 62 imposes a duty on local authorities to have regard to the purposes of national parks when reaching decisions on development. However Section 62 does not preclude development *per se* but seeks to ensure that proposals are subjected to rigorous examination and proved to be justified. In this case I see no reason why the NATA and EIA work would not provide the type of examination sought by national policy guidance in PPG7 para 4.5. I believe it would lead to a fragmented approach if each authority involved in the process of considering the bypass were to carry out independent studies of the impact on the national park.
- 6.2.9 It is also evident that since proposals for a bypass were first mooted there has been a fundamental change in government transport policy. However in this particular case safeguarding the route of the bypass does not prejudice, in any way, the findings of the NATA study. Once completed, the findings of the study will be reported to the regional assembly and, if supportive of construction of the bypass, the scheme will be included in the HA's Targeted Programme of Improvements and the necessary statutory procedures commenced. It is quite likely that these procedures under the highway acts would lead to a public inquiry into objections to the proposals. Therefore safeguarding the route of the bypass in the UDP does not automatically mean that the road would be constructed, if other factors in the future were found to outweigh it.
- 6.2.10 The Council representations make it clear that they consider the traffic conditions justify the bypass proposal which is seen as a fundamental part of providing a balanced package of measures and initiatives to provide both a solution to future travel demand and to the enhancement of the Longdendale villages. Objectors may question the Council's commitment to pursuing alternative solutions to the problem, but essentially the implementation of a significant part of the alternative solutions suggested are outside the control of the Council. For instance it would be misleading to include the A628 as a quality bus corridor when there are no equivalent proposals in the LTP or to rely on the reopening the Woodhead railway line – a matter which is outside the Council's control. Moreover whilst the bypass is still being promoted as the basis of the solutions to the traffic problems, it would not be a good use of resources for the Council to prejudge the outcome or even duplicate the work of the NATA study.
- 6.2.11 Whilst I appreciate that the outcome of the assessment is not known at the present time, the bypass continues to be promoted and is capable of being constructed within the plan period. Moreover even if policy T2 were to be deleted from the plan the bypass could still be built. In the interests of consistency I consider it reasonable that the route continues to be safeguarded until such time as the ongoing studies which are being carried out in accordance with up-to-date government guidance either support or reject that proposal. PPG12 at para 5.22 makes it clear that in this situation the route of the road should be safeguarded in the development plan. Given these circumstances I consider it appropriate that policy T2 remains in the plan.
- 6.2.12 **I now turn to the second issue.** The HA wish to see policy T2 protect not only the line of the bypass, but also land required for mitigation measures. I have seen no information which indicates the extent of land which would be required for mitigation measures nor as far as I am aware are there any up-to-date detail design plans for the road. Moreover from the proposals map it is evident that now allocation E1(3) has been deleted there is no development proposed which would affect the line of the bypass or adjacent land. For the most part the bypass passes through the green belt where development is generally precluded. In my view it is therefore unnecessary to safeguard additional land.

- 6.2.13 Insofar as the objection by Alternative Proposals on Transport is concerned my conclusions on policy T1 should be read in conjunction with those at 6.14.1 – 5 below.

Recommendation

- 6.2.14 I recommend no modification to the plan as a result of these objections.

POLICY T 3

Major Highway Schemes

NAME OF ORGANISATION OR INDIVIDUAL	OBJ'R	OBJ NO	O or S	C WDR
Peak District National Park Authority	597	507	O	

OBJ NO	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION
507	If the public transport options for this route have been looked at it should be stated in the text.

Main Issue

- 6.3.1 Whether it is necessary to amend the text to include reference to the investigation of public transport options.

Conclusions

- 6.3.2 This objection relates specifically to policy T3(1) the Glossop Spur. The reasoned justification to the policy makes it clear that the design and statutory processes for the spur road scheme will dovetail with the HA's proposals for the bypass. In effect the Council say that this means that more detailed development work is required before a NATA assessment is completed and presumably before the Council have looked in detail at public transport options. It would therefore be premature to make the additions to the text proposed by the objector.

Recommendation

- 6.3.3 I recommend no modification to the plan as a result of this objection.

POLICY T 3(1)

Major Highway Schemes - Glossop Spur

NAME OF ORGANISATION OR INDIVIDUAL	OBJ'R	OBJ NO	O or S	C WDR
Alternative Proposals on Transport	270	184	O	
Glossop Friends of the Earth	323	262	O	
Dr M E N Haque	363	375	O	
Anne Robinson	654	549	O	
Derbyshire County Council	239	161	S	

OBJ NO	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION
184/262	The road is dependant on the bypass which has yet to be shown is the most sustainable solution to traffic problems. It will affect the floodplain and various historical features and generate further traffic.
375	The traffic problems could be solved by restricting large vehicles passing through Mottram village.
549	The road is dependent on the bypass which has yet to be shown is the most sustainable solution to traffic. The appraisal of the scheme is flawed. The road would affect the floodplain, landscape and historical features and not solve local traffic problems.
161	Development of the Glossop link should on balance be beneficial to Derbyshire.

Main Issue

- 6.4.1 Whether the spur road is a necessary part of the solution to ameliorate traffic problems in Longdendale.

Conclusions

- 6.4.2 It is a matter of agreement that the spur road proposal is dependent on the building of the bypass which is safeguarded by policy T2. It therefore follows that my conclusions on policy T3(1) are made on the assumption that the bypass will go ahead. Given the interrelationship between the two proposals, my conclusions on this policy should be read in conjunction with those of T2 above. Where the same points have been made, I have not repeated them below.
- 6.4.3 The Glossop Spur road is seen by the Council as providing a more complete solution to the environmental problems caused by traffic in Longdendale than would be provided by the bypass on its own. In principle its construction is supported by Derbyshire County and High Peak Borough Councils and it is included in the GMLTP 2001/01-2005/06 as a major scheme for completion in 2005/06.
- 6.4.4 It was also provisionally accepted for funding by Government as part of the 2001/02 Local Transport Capital Expenditure Settlement subject to further appraisal of the scheme being carried out. Consultants were appointed in early 2001 to undertake a further NATA assessment in line with up to date government good practice. The appraisal work still continues and is using the same information/analysis as the HA in connection with their work on the bypass. This should ensure consistency between the 2 appraisals in terms of traffic, environmental, geo-technical and topographical data. There was also a public consultation exercise in 2001 and whilst this may be criticised by the objectors it did nevertheless enable local people and statutory consultees to air their views.
- 6.4.5 It is the Council's belief that the problems of Longdendale cannot be adequately addressed without the construction of the spur road. The road is seen as playing a necessary part in seeking to produce an integrated land use/transport strategy. However the Council's statement indicates that the spur road is not the only initiative in Longdendale which is being pursued in order to alleviate the traffic problems. Some of the alternatives advanced by objectors such as promoting enhanced bus and rail services, safer walking, cycling and the like are already being supported by the Council in other forums.
- 6.4.6 I consider it more appropriate that the lobbying of other organisations/public bodies is done outside the UDP process as the plan is essentially a land use document. Other suggestions such as the demoting the A628 corridor from the core national road network and directing heavy goods vehicles via the M60-M62-M1 to Sheffield are outside the Council's control.

6.4.7 There remain deep rooted fears about the impact the road proposal would have on the local environment and local facilities. The Council has already commissioned an environmental evaluation for the spur road, as part of its GMLTP Annex E submission. This, as would be expected, indicates that there would be adverse impacts, but so far as I am aware there are no fundamental objections from any statutory undertaker in terms of impact on the flood plain, nature conservation interests, the historic fabric of the locality and the like which would preclude the road construction. In any event before the proposal can go ahead there is the NATA study to be completed and if that is positive, there will need to be a full EIA plus further consultation with the appropriate bodies. Once the principle of the road is established it is a matter for detailed design to see how the adverse impacts can be satisfactorily alleviated.

6.4.8 At the present time the spur road is a definite proposal which affects the use of land and PPG12 (para 5.15) says that such proposals should be included in the appropriate development plan. So far as I am aware there is no substantive and/or published evidence which indicates that the spur road proposals are unnecessary or that other solutions are more sustainable and/or capable of being implemented. I accept that there is the possibility that the NATA investigative work may not support the spur road as the most sustainable solution to traffic/environmental problems, but to delete the proposal before that time would be premature and lead to unnecessary uncertainty for residents of the locality.

6.4.9 I consider policy T3(1) should remain in the plan.

Recommendation

6.4.10 I recommend no modification to the plan as a result of these objections.

POLICY T 3(3)

Major Highway Schemes - Ashworth Lane, Mottram

NAME OF ORGANISATION OR INDIVIDUAL	OBJ'R	OBJ NO	O or S	C WDR
Paul Dodd	245	171	O	
Dr Tim Dowling and Dr Jane Harvey	249	174	O	
Peter & E Flanagan	298	257	O	
Colin Priest	625	525	O	
Mark & P Tipton	795	609	O	
Gill Turner	810	613	O	

OBJ NO	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION
171	This will move traffic congestion from Mottram to Broadbottom and may not be needed after the bypass
174	The road should not be kept in the UDP as the need will only be assessed after the bypass is open.
257	Lack of traffic impact assessment, need to await the bypass, planning blight and road safety.
525	Reasons for objecting given in a previous letter.
609	Lack of traffic impact assessment, uncertainty of bypass timing, road safety, alternative proposals.
613	Safety and environmental concerns. The field should remain a public open space for local community.

6.5.1 This policy has now been deleted from the plan.

POLICY T 5

Metrolink Extension

NAME OF ORGANISATION OR INDIVIDUAL	OBJ'R	OBJ NO	O or S	C WDR
Peak District National Park Authority	597	509	O	
Sainsburys Supermarkets Ltd	672	540	S	
OBJ NO	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION			
509	The current metrolink system is Manchester focussed, but there is scope for other routes and linkages.			
540	Metrolink extension will increase public transport accessibility within Tameside and conurbation.			

Main Issue

6.6.1 Whether the route of the metrolink should be extended on the proposals map.

Conclusions

6.6.2 The responsibility for public transport in Greater Manchester lies with the GMPTA, not Tameside Council. Policy T5 seeks to protect the already approved metrolink extension to Ashton which is likely to be built by about 2008. No further extensions to the metrolink are at present planned.

6.6.3 Although there are on going investigations about the conversion of some local rail lines for metrolink use and/or the establishment of a tram/train operation these are at an early stage. I consider it would be premature to incorporate these concepts from the draft Rail Investment Strategy into the plan until they become firm proposals. If they do develop and become firm proposals they could be incorporated into a future review of the plan.

Recommendation

6.6.4 I recommend no modification to the plan in response to this objection.

POLICY T 7

Cycling

NAME OF ORGANISATION OR INDIVIDUAL	OBJ'R	OBJ NO	O or S	C WDR
Mr M Goodall	325	267	O	
Roland Bardsley Homes	658	51	S	
Countryside Agency	190	635	S (rd)	
OBJ NO	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION			
267	Greater prominence should be assigned to non-motorised travel in integrating land use and transport.			
51	Support in principle provided that "where appropriate" is added.			
635	Support the changes which improve promotion of cycling.			

Main Issue

- 6.7.1 Whether the policy is clear in its objective of promoting cycling as a non motorised form of transport.

Conclusions

- 6.7.2 Throughout the plan, underlying individual land use allocations, are sustainable principles which seek to ensure that new development is accessible by alternative means of transport to the private car. To my mind policy T7 sets out satisfactorily the Council's attitude and commitment to the provision of facilities for cyclists in the Borough both for new and existing development. I see little value in qualifying the first para of the policy by saying that "A borough wide network of cycle routes will be defined *to guide investment*, connecting to residential areas....". In my view as written and unqualified, the policy embraces far more than a network which would guide investment.
- 6.7.3 Even if the phrase "to guide investment" were included as an adjunct to the policy it lacks clarity and does nothing to further the objectives of the policy to encourage cycling. The last paragraph of the policy together with the suggested addition to the text set out in the paragraph below are I believe more appropriate ways of conveying the Council's attitude to cycling in relation to new development proposals.
- 6.7.4 In response to this objection the Council suggest changes to the reasoned justification accompanying the policy. It is proposed that the text be amended by adding after the third sentence of paragraph 1 *The Local Transport Plan sets out targets for increased cycle use*. And after the fourth sentence *Development proposals brought forward will need to demonstrate how the needs of cyclists will be addressed and how the development will contribute to the Council's aim of increasing cycling as a mode of travel*. As proposed for amendment I consider policy T7 and its reasoned justification state clearly the Council's commitment to encouraging cycling as an alternative means of transport.

Recommendation

- 6.7.5 I recommend that the reasoned justification to policy T7 be modified by adding after the third sentence in paragraph 1 of the reasoned justification *The Local Transport Plan sets out targets for increased cycle use*. And after the fourth sentence *Development proposals brought forward will need to demonstrate how the needs of cyclists will be addressed and how the development will contribute to the Council's aim of increasing cycling as a mode of travel*.

POLICY T 8

Walking

NAME OF ORGANISATION OR INDIVIDUAL	OBJ'R	OBJ NO	O or S	C WDR
Mr M Goodall	325	268	O	
Anne Robinson	654	551	O	
Mr M Goodall	325	676	O (rd)	
Countryside Agency	190	636	S (rd)	

OBJ NO	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION
268	Greater prominence should be assigned to non-motorised travel in integrating land use and transport.
551	Walking should be strengthened by inclusion of a road users hierarchy to underpin the transport strategy.
676	To demonstrate a genuine commitment to sustainable movement and give pedestrians primacy the phrase "to guide investment" should be reinstated.
636	Support the changes which improve promotion of walking.

Main Issue

- 6.8.1 Whether the policy is clear in its aim of promoting walking as a non motorised form of travel.

Conclusions

- 6.8.2 At the inquiry the Council proposed changes to the reasoned justification to the policy. They suggested that at the end of the first paragraph there should be added - *The Local Transport Plan sets out targets for increasing walking activity. Development proposals brought forward will need to demonstrate how the needs of pedestrians will be addressed and how the development will contribute to the Council's aim of increasing walking as a mode of travel.* I support these changes which clarify the Council's position.
- 6.8.3 Mr Goodall makes similar points about walking as he does about cycling and for comparable reasons I reach conclusions of a similar vein to those set out in relation to policy T7 above.
- 6.8.4 *PPG13* and *Encouraging Walking: Advice for Local Authorities* give government guidance on walking and appropriate information/policies to include in development plans and walking strategies. *Encouraging Walking* refers to an order in which to consider the needs of different types of transport and says that in general pedestrians should be considered first, although not necessarily given priority in all decisions.
- 6.8.5 The GMLTP is a complementary document to the UDP and devolving from that plan is the *Greater Manchester Walking Strategy*. In line with government policy it recommends that the needs of pedestrians are considered first when assessing new schemes. I understand the Council's policy document *Walking in Tameside* will be updated to conform to the Greater Manchester strategy.
- 6.8.6 Policy T8 and its reasoned justification as set out indicate that the Council is mindful of the prominence that walking should be given in identifying/improving a network of key routes to serve existing land uses and also how new development will be considered. When completed the revised Tameside walking strategy will be a complementary document to the UDP and should be in line with both national and Greater Manchester policy which require priority consideration for walking. In my opinion setting out a formal hierarchy of road users within the policy, whilst a useful tool for decision makers to use as a check list would not assist the objectives of the policy. In addition at the present time, given that the walking strategy is still under review, it would be premature for policy T8 to explicitly state the networks it intends to create.
- 6.8.7 Given these circumstances it follows that the only changes to policy T8 I consider necessary are those suggested by the Council in paragraph 6.8.2 above.

Recommendation

- 6.8.8** I recommend that the plan be modified by adding at the end of the first paragraph of the reasoned justification *The Local Transport Plan sets out targets for increasing walking activity. Development proposals brought forward will need to demonstrate how the needs of pedestrians will be addressed and how the development will contribute to the Council's aim of increasing walking as a mode of travel.*

POLICY T 8(1)

Walking - Bridleway, Ashworth Lane, Mottram

NAME OF ORGANISATION OR INDIVIDUAL	OBJ'R	OBJ NO	O or S	C WDR
Bernard Neild	558	712	O (rd)	
Mark & Paula Tipton	795	701	O (rd)	

OBJ NO	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION
712	Object to a bridleway on Chapman Field.
701	Object to inclusion of reference to an alternative solution resulting from Highways Agency appraisal

Main Issue

- 6.9.1** Whether the reference to the NATA study should be deleted from the reasoned justification.

Conclusions

- 6.9.2** Policy T8(1) for an unmetalled bridleway was introduced at the revised deposit stage and replaces the former T3(3) allocation for a road. Irrespective of the merits of the allocation, it has now been constructed and it would serve little practical purpose if the policy were deleted from the UDP.
- 6.9.3** The reference to the possibility of an alternative solution to deleted policy T3(3) being found as a result of the NATA study currently being undertaken by the HA is factual and merely flags up the possibility that the NATA study may find an alternative solution to the proposed bypass. It would be misleading if it were to be deleted at this stage before the findings of the NATA study are available.

Recommendation

- 6.9.4** I recommend no modification to the policy as a result of these objections.

POLICY T 9

Freight Movement

NAME OF ORGANISATION OR INDIVIDUAL	OBJ'R	OBJ NO	O or S	C WDR
Alternative Proposals on Transport	270	191	O	
Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Executive	339	366	O	

OBJ NO	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION
191	The Council should have an active policy of promoting long and short distance freight by rail.
366	The policy is supported, subject to freight schemes not having an impact on level of service for passenger trains.

Main Issue

6.10.1 Whether the policy should be more positive in its promotion of freight transport by rail.

Conclusions

- 6.10.2 Regarding the main issue, policy T9 says that the Council is supportive of the use of rail for freight transport and also of the proposed Liverpool to Lille new rail freight route. Policy T9(1) seeks to protect the former Crowthorne Curve; and whilst the Apethorn-Godley line has been laid out as part of the Transpennine Trail and policy OL6(7) proposes a recreational route on the line of the former Ashton to Oldham line, none of these developments would preclude the re-use of these lines for rail purposes at some time in the future. To say in the policy that priority will be given for renewed rail use should disused lines wish to reopen for freight would be unduly restrictive. If such a situation were to arise in the future I see no reason why the proposal should not be treated on its merits.
- 6.10.3 In practical terms within the forum of the UDP there is little more in land use terms that policy T9 can say, as there are no firm proposals for rail development within the plan period. Even the proposal for the Liverpool to northern France route is not included in the table of regionally significant transport proposals (set out in emerging RPG13) as the scheme still requires further investigation. And the Strategic Rail Authority's Strategic Plan 2002 indicates that that authority is unlikely to bring forward major investment proposals until after 2010 at the earliest.
- 6.10.4 Both the UDP policies and the GMLTP policies have been developed under the same Government umbrella policies which seek sustainable development and the integration of land use and transport planning. It is not the purpose of UDP policies to lobby other bodies to change their policies, if the Council wish to do that, they can do so outside the UDP process.
- 6.10.5 Whilst I appreciate the objector's concern that more should be done to promote rail freight, it seems to me that these concerns are already being investigated outside the UDP process by the appropriate authorities. Policy T7 of the emerging RPG requires local authorities to develop freight strategies through the LTP process and the Strategic Rail Authority/freight transport companies to assist the transfer of freight from road to rail through the provision of new interchanges. Policy T9 is supportive in principle of such facilities.
- 6.10.6 In so far as the objection by Alternative Proposals on Transport relates to the relative benefits of re-opening the Woodhead rail line as opposed to the construction of the Mottram to Tintwistle bypass, I would refer to my conclusions in respect of the objections to policy T2. Briefly they are that the re-opening of the Woodhead rail line is not a matter which the Council can control; there are at present no firm proposals for the opening of the line; there is no substantive evidence to suggest that the re-opening of the line would obviate the need for the bypass; and in any event the NATA study commissioned by the HA will look at alternatives to the bypass.
- 6.10.7 Although policy T9 is supportive of freight movement by rail, it does not seek to do so at the expense of passenger traffic. Policy T4 also seeks to facilitate passenger trips and

nowhere in either the UDP or the GMLTP is there any attempt to prioritise between the two. Such prioritisation is outside the remit of the Council. I note however that the Strategic Rail Authority is currently consulting appropriate bodies on its developing Capacity Utilisation Policy which ultimately should identify the best combination of services for both passengers and freight.

6.10.8 In the light of the above I conclude that there should be no modification to policy T9.

Recommendation

6.10.9 I recommend no modification to the policy in respect of these objections.

POLICY T11

Travel Plans

NAME OF ORGANISATION OR INDIVIDUAL	OBJ'R	OBJ NO	O or S	C WDR
Action Against Kingswater Park (Waterside Park)	8	433	O	
Redrow Homes (North West) Ltd	643	478	O	
Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Executive	339	368	S	
Wm Morrison Supermarkets plc	858	498	S	

OBJ NO	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION
433	Voluntary travel plans are anti-sustainable. They should be managed by the Council to be accountable.
478	The policy should define what is meant by significant volumes of traffic.
368	Supports requirement to submit travel plans for development generating significant traffic volumes.
498	Support travel plans as an important means of promoting alternative forms of transport through UDP.

Main Issue

6.11.1 Whether the policy is in accord with government policy on travel plans

Conclusions

6.11.2 The objection by Action Against Kingswater Park relates directly to the travel plan produced for the Waterside Park development (policy E1(2)). That travel plan forms part of the application which was recently refused by the Secretary of State, whether it meets the requirements of policy T11 is not for me to say.

6.11.3 As written I consider T11 to be compatible with national policy guidance to be found in PPG13. The Government have also produced 2 documents *Making Travel Plans* and *A Best Practice Guide* to advise on the production of travel plans. The policy must also be looked at against the travel plan strategy for Greater Manchester which is being developed as part of the GMLTP and which seeks to increase the number of voluntary travel plans.

6.11.4 The objectors consider travel plans should be controlled by the Council but it would in my view be unreasonable and unnecessary for this requirement to be written into the policy. The reasoned justification to the policy refers to further guidance being provided in PPG13. That document at para 90 says that travel plans should be worked

up in consultation with the Council, should have built into them measurable outputs and should set out the arrangements for monitoring the progress of the plan, as well as arrangements for enforcement, in the event that agreed objectives are not met. It seems to me that this is sufficient to ensure that the plans are not only acceptable in the first place but also efficiently managed.

- 6.11.5 In the revised deposit draft of the plan the words *generate significant volumes of traffic* were replaced by *result in significant travel implications*. The latter phrase is taken directly from PPG13 which does not define significant, but at paragraph 89 gives examples of the type of development that would require a travel plan. Whilst some thresholds are given it is evident that not only the size and nature of a development will trigger the need for a travel plan, but also its location. Given these circumstances it is evident that Government recognises that *significant* is open to interpretation and must ultimately require a degree of judgement. I see nothing untoward in the policy reflecting government policy in this respect.

Recommendation

- 6.11.6 I recommend no modification to the plan as a result of these objections.

POLICY T13

Transport Investment

NAME OF ORGANISATION OR INDIVIDUAL	OBJ'R	OBJ NO	O or S	C WDR
Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Executive	339	369	O	
Ashton-under-Lyne Civic Society	47	9	S	
Roland Bardsley Homes	658	52	S	

OBJ NO	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION
369	The policy should include a requirement for developer contributions to future public transport schemes.
9	Support the intention to improve the standard of public transport, but note problems in carrying shopping.
52	This policy is accepted in principle subject to thresholds being established.

Main Issue

- 6.12.1 Whether the policy should seek financial contributions towards proposed public transport improvement schemes.

Conclusions

- 6.12.2 As written policy T13 requires a financial contribution only in respect of those developments placing demands on existing transportation infrastructure which could not be overcome by programmed improvement schemes. To my mind this meets the requirements of current national policy. Circular 1/97 says that a planning obligation (which would ensure the financial contribution required by the policy) can only be sought where they are, amongst other things, reasonable and necessary.
- 6.12.3 Para B17 of the Circular gives examples of circumstances which are considered unreasonable. These include development plan policies based on a blanket formulation,

as proposed by the objector, where proper account is not taken of whether the contribution is fairly and reasonably related to the development proposed. Moreover if a scheme could be accommodated within the existing infrastructure and/or where planned improvements would take place anyway, a development contribution would not meet the necessity test. Therefore to include a requirement for all proposed development alongside the route of future public transport schemes to make a financial contribution would be contrary to national policy and cannot be supported.

- 6.12.4 Although there is no objection to the text accompanying the policy I note that it seeks to fund improvements through planning conditions. This is also contrary to government policy. Circular 11/95 at paragraph 83 says that no payment of money can be required by planning condition.

Recommendation

- 6.12.5 I recommend the text accompanying the policy be modified by deleting the reference to funding improvements through planning conditions.

POLICY T14

Transport Assessments

NAME OF ORGANISATION OR INDIVIDUAL	OBJ'R	OBJ NO	O or S	C WDR
Roland Bardsley Homes	658	53	O	

OBJ NO	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION
53	The need for and scope of any TIA should be in accordance with Government guidelines.

Main Issue

- 6.13.1 Whether policy T14 is in accord with government guidelines.

Conclusions

- 6.13.2 PPG13 contains national policy guidance on Transport Assessments. It says that they will be required where developments have significant transport implications. Policy T14 refers instead to a material increase in the volume or character of road traffic. The Council do not put forward any reason why their wording should be preferred. I therefore consider the terminology used in PPG13 is more appropriate.
- 6.13.3 The remainder of the policy adds detail, firstly about the authority to be consulted concerning the scope of the assessment and secondly about the need to consider air quality impact as part of the assessment. These matters add clarity to the policy and are not at odds with the general guidance in PPG13. I note that the Government intends to issue good practice advice on the content and preparation of Transport Assessments, but this is not yet available. Until such time as it is produced and the policy can be tested against it, I consider T14 to be acceptable and broadly in accord with government policy.

Recommendation

- 6.13.4 I recommend that the policy be modified by deleting from the first paragraph of the policy *Where a development is proposed which is likely to lead to a material*

increase in the volume or character of road traffic in the area and replacing it with Where a development will have significant transport implications.... There will also need to be consequential changes in the reasoned justification to the policy to reflect this change.

NON POLICY SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS

Transportation and Access

NAME OF ORGANISATION OR INDIVIDUAL	OBJ'R	OBJ NO	O or S	C WDR
Alternative Proposals on Transport	270	190	O	
OBJ NO	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION			
190	The plan includes no rail or bus schemes for the Longdendale area, especially Hollingworth.			

Main Issue

6.14.1 Whether the plan should include policies for bus improvements in Longdendale.

Conclusions

6.14.2 The GMPTA are responsible for public transport in Manchester. Whilst the Council are part of the Greater Manchester Integration Project which seeks to develop a more effective transport system for the Greater Manchester area, they cannot make decisions independent of the PTA. Moreover bus services are only subsidised by the PTA where services are socially necessary. In Longdendale whilst not prolific, I understand that there are bus services to Ashton, Hyde and Stalybridge bus stations and onwards from there.

6.14.3 The PTA has produced a Bus Strategy which aims to develop an effective bus network in consultation with District Councils and bus operators. The Council say this may provide an opportunity to seek improvements to the bus service, although as yet nothing definite is proposed and it is not intended to extend the quality bus corridor as far as Hollingworth/Woolley Bridge. In essence the situation is similar for the improvement of rail services and the development of tram/train operation on the Hadfield/Glossop and Manchester Piccadilly line.

6.14.4 I appreciate that the Council could lobby the PTA/Executive to regard Hollingworth as a special case for the provision of improved bus services, but if the Council desire to follow such a course of action it seems to me that it is more appropriate if it is done outside the development plan process. Two of the most fundamental principles of including policies within a development plan are that they are land use based and that they are likely to be implemented within the plan period. Given the situation described above I consider it would be misleading of the Council to include within the UDP proposals for bus and/or rail improvements in the Longdendale area when none are currently programmed by the responsible bodies.

Recommendation

16.14.5 I recommend no modification to the plan as a result of this objection.

NAME OF ORGANISATION OR INDIVIDUAL	OBJ'R	OBJ NO	O or S	C WDR
General Aviation Awareness Council	318	259	O	
OBJ NO	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION			
259	The plan should include a policy on the establishment of flying sites for all types of aviation			

Main Issue

- 6.14.6 Whether the plan should include a policy on the establishment of sites for flying/aviation activities.

Conclusions

- 6.14.7 As far as I am aware there are no airfield/airport type developments in or proposed for the Tameside area. PPG13 says that Councils need to consider the role of small airfields and take account of economic, environmental and social impacts of general aviation when formulating development plan policies. Tameside have done this and consider in principle there is little scope for the development of airfields due to the combination of the highly urbanised nature of the flat land and the hilly nature of the less developed areas. They also refer to the proximity of Manchester airport.
- 6.14.8 It seems to me it would serve little purpose to include a specific criteria based policy when the likelihood of such development coming forward is remote. In the event that aviation related development was proposed it would be subject to the normal development control criteria and would fall to be considered against national policy guidance in PPG13 and regional policy guidance in RPG13. With this situation I consider there is no necessity for a policy to be added to the plan dealing with general aviation development.

Recommendation

- 6.14.9 I recommend no modification to the plan as a result of this objection.

NAME OF ORGANISATION OR INDIVIDUAL	OBJ'R	OBJ NO	O or S	C WDR
Peak District National Park Authority	597	513	O	
OBJ NO	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION			
513	The proposals map should show proposals from the Greater Manchester Strategic Rail Study, Central Railway and recreational routes.			

Main Issue

- 6.14.10 Whether the proposals map should show rail proposals and recreational routes.

Conclusions

- 6.14.11 PPG12 says that proposals maps should illustrate policies and proposals in the written statement. The overall objective of the Greater Manchester Strategic Rail Study was to examine the long term potential for the development of rail services in Manchester having regard to the need for an integrated transport policy. The report published in 2002 says that it is unlikely to bring forward proposals until after 2010. Also I understand that the Rail Investment Strategy produced by GMPTA is still in draft form and Central Railway's proposals for a new rail freight route from Liverpool to France has no firm timetable. The emerging RPG does not include the last scheme as a regionally significant transport proposal because further investigation is needed.

6.14.12 Therefore in the absence of any clear proposals likely to be implemented within the life of the plan it is inappropriate to include the recommendations from the rail study and Central Railway's proposal in the UDP.

6.14.13 In respect of recreational routes, I am told that the section of the Trans-Pennine Trail in Tameside was completed in September and that the works on the Pennine Bridleway were due to be completed by the end of 2002. As the proposals map is intended to illustrate land use proposals rather than existing uses/facilities I do not consider it appropriate that these routes should be included on the map.

Recommendation

6.14.14 I recommend no modification to the plan as a result of this proposal.

NAME OF ORGANISATION OR INDIVIDUAL	OBJ'R	OBJ NO	O or S	C WDR
Sandra Ray	640	529	O	
OBJ NO	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION			
529	It is essential that there is a separate section on car parking provision and traffic incorporated into the plan.			

Main Issue

6.14.15 Whether there needs to be a separate/additional section dealing with parking and traffic.

Conclusions

6.14.16 Parking provision is dealt with under policy T10. The objector supports the draft parking standards reproduced as part of that policy which are in line with national policy guidance set out in PPG13. Applying those standards is a matter for the Council when making decisions on individual planning applications, it is not a matter for the UDP. I note the Council intend to provide further information about the application of the standards in SPG which will be a complementary document to the UDP.

6.14.17 Other policies within the Transportation and Access section of the plan deal with all manner of traffic and transport issues. So far as I am aware there are no specific omissions and none have been referred to by the objector. Given these circumstances I do not consider there should be any modification to the plan in respect of this objection.

Recommendation

6.14.18 I recommend no modification to the plan as a result of this objection.

NAME OF ORGANISATION OR INDIVIDUAL	OBJ'R	OBJ NO	O or S	C WDR
Richard Macfarlane	647	539	O	
OBJ NO	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION			
539	There should be staff travel plans and staff travel-to-work audits on key sites			

Main Issue

6.14.19 Whether the plan should make specific reference to the Council requiring staff travel plans and staff travel-to-work audits on key sites.

Conclusions

6.14.20 Policy T11 requires travel plans to be produced in support of new developments which have significant travel implications. The policy refers to national policy in PPG13 and that document at para 90 says that travel plans should be worked up in consultation with the Council, should have built into them measurable outputs and should set out the arrangements for monitoring the progress of the travel plan. In addition policy E7 seeks to encourage employment for local people when new schemes are developed. It seems to me that together these 2 policies which are already in the UDP encourage sustainable patterns of travel to work and employment for local people: and therefore meet the gist of the objection.

6.14.21 The Government has produced guidance on travel plans. Insofar as the objection is concerned with the mechanics of monitoring travel patterns and setting targets for the proportion of the workforce living close to the employment source, I consider these details should be part of individual travel plans and/or development proposals, not specifically set out in the text of the UDP. Being over-prescriptive in the plan would lead to inflexible and possibly impractical policies.

Recommendation

6.14.22 I recommend no modification to the plan as a result of this objection.

NAME OF ORGANISATION OR INDIVIDUAL	OBJ'R	OBJ NO	O or S	C WDR
Peter Simon	694	567	O	
OBJ NO	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION			
567	The plan makes no mention of alternative transport strategy to reduce over-dependence on cars and lorries.			

Main issue

6.14.23 Whether the plan deals adequately with alternative transport strategies to reduce reliance on cars.

Conclusions

6.14.24 Insofar as the objection is concerned with road proposals and the impact of such development on the Longdendale area, these matters are addressed fully in my conclusions to policies T2 and T3(1). And to avoid repetition my conclusions on the objections to those policies should be read.

6.14.25 Briefly they are that at the present time both road schemes are supported by a combination of national, regional and local authorities who believe there is a need for them to alleviate the traffic problems in Longdendale. However in accord with national policy both schemes are currently being reassessed as part of a NATA study, the basic approach of which accepts that new road construction should only be considered once a thorough examination of all possible solutions to a particular problem have been evaluated. I consider it would be premature to delete the schemes from the plan until the outcome of that study is known.

6.14.26 I note here that the Council have in addition undertaken various other measures in order to alleviate road conditions and support enhanced bus and rail schemes, safer walking and the like in forums outside the UDP process. Within the UDP process the underlying objectives of the plan and specific land use allocations seek to minimise the need for and also promote more sustainable forms of travel. Transport indicators are

regularly monitored as part of the LTP process and I see no reason for them to be duplicated in the UDP. Given these factors I do not believe any modification to the plan should be made as a result of this objection.

Recommendation

6.14.27 I recommend no modification to the policy as a result of this objection

NAME OF ORGANISATION OR INDIVIDUAL	OBJ'R	OBJ NO	O or S	C WDR
Stayley Developments Ltd & AMEC Developments Ltd	21	75	O	
OBJ NO	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION			
75	The Ashton Northern Bypass should be identified as a corridor with high public transport accessibility to which developments which generate higher traffic levels should be focussed.			

Main Issue

6.14.28 Whether the Ashton Northern Bypass should be identified as an integrated transport corridor on the proposals map.

Conclusions

- 6.14.29 Once completed the Ashton Northern Bypass will afford an alternative approach to Ashton town centre from central Manchester and areas to the south. It will be an attractive route for car drivers using the M60. The road will also carry the Ashton metrolink extension and no doubt a number of buses that at present use the A635 Manchester Road will be diverted onto the road. There are also proposals for cycle lanes. The bypass will therefore afford access to the Ashton Moss development and beyond to Ashton town centre by alternative means of transport to the car. It will in effect be an integrated transport corridor through the Ashton Moss development.
- 6.14.30 Ashton Moss would not though be as accessible as Ashton town centre, a location where the UDP seeks to focus development. The town centre is currently served and, so far as I am aware, will continue to be served by more buses than would pass through the Ashton Moss site on the northern bypass. It also has a railway station. Moreover the metrolink will extend as far as the town centre with its variety of facilities and services. The mixture of facilities means that there is the opportunity for short journeys on foot. Further whilst the northern bypass will undoubtedly have good transport links it is not identified in the LTP as one of the key transport corridors which are proposed for development as quality bus corridors. The purpose of the quality bus corridors is to afford a high degree of accessibility for passengers, pedestrians and cyclists. These other routes, although different, will also have a high level of accessibility to development.
- 6.14.31 The quality bus corridors are not identified on the proposals map and neither are any integrated transport corridors. To include the northern bypass would therefore result in the identification of a relatively short stretch of road on one of the routes into the town centre. It would be a unique allocation in the plan. From the information I have seen I am not satisfied that in practical terms that this should be the case. There are other routes into Ashton which provide good access by bus and the metrolink would travel through other areas. Ashton Moss may be the only significant undeveloped site along the way in Tameside, but this does not mean that other sites could not come forward for redevelopment and/or refurbishment which would benefit from equally good transport links.

6.14.32 It follows from the sustainable objectives of the plan that the Ashton Moss site would not have been put forward for development if the Council had not considered it to be in an accessible location. The benefits of the bypass have already been recognised with the allocation of the area for development. To further identify the road as an integrated transport corridor on the proposals map along which development should be focussed would to my mind go further than the present allocation and could undermine the objectives of the plan which seek concentrate development within town centres.

6.14.33 Given these conclusions I do not consider the northern bypass should be allocated as an integrated transport corridor on the proposals map.

Recommendation

6.14.34 I recommend no modification to the plan as a result of this objection.