



3/18 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol, BS1 6PN

Customer 0303 444 5000
Services: Knutsfordtobowdon@infrastructure.gsi.gov.uk
e-mail:

Your Ref:

Our Ref: TR010002

Date: 12 September 2013

Dear Sir/Madam

**THE PLANNING ACT 2008 (AS AMENDED BY THE LOCALISM ACT 2011) AND
RULE 8 OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING (EXAMINATION PROCEDURE)
RULES 2010**

**Application by the Highways Agency for an Order Granting Development
Consent for the A556 Knutsford to Bowdon Scheme located between Junction
19 of the M6 and Junction 7 of the M56 to the south of Manchester**

Notice of procedural decisions made at and following the Preliminary Meeting

I am writing to inform you about the procedural decisions made by the Examining Authority at and following the Preliminary Meeting held on 3 September 2013 at the Curzon Cinema, Toft Road, Knutsford, Cheshire, WA16 0PE. This letter provides you with the timetable and the initial questions that the Examining Authority is asking in the examination.

A note of the Preliminary Meeting has been published on our website

<http://infrastructure.planningportal.gov.uk/document/2009959>

and will be made available for inspection at the venues listed in Annex A. An audio recording of the preliminary meeting has also been published on our website.

1. Procedural decision and timetable

The Examining Authority is grateful to all those who attended and for all the views expressed at the Preliminary Meeting. All matters raised have been considered carefully.

The Examining Authority has now made a procedural decision about the way in which the application is to be examined. A copy of the procedural decision is enclosed with this letter at Annex B and the timetable now set by the Examining Authority is at Annex C.

2. Written questions and requests for further background information

The Examining Authority has decided to ask a number of questions to the applicant and interested parties in order to receive further information about matters it considers relevant to the application. These questions are set out in Annex D, and responses must be received **on or before Friday 4 October 2013**.

A further request to the applicant under Rule 17 for additional information is set out in Annex E, and these documents must also be received on or before **Friday 4 October 2013**.

The Examining Authority may write to interested parties with further questions or with a request for more information as the examination progresses at the timetabled dates and at any other time during the examination¹.

The Examining Authority now invites all interested parties to submit written representations and evidence on any matters concerning the application, and relevant representations already submitted, in accordance with the timetable set out in Annex C.

Please send your representations to us using the email or postal address at the top of this letter quoting reference **TR010002** and your unique reference number, if one is quoted at the top of this letter.

Representations can deal with any relevant matter. They are not restricted to the matters set out in the Examining Authority's initial assessment of principal issues which was discussed at the preliminary meeting, nor restricted to the questions set out in Annex D.

Please note if you are submitting a written representation, you must identify those parts of the application or specific matters with which you agree and those parts with which you do not agree. You must state the reasons for your disagreement.

3. Guidance for the submission of written representations

There is no prescribed form for written representations under primary or secondary legislation. In accordance with DCLG 'Planning Act 2008: Guidance for the examination of applications for development consent (April 2013)', participants should provide with their written statements, *"any data, methodology and assumptions used to support their submissions"*.

Any written representation that exceeds 1500 words should also be accompanied by a summary. This summary should not exceed 10% of the original text. The summary should set out the key facts of the written representation and must be representative of the submission made.

To assist in the timely processing of written representations to be submitted by the deadline of Friday 4 October 2013 I ask that interested parties send, where practicable, electronic copies of their submissions as email attachments to knutsfordtobowdon@infrastructure.gsi.gov.uk by 11.59pm on Friday 4 October 2013. Electronic attachments should be clearly labelled with subject title and not exceed 12MB for each email. It is helpful if written requests to attend hearings are forwarded separately. Should electronic submissions include a number of technical

¹ Rule 17 EPR

surveys of 300 pages or more, interested parties are advised to send to us, by post, an additional full paper copy of their submission.²

Timely submissions in advance of the deadlines set in the timetable are encouraged and welcomed. It would also be helpful if respondents could provide electronically duplicate copies of their submissions from which their signature and contact details have been redacted.

4. Availability and inspection of representations and documents

Written representations, responses to relevant representations and to questions, local impact reports, comments or any other documents or information about the application, must be made available to all interested parties and to anyone who requests an opportunity to inspect and take copies of them.

We will make these available by publishing them as soon as practicable on the National Infrastructure, Knutsford to Bowdon A556 project pages on the Planning Portal website. We shall also provide an opportunity for inspection and copying at a number of locations in the vicinity of the application site. The notification of the deposit locations is at Annex A.

5. Changes to the timetable

If I need to vary the timetable set out in Annex C for any reason, then I shall write to you and inform you of the changes. I shall also do this if the date, time and place of any hearing are changed, except in the event of an adjournment.

6. Deadlines for receipt of documents and requests for hearings

It is important to note that if written representations, responses to relevant representations and to written questions, local impact reports, further information or requests for hearings are not received by the dates specified in the timetable, the Examining Authority may disregard them.

7. Award of costs

I also draw your attention to the possibility of the award of costs against any party who behaves unreasonably. You should be aware of the relevant costs policy that applies to National Infrastructure Projects. The policy is available on the National Infrastructure pages of the Planning Portal website.

8. Future notifications

If you are an interested party you will continue to receive notifications from the Planning Inspectorate about the examination throughout the process. If you have received this letter because you attended the Preliminary Meeting but you are not an interested party you will **not** receive any further communication from us relating to this application. You can, however, visit the dedicated project page on the Planning Inspectorate's website to stay informed of the progress of the examination of this

² Subject to EPR Rule10(6)(a), we request the applicant to supply 5 paper copies of their written representation(s) for the Examining Authority to use and make available for public inspection under Rule 21. 3

application. If you are a statutory consultee who has not made a relevant representation but wishes to become an interested party, you should inform me as soon as possible.

Yours Sincerely

Peter Robottom

Peter Robottom MA(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI MCMI

Examining Authority

Annexes A.	Availability of relevant representations and application documents
B.	Procedural decision
C.	Timetable for examination of the application
D.	Examining Authority 's first written questions and requests for information
E	Request for information Under Rule 17

Advice may be given about applying for an order granting development consent or making representations about an application (or a proposed application). This communication does not however constitute legal advice upon which you can rely and you should obtain your own legal advice and professional advice as required.

A record of the advice which is provided will be recorded on the Planning Inspectorate website together with the name of the person or organisation who asked for the advice. The privacy of any other personal information will be protected in accordance with our Information Charter which you should view before sending information to the Planning Inspectorate.

Annex A

Availability of relevant representations and application documents

On the National Infrastructure pages of the Planning Portal's website at:

<http://infrastructure.planningportal.gov.uk/projects/North%20West/A556-Knutsford-to-Bowdon-Scheme/>

For inspection and copying at:

Macclesfield Customer Service Centre

Town Hall
Market Place
Macclesfield
SK10 1EA

Tel: 0300 123 5500 – Contact is Sarah Bartoli

Opening times:

Monday to Friday 8.45 - 17:00

Copying charges: 10p per A4 sheet (black and white), other sizes at additional cost.
Copying charges quoted are indicative costs as at March 2013.

Knutsford Library

Toft Road
Knutsford
Cheshire
WA16 0PG

Tel: 01625 374873 – **NOTE – only open until 13:00 on Wednesday** - Contact is not required. Staff are available to accept visitors at any time the library is open.

Opening times:

Monday and Friday 9:00 – 17:00

Tuesday and Thursday 9:00 – 19:00

Wednesday 9:00 – 13:00

Saturday 9:30 to 13:00

Copying charges: 10p per A4 sheet (black and white), other sizes at additional cost.
Copying charges quoted are indicative costs as at March 2013.

Annex B

PLANNING ACT 2008 ["PA 2008"] AND THE INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING (EXAMINATION PROCEDURE) RULES 2010 (EPR)

Procedural Decision regarding an application for the proposed Knutsford to Bowdon A556 Improvement Scheme

Principal Issues

I have carefully considered the request made on behalf of Mere Parish Council and Millington Parish Council that the consultation process should be a principal issue subject to examination. The examination is intended to consider the substance of the Development Consent Order that has been sought and the substance of the development that would be authorised. The adequacy of the Consultation process was carefully considered at the acceptance stage taking into account representations received including the views of Cheshire East Council and the evidence presented in the Consultation Report that the applicant had regard for points raised during the consultation. Consequently, I do not consider that this procedural matter is an appropriate issue for consideration during the Examination.

However, the substance of the Parish Council's representation, namely that they favour an alternative junction strategy, if there is to be a scheme of the nature of that proposed in the DCO, will be considered as one of the alternative options and alignment that I will be examining and in respect of which I am scheduling Issue Specific Hearings.

Those hearings will also be able to address additional points raised by Millington Parish Council in relation to the Millington Lane over-bridge and the issue of online improvements raised by NWTAR and traffic flows to be considered will also include those arising during any construction period.

I have carefully considered whether it is necessary to amend the list of principal issues following my initial assessment of the application. During the course of the examination I will be considering all relevant and important matters and will investigate matters where I need more information before making a recommendation to the Secretary of State. At this stage I do not believe that I need to amend the list of principal issues as all matters raised can be considered in relation to the issues already identified.

Timetable

At the Preliminary Meeting I drew attention to a need to adjust certain deadlines to make allowance for the Christmas and New Year Holidays and also that the availability of venues may need minor variation of previously suggested sitting days.

A number of representations were made by or on behalf of land-owners at the Preliminary Meeting seeking to ensure that there would be ample opportunity for consideration of detailed points raised in relation to the impact on the land or buildings in which they have interests. Representations were also received in writing on behalf of the Tatton Estate and related landholdings making similar points and seeking if at all possible for their interests to be addressed outside the school holiday period. Taking account of venue availability I have therefore scheduled additional site visits on Tuesday 10 December and additional Compulsory Acquisition Hearings and

site visits on Thursday and Friday 19 and 20 December 2013 in lieu of Tuesday 17 December but also scheduled a Compulsory Acquisition hearing for Tuesday 7 January 2014.

Those who wish me to view particular localities on my site visits should notify this in writing by the deadline that I have added to the Examination Timetable.

Some suggestions were made for possible venues closer to the proposed scheme for Open Floor hearings after I raised my willingness to consider such possibilities. However, one venue suggested is owned by an Interested Party/Affected Person who has made representations concerning the scheme and the other would be some way to the north-west of the scheme and therefore not offering an overall advantage over the main venue proposed which is that most readily accessible by public as well as private transport in the locality.

All hearings during December 2013 will therefore take place at **The Curzon Cinema, Toft Road, Knutsford, Cheshire, WA16 OPE**. As this venue is not available for the January hearing sessions, those will take place at **Cottons Hotel, Manchester Road, Knutsford, Cheshire WA16 OSU**.

In the light of attendance at the Preliminary Meeting and my offer to hold an evening session, I have scheduled Open floor Hearings for the afternoon and evening of Tuesday 17 December 2013.

Provision has been made in the timetable for comments on a draft Report on the Integrity of European Protected Sites (RIES) that will be prepared by the Planning Inspectorate from the information that has been submitted.

Other matters

I have considered the point raised on behalf of NWTAR as to whether the Highways Agency had properly undertaken an Impact Assessment in accordance with the Document: "HM Government Impact Assessment Overview, August 2011". Paragraph 2 of that document states that such an assessments are generally "required for all UK Government interventions of **a regulatory nature** (*my emphasis*) that affect the private sector, civil society organisations and public services".

The A556 Knutsford to Bowdon scheme is not an intervention of a regulatory nature but a physical project that is subject under European legislation to a requirement for environmental assessment and for the application for development consent to be accompanied by an Environmental Statement under the relevant regulations³. This requirement has been complied with.

³ The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2009

Annex C

Timetable for Examination of the Application

Item	Matters	Relevant Dates
1	Preliminary Meeting (This is the start day for the purposes of determining the period of the Examination)	Tuesday 3 September 2013
2	Issue of: <input type="checkbox"/> Procedural timetable (Rule 8(1) and (2)) <input type="checkbox"/> ExA first written questions (Rule 8(1)(b)(i) and (iii))	Thursday 12 September 2013
3	Deadline for receipt by ExA of additional documents requested under Rule 17	Friday 4 October 2013

<p>4</p>	<p>Deadline for receipt by the ExA of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Comments on relevant representations (RRs) (Rule 8(1)(c)(i) and (d)(i) and Rule 3(2)(b)) <input type="checkbox"/> Any summaries of RRs exceeding 1500 words (Rule 8(1)(i)) <input type="checkbox"/> Written representations (WRs) (Rule 8(1)(a) and Rule 10(1) and(2)) <input type="checkbox"/> Any summaries of WRs exceeding 1500 words (Rule 8(1)(i)) <input type="checkbox"/> LIR by local authority (Rule 8(1)(j)) <input type="checkbox"/> Responses to ExA's first written questions (Rule 8(1)(b)) <input type="checkbox"/> Statements of common ground (SoCG) (Rule 8(1)(e)) <input type="checkbox"/> Notification of wish to make oral representations on the specific issue or issues being examined at the Issue Specific (IS) hearings, relating to alternative options and alignments including junction proposals, traffic flows and noise/air quality assessments; any amendments to the draft development consent order (DCO) and its requirements and protective provisions by interested parties (s91 (PA 2008) and Rule 8(1)(k)) <input type="checkbox"/> Notification of wish to be heard at a compulsory acquisition (CA) hearing by affected persons (APs) (s92(2) (PA 2008) Rule 8(1)(f) and Rule 13(1)) <input type="checkbox"/> Notification of wish to be heard at an open floor (OF) hearing by interested parties (IPs) (s93(1) PA 2008, Rule 8(1)(f) and Rule 13(1)) <input type="checkbox"/> Notification of particular localities that interested parties or affected persons would wish the ExA to view. 	<p>Friday 4 October 2013</p>
-----------------	---	-------------------------------------

5	<p>Notification by ExA of confirmed date(s) time(s) and place(s) for:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> IS hearings (s91 PA 2008 Rule 13(3)(a) and Rule 8(1)(h))</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> CA hearing (s92 PA 2008 and Rule 13(3)(b))</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> OF hearings (s93 PA 2008 and Rule 13(3)(a))</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Accompanied site visits (Rule 16(3))</p>	Thursday 10 October 2013
6	<p>Deadline for receipt by the ExA of:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Comments on WRs and responses to comments on RRs (Rule 8(1)(c) and (d) and Rule 10(5))</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Comments on LIR (Rule 8(1)(j))</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Comments on responses to ExA's first written questions (Rule 8(c)(ii) and(d)(ii))</p>	Friday 1 November 2013
7	Issue of 2 nd ExA written questions and a draft Report on the Integrity of European Protected Sites (RIES)	Wednesday 7 November 2013
8	Deadline of receipt by ExA of responses to 2 nd ExA questions and the draft RIES	Thursday 29 November 2013
9	Date reserved for initial accompanied site visits to application site and surrounding area (Rule 16(2))	Monday 9 December 2013 (pm) and Tuesday 10 December
10	<p>Time period reserved for IS hearings on:</p> <p>(1) alternative options and alignments including junction proposals, traffic flows and noise/air quality assessments and</p> <p>(2) first consideration of DCO wording (Rule 8(1)(h)) including its requirements and protective provisions</p>	<p>Wednesday 11 and Thursday 12 December</p> <p>Friday 13 December 2013</p>
11	Time period reserved for any OF hearings	Tuesday 17 December 2013 (pm and evening)

12	Time period reserved for any CA hearings (Rule 8(1)(h)) and related accompanied site visits	Wednesday 18, Thursday 19 and Friday 20 December 2013 (and Tuesday 7 January 2014)
13	Deadline for receipt by ExA of any comments on responses to ExA 2 nd questions and the draft RIES	Friday 20 December 2013
14	Time period reserved for any further accompanied site visits arising out of the Examination.	Monday 6 January 2014 (pm) [and if necessary pm Wednesday 8 January 2014 and on Thursday 9 January]
15	Time period reserved for further CA Hearing (Rule 8(1)(h)) and related site visits.	Tuesday 7 January 2014
16	Time period reserved for further IS Hearing on alterations to the wording of the draft DCO, its requirements and protective provisions	Wednesday 8 January 2014
17	Deadline for receipt by ExA of: <input type="checkbox"/> Any proposed amendments to the draft DCO, requirements and s106 undertakings (Rule 8(1)(k)) <input type="checkbox"/> Any written summary of the oral cases put at the IS, CA or OF hearings (Rule 8(1)(k))	Friday 17 January 2014
18	<i>If required, any further ExA questions would be issued no later than Thursday 9 January 2014 and any further hearings, if required, would take place in w/c 3 February 2013.</i>	
<p>The Examining Authority is under a duty to complete its examination of the application by the end of the period of 6 months beginning with the day after the start day (s.98(1) PA 2008). This deadline is therefore 4 March 2014.</p>		

Annex D

Examining Authority's First Questions

Questions to the Applicant (Highways Agency) on matters other than the wording of the DCO

1. What further consents are required in addition to those sought in the DCO? Please supply a list and indicate the present situation with regard to obtaining each of the consents listed, appending any draft licence applications that have been prepared.
2. Please confirm the extent to which the ES is based on the levels and dimensions specified on the Submitted Engineering Drawings and Sections as amplified by the design drawings of structures sent in response to my s89(3) request item 9.
3. Is there agreement with Cheshire East Council on the details of the A50 Junction with the proposed new A556 and details of the junctions works or safety measures on the proposed de-trunked A556 and minor roads? If not, please indicate what matters are outstanding.
4. What is the Highways Agency response to the suggestion that the A50 junction with the new A556 could be simplified to reduce land take?
5. Is the designation of the de-trunked A556 agreed with Cheshire East Council?
6. What is the Highways Agency response to suggestions by Millington Parish Council that the Millington Lane motorised vehicle bridge is unnecessary and could lead to rat-running via Rostherne to Tatton Park?
7. What is the Highways Agency response to suggestions in representations that an alternative means of maintaining access along Old Hall Lane should be devised at Tabley that would be less circuitous and therefore less harmful to the parish hall and the parish church and involve less land-take and impact on Over Tabley Hall?
8. In the vicinity of Millington it has been suggested in representations that the northern end of the offline improvement should be set at a lower elevation involving deeper cuttings and less intrusive over bridges at Chapel Lane and Millington Lane. The constraints imposed by the need to realign and safeguard an oil pipeline and avoid, if possible, pumped highway drainage have been referred to. Given that agreement has yet to be reached with Mainline Pipelines Ltd on the nature of diversion and safeguarding of that pipeline, please indicate the possibilities that might exist for setting this section of road at a lower level.
9. Work No 7 is stated to involve re-alignment of a United Utilities water main. Please provide a full description of the nature of this work, including identification of the existing main that is to be realigned. Please confirm whether the work is agreed with United Utilities and whether protective provisions will be added to the DCO.
10. Various land-owners/occupiers have expressed concern over the extent of land-take, particularly for temporary possession for use as site compounds or for other purposes. Concern is also expressed that the land-take for mitigation

works is excessive, particularly where the mitigation is to address issues relating to works on other land-holdings. In view of the comment at paragraph 6.10 of the Statement of Reasons, that "If in the event less land is required the applicant would not seek to acquire all the land", please consider whether there are any plots that could be deleted from the Land Plans and Book of Reference or be reduced in extent. Please also explain the category of temporary use "associated with all works" as the location of some of these plots appears to imply that they could only be used in relation to certain works.

11. Please indicate the extent of low-noise surfacing intended for the proposed new A556 and related works.
12. Please clarify the extent of lighting proposed. Your response to the s83 request item 12 indicates that provision of new lighting at the Mere and Bucklow Hill junctions will be considered and developed in agreement with Cheshire East Council. The notes on the drawings only indicate this in relation to the proposed junctions with the de-truncked A556 and not those with the new A556. Is lighting of those junctions with the new A556 intended? Is lighting envisaged at either de-truncked or new A556 junctions for Tabley?
13. Is further consideration being given to the signing proposals in view of the objections raised by Premier Inns and the apparent inconsistency in the signing of Mere and local facilities? Have the signing and arrangements for special events been agreed with the National Trust and Cheshire East Council?
14. The drawings provided of possible replacement parking for Tabley Parish Hall and St Paul's Church, Tabley in response to the s83 request item 10 do not appear to show a capacity comparable to that lost through the works on the hall car park or through the de-truncking works along the existing A556, bearing in mind that a bus bay exists as well as the remainder of the layby. In consideration of notes on the drawings and in the covering statement, can drawings be provided showing the maximum replacement parking provision possible in these locations?
15. What is envisaged with regard to the routing of bus services that currently use or cross the existing A556?
16. Concern has been expressed over the validity of the photomontages which are intended to show the impact on views from Over Tabley Hall. Do the Highways Agency intend to submit replacement photomontages with corrections for the limitation on the window view by an horizontal window astragal and the absence of proposed fencing around the balancing pond? A worst case situation for the design year does not seem to have been illustrated, namely winter illustrations when deciduous trees and shrubs would not be in leaf. Please provide such montages for the design year.
17. A number of representations have queried the validity of traffic flow projections, for example as to whether they have been modelled over a wide enough part of the main highway network or conversely whether assignments to local roads can be relied upon given the nature of the model used. Please supply up to date figures on the basis of the assumptions used in the DfT Road Transport forecasts issued in July 2013 having regard to (1) proposed the Hard-shoulder running along most if not all relevant sections of M6 and M56; (2) the completion of all the proposed Metrolink schemes referred to in your response

to the s83 request item 5 and (3) the proposed northern hub heavyrail schemes. In the context of these projections, please provide an explanation of the apparent increases in traffic flows on some major roads in the vicinity that are not obviously feeding or fed by the DCO scheme to a greater extent than by the existing A556 such as the A50, the A56 in the vicinity of Lymm and the inner part of the M56, A5103 and M60 in Greater Manchester in the Do Something scenarios. Are the increases on the A50 primarily a consequence of the proposed absence of conflicting movements with the new A556 and the proposed switch in priority at its junction with the proposed de-trunked A556 and the consequent assumption of reduced delays on this cross route? Please also provide an explanation of the projected increases in flows on Agden Lane and Wrenshot Lane remote from the DCO scheme.

18. In response to the s83 request item 5, very little information is given at paragraphs 2.6 and 2.7 on the previously considered proposals to extend the Metrolink service south from Altrincham and to create a heavyrail link into Manchester Airport from the West (from the vicinity of Mobberley), perhaps accompanied by provision of a park and ride car park in the vicinity of the M6 although such proposals might have a direct influence on some of the flows modelled for the DCO scheme. Please provide an up to date statement from Network rail and/or Transport for Greater Manchester/Greater Manchester Combined Authority/Manchester International Airport on their current thinking in relation to such possibilities.
19. In view of the identified cumulative impact with regard to Hs2, please provide a statement from Hs2 Ltd on the degree of flexibility that is inherent in the alignment contained in the current consultation exercise. For example, does it extend to reconsideration of the strategic alternatives referred to in the 29 March 2012 Options Report which are described as feasible, albeit at a higher cost; to local realignments such as the Manchester Airport and Piccadilly spur crossing the M56 further west and then running closely along the north side of M56 to the point where the crossing is currently indicated; or does it only apply to minor variations such as setting the lines at a lower level with more by way of tunnelling whether bored or cut and fill. *[This request could be addressed by attendance of a representative of Hs2 Ltd at the proposed Issue Specific Hearing on Alternative alignments.]*
20. The matrices concerning the potential affect on European Protected Sites supplied in response to the s89(3) request item15, do not follow the guidance contained in the latest version of Advice Note 10⁴. They are difficult to interpret as the effects considered are not described in the screening matrices or integrity matrices whether individually or by groupings; the descriptions of "how presented" in the matrices are longer than those of the impacts listed themselves and no explanation is given of the purpose and import of the various tables. Attention is directed to the example of the matrices and related report produced for the North London (Electricity Line) Reinforcement, the Hornsea Project One Offshore Wind Farm and the South Hook CHP Reinforcement applications⁵. In the light of these documents, please submit clearer matrices.

⁴ [Advice Note 10: Habitat Regulation Assessment](#)

⁵ [North London \(Electricity Line\) Reinforcement](#) [Hornsea Offshore Wind Farm \(Zone 4\) – Project One](#) [South Hook Combined Heat & Power Station](#)

Question to the Highways Agency, Natural England and the Environment Agency

21. Please indicate the extent to which agreement has been reached between the Highways Agency, Natural England and the Environment Agency over outstanding points concerning protected species. *This request could be addressed by Statements of Common ground.*

Question for Highways agency, Cheshire East Council and English Heritage

22. Is the programme for archaeological and historical evaluation and recording now agreed between all parties? *This request could be addressed by a Statement of Common ground.*

Question for Cheshire Wildlife Trust

23. Please expand on the concerns expressed in your representations with regard the effect on wildlife and biodiversity.

Question for the Highways Agency and Cheshire East Council

24. In both the submitted Planning Statement and the revised Planning Statement provided in response to the s89(3) request item 7 there is reference to the existence of saved policies of the Macclesfield Local Plan but none are specifically identified. Please clarify whether any relevant policies of that Plan remain saved and, if so, provide full details of such policies.

Question for the Highways Agency and A556 Lobby Group

25. Is there any documentary evidence of the views of the Road Haulage Association and Freight Transport Association on the present situation regarding the A556 and on the DCO proposals?

Question for the A556 Lobby Group

26. Membership or support for the views expressed is variously put at 1500 or 1600 persons. Please indicate the nature of membership and the process whereby support for views expressed was indicated by the membership.
27. What further appraisal of the Junction 20 proposal is sought over and above that contained in the Consultation report?

Question for Mere Residents Association

28. Please indicate the extent of membership, the nature of that membership and the process whereby support for views expressed on behalf of the Association was indicated by the membership.

Questions for Cheshire East Council (Rights of Way and Local Access Forum) and others expressing concerns over continuity of rights of way.

29. Please indicate and illustrate on plans what issues remain to be addressed in relation to the DCO scheme, distinguishing points where the present network

available to NMUs of the highway will be harmed from additional improvements that may be sought as a consequence of or in the context of the DCO scheme.

Question for NWTAR and the Campaign for Better Transport

30. Please indicate the basis on which the DfT "Road Transport Forecasts 2013" which were issued as recently as July 2013 are not accepted as this document includes consideration of "Peak car" and the "London Scenario" as well as considering the effect of Hs2.

Questions on the wording of the DCO for the Highways Agency, Cheshire East Council and all Interested Persons [*Where specific alterations are sought or conceded, please submit a tracked changes version of the DCO or a relevant extract to clarify the nature of the change*]

31. In the Requirements (Schedule 2), many matters are specified as for the approval of the Secretary of State or determination by the Secretary of State. As the applicant is an agency of the Secretary of State and the Secretary of State is not a planning authority, comment would be appreciated on whether the majority of such references would more appropriately solely refer to the relevant planning authority, namely Cheshire East Council, against whose decisions there would be a right of appeal?
32. A number of representations express concern over the apparent weakness of the Requirements designed to ensure that mitigation and monitoring are implemented on a continuing long-term basis to ensure maturity of landscaping and establishment of habitation creation measures. Will the Highways Agency please consider appropriate strengthening to ensure that the measures proposed in the ES are achieved and also whether the wording should be more specific to reflect best practice.
33. In the ES there are references to a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), a Handover Environmental Action Plan (HEMP), an Environmental Masterplan, a Site Waste Management Plan, a Materials Management Plan, a Soil Resources Plan and a Traffic Management Plan. The DCO Requirements only refer to the CEMP and an Ecological Management Plan. Please explain the relationship of all plans to each other and how their implementation will be secured through the DCO and its Requirements. Will the Highways Agency please suggest amended wording as appropriate. A tabulation may be an appropriate means of clarifying how all the mitigation and monitoring measures referred to in the ES are or will be secured in the DCO.
34. Should there be a requirement seeking final details of structures, mammal underpasses, outfalls and similar features?
35. Please state the height and materials proposed for the Green Bridge parapets and whether its precise location is agreed with the statutory conservation bodies?
36. Should the need for recording archaeological and historical features be written into Requirement No 8?
37. Please provide the omitted Schedule 8 with the protective provisions to

safeguard the interests of affected statutory undertakers as referred to in article 33.

38. In article 21(7)(b) and 21(8)(a) should "of way" follow "right" or have these words been included in error?



The Planning Inspectorate

ANNEX E

3/18 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol, BS1 6PN

Customer: 0303 444 5000
Services: Knutsfordtobowdon@infrastructure.gsi.gov.uk
e-mail:

Mr Swapan
Highways Agency
Piccadilly Gate
Store Street
Manchester
M1 2WD

Your Ref:

Our Ref: TR010002

Date: 12 September 2013

Dear Mr Swapan

Rule 17 of the Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

Application by the Highways Agency for an Order Granting Development Consent for the A556 Knutsford to Bowdon Scheme located between Junction 19 of the M6 and Junction 7 of the M56 to the south of Manchester

Request for additional Background Information

I was grateful for your compliance with my procedural request under section 89(3) of the PA2008 for supply of a number of additional documents by 27 August 2013. In the light of the content of these documents, the application documents and representations received, please if supply the following additional documents **no later than 4 October 2013**:

1. a copy of the Hs2 Report on Options for Phase two of the high speed rail network dated 29 March 2012;
2. a copy of the report of the Inspector who conducted an Inquiry in August 1993 and of the Secretary of State's decision letter of June 1996 publishing the Orders for the A556(M);
3. a copy of the Ministerial or Departmental instruction of July 1998 suspending action on this scheme;
4. a copy of the Ministerial or Departmental instruction following the publication of the MIDMAN study in March 2002;
5. a Copy of the Secretary of State's decision of April 2003 to reject both the A556(M) and M6 Junction 20 schemes and to commission the A556 Route Management Study (RMS);

6. a copy of any Ministerial or Departmental instruction following the Final Report of the RMS study in February 2005;
7. a composite drawing superimposing the proposed land take of the current DCO scheme on that contained in the A556(M) Orders to demonstrate the difference in land take referred to in paragraph 6.3.16 of the Consultation Report;
8. details of any "minor" safety or other traffic management improvements that have been designed or devised but not implemented along the relevant section of the existing A556;
9. a schedule providing a sequence of traffic flow counts along the relevant section(s) of the A556 covering the period at least from 2000 onwards to the present time and also a similar sequence for other relevant links in the highway network in the vicinity of the DCO scheme. The points or links to which the figures relate should be clearly identifiable.
10. a copy of the Government statement of 2 August 2013 "Transport an Engine for Growth";
11. the listing entries for Moss Cottage; Over Tabley Hall; Over Tabley Farm Buildings; church of St Paul Over Tabley and the Langford Brooks Monument; Mere Old Hall and Mere Old Hall kitchen garden; and Denfield Cottage, Back Lane, Millington;
12. supply of the letter from the Met Office to the Planning Inspectorate dated 20 August as this was not appended to your response 11 to the s89(3) Annex F requests, although stated to have been;
13. notwithstanding the response at item 6 to s89(3) Annex F requests, provision of an up to date Webtag Economic Appraisal with BCR figures for the DCO Scheme and the Junction 20 alternative scheme canvassed in representations and evaluated in the Consultation report;
14. an Economic Impact assessment Report unless such is being provided by Cheshire East Council as part of their Local Impact Report.

Yours Sincerely

Peter Robottom

Examining Authority

Advice may be given about applying for an order granting development consent or making representations about an application (or a proposed application). This communication does not however constitute legal advice upon which you can rely and you should obtain your own legal advice and professional advice as required.

A record of the advice which is provided will be recorded on the Planning Inspectorate website together with the name of the person or organisation who asked for the advice. The privacy of any other personal information will be protected in accordance with our Information Charter which you should view before sending information to the Planning Inspectorate.