

Glossopdale Area Forum, Wednesday 7th June 2006

Questions and Answers

Reference: 01GD 06/06/06 Bypass

Question: The stated purpose of this meeting is to make people aware of the proposals and how they can make their views known. Yet people have already had the chance to make their views known on the bypass, a three month consultation period has just ended. According to the HA 2,400 people have already made their views known, the majority of whom have objected to the proposal. So what is the point of this meeting? Is it just to rally the pro bypass troops? The timing of it, ie post consultation, seems very strange. As for the Spur, HPBC have already approved it as a planning application so there is little point in asking for people's views. As it happens, at the time when people's views were relevant the public were denied the right to speak at the council meeting where it was passed and there was very little debate amongst the voting members in the chamber. The application was just rubber stamped despite a large body of opposition whose concerns were simply dismissed. So much for wanting people's views.

Answer: The forum gives local people the opportunity to find out more about the scheme as it develops. There will be a public inquiry into the scheme at which the views of the public will be sought and considered.

High Peak Borough Council has a policy of allowing applicants and objectors to speak at its development control committee.

Reference: 02GD 06/06/06 Bypass

Question: Why are the organisers of the forum composed almost exclusively of pro bypass organisations such as HA, Tameside, HPBC etc? Why are objectors such as CPRE, APT, SSW, Kirklees Council, government advisors English Nature etc not invited onto the panel? Again it sounds like a pro bypass rally.

Answer: The forum is an opportunity to hear more about the bypass proposals. It is open to all.

Reference: 03GD 06/06/06 Tameside MBC input

Question: As this is a Derbyshire area forum why are Tameside on the forum at all? They have their own forum. I recognise they are major supporters of the Spur Road but as HPBC are in attendance their presence is not required.

Answer: Tameside MBC are the highways and planning authority responsible for a large part of the route affecting Glossopdale. In our view it is important that local people understand what their proposals include and how they are developing.

Reference: 04GD 06/06/06 Environmental impact

Question: At the last Cabinet meeting HPBC renewed its support for the Nottingham Declaration: it commits the Council to work with Central Govt to contribute to the delivery of the UK Climate Change programme, the Kyoto Protocol, and the targets for CO2 reduction by 2010. Your Environmental Spokesperson Cllr.Glynis Kirk has recently stated:- "We cannot ignore the impact of Climate Change at a local level..... I see our endorsement of the Nottingham Declaration as a significant contribution to our commitment to the environment and the community". How does this commitment square with HPBC's support for the Mottram/Tintwistle bypass when the Environmental Statement indicates a rise of approx 7% in CO2 output from the project and the Highways Agency accepts this will set back the governments programme on tackling climate change?

Answer: There will be an overall reduction in air pollutants with the scheme in place. Although there would be adverse effects for some areas, these would be outweighed by improvements for others. With the scheme in place all air pollutants are below the UK Air Quality Strategy (AQS) Standard with the exception of annual average NO₂ concentrations at some properties. However, NO₂ concentrations would still exceed this standard without the scheme in place. Most areas along existing A57/A628, including Tintwistle would see a significant improvement in NO₂ concentrations. However, there would be an estimated 7% increase in CO₂ emissions overall, in part due to vehicles being able to travel at higher speeds on the bypass.

Reference: 05GD 06/06/06 Environmental impact

Question: What is the point in asking individuals to reduce their own greenhouse gas emissions, to recycle etc, when schemes like this are still being actively pursued and HPBC are actively supporting such schemes? You are simply undermining everything that the government, individuals, and the council itself are all trying to achieve.

Answer: Alternative solutions were appraised by the Highways Agency during 2002-2203 in accordance with “Guidance on the Methodology for Multi Modal Studies” and “Applying the Multi-Modal New Approach to Appraisal of Highway Schemes”.

The merits of public transport improvements, an HGV ban and the development of the bypass were all considered. The appraisal concluded that the bypass would be the most effective method of removing traffic and its’ associated problems from the villages of Mottram, Hollingworth and Tintwistle.

Public transport improvements considered, included; Hope Valley line service improvements, West Coast mainline modernisation, Matlock to Buxton re-opening, Leeds to Manchester line service improvements, planned Metrolink extensions, bus/coach services considered and Woodhead Tunnel re-opening. The appraisal concluded that public transport improvements would bring about:

- A very small reduction in traffic on trunk road in the villages (2-3%);
- A very small reduction in congestion; and
- Do little to solve problems in the village.

The investigation into an HGV ban on the A628 corridor concluded that it would:

- Have a limited effect in reducing congestion in the villages;
- Displace HGVs onto other Trans -Pennine routes;
- Be contrary to South Pennine Integrated Transport Strategy;
- Not be consistent with “Core Trunk Road”
- Make access to local businesses more difficult; and
- Any ban would be difficult to enforce.

The Regional Transport Strategy recognises that “Despite the focus on behavioural change and public transport provision, there will still be a need to develop additional highway capacity in the region”. (p. 53)

Reference: 06GD 06/06/06 Bypass

Question: Is it true that were the bypass to progress that the Denton roundabout would need to be widened and are the people of Denton aware of this? Have their views been sought? Have they ever been consulted or been visited with an exhibition?

Answer: There are no proposals to amend this junction.

Reference: 07GD 06/06/06 **Environmental impact**

Question: Is it true that the air monitors in Denton have been repositioned in order to give a reduced reading so that further pollution in Denton can be accommodated?

Answer: **No**

Reference: 08GD 06/06/06 **Cost of bypass**

Question: If the most recent figures I have seen are to be believed the current cost of the proposed bypass is around £112 million. According to the original H.A. report from the early 1990's about 430 households will gain relief from the proposed bypass. This works out at over £250,000 for each and every household to be bypassed. Does the panel feel that this represents value for money?

Answer: Using nationally accepted ways of analysing the cost and benefits of road projects it has been shown that the cost of the scheme is outweighed by benefits by 6 and a half times, which represents good value for money.

Reference: 09GD 06/06/06 **Bypass**

Question: What is the fall back position for dealing with the traffic congestion problems if the bypass project fails? How soon can the bypass project be dumped so that these alternatives can be implemented.

Answer: The Highways Agency will be presenting evidence at the Public Enquiry, the Secretary of State will make a decision; in this decision, he will consider all matters & will if necessary propose alternatives.

Reference: 10GD 06/06/06
Role of Glossopdale Area Forum

Question: Will this area forum be retrospectively called a consultation as was the case recently with the Tameside newspaper adverts that only had tear off slips for bypass supporters? It has not been advertised as a consultation nor could it reasonably be called such when the only people on the panel represent organisations whose minds are already made up. Hence this is more of a rally than an attempt to 'consult'.

Answer: It is not a consultation event but an opportunity for local people to hear more about the scheme and the programme for development.

Reference: 11GD 06/06/06
Bypass and employment

Question: Tom Levitt MP states that he supports the road for economic reasons, the Highways Agency state that they are building it to give relief to the villages. So is it about providing relief or about expanding the local economy? If the latter what is the case for it, given there is minimal unemployment in the valley and that no one has ever been consulted for their views on Rossington Park?

Answer: In the view of High Peak Borough Council the by-pass will make a significant positive impact by relieving the impact on the Longdendale villages and contribute to the development of the local economy. Unemployment in Glossopdale is low but there are pockets of significant higher unemployment such as at Gamesley which is one of the 10% most deprived areas in England. In addition there has been a decline in employment in the Borough compared to a national increase. Manufacturing employment has been hit especially hard. In relation to Rossington Park this scheme was part of the council's local plan which was subject to extensive consultation and public inquiry. The detailed proposals were also subject to consultation as part of the normal planning process.

Reference: 12GD 06/06/06 **Environmental issues**

Question: As this is an environmentally sensitive issue would it not be more appropriate for Environmental Spokesperson Glynis Kirk to represent HPBC instead of Councillor Lomas, particularly in view of the fact that she was absent from the Cabinet meeting that rubber stamped support for the bypass draft orders?

Answer: Councillor Kirk has been closely involved in the discussion on the scheme prior to the Executive meeting at which the draft orders were discussed and approved with a number of additional recommendations.

Reference: 13GD 06/06/06 **Bypass**

Question: According to a Highways Agency press release there have been 1,400 objections to the Bypass proposal. HPBC are not counted amongst these 1,400. Is the representative of the HPBC not shamed and embarrassed by this. Does the council not have a duty to raise the concerns that local taxpayers and many other organisations including DCC have expressed?

Answer: High Peak Borough Council has supported the principle of the by-pass for the reasons outlined earlier. There is support for the scheme among local people especially those most directly affected by the current levels of congestion in Longdendale. The council has raised some concerns about the detail of the proposals and in particular the impact of the spur on traffic levels in Glossopdale. Derbyshire County Council supports the scheme and it is part of their Local Transport Plan.

Reference: 14GD 06/06/06 **Traffic**

Question: Please could someone explain to what will happen to the extra traffic on the M67 when it reaches the junction with the M60 at Denton, a junction which is already in gridlock for most of the day.

Answer: **A 6% increase in traffic through that junction is expected. This should not unduly affect operation of that junction.**

Reference: 15GD 06/06/06

Traffic and environmental impact

Question: In the opposite direction up to the summit of Woodhead slow moving traffic will cause more pollution, which will enter our water supply and cause further ecological issues with surrounding moorlands

Answer: **The works being undertaken to provide the bypass, will improve water quality. If there is an incident, then there may be more pollutants.**

Reference: 16GD 06/06/06 Traffic

Question: Finally, one of the first roads to close in the times of inclement weather is Woodhead, to where does the traffic disappear and what are the recommended escape routes from the A628 when closed by one of the frequently occurring accidents?

Answer: Pending

Reference: 17GD 06/06/06

Questions to Area Forums

Question: In the past Elector/Resident's questions have been left unacknowledged and unanswered during Forums or later on the Council website despite assurances, so what guarantees are the Council offering this time that questions (where clearly not overwhelmingly duplicatory and thus answered elsewhere) will be properly and fully answered?

Answer: HPBC will always strive to answer all questions as fully and comprehensively as possible. If there are emissions, then it could be that an answer is still pending. Some questions take longer to answer than others, because of their complexity or need to consult with other partners. Please continue to keep us informed on this.

Reference: 18GD 06/06/06 Cost of bypass

Question: Why are High Peak Borough Council allowing the HA and Tameside MBC to instigate a scheme comprising of the A628 bypass and the resulting Glossop Spur at the expense of Glossop residents: as the whole package would indeed take traffic of Tameside's (Longdendale's) admittedly over congested roads but mainly by redirecting this over- congestion into Glossopdale with hugely enhanced traffic flows in the Borough as predicted and modelled by the relevant Consultation Assessments?

Answer: The scheme will significantly reduce the level of congestion in the Tintwistle (a village in the High Peak). High Peak Borough Council has acknowledges the concern expressed regarding the predicted level of through traffic traveling along the A57 through Glossop town centre and the Peak District National Park, once the bypass and Glossop Spur are in place. As such, it has requested that the Highways Agency;

- make further investigation into the impact of the scheme over a wider area than is currently considered and include the A57, Glossop, Broadbottom and Charlesworth.
- make further investigation in order to identify the most appropriate mitigation measures to prevent excessive through traffic along the A57, particularly over the Snake Pass, and that these measures are included as an integral part of the scheme.

Reference: 19GD 06/06/06

Role of Glossopdale Area Forum

Question: What are the Objectives of this Glossopdale Forum on the Bypass and the Spur and if those of "giving information/answering questions" as indicated in the press releases, why is this Forum topic being dealt with Post Consultation rather than Pre Consultation period, which appears in view of the timing to be an empty exercise?

Answer: The forum is an opportunity to discuss issues that are of interest to local people. The by-pass and spur will be subject to a public inquiry and this is an opportunity for residents to obtain more information on the subject and question those most directly involved in the project.

Reference: 20GD 06/06/06 Bypass consultation

Question: With respect to above question - Is the choice of the Bypass and the Spur as a Forum topic at this time an acknowledgement by the Council, as seems possible, that the Highways Agency has failed (at initial and subsequent Consultation) to properly consult Glossop residents on this matter, neglecting them to focus only on those in Longdendale?

Answer: Please see above

Reference: 21GD 06/06/06 Environmental impact

Question: In view of Climate Change concerns and the Council's commitment to the Nottingham Declaration on climate change what particular steps are being taken (with targets) to deal with the Petrol/Diesel carbon output component from motor driven vehicles within High Peak Borough, and how are such unarguably necessary reductions compatible with the assents given by the Authority to schemes such as the Bypass and Spur acknowledged to enhance motor traffic flows and thus emissions within the Borough?

Answer: The council has a number of planning policy designed to reduce carbon emissions. In addition High Peak Borough Council is a beacon council for sustainable energy and has achieved the European-wide Eco-management and Audit Scheme.
As part of our environmental policy we promote green travel plans among local businesses.
(Please see question 04GD for a more detailed explanation of the impact on air pollutants.)

Reference: 22GD 06/06/06 Bypass alternatives

Question: What alternatives have the Borough actively explored to the Bypass and Spur to allow themselves and High Peak residents necessary choice in this transport issue, before endorsing the schemes within the High Peak Local Plan?

Answer: Please see question 05GD.

Reference: 23GD 06/06/06 Bypass alternatives

Question: If the Council have not seriously explored any alternatives would they therefore consider removing all endorsements and assents to the schemes until all alternatives have been explored proactively both singly and jointly as a package?

Answer: Please see question 05GD.

Reference: 24GD 06/06/06 Bypass alternatives

Question: The same question with slight modification might be asked of the Highways Agency upon the panel if they can be so addressed? Have they used the AST assessment process to explore a joint package of measures that could answer the congestion problem without damaging the sensitive environment and creating significant future traffic growth?

Answer: Please see question 05GD.

Reference: 25GD 06/06/06 Party stance on bypass

Question: As the leader and several councillors within the HPBC Council and cabinet are Social Democrats how precisely does their policy on the road schemes reflect their parties national position on transport issues?

Answer: Air-borne pollution will be reduced by the scheme and the council is liaising with Tameside MBC and Derbyshire County Council to reduce the adverse impact of the scheme. The council has a package of measures to improve environmental conditions including the promotion of green travel plans, and is examining the feasibility of providing a rail station at Gamesley"

Reference: 26GD 06/06/06 A628

Question: What are the plans for the road management of the A628 in the light of a new by-pass?

Answer: As it is ie by the Highways Agency. The old A628 & A57 would be de-trunked & become responsibility of Derbyshire CC & Tameside MBC.

Reference: 27GD 06/06/06
Economic impact of bypass

Question: The Highways Agency was requested to take into account in its design of the A628 bypass the need to support economic regeneration in the Glossopdale area. How has this been done? What economic regeneration is predicted in Glossopdale as a result of the bypass being opened and based on what evidence? What evidence is there that the bypass is necessary for economic regeneration to occur and what guarantee is there that this benefit would materialise? ?What kinds of jobs would be created in Glossopdale?

Answer: High Peak is designated as a 'lagging' area for economic growth. Employment in the area is declining compared with growth elsewhere in the UK. Manufacturing employment which accounts for 1 in 4 of all jobs in the area has been particularly badly affected. The council has produced a regeneration strategy which sets out the council's aims for job creation. It is available on the council's website – www.highpeak.gov.uk

Reference: 28GD 06/06/06
Economic/environmental impact of bypass

Question: The Highways Agency claims in its economic impact report for the bypass (para 7.5) that the bypass would counter the tendency towards out-migration of people and jobs and further traffic growth only if the scheme is coupled with further environmental improvements. What environmental improvements is HPBC planning?

Answer: Please see the above reference to the council's regeneration strategy.

Reference: 29GD 06/06/06 **Economic/environmental impact of bypass**

Question: Glossopdale is the largest but most deprived urban area within the High Peak. Half the households in Gamesley ward are without a car (2001 Census). The bypass would promote travel by private car. How would the bypass benefit the residents of Gamesley?

Answer: The by-pass would benefit local people by creating the opportunity for job growth in an area of declining local employment opportunities. The council is actively assessing the feasibility of a rail station at Gamesley as part of a range of measures to reduce dependence on private cars.

Reference: 30GD 06/06/06 **Accidents**

Question: What is the estimated increase in road accident fatalities on the A628 / A616 as a consequence of building the bypass?

Answer: **Pending**

Reference: 31GD 06/06/06 **Accidents**

Question: What were the exact circumstances behind the 2 fatalities listed in the Non Technical Summary as apparently they were not connected with congestion, occurred in the late evening on a weekend and were a consequence of reckless driving?

Answer: **Pending**

Reference: 32GD 06/06/06 **Traffic**

Question: Given that over two thirds of the traffic comes from Glossop why do we have to have a full bypass, wouldn't just building the Glossop spur be sufficient.

Answer: The Spur in its own right is not a solution.

Reference: 33GD 06/06/06 Traffic

Question: In light of the bid from Translink to re-open the Woodhead Railway to carry HGV traffic would it not be better to consider an alternative solution combining the Glossop Spur with the Translink scheme?

Answer:

Reference: 34GD 06/06/06 Bypass

Question: The Peak Park Authority is saying that they have changed their views relating to the Tintwistle/Hollingworth/Mottram By-pass by going against it. Does this mean that they are also against the A616, which is the main cause of our traffic problems, and agree to close the junction on the M1?

Answer: The National Park Authority has always given an 'in principle' support for the above scheme. However, this support always retained a caveat that (along with other public bodies) it would be able to reserve judgment on the scheme should it have a significant environmental impact upon the National Park. When final details of the scheme were published within the Environmental Statement earlier this year, the Authority determined that it could not give its support as for the proposed scheme as it currently stands. The basis for this decision was that the extra traffic generated by the proposed scheme would have a significant impact upon the; wildlife, landscape and tranquility of the National Park as well as impacting upon people's ability to enjoy its unique characteristics.

The reduction in traffic growth across the National Park relies on the implementation of a whole package of measures as set out in the South Pennines Integrated Strategy (SPITS). As it currently stands the closure of the A616 is not part of this package of measures. Such a proposal would necessitate detailed modeling and analysis before the Authority expressed any viewpoint. In reaching such a decision the Authority would have to make a judgment on the impact of the proposal upon the National Parks' key purposes as set out in statute, namely;

- To conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area, and
- Promote opportunities for understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the area by the public.

Failure to abide by these purposes as set out in the Environment Act (1995) would mean that the Authority was failing in its statutory duty as a public body.

Highways Agency presentation– Questions & Comments on the night

Q:

The majority of Tintwistle residents are in favour of the bypass. At Hollingworth presentation, people were told that only objectors were allowed to write in, later told this was untrue, what's the case?

A: OBJECTIONS had to be in by 15 May 2006. People can still write in at any time; we'll endeavour to answer all questions/comments. (Highways Agency)

Q: I'm in favour of bypass; the traffic is tearing through at red lights – it's ridiculous for local residents, it needs a red light camera.

A: Leave details & we can let you know if there are any proposals for changing Gunn Inn Lights. Pending.

Q: There is no reference to accidents on A628 & A616 – what does the Highways Agency intend to do about them?

A: We are looking into this & information will be available at the Public Enquiry.

Q: Is there any alternative to the bypass? Has the Public Enquiry been put back by 2 years?

A: The Highways Agency doesn't believe there is any other alternative. The Minister wants the Public Enquiry early next year.

Q: The Highways Agency appear to be worried about public safety. I've been trying to get a gully emptied for 2 years; We were blaming Highways Agency, but it's actually their sub-contractors for A628. A sign was supposed to be going up, but we were told the bypass was coming. If the Highways Agency aren't going to sort it out, why not pass it back to Derbyshire CC & ask them to sort out? This is an ongoing problem that hasn't been resolved.

A: In terms of the bypass, we would expect bypass construction in 2008 & completion in 2010.

Further comment: There are 15 things wrong with A628 which make it dangerous. It took me 18 months to get footpaths sorted by High Peak.

Q: In the analysis of traffic flows, HGV's were expressed in vehicle numbers, not vehicle journeys. I would like to see figures expressed in journeys too. We were upset when the Minister made his announcement & Tintwistle Parish Council have been campaigning for a by-pass for a number of years.

A: We express vehicles in the accepted terms which are standard to maintain national consistency. (Highways Agency).

Q: There was no mention of increase in traffic on A628, the 4th most dangerous road in GB, already a high fatality rate. There will also be a 70+% of traffic through Glossop. How does this square with the figures you've given?

A: The figs relate to the wider area & reflect the special nature of where the bypass would go. I can't comment on 70+% of traffic in Glossop; in certain roads there would be an increase & potentially less in other areas. We will be able to be cross examined at the Public Enquiry & the Inspector will decide on all evidence submitted to make a decision. (Highways Agency)

Q: I am concerend about the increased traffic on A628. There are roadside walls damaged all the way down, due to speeding drivers and fatal accidents. What precautions are yo u taking to stop an increase in these accidents?

A: The Minister has asked us to investigate this & to address safety problems. To look at what we can do to make the roads safer. (Highways Agency)

Q: Concerning the section at Mottram involving the tunnel, why hasn't a geological survey been undertaken?

A: This has been done, in Aug 2004 onwards. We now have enough information and the evidence will be presented at the Public Enquiry. A57 traffic – we have experienced travel consultants who will be presenting evidence to the Public Enquiry.

Q: The Highways Agency forecast an increase in pollutants in Glossop, what health measures do High Peak propose to deal with this?

A: Answer pending.

Q: Are there Global warming implications for Glossop?

A: Yes.

Q: At least pollution should be shared equally. Can we replace trees that are coming out, before the work starts? The Councils have removed trees without replacing them in the past.

A: The Highways Agency have made proposals in the Environmental Statement which outline Highways Agency suggestions. We can't confirm that it will be done before work starts.

Glossop Spur. Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council Presentation – Questions & Comments

Q: When major roadworks were carried out a few yearsa ago & there was a lorry ban, Glossop was a different place. Why can't we have a lorry ban instead of spending all this money?

A: The Spur doesn't really have an impact on the bypass, the Spur picks up traffic from Mottram Moor & provides relief just for Woolley Lane for a very short distance. The substantial benefit comes from the bypass. (Tameside MBC)

Q: Concerning the Spur relieving Woolley Lane/Bridge: you're putting 62% additional traffic through the town. I can't understand why you are proposing to increase traffic through our town by up to 62%? Why are we proposing to spend all this money?

A: The increase in traffic through the town by 62% is a major misunderstanding. If you look at the figures for the A57 at Dinting Vale. Those increases are recorded at Tameside side of junction; they are just to Tameside junction. If you look at Broadbottom, there will be a reduction of 7,000 vehicles on to the A57. The referred increase, refers to the junction, after that point, the traffic flows come together & we look at the differences. We are therefore talking about 1,000 vehicles which is about growth. (Tameside MBC)

Q: It seems that it is either it's a 63% or not? Which is it?

A: See above.

Q: Are the Sec. of State for Transport & Minister of Roads; both dealing with the matter as Ministers?

A: Yes, the Secretary of State has powers which he can exercise, or others can exercise on his behalf. Dr S Ladyman is the Minister of State for Transport. The Secretary of State for Transport has overall responsibility, but the Minister made the statement. (Tameside MBC)

Q: As a local business, we welcome plans to encourage people to come into Glossop. People won't come to Glossop because they don't want to sit in traffic. Has anything been undertaken to see how journey times can be reduced?

A: There is currently an average 30 minute delay through Mottram. We expect it to be reduced to 10 mins; an average 20 min saving along bypass roads. (Tameside MBC)

Q: Can you confirm the potential impact of the Bypass without the Spur?

A: This is difficult to assess; it's a combined effect & the Highways Agency have model to which Spur can be added. If the bypass is built without Spur, The Gun Inn junction will still be very busy & Woolley Lane will remain unchanged. (Tameside MBC)

Q: It takes 30 mins to get into Glossop because of lights at Tesco. If you can't get into Glossop after the bypass, then people will take the B road & come into Glossop via Old Glossop. Is this true?

A: A very complicated question concerning a complicated local route. This needs to be investigated in more detail. (Tameside MBC)

Partner comments provided on the night.

High Peak BC

One of the issues that has been raised is regeneration; we support the scheme because there will be benefits to the local economy. High Peak's manufacturing is declining much more quickly than other areas & by building these roads we can get jobs back into the borough. We have a package of measures to regenerate Glossop, around £5M & outlying areas. Our regeneration policies are complementary to the bypass & Spur schemes to enable local people to live & work in the area.

The Environment - we see these measures as being the best alternative. By working in partnership, we will put measures in place to implement improvement initiatives.

Derbyshire CC – Mottram/Tintwistle By-pass, Derbyshire CC have supported measures to relieve traffic problems in that area & the promotion of the bypass. However, we are concerned about accidents & the A628 has already been highlighted as an accident blackspot. We expect the bypass to reduce that. To the east of that area, there have been 4 fatalities and we want to discuss the potential to reduce accidents in that area. Environmental issues – we want to see mitigation, eg planting etc. and want to discuss this with the Highways Agency. Concerning the treatment of A628, eg gullies etc, we want to keep that section in good condition. Public transport issues are also important to us and we want to discuss that further with the Highways Agency. A57 Spur, we support that, although we are disappointed that it doesn't reduce traffic volume & would like to discuss how we can make it unattractive to vehicles.

Peak District National Park Authority – We object to the scheme. The Park has the responsibility to;

- 1) Conserve & enhance natural beauty of Park.
- 2) Encourage ALL to enjoy natural beauty of Park.

We considered the evidence and measured it against our 2 key aims & decided we couldn't support scheme because;

- 1) Of increased traffic through the National Park. We are worried about the effects on ecology, landscape, tranquility & ability to enjoy those areas.
- 2) Of potential increase of accidents in Park.

Police

We support the democratic process to improve traffic flow through area and would support Derbyshire CC in safety measures. We anticipate protests & we will facilitate peaceful protests.

Q: The roads are currently busy, but a 62% increase of traffic into Glossop will make it worse. How is this safe? Why aren't we promoting jobs through tourism?

A: The Local Plan sets out where we allow developments, eg Rossington Park, suited to needs of modern industry. We are looking at ways of introducing sustainable economic development across the whole of the Glossopdale area.

We are keen to discuss traffic flows through Glossop with our partners; HA & DCC. Our goal in regenerating Glossop means providing opportunities for local people. (High Peak BC)

Questions submitted by e mail after the meeting:

Question 1

The spur is forecast to attract 20.000 extra vehicles daily on to A57 at Brookfield. Given that this road is gridlocked from Dinting to Glossop every rushhour and Saturday, what plans does High Peak have to accommodate them or should we expect a tailback from Glossop lights up the Spur on to Mottram Moor?

Answer: Pending

Question 2

The Spur is to be built across the only remaining floodplain between Tintwistle and Broadbottom and will reduce its size by one third. What contingency measures have High Peak Council planned to protect residents and businesses from the increased risk of flooding of their premises due to this loss of soakaway land.

Answer: Pending

Question 3

The Highways Agency forecast that if the Bypass and Spur are built there will be an increase in ALL pollutants within the valleys, including CO2 the Greenhouse gas. Glossop is already an asthma blackspot, especially Gamesley. What health measures do the High Peak propose to implement firstly to prevent even more of our children carrying their inhalers to Nursery or Primary school and secondly to mitigate the extra 7% increase in CO2 forecast by the Highways Agency in view of the threat of global warming?

Answer: The environmental impact statement forecasts that there will be an overall reduction in air-borne pollution and especially the type of particulates that are considered to be responsible for asthma.

Binnovation Update: Comments Questions and Answers

Q: People are not using their Green Bins and they are left on the street

A: We are asking residents to pull their bins off the street.

Q: Why can't we have communal green bins for groups of residents?

A: we will consider this

Q: Since local businesses generate a lot of card why can't they have green bins?

A: Businesses pay business rates for different services. We will consider this but we cannot deal with this until waterswallows recycling facility is ready.

Q: I don't have a garden so don't use my green bin so why should I have a 2 weekly collection of my black bin for the same Council Tax? My black bin is also full after a week.

A: We have provided opportunities for a range of waste to be recycled so the 2 week collection for the black bin should be sufficient if you are using these other facilities. We can offer advice on recycling.