

Appendix 6A: Summary of Consultation and Responses

Consultee	Date Consulted	Response Date	Response Summary
Initial Engagement			
Adlington Parish Council	25 th September 2009	23 rd October 2009	The Council express unanimous support for the scheme.
Bollington Town Council	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response
Bridleways Association (Manchester)	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response
British Geological Society	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response
British Horse Society	25 th September 2009	8 th December 2009	Information will be passed onto the Cheshire and Manchester Committees for consideration.
Cheshire & Wirral Amphibian and Reptile Group	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response
Cheshire & Wirral Ornithological Society	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response
Cheshire Local Access Forum	25 th September 2009	5 th October 2009	The forum wishes to remain consulted on developments relating to PRoW. Adequate provision should be provided to maintain access for Wilmslow public footpath nos. 7, 10 and 119, and Poynton public footpath nos. 3, 21, 31, and 37.
		12 th October 2009	If over / under bridges are not provided as per the previous scheme for all PRoW, the scheme would result in severe severance to local communities.
Cheshire Bat Group	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response
Cheshire East Council	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response
Cheshire Mammal Group	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response
Cheshire RIGS Group	25 th September 2009	14 th October 2009	There are no RIGS in the Cheshire area surrounding the proposed scheme.
Cheshire Wildlife Trust	25 th September 2009	5 th November 2009	Records of SBIs including maps and site descriptions within 1km of the proposed scheme. SBIs include Dobbin Brook Clough, Wigwam Wood, Poynton Park Lake, Norbury Brook, Park-Pit Grasslands Poynton.
Chester & District Ornithological Society	25 th September 2009	28 th September 2009	The scheme is outside of the organisation's area of interest and they are therefore unable to supply any useful information.
Country Land and Business Association	25 th September 2009	16 th October 2009	A number of CLA members land will be affected and the CLA can provide a conduit to these landowners for the flow of information relating to the proposed scheme.
CPRE	25 th September 2009	28 th October 2009	Response through North West Transport Activists Roundtable.
CTC National Cyclists Organisation	25 th September 2009	28 th October 2009	Response through North West Transport Activists Roundtable.
Cycle Stockport	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response
DEFRA	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response
Disability Stockport	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response
Disley Parish Council	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response
Dragonfly Association for Cheshire & GM	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response
English Heritage	25 th September 2009	27 th October 2009	The organisation does not hold detailed information relating to the historic environment. It is advisable that the local authority conservation officers are consulted with regards to such information. Consideration of the potential effects will be given after review of the EIA findings.
Environment Agency	25 th September 2009	2 nd November 2009	None of the three water courses crossed by the proposed scheme have the capacity to receive unrestricted drainage flows and the drainage design should be based on SUDS principals. A site waste management plan will be required.
Government Offices North West	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response
Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit	25 th September 2009	18 th November 2011	As the route alignment remains unchanged from the previous scheme, the previous recommendations for mitigation will be sufficient. GMAU are not aware of any new discoveries that would update the existing information.

Consultee	Date Consulted	Response Date	Response Summary
Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	25 th September 2009	2 nd November 2009	GMEU can provide data and have a number of contacts for district staff.
Greater Manchester Geological Unit	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response
Greater Manchester RIGS Group	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response
Greater Manchester Transport Resource Unit	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response
Highways Agency	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response
Lancs & Cheshire Entomology Society	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response
Mammal Review (Manchester University)	25 th September 2009	6 th October 2009	Unofficial response from former editor of Mammal Review. Suggests we check European COST 341 report and consider impacts with mammals as a safety issue.
Manchester Airport Group	25 th September 2009	16 th October 2009	The company is supportive of the scheme overall, but consideration to the ecology and landscape mitigation needs to be given to minimise the risk of bird hazards. Also landscape design should not impact on navigation, lighting or runway approach.
Manchester City Council – Planning Department	25 th September 2009	14 th December 2009	David Lawless will be the case officer overseeing the Manchester portion of the proposed scheme.
		16 th December 2009	Request for site boundary plan.
		17 th December 2009	Unlikely to be any additional environmental sensitivities since the 2003/04 scheme.
Manchester Friends of the Earth	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response
Manchester Museum	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response
National Farmers Union	25 th September 2009	8 th December 2009	Have not received initial consultation.
Natural England	25 th September 2009	29 th October 2009	There are no statutorily designated sites for nature conservation within the area. There are likely to be protected species within the area and the relevant permits will need to be obtained. The ES needs to contain information on the quantity of habitats which will be affected including timescales for recovery. Mitigation should look to create opportunities for enhancing biodiversity through the delivery of LBAP targets. All aspects of landscape should be taken into consideration. Consideration of the Green Infrastructure Guide should be given in developing mitigation measures.
North West Fungus Group	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response
North West Regional Assembly (4NW)	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response
North West Regional Development Agency	25 th September 2009	3 rd December 2009	Copy of the Northwest Regional Economic Strategy with reference to the SEMMMS scheme issued.
North Wwst Transport Activists Round Table	25 th September 2009	28 th October 2009	Object to the scheme in principal due to perceived conflict with sustainability principals and guidance, and resulting increases in carbon emissions. There would also be local impacts to great crested newt ponds at Styal, the Ladybrook Valley, Ladybrook Interest Trail, Norbury Brook and Hollow. In particular the scheme would result in loss of ancient woodland and part of a site of biological interest at Norbury Brook. Many householders would be affected by traffic noise, light pollution and visual impacts.
Offerton Parish Council	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response
Peak & Northern Footpaths Society	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response
Pott Shrigley Parish Council	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response
Poynton-with-Worth Parish Council	25 th September 2009	11 th November 2009	Poynton Town Council believe that the road will have a number of beneficial effects including reduced local traffic congestion and corresponding air quality and noise effects. The Council would strongly urge the scheme to include the link from the A523 at the Little Chef to the Chester Road link to the proposed eastern section of the new A555. The scheme should have access to the A523, be dual carriageway and have full grade separated junctions.
Prestbury Parish Council	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response

Consultee	Date Consulted	Response Date	Response Summary
Ramblers Association	25 th September 2009	10 th October 2009	The association wishes to be included in the interest groups consulted throughout the scheme to continue the previous constructive dialogue. The previous scheme included overbridges for all severed PRow and confirmation that these proposals have not been altered would be appreciated. There are a large number of footpaths which cross the study area with many benefits to the walking public. In the view of the Greater Manchester and High Peak Area branch of the association, the road will result in a severe loss to the walking public.
rECOrd	25 th September 2009	Multiple correspondence via email	Wide range of historic and constraints maps and data available.
Ringway Parish Council	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response
RSPB	25 th September 2009	7 th December 2009	The RSPB do not hold any bird data. The BTO and local bird groups should be contacted for such data. Loss of bird nesting habitats such as hedgerows, trees and other semi-natural habitat maybe an issue.
Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response
Stockport Primary Care Trust	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response
SUSTRANS	25 th September 2009	2 nd November 2009	SUSTRANS would like to see an assessment of the CO ₂ implications. In addition the EIA should address specific points about safe and convenient access on foot or by bicycle at the following locations and provide high quality design solutions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North-south movement on Styal Road • East-west from Handforth/Stanley Green to Ringway Road West to the Airport • North-south along Wilmslow Road • North-east, south-west along Woodford Road • North-south along Macclesfield Road
Tameside Area Health Authority	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response
Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response
The National Trust	25 th September 2009	30 th November 2009	The trust do not have any information which may be of use for the assessment. It should be noted that historical assets, Styal Estate, Lyme Park, and the Styal conservation area are all within the vicinity though unlikely to have any direct impacts. Aspects to be included in the EIA should include visual impacts, landscape character, noise, air quality, and biodiversity.
The Open Spaces Society	25 th September 2009	8 th December 2009	The society does not normally comment on such schemes.
The Pondlife Project	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response
The Woodland Trust	25 th September 2009	15 th December 2009	Have not received initial consultation.
Wildlife Trust for Lancs, Manc & Mersey	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response
Wirral & Cheshire Badger Group	25 th September 2009	N/A	No Response
Scoping Consultation			
Adlington Parish Council	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
Bollington Town Council	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
Bridleways Association (Manchester)	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
British Geological Society	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
British Horse Society	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
Cheshire & Wirral Amphibian and Reptile Group	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
Cheshire & Wirral Ornithological Society	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response

Consultee	Date Consulted	Response Date	Response Summary
Cheshire Local Access Forum	3 rd February 2010	9 th February 2010	Acknowledgement of receipt of the scoping report. CEC Public Rights of Way Team will wish to be kept informed as to the proposals of the scheme.
Cheshire Bat Group	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
Cheshire Mammal Group	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
Cheshire RIGS Group	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
Cheshire Wildlife Trust	3 rd February 2010	16 th February 2010	No reference to breeding birds surveys in the scoping report.
		17 th February 2010	[Mouchel response: formatting error rolled breeding bird surveys and habitat suitability index scores for GCN into a single bullet point. It is Mouchel's intention to conduct three breeding bird surveys between March and August]
Chester & District Ornithological Society	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
Country Land and Business Association	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
CPRE	3 rd February 2010	14 th February 2010	Response coordinated through the NW Transport Activists Roundtable.
CTC National Cyclists Organisation	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
Cycle Stockport	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
DEFRA	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
Disability Stockport	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
Disley Parish Council	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
Dragonfly Association for Cheshire & GM	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
Government Offices North West	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	3 rd February 2010	10 th March 2010	GMEU raised a number of points as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas of ridge and furrow are of both landscape and ecology importance • The Scoping Report figure showing the location of protected areas has a number of errors relating to boundaries and designations • CEC ecologists should be consulted • Concur with the list of follow up surveys • Badger surveys should record all evidence of usage including latrines and foraging paths. Bead baiting surveys may be required • Additional surveys including toad, water vole, brown hare, invasive species (specifically Japanese knotweed), and barn owls should be considered • There are additional GCN ponds around Poynton
Greater Manchester Geological Unit	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
Greater Manchester RIGS Group	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
Greater Manchester Transport Resource Unit	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
Highways Agency	3 rd February 2010	26 th March 2010	The traffic model should have sufficiently broad coverage to identify any direct and indirect impacts to the HA network particularly the M56 in relation to the air quality.
Lancs & Cheshire Entomology Society	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
Mammal Review (Manchester University)	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response

Consultee	Date Consulted	Response Date	Response Summary
Manchester Airport Group	3 rd February 2010	8 th March 2010	The Airport Company is largely supportive of the scheme and their views remain largely unchanged since the 2004 consultation round. The response covers three areas; scheme objectives, aerodrome safeguarding, and airfield operations. With regards to environmental assessment, key considerations include landscape and ecology design which should seek to minimise the risk of bird hazards surrounding the airport. The design should avoid any impacts on runway lighting or navigation aids. This potential impact should be recognised under the section on construction effects.
Manchester Friends of the Earth	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
Manchester Museum	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
National Farmers Union	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
Natural England	11 th February 2010	26 th February 2010	[Consultation sent and received via SMBC] Natural England confirm that there are no designated sites for nature conservation within the study area.
North West Fungus Group	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
North West Regional Assembly (4NW)	3 rd February 2010	9 th March 2010	Mouchel should be aware of the Regional Spatial Strategy and the Draft Regional Strategy – RS2010 documents.
North West Regional Development Agency	3 rd February 2010	26 th February 2010	No comment regarding the scope of the assessment. With regard to the need for the scheme reference should be made to Action 72 of the Northwest Regional Economic Strategy 2006.
NW Transport Activists Round Table	3 rd February 2010	14 th February 2010	Request for a hard copy of the scoping report.
Offerton Park Parish Council	3 rd February 2010	3 rd March 2010	The Council have no opinion on the scoping of the scheme.
Peak & Northern Footpaths Society	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
Pott Shrigley Parish Council	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
Poynton-with-Worth Parish Council	3 rd February 2010	11 th March 2010	The Council believe that the scheme could potentially increase HGV traffic through Poynton without the inclusion of the southern link road. The closure of the BAE Systems Woodford site in 2012 will make the construction of the southern link road more cost effective.
Prestbury Parish Council	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
Ramblers Association (Greater Manchester and High Peaks Area)	3 rd February 2010	2 nd March 2010	The Scoping Report did not pick up in the key consultation issues section the groups concerns about the effects of the scheme on the recreational walking environment raised in the initial engagement consultation phase.
rECOrd	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
Ringway Parish Council	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
RSPB	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
Stockport Primary Care Trust	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
SUSTRANS	3 rd February 2010	4 th March 2010	The study should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An assessment of air quality and emissions from traffic • The affect on public health • How the severance effect of the new East/West road will be overcome. It would very disappointing if this road is designed without any thought to overcoming severance.
Tameside Area Health Authority	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
The National Trust	3 rd February 2010	16 th February 2010	The National Trust acknowledges receipt of the Scoping Report and will provide any particular comments by the 10 th March. [N.B. no further comments received]
The Open Spaces Society	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
The Pondlife Project	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
The Woodland Trust	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response

Consultee	Date Consulted	Response Date	Response Summary
Wildlife Trust for Lancs, Manc & Mersey	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
Wirral & Cheshire Badger Group	3 rd February 2010	N/A	No Response
Ecology Forum			
Ramblers Association	7 th March 2012		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is the project responding to habitat fragmentation? What is Stockport MBC's policy on low noise road surfacing?
Ramblers Association, North West Transport Round Table / Stockport Friends of the Earth, Friends of the Earth / Stockport Cycle Users	7 th March 2012		The removal of Himalayan balsam and Japanese knotweed was regarded as a positive impact resulting from the Proposed Scheme.
North West Transport Round Table / Stockport Friends of the Earth	7 th March 2012		What is Stockport MBC and the other Local Authorities policy on development of the Proposed Scheme within the Greenbelt?
Stockport Friends of the Earth	7 th March 2012		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The group is concerned that the appropriate care and assessments are taken with regard to Norbury Brook and the associated Ancient Woodland. How will the Proposed Scheme work if the Poynton Bypass is given planning permission and built and has this scenario been considered in the traffic modelling? A number of questions were raised relating to the impact of the Proposed Scheme on green house gas emissions and the basis of the air quality models. What is happening to the field opposite Overdale and the Junction of Woodford Road and the West Coast Mainline with regard to flood compensation?
Friends of the Earth / Stockport Cycle Users	7 th March 2012		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A number of questions were raised on how visual and landscape assessments work and whether a 3D fly through and cross sections would be made available. What will happen to the walking route along Norbury Brook where it would be crossed by the Proposed Scheme.
National Trust	7 th March 2012		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have surveys been completed for invertebrates e.g. <i>Saprolixlix</i>? Particular interest in these around Norbury Brook wet woodland, and Styal With regard to bat-hops, midges tend to gather in the sheltered areas where it is warmer. Will this result in bats flying through the bat hops to reach them? Have all ponds been considered? Ephemeral ponds have some of the richest species diversity Will there be an opportunity for woodland creation?
Stockport Nature Network	7 th March 2012		Will there be an impact on fragmentation of great crested newt meta-populations resulting from the Proposed Scheme and how will this be mitigated?
Stockport Greenspace forum	7 th March 2012		At the Woodford recreation ground there are existing problems with parking. Will the Proposed Scheme add to this or are there any proposals to reduce this problem?
Manchester Geological Association	7 th March 2012		There are geological sites located at the west end of Norbury Brook close to the alignment of the Proposed Scheme. Are these known?
Mycological Society, North West Fungus Group, Cheshire Wildlife Trust, Stockport Nature Network Butterfly Conservation, RSPB Stockport Local Group, Marple Naturalists, Stockport MBC	7 th March 2012		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A continuous strip of grassland for wildflowers would be beneficial to wildlife particularly butterflies and other invertebrates. At length discussion about ecological mitigation proposals. Were botanical surveys undertaken?

Consultee	Date Consulted	Response Date	Response Summary
Cheshire Wildlife Trust	7 th March 2012		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HSI scores should not be used to scope which ponds are surveyed for great crested newt but should instead be used to supplement great crested newt surveys. • Were surveys for water vole and white clawed crayfish undertaken? • Will amphibian fencing be used as part of the permanent mitigation measures? Would be preferable to see landscape design such as short grass area to deter amphibian encroachment on to the road. • Who is responsible for maintenance of the landscaped areas and habitats after construction? • Will drainage ponds be considered as part of the ecological mitigation.
Stockport MBC	7 th March 2012		Were surveys for toads and brown hare undertaken?
Mycological Society, North West Fungus Group	7 th March 2012		There is nothing to suggest that there would be any unusual or special fungi present in the study area. The difficulty of surveying fungi and subsequently assessing potential impacts was discussed.
Vulnerable Road User Groups Forum			
	28 th March 2012		Equestrians are not considered within the separate walking and cycle route. A wide non-tarmac strip would be required to be suitable for equestrians, and equestrians would need a right of way along the route which they do not under the current proposals.
	28 th March 2012		Cyclists would require the commuter route to be tarmac or similar surface treatment to ensure that work clothes etc whilst riding are not soiled in wet weather.
	28 th March 2012		General support for the proposals from the walking and cycling groups.
Historical Forum			
HLRA	10 th May 2012		Are there any mining remains in the area and have these been considered in the assessment?
Unknown	10 th May 2012		Norbury is a very old area. The name is Anglo-Saxon and means northern borough Built heritage site 123 (Diary House Farmhouse) is currently in a very poor state of repair
LLF Phase 1			
Environmental Comments	Phase 1 LLFs (8 th January 2013 to 23 rd January 2013)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A key concern raised at all LLF meetings was in reference to increased traffic noise following the opening of the scheme. There was a request for clearer and better information to be available in the future to address concerns on this issue. Attendees of the LLFs requested that low noise surfacing and more and larger noise bunds, along with increased fencing and screening should be introduced, where possible; • Attendees requested that where the road is shown in cutting it should be built at a lower level than proposed, if possible. This would help to absorb the noise from traffic and reduce visual impact along the corridor; • There was support for increased planting of trees to screen the new road and assist with noise mitigation but also to create improved wildlife habitats; • Concern was expressed about air quality impacts along existing roads where traffic will increase following the introduction of the Scheme but also by residents that have properties close to the proposed road; • There was interest in the changes to Public Rights of Way with a desire for these routes to be retained, for example in the Norbury Hollow and Clay Lane areas. Some attendees expressed concerns about some of the changes to the PRow and the proximity of these to their properties, due to fears that it would pose a crime and antisocial risk to local properties; • Comments were also made about wildlife in the area at some of the LLF events. For example, the field behind Davies Avenue is currently a resting place for geese; • Concern was raised with regards to the potential impact on local flooding as a result of the Scheme being introduced. An example given of an area prone to localised flooding is the land behind Davies Avenue. Existing flooding issues on A555 and the Alderley Edge by-pass were also highlighted; and • A large number of attendees stated that they were concerned by the status of the local Green Belt land and whether the introduction of a new road would lead to future development on the land in the form of new houses or employment sites. Suggestions were given to secure the future of the land as Green Belt including designating areas of woodland with the view that this would act as a way to off-set any increase in levels of pollution generated by higher traffic volumes along the new road as well as acting as a potential barrier from a visual perspective.

Consultee	Date Consulted	Response Date	Response Summary
LLF Phase 2			
Noise Impact	Phase 2 LLFs (7 th May 2013 to 3 rd July 2013)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General concerns about increased noise levels predicted in areas close to the scheme and in those areas that will see an increase in traffic as a result of the scheme, particularly High Lane and Disley; • Questions as to what bunding and noise fencing would look like; • Requests for additional air quality and noise figures including for both junction options at Location 6 and existing air quality and noise figures; • Request for review of noise fencing allocation on the south side, directly opposite Park House Farm to help protect Glastonbury Drive residents; • Questions as to how the noise figures had been calculated and if stop start traffic was included within the calculations; and • Request for additional noise mitigation in the vicinity of the West Coast Main Line Crossing.
Visual Impact			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about loss of existing views of surrounding countryside. A particular concern about this issue was raised by residents of Darley Road with requests made for bunding to be lowered and the acoustic fence to be less visually obtrusive and placed on the road side of the bund to address these concerns; • Concern about the proximity of the realigned A6 and associated drainage features to properties. • A request was made that the realigned A6 be moved further north at the Yew Tree Avenue end; • Queries about why the Relief road cannot tie in with the existing A6; • Request for additional screening of the West Coast Main Line crossing; • Concern about the visual impact of the farm accommodation bridge on Woodford Road. A request was made for this to be reduced in height and positioned further from residential properties; • Questions as to whether residents would be due compensation or boundary/screening treatments through the scheme budget to improve fencing/screening at rear of properties; and • More screening against noise/visual each side of the A34 junction is required.
Landscaping Impact			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request from Darley Road residents for less obtrusive landscaping treatment, more shrub planting, • General questions as to the type of landscaping proposed; and • Questions as to where there is a national policy on what plants / grasses should be introduced on new road side embankments and if this is reflected in the scheme.
Ecological Impact			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about the impact on wildlife and bird species, with the identification of known bird species in the Cheadle area; • Questions as to how the impact of wildlife will be addressed by the scheme; and • General concern about the loss of habitats and impact on wildlife species as a result of the scheme.
Other Environmental			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Queries from residents on A6 Buxton Road about existing flooding/ponding in gardens and fields to rear of their properties between them and re-aligned A6. Requests were made to ensure that the road does not make the situation any worse and/or there is an opportunity to improve this existing situation; • Concern about whether the road will change the designation of adjacent land plots, currently green belt; • Members of the public would like to see the existing air pollution on plan and not just the pollution caused by the scheme; • Concern about deterioration in air quality in areas that will see an increase in traffic as a result of the scheme, particularly High Lane and Disley; and • Questions as to whether figures on air quality take into account stationary traffic.
Queensgate School LLF			

Consultee	Date Consulted	Response Date	Response Summary
Environmental	12 th February 2013 & 11 th June 2013		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request for more detail modelling of noise levels in the school field; • The forecast noise levels in the school field of 60-65db are too loud for outdoor play; • Concerns that noise levels during peak hours on the road network will be such that outdoor activity will have to be scheduled to avoid peak times; • Construction work should be timed to take place during school holidays; • The school's boundary fence should be improved at the scheme's cost; • Noise monitoring should be undertaken within the school's field; • Concerns about fluctuations in noise levels due to changes in weather conditions and the mix of vehicles on the road; • Concerns that the forecast increase in air pollution with the scheme in place would have a negative impact on pupils' health; • Concerns about safety and security of the school due to the proximity of the pedestrian and cycleway and associated link to Albany Way. A request was made for a design audit to be undertaken by the police along with a site visit; • Support for the walking and cycling route to the school as it will improve access to the school from the Woodford Road side; and • The pedestrian/ cycleway should be moved to the south of the noise barrier along the length of the scheme south of the Australia estate.