

**Save Swallow's Wood
& Alternative Proposals on Transport**

**A57/A628 Mottram-Tintwistle Bypass and
A628/A616 Route Restraint Measures**

Proof of Evidence: Volume 2

Presented on behalf of Alternative Proposals on Transport
and Save Swallow's Wood

by

Pat Ellison

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. My name is Pat Ellison representing Alternative Proposals on Transport. I was born at Brookfield and lived for 62 years in Hollingworth since when I have lived the other side of the river at Gamesley. My family have lived here since the late 1700s and I have a reasonable fund of local knowledge. I was a professional field archaeologist, gaining my BA (Hons) from York in 1987 after which I spent fifteen years in field archaeology much of it in England, often in advance of road schemes or pipelines. I also spent much of one year in Saxony as grabenstechnischer locating prehistoric gravefields and DMVs (deserted mediaeval villages) and devising sampling strategies in advance of major quarrying work in the brown coal area. Apart from minor archaeological questions I am here as an amateur whose local knowledge may be useful in putting our case.

1.2. Alternative Proposals on Transport is a local group formed as a result of a small (about 60 people) public meeting organised in Hollingworth fourteen years ago. The majority of attendees were opposed to the scheme mainly because of the route and the damage it would cause. Thirty people signed up that night but within a year we had 117 local supporters, all of whom gave a small contribution to support the group, plus 71 from elsewhere in Tameside and 17 from outside the area. (A list can be provided to the Inspector alone if required). After the Bypass was put back in the programme our numbers were augmented by contributors joining at local events and who signed various petitions to the Ministers of Transport.

2. SUMMARY

- 2.1. The bypass is a bad solution to a local problem and the only solution that has ever been offered to us. Almost two thirds of our traffic continues on the A57 towards Glossop and Hadfield and is mainly commuter traffic; this is not addressed by the bypass proposal. This bypass is therefore a bad solution unless its real purpose is not to address the traffic problem and quality of life in the villages as frequently stated but in reality to facilitate east/west long distance traffic as a rat-run to the M1 or even as a further stretch of the M67 which was originally designated as a Motorway Bypass. Is the Longdendale Bypass merely another bit of this and what will its designation be as a road? The claim that, “the Bypass has now been designated a Long Distance Strategic Route” is at odds with the scheme objective, to relieve the villages of Mottram and Hollingworth from congestion¹.
- 2.2. The bypass proposal is inappropriate because slashing alternatives to the car has created much of the perceived ‘need’. Local bus services have been pared to the bone, making car use the only option for local residents. Public transport – i.e., buses into Hollingworth, express buses for rush hours, or even a Quality Bus Corridor – have been withheld despite Tameside being a member of GMPTE. A trial HGV ban to lessen the lorry nuisance through the villages has been refused. Rail freight through a reopened Woodhead line has received little support from Local Authorities. In short, the villages have had public transport withheld from them and even remedial measures such as traffic lights which ‘talk to each other’ to manage the traffic have not been tried and is at odds with the UPD objective that, “...*this approach accepts that new road*

¹ Report of an Inquiry into the Revised Draft Replacement, Tameside UDP Oct/Nov 2002, Conclusion §6.2.5

*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 scheme 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.”*² For these reasons I contend that the Bypass is a bad solution to a local problem.

- 2.3. The bypass is a bad solution as it purports to be in response to local demand with the figure 94% support quoted to bolster this statement. This overwhelming local support does not in fact exist, as the results of our survey demonstrate³. The Bypass is actually the desire of Councils rather than of residents. As far back as 1993 when local residents were ‘consulted’ on the route (having been given a choice of only two bad routes within the valley the support they claimed was actually lacking.) The H.A had a three day exhibition in Hollingworth which 1,600 people attended. Leaflets were available and taken. In addition 4800 leaflets were delivered to local households, and 234 individual letters distributed to households immediately affected, plus many more leaflets were made available at post offices, libraries and council offices locally and from all this effort less than one third produced a response and this total does not include those who took questionnaires from Post Offices, Libraries and Council Offices presumably with an intent to reply, nor the 1600 people who collected questionnaires at the three day exhibition.
- 2.4. Of this, at its largest estimate, 94% of less than one third of households supported a bypass. Were the other over two thirds of households deemed to

² Report of an Inquiry into the Revised Draft Replacement, Tameside UDP Oct/Nov 2002, Conclusion §6.2.6

³ Appendix D, Tintwistle Survey, 508-APP-4

have supported it by default? Or could it be that two thirds of the households did not want a bypass?

3. LANDSCAPE & LOCAL HERITAGE

3.1. We consider that the present line of the proposed bypass on the north side of our valley would lead to the devastation of this hillside and the character of the valley would be totally altered. The north side of our valley is at present a string of farms. Whilst it may not compare with the rich lands elsewhere, it has provided a livelihood for local farming families for generations and it preserves Longdendale's distinctive character. At present Longdendale, despite how you designate it on land-use maps, is essentially a semi-rural area.

3.2. The building of the bypass will leave a strip of land between it and the villages which will be target for further development turning the Longdendale villages of Hollingworth and Mottram into one sprawling suburb edging a motorway. Recent developments around the M67 roundabout are merely a forerunner of what we foresee being visited on our valley along the route of the bypass.

3.3. At the Public Inquiry into Tameside's Draft UDP, APT put in an objection to designation of Longdendale High school as a 'developed area within the green belt'. A further area to the north of the A57 between M67 roundabout and Mottram had originally been included as a site to be removed from the Green Belt for housing and industrial development as also had land beside Woolley Lane, Hollingworth but these were withdrawn from the Draft Unitary Plan before Public Inquiry together with two copy sheets from Draft Unitary Plan. An even earlier plan had intended to use land between Manor Farm, Market St. Hollingworth and Green Lane/Throstle Nest, Hollingworth as housing development land. (overleaf) Bearing in mind the vast amount of

development during Tameside's stewardship of the area we do not consider our fears to be unfounded.

3.4. The route is badly chosen on many grounds which can be summarised as:-

Destruction of the area's semi-rural character

Severance of the community from its hinterland and natural leisure resources.

Destruction of the site of an ancient traditional event – Mottram

Agricultural Show – for which no equivalent venue exists despite several years of negotiations.

Disregard of the nature of the valley especially land above the line of the bypass i.e. it has many springs and is prone to flooding and landslips.

It will cause major disruption to Swallow's Wood, a designated Nature Reserve, and to its surroundings.

It will destroy or damage an area of National Park, which is everyone's heritage to enjoy.

The bypass will disgorge its increased traffic on to an unsuitable road, the A628 (accidents, landslips, high winds, snow.

Putting increased traffic on to the A628 will greatly increase the chances of a major pollution hazard to the Longdendale Reservoirs alongside and below it.

- 3.5. The Longdendale valley is essentially semi-rural in that it comprises four villages and their hinterland. Broadbottom to south is irrelevant to this Inquiry. Mottram is an old hilltop village comprising a settlement pattern around the church with some ribbon development along the roads that are above and outside the valley. This village has lost much of its old character despite its 'Conservation Area' due mainly to the large 1960s Manchester overspill estate of Hattersley but as all of this is outside the Longdendale Valley does not affect my contention that Longdendale is essentially a semi-rural area.
- 3.6. The village of Hollingworth was, within the last fifty years, an old style linear village built along Market Street and Woolley Lane, surrounded by and including farms and farmland. Fields Farm was acquired in the late 1940s to

build the Fields Estate and at that time Holly Grove farm was also still operational. In the 1970s and 1980s Nettle Hall and Vale Farms , Coach Road and Mottram Moor Farm were being worked. Now, although the village has been considerably enlarged since Tameside had stewardship of it, it still has one working farm fronting the main road at Manor Farm and another, Meadowbank, on Green Lane whilst Woolley Farm, off Woolley Lane has only recently ceased farming and its land is still being farmed by Carr House Farm.

3.7. Almost immediately outside the village we still retain Home Farm, Woolley Bridge Road, much of whose land is within Longdendale in the valley bottom, Carr House Farm, off Mottram Moor which now incorporates parts of defunct farms Woolley Farm, Pear Tree Farm, and Mottram Moor Farm; Robin Hood Farm, Lumn Farm, Hardtimes Farm, Landslow Green Farm, Widowscroft Farm, running right along the valley all the way to Townhead at Tintwistle. The last village on this side of Longdendale is Tintwistle, another essentially linear village running along Manchester Road and down New Road towards Hadfield.

3.8. This bypass will irreparably damage our semi-rural valley firstly by its vast land-take not only for the road itself but also for the enormous embankments/cuttings it requires and for the extra land-take for balancing ponds. Whilst it may be correct to categorise the land lost as 'only grazing land or grassland,' I would like to point out that grass is actually a crop, the winter feed on which stock depend and that grazing land is the sustenance for animals producing milk locally. (We still have doorstep delivery in this area and would like it to continue.)

3.9. Severance: I cite Coach Road, Spring Street leading to The Lumn, Cow Lane, Arnfield Lane, Crossgate Lane with the path leading to Swallows Wood, all of which will be crossed by the bypass and which will suffer various 'rationalisations,' which make access to our traditional places of leisure – the moors east of Arnfield, Swallow's Wood, Hollingworth Hall moorland less attractive or longer.

Mottram Show

3.10. Mottram Show is part of our heritage as a farming community and continues in popularity and in support even though some of our farms have vanished. It is a major event with exhibitors travelling from a very wide geographical area that encompasses Derbyshire, Cheshire, Staffordshire, Yorkshire, Lancashire and even Cumbria.

3.11. James Hunter, archaeologist, states in his Proof⁴ that, "*The area which is noted as recreational... is of NEGLIGIBLE importance. Although the magnitude of the change to Mottram Showground would be Major Negative the change would be to a site which has moved over the years and cannot be considered to have any time-depth. The significance of the impact would therefore be neutral.*"

3.12. Whilst I realise that this is an archaeological conclusion it is inaccurate. The site of the show has not 'moved over the years' as if it were some peripatetic Brigadoon. The site of the show has moved only once and not of its own desire. The building of the Hattersley overspill estate by Manchester Corporation alongside Hyde Road and the Longdendale Recreation Centre built as an amenity for them wiped out the old site (painted by Mr. Lowry). The present

⁴ Paragraph 7.2.7

site was finally found and the Show moved to its present location.

(photographs overleaf)

3.13. I wish to appear as my own witness to show what Mottram Show means to a
local person.

3.14. We feel that the nature of the valley especially land above the line of the bypass has been disregarded. We have grave concerns about the impact the building of a bypass will have on the local environment especially with its being prone to landslips. The whole of the north side of the valley and much of the south side of the Longdendale valley is landslide country with both historic and modern instances recorded.

Landslides

3.15. Above Old Hall Lane in Mottram is the historic Hague Slip, which caused problems when the Old Hall estate was built. A little north west of this is Deep Cutting on Stalybridge Road. This was cut through solid rock in 1826 by the Saltersbrook Turnpike Trust. In the 1930's it had a severe landslide (photo unknown provenance overleaf) as a result of which a retaining wall was built. This was renewed in the 1990's and strengthened. Work has recently been going on there with men checking the sensors, which were installed in 1990s.

3.16. There is at present a small active landslip at Thorncliffe Farm, as noted in the Highways Agency's environmental statement⁵: *'a small active landslip is present just south of the bypass route at Thorncliffe Farm where the pressure of farm waste on the slope crest has apparently mobilised the underlying soils on the side of Thorncliffe Valley'*. If this small landslip is already present, what effect will the weight of the bypass up-slope from it have? How many further 'small landslips' will be precipitated by pressure from the bypass?

3.17. In 2001, a landslip affected Saltersbrook bridge on the A628 and caused it to be safe only for single lane traffic for a period of several months whilst Scott Wilson (Engineers) dealt with it.

⁵ Env. Statement 6.4.39.iv

- 3.18. In 2002, *'A landslide halted trains on the Glossop to Hadfield line late on Monday afternoon bringing misery to commuters. Days of heavy rain resulted in part of an embankment coming down in Hadfield. North Western Trains provided buses between Glossop and Hadfield station while Railtrack cleared the line'*.⁶
- 3.19. In 2004, a landslip occurred on the Holmfirth road just above the A628 junction.
- 3.20. In 2005, a severe landslip to the south of the A628 (photographs overleaf) put the Longdendale Trail out of action.
- 3.21. Previous serious landslides occurred in the 1840's during the construction of the Longdendale Reservoirs (immediately next to A628 road) and resulted in considerable delays in their construction. One of these *'carried the hut village of New Yarmouth, where the navvies lived, a distance downhill'*. Bateman (1884)⁷ recorded that *"the largest earthflow in the Tintwistle Knarr slide was re-activated during reservoir construction work in 1852"* and that *"movements in the flow extended from the reservoir edge up the slope some 545m to a height of 245m O.D. The thickness of the flow was observed to be 5.5m"* and this has apparently been confirmed by boreholes drilled for the North Western Road Construction Unit. If the Tintwistle Knarr slide could be re-activated what guarantee is there that other slides will now be so reactivated by the Bypass construction work?
- 3.22. The Highways Agency Geological Report shows two faults running on the north side of the valley. The major one runs approximately north/south, the lesser fault intersecting it east west. The presence of these together with the history of landslides/landslips throughout the area seems to show that this valley is not suitable territory for a bypass without putting the inhabitants and their property at risk. One section of the bypass runs across the hillside,

⁶ Report from Glossop Chronicle Feb. 28th 2002

⁷ Bateman, J.F.L., (1884), *A History and Description of the Manchester Waterworks*, Manchester

upslope of Longdendale school, less than two fields away. According to the farmer whose land it once was and whose family had farmed it for several generations, the playing field between the school and the proposed bypass had 32 springs in it. The playing field was unusable due to water for several years after the school was built. One cause of landslips is water action on underlying geology. We do not want an Aberfan in Longdendale once the weight of the bypass on its embankment destabilises the hillside. (Section of local map showing 'rises' overleaf.)

3.23. Another consideration when putting increased traffic on the A628 is the increased risk of landslides/landslips. There have been several landslips in the area since 2001, one of which limited this road to single lane traffic for months. See Section 3.4 and list of local landslides and photographs.

3.24. One of the causes of landslides is water acting on underlying geology. The previous incidents in the region of the A628 show that the underlying geology is imperfect and global warming forecasts predict much more rain for this region, as stated in the Draft Regional Planning Guidance for the North-West⁸, which predicts "more winter rainfall, higher wind speeds".

3.25. Also, as demonstrated by the 'small active landslide' at Thorncliffe where '*pressure of farm waste has mobilised the underlying soils*'⁹. Increased pressure can increase likelihood of landslides - and lorries are getting much bigger and heavier.

Flooding

3.26. A further problem is that of flooding. This may seem a red herring, but Old Hall Lane in Mottram has been subject to severe flooding incidents. At 4 Old

⁸ RPG 13. Public Consultation Document. p. 79, Ch.8. 8.2

Hall Lane, between 1997 and 2005 there were 22 days of flooding which resulted in resident losing contents of ground floors and having to be pumped out by the Fire Brigade. They were caused by water coming down Old Hall Lane and turning it into a 'raging river'. Tameside MBC dug out channel of old river/stream in woods that used to take away water. This flooding is not yet cured and is at present being investigated by United Utilities, and is designated as DG5 flood property. I hope to produce Mrs. Croft as witness to this her time and circumstances allowing. Photographs overleaf and letters pertaining to this are in the Appendix to this document.

3.27. Further problems have been caused by the small boreholes drilled to investigate water table. One of these in Tollemache Close behind 4 Old Hall Lane, did hit subsurface water and the water released underground hit No 4 with such force it caused structural damage (photograph overleaf)

Swallow's Wood

3.28. This bypass runs straight across Swallow's Wood, a designated Nature Reserve and leisure resource not only for the immediate area and villages but for people from much further afield. We meet groups or families from all around Manchester enjoying the walk, drinking in the countryside and enjoying every minute of their day out. Bird watchers from all the towns in Tameside gravitate there. Swallows Wood is a much valued and much used Nature Reserve which encompasses within its small space a wide and varied range of habitats and associated ecosystems as shown by the later *Ecology and Nature Conservation Technical Report, Part 1: Plants and Habitats Phase II Habitat Survey and Assessment* enlarges on the above as follows:

⁹ H.A. Proofs: Environment Statement 6.4.39.iv

- 3.29. *"This site includes those areas of Swallows Wood and Hollingworth Hall wood within the route corridor...habitats at present include broadleaved woodland and plantation, dense scrub, unimproved and semi improved grassland, marshy grassland and aquatic habitats."* This is a good spread of habitats to have within one ¹⁰ smallish area and is one reason why we value this space so highly. (photos after p.17)
- 3.30. In Chapter 5: *"Site 8 Swallows Wood: is assigned a Medium to Lower-medium value."*
- 3.31. As a lover of the area I would dispute this in a local evaluation and wonder whether there is another such habitat-rich site within either Tameside or Glossopdale. The ecology assessment acknowledges¹¹: *"This is a large area of ecological interest extending beyond the confines of the survey corridor. There are no statutory designations attached to this site but most of the site had a non-statutory designation."* Furthermore, *"The very small area identified as unimproved neutral grassland is very species rich and is an example of a NVC community type that has become rare due to agricultural improvement of hay meadows. The importance of this community would be increased if it was possible to identify it definitely as old grassland (and hence not readily re-creatable)."*

Fungi and Wildlife

- 3.32. *"Swallow's Wood and surrounds had an assemblage of a large number of common species with 36 species recorded in 2001 and a further 4 in 2005."*¹² Swallows Wood and its immediate surrounds are a valuable local resource as regards fungi. Several edible species grow here and are highly valued by those of us who collect a proportion of them. The main desirables, such as parasols, penny bun and chicken of the woods but also lesser items such as amethyst deceiver, Jews'

¹⁰ Ecology and Nature Conservation Technical Report, Part 1 Plants and Habitats

¹¹ Ibid. §4.9.1

¹² Ibid.

ears and velvet shanks are not widespread locally. How do you easily recreate over a century's worth of habitat in the wake of your destruction.

3.33. We have no criticism of the expertise with which this evaluation was carried out. We cannot easily criticise the conclusions and mitigation strategies. What we do dispute is the decision to use Swallow's Wood as part of the route at all and suspect that this is done because as merely a Derbyshire Wildlife Site (DWS) and Site of Biological Importance SBI this is a non-statutory site with no legal protection at all and therefore easy to bulldoze through. S.M. Lowther's own Report commissioned by the Highways Agency presents the results of their surveys honestly and 'puts the best face' on the resulting mitigation strategies, stating: *"The Bypass passes through this area by means of a viaduct which spans the valley. WHEN COMPARED TO THE EFFECTS OF INFILLING THE VALLEY AND DESIGNING THE ROAD ON AN EMBANKMENT, THE PROPOSED DESIGN REDUCES THE LAND TAKE SIGNIFICANTLY AND REDUCES THE EFFECT OF SEVERANCE OF HABITATS."*¹³

3.34. All we have to add to that is that when compared to the effects of leaving Swallow's Wood alone a bypass on top of a viaduct is disastrous. Who wants to spend their leisure hours walking around an earthwork and under a viaduct? The Reserve is an area of peace and tranquillity where we can go to recharge our batteries, forget our worries and stress, take gentle exercise for our hearts and muscles, learn about nature in many of its forms, listen to the birdsong and even watch the ducks and coots on the pond and the dragonflies over it. With a bypass on two sides and above our heads the very idea of peace and tranquillity is destroyed. Traffic on bypasses and viaducts can be heard for

¹³ Environmental Statement, §3.2.3.11

miles and is very intrusive. Add to that the road dust gently filtering down for us to breathe, the litter abandoned to the air by those who care nothing for the landscape gently accumulating under the viaduct and the general appearance of the enormous concrete legs that usually support viaducts what have we left of value as a local resource?

I wish to produce Mr. Bill Beckwith, a retired gentleman who lives in Greater Manchester, to say what Swallow's Wood means to him and the part it plays in his life.

Suitability of the A628

- 3.35. A further problem, which has not been mentioned when considering the route and especially the proposed viaduct over Swallow's Wood, is the susceptibility of the Longdendale Valley to damage from high winds/gales. Winds funnel down the valley increasing speed as they go and increase with height.
- 3.36. I cite my own direct experience of this when slates blew off my roof during a local gale. I lived in Moorfield Terrace, Hollingworth, which is lower down the valley than Swallows Wood. The Insurance Company refused to pay on the grounds that their wind monitoring station said it was not a sufficient force to do the damage. When asked for their monitoring station they said Ringway Airport. I asked them to go back to Ringway and tell them exactly where I lived because Ringway is on a flat plain. They were then told that winds in Longdendale were at least 10mph higher than at Ringway and I was paid.

Already this year we have had two serious gales causing widespread damage locally.

Impact on the National Park

3.37. It will destroy or damage an area of National Park that is everyone's heritage.

I merely mention this as an objection but do not intend to defend it as I understand that Friends of the Peak Park are doing this and I wholeheartedly support them in their efforts.

3.38. The bypass will disgorge its increased traffic on to an unsuitable road. The A628 is totally unsuitable to any increase in traffic. Although it is 'theoretically' capable of supporting its present loading the nature of the road mitigates against any increase (personal communication from John Reed, former senior traffic control engineer East Midlands). It is one of the most dangerous roads in the country (European Road Assessment Programme Results May 2006 says 11th in the Consistently Higher Risk Roads Table) with accidents an almost weekly reality. (Photo overleaf). It is narrow, twisting and looks like a country road where you can 'put your foot down'. (photos overleaf) It also has more than its share of HGVs, many of them Hull-Liverpool traffic, avoiding the M62.

3.39. Closures due to weather: A further consideration when putting bypass traffic on to the A628 is that it is regularly closed due to snow or high winds, hence the 'Woodhead Closed' signs at the Gun. (This is excluding closure due to accidents). This is a high and exposed route for much of its length and thus extreme weather has a worse effect on it than on a more sheltered road. As someone who has lived here for 69 years my winters were always punctuated with tales of Woodhead blocked by snow and travellers seeking refuge in the George & Dragon Pub packed like sardines and sleeping on billiard tables.

Alas the George & Dragon was demolished as being in the water catchment area but last year the mantle was assumed by Sean Wood at Bleak House who allowed stranded motorists to use his facilities and made them drinks. (Lists of gales/snow reported incidents in Appendix.)

- 3.40. Unsuitable traffic on other local roads: All Bypasses attract increased traffic and on this route HGVs will be a major part of these attracted vehicles. Many of them will be foreign and reliant of SATNAV and will inevitably end up on other local unsuitable roads as did the two examples witnessed on 30th and 31st May this year.

30 May 2007 A P & O container lorry was stuck on Chunal looking for the way to Woodhead.

31 May 2007 A 40-ton lorry, very slow, very wide, (tradeplate N.Lincs, Scunthorpe) on A628 going towards Tintwistle. He turned off left at Bleak House . When at Devil's Elbow a D.C.C. van was rebuilding a wall and he had to ask them to move their stone lorry and their lights and help him back and fill. He went into Glossop and up Chunal from there.

- 3.41. We already have problems with lost heavy lorries throughout the area and this bypass will increase the problem especially when the A628 is blocked by accidents.

Increased Risk of Pollution Hazards

- 3.42. Putting increased traffic on the A628 will greatly increase the likelihood of a major pollution hazard to the Longdendale reservoirs alongside and below it. Over the last fifty years life in Longdendale has been occasionally enlivened by vehicles leaving the A628 and landing in the reservoir, fortunately with minimal damage to occupants. This has been an ever-present threat to the

water supply. The latest lorry was, fortunately, only carrying newsprint which was duly hauled out in bundles by the local sub-aqua club.(2005) Other accidents have been more serious involving dangerous chemicals, diesel/petrol and most seriously milk. In H.A. ES Vol.2a 2nd revision –Section 7 Water Quality and Drainage: 7.4.75 “ ...extended study area, the Longdendale Valley impounding reservoirs are run by United Utilities and used to supply drinking water to the City of Manchester as a local supply and form part of the regional network supply.” establishing their importance. In para. 7.5.17: “The most potentially damaging impact arising from the increase in traffic flows along the bypass would be an accidental spillage, resulting in large-scale uncontrolled releases of potential pollutants” but this does not take into account the same type of spillage on the A628 leading off the bypass. Also para. 7.5.17 “ ...the acceptable probability of accidental spillage specified by guidance is less than 1% in 100 years. The probability of a serious spillage incident on the existing A57/A628 road has been ESTIMATED and used for comparison purposes with the bypass...” The probability of a serious spillage incident on the existing A628 road does not need to be ESTIMATED. The facts are readily available and the blithe 1% figure does not present a readily assimilated picture as, for example, 15 a year might do. In fact the whole case for HA and Tameside is bedevilled by percentages rather than actual figures. Information about accidents is provided as Appendix C.¹⁴ (photos of two incidents overleaf)

¹⁴ 508-APP-3

4. ARCHAEOLOGY

4.1. I would first like to make it clear that I am not questioning the skill or professional competence of those who undertook this work. This was not a research investigation so the brief was correspondingly limited, with the understood guarantee that any unexpected archaeological remains would be dealt with at time of construction. From that point of view those undertaking the work have 'ticked all the boxes' in the appropriate manner. However I do question the base information on which the surveys relied. From this point of view it was an inadequate archaeological investigation of an old landscape. It seems to have been based on only partial information of the area relying extensively on SMR/NMR records and Air Photos both of which sources can be misleading. SMRs have historically been compiled on a 'bung it all in' basis without any rigorous checks to avoid duplication, misinformation or misidentification of sites (for example Woolley Farm is consistently confused with Woolley Mill Farm two or three miles away): SMRs are only a record of what is known and what has been reported, and in an area where archaeological activity and archaeologists have been largely absent for the last hundred years there are wide gaps in knowledge.

- 4.2. The fact that Longdendale and Glossopdale have a long history of use/occupation/settlement outside the line of the bypass; and the sweep of ridge and furrow north of the bypass route, running from Hadfield and Tintwistle, above Hollingworth and to Harrop Edge and alongside Grange Farm at the M67 roundabout leaves cause for concern when we are told in effect that nothing of note happened here. Longdendale was important throughout history. In the 1400's Hollingworth Hall belonged to the Lovells, by 1600's it was Reginald Bretland, Sergeant at Law, his marble effigy in Mottram Church. In the 1700s servants at the Hall were accused of witchcraft. During the English Civil War Col. Dukinfield descended with his troopers on all the local yeomen, Bottoms Hall, Hollingworth Hall, Higher Hall (Mottram Old Hall), Widowscroft, Woolley, The Banke demanding money and remounts, but apparently, like Ozymandias, 'nothing remains'. We don't even have a 'shattered visage' in the sand!
- 4.3. Almost the entire valley was farmed up until last century including those of Middle, Higher and Lower Bank, North Britain and Crowden most of which were demolished in the 1930s or 1940s as being in the water catchment area.
- 4.4. It proved difficult to obtain any of the earlier 'investigations' or 'geophysics surveys' on which the base information was founded which made it difficult competently to assess the later processes until now. Two quibbles I have and would request an explanation for: -why the trench to gain information about possible prehistoric presence was sited 300m away from where the artefact giving rise to it was found, and why the trench north of Mottram Moor looking for putative Roman Road was sited on known made ground. (This area was considerably built up after Deep Cutting was made in order to fill in a deep dip

in the road and make it easier for carts to use it and this information should have been available to the archaeologists)

- 4.5. There was barely a mention within James Hunter's Proof of the industrial archaeology still remaining within Swallows Wood. This seems to be an oversight considering that they are part of the Longdendale Reservoir development which began in the 1840s and was at that time the largest scheme of its kind in England and the world. The only acknowledgement of its presence was §7.4.51: *'Site 279 is a culvert which would be crossed and buried by the bypass. The asset is of low importance.'* As the Longdendale Reservoirs in their entirety were, as stated, the earliest in England and are closely associated with the three Woodhead Tunnels which are fairly significant in railway history, plus the Woodhead chapel and associated churchyard with navvies graves, the group together should merit consideration as a site of importance and thus the culvert mentioned should not be evaluated as a free-standing feature but as part of the whole - the remains in Swallows Wood and at Arnfield date from 1850.

5. REFERENCES

Reference for Section 2

para 2.1: Copy of cover of previous local bypass - namely Denton-Hyde Bypass Motorway M67 (see insert over page)

para 2.1: Extracts from letter from H.A. ref: 65/18/285 27th October 2006 in response to my objection that "The bypass is not an appropriate solution to the traffic problem".

Para 1: *"The Scheme is being promoted to address the current problems within Mottram, Hollingworth and Tintwistle, rather than for the provision of greater capacity on the A57T, A628T, A616T."*

Para 3: *“As such the Scheme’s objective is to move traffic outside these villages, rather than further afield. The traffic forecasts record that a high proportion of vehicles, and especially HGVs, would transfer to the bypass”*

para 2.2: Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions:
Sustainability Appraisal of the Secretary of State’s Proposed Changes to Draft Regional Planning Guidance for the East Midlands. Appraisal Report: February 2001. Entec U.K. Ltd. Policy 85: Trans European Networks: *“This policy is potentially incompatible with a number of sustainable development objectives..... The incompatibilities arise largely because of the focus on roads rather than on transport alternatives such as rail. There is also no reference to the TENS being subject to any environmental or sustainable development criteria”*

para 2.2: Government Office for the North West. Panel Report on the Public Examination into People, Places & Prosperity, Draft RPG. 2001 9.62 A57/A628 (T) Mottram Hollingworth and Tintwistle bypass.

§9.62 *“.....We also noted that the Panel for the Yorkshire and Humber RPG concluded that it would not be appropriate to support any of the A628 proposals in advance of full appraisal”*

§9.67 *“.....East Lancashire Partnership think that the scheme could be replaced by car carrying and lorry carrying shuttles on a restored Woodhead railway route”*

Draft Regional Planning Guidance for Yorkshire and the Humber (RPG12) incorporating Secretary of State’s proposed changes. March 2001. Public Consultation

Policies for the Transport System: §7.24 *“ The reopening of a number of disused rail lines is currently being investigated, for example the reopening of the Woodhead route between Manchester and Sheffield as part of Central Railways proposals The protection of areas of railway land that may be of use for the enhancement of services on existing routes May also be*

important for the development of a sustainable transport system for both passengers and freight”

§7.25 Whilst road freight movement will continue, it is vital to place greater emphasis for freight movements on the use of railImproved road and rail connections and intermodal facilities will facilitate this change of emphasis.

Freight Transport: §7.54 “Consideration should be given to the potential use of Freight Facilities Grants and Track Access Grants to help businesses switch freight transport from road to rail.”

Resources: Rail: Category C (90% utilisation predicted by 2011.

§7.100 “The Strategic Rail Authority Railtrack and the rail freight industry are working closely to assess the costs and benefits of a variety of options to increase loading gauges (the maximum height, length and width of a freight vehicle that can travel on the network.)In addition to provide sufficient capacity for forecast freight growth on the South Trans-Pennine Route north and east of Sheffield infrastructure improvement would also be required. Central Railways are considering the development of a new rail freight route between north-west England and the Channel Tunnel which would involve the reopening of the Woodhead Tunnel north of Sheffield.”

Para 2.2: House of Commons : Environmental Audit Committee: Reducing Carbon Emissions from Transport: Ninth Report of session 2005-06: Volume 1.

Section: Land Use Planning and Road building: 90: "Allowing regions the freedom to nominate projects for funding seems mainly to have resulted in a very high proportion of bids for road projects..."

Para 2.2: House of Commons: Environmental Audit Committee: Transport Emissions: Government Response to the Committee's Ninth Report of Session 2005-06 on Reducing Carbon Emissions from Transport. Twelfth Report of Session 2005-2006. Section : Transport Emissions.

Para 4."while the Government Response can justifiably point to many measures which the Department is taking, it remains our opinion that these still do not add up to a commensurate response to the threat of dangerous climate change given the transport sector's contribution to it..... the sense of entitlement owing to transport as a special case, which leaves us wondering whether the Department truly appreciates the magnitude of this issue"

Para 6. "The Department does notreport transport's unique position as the only sector of the economy with consistently rising emissions since 1990"

Conclusions and Recommendations: Recommendation 1: "Transport has an especially important role to play in responding to the challenge of averting dangerous climate change. "in particular transport will be critical to our long-term goal of reducing carbon emissions" Encouraging a move towards more environmentally friendly means of transport."

Recommendation 34: We were unimpressed by the Secretary of State's defence of the Government's record on road building. Estimates of CO2 emissions arising from road kproposals should be subject to independent

audit. Furthermore, given that, by its own admission, MORE ROAD SPACE LEADS TO MORE TRAFFIC AND EMISSIONS, the Department should deliberately apply more stringent criteria to appraisals of proposals for the construction of new roads relative to lower carbon alternatives....”

para 2.2: Government Office North West: Sustainability Appraisal of the Proposed Changes to Draft Regional Planning Guidance for the North West. Final Report: June 2002. (Baker Associates)

Section:

- Transport System: Appraisal Objective - To reduce all forms of air pollution ...
- Brief Commentary on Performance: “Long term potential to decrease air pollution from road freight..... port-related traffic is largely road based which has adverse implications for localised air quality. Where it is possible, to achieve the desire to improve rail links to ports...”
- Section: High and sustainable levels of economic growth:
- Appraisal Objective: To promote increased choice of transport by investing in rail freight infrastructure.”

Para 2.2.: South East Manchester Multi-Modal Study. Final Report.

September 2001. (Steer Davies Gleave Llewellyn-Davies : WS/Atkins:

Section: Freight p.88.

Para. 6.52 “From a strategic point of view: “The principle opportunity is the reopening of the Woodhead line to traffic”

Page 6.53 “Although national or regional schemes such as piggyback rail services to the Continent from a North West railhead, or a transpennine link

from Manchester to the Midland Mainline, could serve the interests of the study area by diverting through traffic ...”

Para 2.2: The Revised Draft Replacement U.D.P. Public Inquiry, October 2002:

- Copy of APTs objection attached over page.
- Council PROOF: Para 3.2. “The Government’s transport 2010 – the 10 year Plan was published in 2000. The Plan has an objective of an 8% increase in the volume of rail freight by 2010...”

Para 3.9: There are a number of disused and/or dismantled railway lines within the Borough. A balanced view has to be taken about the realistic potential for the reopening of a former rail line and the benefits that may be brought about by the re-use of the land for other purposes. ... 3 disused rail lines in the Borough. The alignment of the former Apethorn Godley line has been reclaimed and laid out as an informal linear space incorporating a footpath, bridleway and cycleway. However, the potential reuse, for rail purposes, of a former rail line is recognised in Policy T9 (2) which seeks to protect the alignment of the former Crowthorne Cure rail route...”

Para 3.10: The Council has resolved to support in principle Central Railway’s proposal for a new freight route ...which would pass through the Borough, connecting Manchester with Sheffield via a reopened Woodhead tunnel. This is potentially of major importance for rail freight transport in the north west...”

para 2.2: Copies of two letters of opposition from Godley private housing estate which influenced the Council (over page). See Apethorne/Godley Rail Link Facts paras 1, 2, 4 – 6. The Council vetoed reopening this disused

track and thus damaged case for reopening Woodhead. The land around Godley was being considered as one option for an exchange point as it was near M67 (personal communication).

para 2.2: Op Cit: Document C270-190:

Council's Proof: para 3.5. "A bus strategy has been developed by GMPTA in association with District Councils... The strategy aims to deliver an effective, affordable, high quality bus network ... The bus strategy MAY therefore provide an opportunity to seek improvements to bus services in the Longdendale Area"

Para: 3.7 "...Ashton to Stalybridge and Denton to Hyde are included within the Quality Bus Corridor programme 2005-2006 but ... Proposals do not extend to Longdendale. The Highway's Agency proposal for the Mottram to Tintwistle Bypass together with the Council's proposal for the Glossop Spur will if implemented provide relief of through traffic for the villages."

Para 3.8., Rail services operate between Hadfield/Glossop and Manchester Piccadilly ..."

Para 4.1. "...Specific public transport policies for the Longdendale area are not included. The development of any such proposals are dependent on the outcome of further work on the Highways Agency's Mottram to Tintwistle Bypass and the Council's Glossop Spur proposals..."

Para 2.2: Article from Railwatch - No 76. July 1998: Parcels go by piggyback. (see over page)

Para 2.2: Webpage eddiestobart.co.uk/News/2006 (see over page)

Para 2.2: Copy of letter from Central Railway 1998 (see over page)

Para 2.2: Copy of letter from GMPTE 2002 regarding Quality Bus Corridors.

Para 2.3: (Statement from resident to show that the survey conducted by Siege discounted all whose response to their first question 'Do you support the Bypass' was 'No' thereby nullifying the entire survey, MVA survey form which was presented with the caveat 'all these must be carried out together'. In addition 91 letters were received of which only 9 supported the brown route and a 58 opposed a bypass which is a far cry from 94% support.

Para 2.3. MVA survey results - Conclusions - 39% strongly agreed with a bypass. Over 90% agreed with the reopening of Woodhead for freight.

Para 2.3. Cutting from newspaper re Tintwistle's petition (see over page).

Para 2.3 (A further cause for complaint on this survey as support for the Bypass is the survey areas. They are not, as one would expect, along the line of the road. They are, with the percentage of whole sample they represent: Oldham 17%, Stockport 8%, Tameside 8%, Macclesfield, Congleton, (Cheshire) 6% Staffordshire Moorlands and East Staffordshire 6%, High Peak 9%, Derbyshire dales and Amber Valley 8%, N.E. Derbyshire and Chesterfield 8%, Sheffield City 12%, Barnsley 7%, Kirklees (W.Yorks) 9% for those surveys where residents are surveyed at home.

WHEN I TELEPHONED MVA TO ASK HOW MANY RESIDENTS WERE SURVEYED IN LONGDENDALE THEY SAID 130 IN THE ENTIRETY OF TAMESIDE AND COULD NOT SAY WHETHER ANY OF THESE WERE ACTUALLY IN MOTTRAM OR HOLLINGWORTH, THE AREAS MOST AFFECTED.

In addition, the survey was also conducted at tourist spots in the High Peak Monsal Head, Teggs Nose, Bakewell Riverside, Buxton Spring Gardens,

Dovedale, Castleton, Holmfirth, Dovestone Reservoir, Chatsworth, Matlock Bath, , Ashbourne, Leek Market Square and Edale near the Pennine Way none of which are particularly near or likely to be affected by a bypass.

References for Section 3

para 3.3: Extract from Revised Draft Replacement Tameside UDP Public Inquiry Oct 2002 C.270-183 (copies enclosed)

para 3.3: Summary of original objection “trunk road scheme is inconsistent with national, regional and local policy. ...Adverse landscape impacts...excuse for further development within Green Belt ...”

para 3.3: Council’s Proof: 4.9. “...neither would infilling e inevitable. Any such development would be judged on its merits...”

para 3.3: Extract op.cit. Ref 270/.188: APT/s objection to OL3 Existing Developed Site within the Green Belt. Copy of original objection from APT.

para 3.3: Copies of E1 and E4 from op. Cit.

para 3.15 – 3.21: See Appendix E: Academic Papers (Landslides)

para 3.15 – 3.21: Photographs of various local landslides

para 3.15 – 3.21: Cutting from Glossop Chronicle Nov 4th 1960 to support contention that embankments in this area are not necessarily stable. This shows that water damage on embankment damaged one of pillars of Hattersley railway bridge.

para 3.15 – 3.21: Bateman J.F.L., (1884) A History and Description of the Manchester Waterworks, Manchester) from which extract quoted in Proof.

para 3.15 – 3.21: Photographs of various local landslides.

para 3.15 – 3.21: Glossop Chronicle – Wood on the Wildside – Personal recollection of 1981: “Not long after I moved into Bleak House (on A628)

there was a downpour which targeted my side of Bleaklow from shining Clough to Torside Edge. Within seconds so much rain fell from the sky that it became impossible to see across the valley..... The valley geography changed. Streams that had been meandering in one direction for hundreds of years were suddenly forced to change direction by boulders. One rock which must have measured at least six feet round cut out yards of fresh clough as I descended at speed past the old paper mill at Crowden before going into the culvert that ran beneath the back road and Woodhead Railway line. Seconds later the culvert burst as tons of water rushed over and under and the road disappeared under a fusillade of water. At Lodge Farm a tractor and some very old farm machinery were transported from the farm to 100 yards below it and three sheep were washed down the hillside to their doom”

para 3.23: List of local landslide incidents (see over page)

para 3.26: Letters pertaining to flooding at Old Hall Lane

para 3.26: List of floods 4 Old Hall Lane Mottram

para 3.27: Letter and photograph regarding damage done by water released when drilling one small borehole at rear of property.

para 3.28: Photographs of range of habitats.

para 3.28: Photographs fungi

para 3.32–3.34: Two lists of flora and fauna noted at Swallows Wood.

para 3.32–3.34: HA/ECO/3/1 S.M.Lowther. Chapter 4. 5.4.

para 3.32–3.34: Op.cit. Habitat Survey – Part One - 1.3.47 ; 1.3.52, 1.3.58, 1.3.62, 1.3.63, 1.3.66, 1.3.67, 1.3.78, 1.3.79. and 4.9.2 –4, 4.9.17 , 4.9.18.

para 3.32 – 3.34: E-mail letter of support from local person, Vivienne Westwood, who grew up here to say how she values the Reserve and the area around.

para 3.38: See Appendix E--List of accident reports taken from Glossop Chronicle and Glossop Advertiser. This is by no means a comprehensive list, merely the cuttings I had saved. This selection of reports is designed to bring home the reality of accidents on this A628 road as bald statistics do not.

List of accidents with length of time each closed the A628 to traffic.

List of accidents where it explicitly states which emergency services were present although police and ambulance are generally present and many others needed the Fire services

IN 2004 during the Fire Station Campaign it was stated that it cost a minimum of £700 for every turnout however small!

para 3.38: Photograph of accident.

para 3.38: List of cuttings from Glossop Chronicle or Glossop Advertiser with details of snow closing Woodhead A628.

List of cuttings recording severe gales in Longdendale and Glossopdale
This also pertains to Swallows Wood where a bridge over the Reserve is planned.

para 3.39: See List of accidents on A628 where weather is mentioned as a cause (see Appendix C)

para 3.39: Picture of snow, damage from heavy rain

para 3.42: See Appendix C for list of cuttings from Glossop Chronicle and Glossop Advertiser with details of accidents on the A628 involving pollution hazards.

para 3.42: Photos of a previous lorry which landed in the reservoir after an accident on the A628 and Chemical Alert article.

References for Section 4

para 4.1-4.5: Photographs of the ridge and furrow which rings the valley some just above line of bypass.

para 4.1-4.5: Picture of Datestones of farmhouses demolished as being in water catchment area in 1930s to 1940s which show that even the area which appears to be 'waste' north and east of the line of bypass were, within memory, farmed.

para 4.1-4.5: Map of Mottram in Longdendale, 1794.