

# A556 KNUTSFORD TO BOWDON IMPROVEMENT SCHEME

The A556 (Knutsford to Bowdon Improvement)  
Development Consent Order 201[ ]

Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference: TR010002

---

## STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

Between

**HIGHWAYS AGENCY**

And

**CHESHIRE EAST COUNCIL**

---

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 5	August 2013	1 <sup>st</sup> Draft

*Page Left Intentionally Blank*

DRAFT

## CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction	4
1.1	Purpose of Statements of Common Ground	4
1.2	Parties to this SoCG	4
1.3	The Scheme	5
1.4	Structure of this SoCG	6
2.0	Consultation with CEC Overview	7
2.1	List of Reference Documents	7
2.2	Pre-Application Consultation	8
2.3	Post-Application Consultation	9
3.0	Air, noise and contaminated land	10
4.0	Highways and transportation	12
4.1	Junction designs	12
4.9	Tatton Park	12
4.16	Road safety	14
4.20	Commuted sums	14
4.24	Areas of agreement between the HA and CEC	15
4	Planning issues	16
5	Drainage and flooding	17
6	Public rights of way	18
7	Landscaping, nature conservation and built environment	20
8	Conclusion / Summary	21
9	Appendices	
	• Appendix 1: NOTES OF MEETING BETWEEN CEC, HA AND JACOBS 15/06/2010	
	• Appendix 2: NOTES OF MEETING BETWEEN CEC, HA AND JACOBS 12/01/2010	
	• Appendix 3: NOTES OF MEETING BETWEEN CEC, HA AND JACOBS 09/02/2010	
	• Appendix 4: NOTES OF MEETING BETWEEN CEC, HA AND JACOBS 05/08/2010	
	• Appendix 5: NOTES OF MEETING BETWEEN CEC, HA AND JACOBS 22/08/2011	
	• Appendix 6: NOTES OF MEETING BETWEEN CEC, HA AND JACOBS 24/09/2012	
	• Appendix 7: NOTES OF LOCAL ROAD DEPARTURES MEETING 14/03/2013	
	• Appendix 8 : DEPARTURES REPORT Aug 2013	
	• Appendix 9: NOTES OF VALUE ENGINEERING WORKSHOPS 10/07/2013	
	• Appendix 10: NOTES OF VALUE ENGINEERING WORKSHOPS 11/07/2013	
	• Appendix 11: CEC's Relevant Representations dated 19 <sup>th</sup> June to 2 <sup>nd</sup> July 2013	

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Purpose of Statements of Common Ground

1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground (“SoCG”) relates to an application made by the Highways Agency to the Planning Inspectorate under Section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 (“the Application”).

1.1.2 The Application is for an order granting development consent (the “DCO”). The draft DCO is referred to as *The A556 (Knutsford to Bowdon Improvement) Development Consent Order 201[ ]*. The made DCO would grant powers to construct a new section of highway and make improvements to the existing A556 trunk road in Cheshire between M6 Junction 19 near Knutsford, Cheshire and M56 Junction 7 near Bowdon, Greater Manchester, and would include improvements to the M6 Southbound carriageway between M6 Junction 19 and Knutsford Services. This proposed development is referred to in this Introduction as “the Scheme”.

1.1.3 The Application was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on the 24th April 2013, and the Planning Inspectorate accepted the progression of this Application to the examination stage on the 17th May 2013.

1.1.4 This SoCG has been prepared in respect of the Scheme. Guidance about the purpose and possible content of SoCGs is given in paragraphs 57-62 of the Department for Communities and Local Government’s “*Planning Act 2008: examination of applications for development consent*” (26<sup>th</sup> April 2013 version). Paragraph 57, copied below, confirms the basic function of SoCGs:

*“A statement of common ground is a written statement prepared jointly by the applicant and another party or parties, setting out any matters on which they agree. As well as identifying matters which are not in real dispute, it may also be useful for a statement to identify areas where agreement has not been reached. The statement should include references to show where those matters are dealt with in the written representations or other documentary evidence.”*

1.1.5 SoCGs therefore are a useful and established means of ensuring that the evidence at the post-application examination focuses on the material differences between the main parties, and so aim to help facilitate a more efficient examination process.

### 1.2 Parties to this SoCG

1.2.1 This SoCG has been prepared in respect of the Scheme by the Highways Agency (“HA”), as the Applicant, and Cheshire East Council (“CEC”).

- 1.2.2 The HA is an Executive Agency of the Department for Transport, and is responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the strategic road network in England on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport. The network is made up of England's motorways and all-purpose trunk roads (the major "A" roads). The A556 road in Cheshire between M6 Junction 19 near Knutsford, Cheshire and M56 Junction 7 near Bowdon, Greater Manchester is part of the trunk road network for which the HA is responsible. Following the Scheme, the HA will be responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the new route of the A556.
- 1.2.3 CEC have submitted Relevant Representations on a departmental basis to cover the range of issues that the proposal potentially affects.
- 1.2.4 CEC is the Local Highway Authority and planning authority. It is also manages the operation of Tatton Park. CEC is responsible for the maintenance and improvement of its 1,700 mile road network. Following the opening of the new road CEC will take over responsibility for operating, and maintaining the de-trunked Chester Road (subject to agreement on the level of commuted sum).
- 1.2.5 The Highways Service aims to achieve the Government's five transport objectives (promoting accessibility, improving safety, promoting transport integration, contributing to an efficient economy and protecting the environment) as outlined in the Local Transport Plan. Flood risk management is another area for which the Highways Service is responsible.
- 1.2.6 CEC's Public Protection and Health Department is responsible for monitoring and protecting various aspects of the environment. They undertake continuous review and assessment of air quality within the area following a process defined by Government. All new development has the potential to impact on air quality. In some cases, CEC may require that an air quality impact assessment is undertaken and submitted alongside a planning application. This allows CEC to determine whether the proposal will adversely impact on local air quality, and if so, what level of mitigation is required. Environmental Health, also deals with the issue of noise and its control.
- 1.2.7 CEC's Spatial Planning Department are responsible for the development of planning policy including production of the local plan.
- 1.2.8 CEC's Heritage and Design team are responsible for monitoring the built and natural environment with regard to the potential impacts of development on conservation areas, listed buildings and biodiversity / ecology, trees, hedges, woodland and landscape.

### 1.3 The Scheme

1.3.1 The Scheme is a 7.5-kilometre / approximately 4.7-mile improvement, and would improve the route to a consistent standard of modern dual carriageway.

1.3.2 The main aspects of the Scheme include:

- (a) construction of a new, dual carriageway standard section of the A556 from M6 Junction 19 to a point north of Bucklow Hill, to bypass Tabley, Mere and Bucklow Hill to the west;
- (b) improvement of the existing A556 north of the new bypass section, from the point north of Bucklow Hill up to the M56;
- (c) improvement of the layout of M56 Junction 7 at Bowdon;
- (d) improvement of the M6 Southbound carriageway between M6 Junction 19 and Knutsford Services;
- (e) creation of junctions at Tabley, the A50 and at Millington allowing local road network traffic access to and from the new A556;
- (f) changes to existing adjacent local roads to enable safe connections with and over the new A556;
- (g) changes and improvements to facilities for non-motorised traffic to enable more and safer crossings of the new A556;
- (h) changes to the section of the current A556 to be bypassed, including the creation of additional facilities for non-motorised traffic along with measures to make the bypassed section more suitable as a road for rural, local traffic;
- (i) the transfer of responsibility of the section of the current A556 to be bypassed to the local highway authority, Cheshire East Council; and
- (j) measures to mitigate environmental impacts of the Scheme.

1.3.3 More detail about the Scheme design and features is provided in other Application documents. These include the DCO (Application Document Reference 3.1), the Environmental Statement (“ES”) (Application Document References 6.1 – 6.3) and the Works Plans (Application Document Reference 2.3).

## **1.4 Structure of this SoCG**

1.4.1 This SoCG has been structured to reflect the issues of interest to CEC in relation to the Scheme.

1.4.2 Firstly, Section 2 of this SoCG provides an overview of the history of the HA’s consultation with CEC on the Scheme. This overview starts from around the time of the Scheme’s Amended Preferred Route Announcement of March 2010; however, there was earlier liaison between HA and CEC also.

1.4.3 Subsequent sections of this SoCG reflect the issues raised by CEC departments in their Relevant Representations (“RRs”) dated 19<sup>th</sup> June, 26<sup>th</sup> June, 27<sup>th</sup> June and 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2013 sent to the Planning Inspectorate. The organisation of this SoCG mirrors the organisation of the RR for ease of reference and use during the examination process. In brief, these subsequent sections cover the following:

- (a) Air Quality, Noise and Contaminated Land (Public Protection and Health)
- (b) Junction Designs, Road Safety and Commuted Sums (Highways and Transportation)
- (c) Planning Issues (Spatial Planning)
- (d) Drainage and Flooding (Highways)
- (e) Public Rights of Way (Public Rights of Way Unit )
- (f) Landscaping, Nature Conservation And Built Environment (Development Management)

1.4.4 Throughout this SoCG, the phrase “It is agreed...” signifies any point of agreement that has been specifically stated as agreed by HA and CEC.

DRAFT

## 2.0 CONSULTATION WITH CEC OVERVIEW

### 2.1 List of Reference Documents

2.1.1 This SoCG makes reference to a variety of previous documents, consultation responses and meeting minutes relating to past consultation and liaison between HA and CEC. Many of these are listed below. Some of these reference documents are appended to this SoCG, and others are Application and other documents available on the Planning Inspectorate's webpage for the Scheme. This webpage can be accessed here: <http://infrastructure.planningportal.gov.uk/projects/North%20West/A556-Knutsford-to-Bowdon-Scheme/>

- (a) Notes of the meeting between CEC officers, Jacobs and the HA dated the 15<sup>th</sup> June 2010, being one of a series of meetings to discuss A556 De-Trunking Work and Side Road Geometry (see Appendix 1 to this SoCG)
- (b) Notes of the meeting between CEC officers, Jacobs and the HA dated the 12<sup>th</sup> January 2010, being one of a series of meetings to discuss A556 De-Trunking Works (see Appendix 2 to this SoCG)
- (c) Notes of the meeting between CEC officers, Jacobs and the HA dated the 9<sup>th</sup> February 2010, being one of a series of meetings to discuss A556 De-Trunking Works (see Appendix 3 to this SoCG)
- (d) Notes of the meeting between CEC officers, Jacobs and the HA dated the 5<sup>th</sup> August 2010, being one of a series of meetings to discuss A556 De-Trunking Works and Junction Strategy Meeting (see Appendix 4 to this SoCG)
- (e) Notes of the HA workshop dated the 22<sup>nd</sup> August 2011, to consider CEC Technical Design/Departures – DTW and LRN (see Appendix 5 to this SoCG)
- (f) Notes of the meeting between CEC officers, Jacobs and the HA dated 24<sup>th</sup> September 2012 to discuss various issues including NMU facilities and the SOCG (see Appendix 6 to this SoCG)
- (g) Notes of the meeting between CEC officers, Jacobs and the HA 24<sup>th</sup> September 2012 to discuss Local Road Departures (see Appendix 7 to this SoCG)
- (h) CEC departures report August 2013 (see Appendix 8 to this SoCG)
- (i) Notes of value engineering workshops held at CEC offices in Crewe on 10/07/2013 (see Appendix 9 to this SoCG)

(j) Notes of value engineering workshops held at CEC offices in Crewe on 11/07/2013 (see Appendix 10:to this SoCG)

(k) Appendix 11: CEC's Relevant Representations dated 19<sup>th</sup> June to 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2013

## 2.2 Pre-Application Consultation

2.2.1 There was some local representation from members of the public about the inadequacy of the consultation process. These issues are reported in the Scheme Consultation report.

2.2.2 In addition, as confirmed in the previous section of this SoCG, the HA has been consulting and liaising with CEC on the Scheme over a longer period of time than indicated by the list of reference documents above. The ES in numerous places refers to communication with CEC on various aspects of the Scheme. Much of this consultation and liaison was informal, i.e. non-statutory engagement prior to that carried out in accordance with the Planning Act 2008. Section 4 of the ES summarises the history of HA's consultation of CEC, in particular paragraphs 4.1.16 – 4.1.17. These are reproduced below:

- *“4.1.16 . Consultation of Cheshire East Council has been addressed to a wide range of specialist officers, including planning and highways officers and specialist officers dealing with air quality, noise, ecology, landscape, heritage, countryside access and rights of way. Some of this consultation has been on an individual, one-to-one basis, between specialists within the EIA team and their opposite numbers within the Council; while some has been joint with multiple officers and/or other consultees. In addition, Cheshire East Council Heritage responded to consultation by the IPC and their letter is reproduced within the IPC's Scoping Opinion (see also Appendix 2.2).”*
- *“4.1.17 In addition to correspondence about the EIA, relevant officers of Cheshire East Council attended the initial scoping meeting of 2 February 2010 and other joint EIA-related consultation meetings with Natural England or English Heritage, all described above. Separate consultation has been carried out within the wider project, principally relating to the design of the de-trunking works for Chester Road, as Cheshire East Council is the highway authority that will take responsibility for Chester Road after it is de-trunked. Although this consultation did not form part of the EIA, it is relevant, in that the design of the de-trunking works is relevant to several EIA topics. Cheshire East Council was also the principal consultee in respect of planning the scope and format of the consultation of the community under Section 47 of the Planning Act 2008.”*

## 2.3 Post-Application Consultation

- 2.3.1 Following the acceptance of the Application, HA and CEC commenced liaison on the preparation of this SoCG. This included a meeting on the 8<sup>th</sup> August 2013 agreeing the approach for this SoCG.
- 2.3.2 Subsequently, with reference to the RRs, HA and CEC have prepared the following list of issues raised in CEC's RRs and confirmation of the agreed position between the two parties.

DRAFT

### 3.0 AIR, NOISE AND CONTAMINATED LAND

- 3.1 CEC Issue - Dust emissions, which would be expected during construction, are proposed to be mitigated by a number of measures such as water suppression, wheel washing and cleaning. These should be contained within the Construction Management Plan (CEMP).
- 3.2 HA response - Issues raised are included in the CEMP, Appendix D Environmental Control Plans.
- 3.3 It is agreed that CEC's concerns have been addressed in the CEMP.
- 3.4 CEC have raised no specific issues with regard to air quality, noise and vibration directly associated with the scheme but intend to make representations on these in due course.
- 3.5 CEC do however have concerns with regard to the environmental implications of the forecast increases in traffic on the wider network including the A556 south of the M6 and on the M6 itself. The published assessment confirms that levels of NO<sub>2</sub> may breach the objective in this location and as such Cheshire East may be required to declare a further AQMA in this area. This is considered a negative local impact.
- 3.6 CEC have raised a concern with regard to contaminated land.

#### **Ecology and Landscape**

- 3.7 In the view of the CEC Principal Nature Conservation Officer the proposed development cannot at this time be considered to be fully sustainable in terms of ecology. The CEC Principal Nature Conservation Officer recommends therefore that the residual adverse impacts of the proposed development are 'offset' by means of a commuted sum secured by means of an appropriate legal agreement. It is estimated that this figure should be between £50k and £100K to be used to fund various local schemes.

#### **Wider Air Quality Mitigation Proposal**

- 3.8 Mitigation will be sort funded from a commuted sum to be agreed with the HA. CEC will deliver a range of multi modal / air quality / environmental improvement measures in the vicinity of the scheme. This commuted sum will be agreed prior to the closure of the examination of the scheme so that it can be included in the Inspectors report.

## 4.0 HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION

### JUNCTION DESIGNS

- 4.1 CEC have some concerns with regard to the A50 / new A556 roundabout junction design. They don't consider that the junction will operate efficiently with the forecast flows.
- 4.2 The HA are working in conjunction with CEC to develop a mutually acceptable design for the junction that addresses these concerns, following a number of interactive workshop sessions held at CEC offices.
- 4.3 CEC have concerns with regard to the "Mere cross roads" A50 / de-trunked A556 junction design. They don't consider that the junction will operate efficiently particularly when events are being held at Tatton Park and when there are incidents on the M6.
- 4.4 The HA are working in conjunction with CEC to develop a mutually acceptable design for the junction that addresses these concerns, following a number of interactive workshop sessions held at CEC offices.
- 4.5 CEC have concerns with regard to the "Bucklow Hill junction" A5034 Mereside Lane / de-trunked A556 junction design.
- 4.6 The HA are proposing an alternative design encompassing a revised crossing and island arrangement to simplify movements and will seek agreement from CEC on the revised proposal. This follows a number of interactive workshop sessions held at CEC offices.
- 4.7 CEC raised concerns with regard to the proposed width of various sections of the de-trunked A556 and the speed limits at the value engineering workshops in July 2013.
- 4.8 At the interactive workshop sessions concerns were raised by CEC about the drainage proposals for the Non Motorised Users (NMU) route and associated bund that separates it from the road. These are being discussed with the HA but have yet to be resolved.

### TATTON PARK

- 4.9 Tatton Park (hereafter referred to as "Tatton") has been involved in discussions with the HA and its contractors in providing input to the options and giving views on issues as Tatton sees them in relation to the scheme and its impacts. Tatton has been asked to provide a Statement of Common Ground but as a CEC managed site this ~~input is included within this report. As Tatton is land owned by the~~

National Trust, it is understood that the Trust have been having their own discussions with the Highways Agency in relation to both Dunham Massey and Tatton Park and are providing expert opinion in relation to many issues including possible Noise and Visual impact concerns, which the Tatton management and CEC have left to the Trust to discuss in relation to the Tatton estate.

- 4.10 The HA have been in discussions with Tatton to gain their views on the proposals and a number of amendments to the scheme have been made. Tatton is fully engaged in the progression of the scheme and this will continue throughout project construction. The option selected by the HA provides the least impact of all the suggested schemes to Tatton, however Tatton believes that there will be some adverse impacts compared to existing arrangements.
- 4.11 The access to Tatton from the new road potentially improves matters on some aspects of existing traffic issues, however potentially not having the diversity of using the Cherry Tree Lane event traffic route may funnel more traffic in one direction with little scope to flex. If this road can continue to be used this will allow greater flexibility in managing event traffic in particular.
- 4.12 Tatton has raised issues over the new egress route from Tatton on to the A50 and the new link road, particularly on main event days. Whilst currently two routes for egress on to the A556 can be used, the new system will only allow one route and reduces options. Following meetings with the HA and its contractors it was agreed that Costain would work on event traffic management issues and devise an agreed traffic management plan, most notably concentrating on the RHS Show and see if any areas could be reviewed and improved in light of this with agreed plans being worked through before construction starts. No further discussions have yet taken place so Tatton cannot comment on progress with this agreed traffic management strategy.
- 4.13 Tatton has also highlighted the potential negative impact to Clamhunger Lane of increased traffic as a result of the new scheme, with no understanding of how this may be resolved.
- 4.14 Tatton highlighted concerns on the increased level of traffic joining the A50 northbound before Mere traffic lights and would suggest that the revision provided by CEC's transportation officer of additional northbound left turn lane at Mere traffic lights might improve this compared to the suggested scheme (see para 4.3). The traffic lights at this junction need to be 'intelligent' to respond to event traffic at certain times. With all the current information provided, this needs to be reflected in the traffic management plans for events and assessed properly with those plans.

- 4.15 Tatton has agreed it is happy to liaise with the Agency and CEC Highways over developing a unified Brown and White signage strategy for the new road and link roads to Tatton. This would make sure that routes from M6 northbound, M6 southbound, M56 eastbound, M56 westbound, A556 (new road) east and westbound, A50 north and southbound are all linked effectively with a new signage strategy for the CEC controlled A/B roads. This would minimise the impact to local residents in Mere, Rostherne and Knutsford. This also needs to work effectively with regard to a Yellow event signage strategy for Tatton events and 3rd party run events at Tatton including the RHS Show. The related issue of signage from M56 Junctions 6 and 9 and M6 Junction 20/20A would need to be considered to replace some of the flexibility lost through all of the proposed schemes for major events traffic but would need further discussion with the RHS and other local councils.

#### ROAD SAFETY

- 4.16 CEC agree with the HA that the existing A556 has safety problems that will be resolved by the proposed scheme. There were 98 personal injury accidents on the A556 (including relevant parts of its junctions with the M6, A50, A5034 and M56) in the period January 2007 to December 2011, including 1 fatality and 13 serious injuries. The scheme will significantly reduce this number.
- 4.17 CEC undertook a stage 1 safety audit of the proposed departures from standards on the de-trunked A556 and identified some issues. The departures report is approved and is attached at Appendix 8 for information.
- 4.18 At the interactive workshops held at CEC offices these issues were considered at length and HA to produce two alternative designs, to be presented to CEC for approval in due course.
- 4.19 CEC have identified issues on the local road network associated with the scheme.
- 4.20 As noted below CEC have proposed a commuted sum for mitigation measures that may be required to address unforeseen issues on the local road network.

#### COMMUTED SUMS FROM THE HA TO CEC

- 4.21 CEC have estimated costs for maintenance of the de-trunked highway including carriageway, lighting and the new non motorised user route.

- 4.22 It is agreed that a commuted sum will be agreed between the HA and CEC prior to the closure of the examination of the scheme so that it can be included in the inspectors report.
- 4.23 A further commuted sum will also be subject to discussion and agreement between the HA and CEC to address unforeseen issues on the local road network. This commuted sum will also be agreed prior to the closure of the examination of the scheme so that it can be included in the Inspectors report.
- 4.24 A separate commuted sum will also be agreed to mitigate environmental impacts associated with increases in traffic on other parts of the CEC road network. This commuted sum will also be agreed prior to the closure of the examination of the scheme so that it can be included in the Inspectors report.

#### AREAS OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN CEC AND THE HA

- 4.25 Following the value engineering workshops in July 2013, the following agreements were reached:
- 4.26 It was agreed that a revised junction design is to be developed by the HA (based on CEC concept designs) and capacity assessed in due course to address the identified issues at the A50 / new A556 roundabout. The detailed design will be agreed prior to the closure of the examination so that it can be included in the Inspectors report.
- 4.27 It was agreed that a revised junction design is to be developed by the HA (based on CEC concept designs) and capacity assessed in due course to address the identified issues at the A50 / de-trunked A556 junction ("Mere Crossroads"). The detailed design will be agreed prior to the closure of the examination so that it can be included in the Inspectors report.
- 4.28 It was agreed that the new traffic signals at Mere will be 'intelligent' - able to react to changing conditions on the strategic road network and for event traffic for Tatton Park. Details and specifications will need to be agreed prior to the closure of the examination so that it can be included in the Inspectors report.
- 4.29 It was agreed that a revised junction design is to be developed by the HA (based on CEC concept designs) and capacity assessed in due course to address the identified issues at the A5034 Mereside Road / de-trunked A556 junction in Bucklow Hill. The detailed design will be agreed prior to the closure of the examination so that it can be included in the Inspectors report.

- 4.30 It was agreed that with the current option presented, the existing A556 will not be closed down during the construction of the new road and therefore this will have little or no impact to operations at Tatton Park.
- 4.31 It was agreed that if there are to be some minor closures (a week or weekend) to link in the new road then Tatton Park has no issue over the construction impact to traffic.
- 4.32 It was agreed that the HA work on event traffic management issues and devise an agreed traffic management plan, most notably concentrating on the RHS Show and see if any areas could be reviewed and improved in light of this with agreed plans being worked through before construction starts.
- 4.33 It was agreed that the HA will provide forewarning of any impact so that it can be built in to the planning of literature/websites promoting Tatton Park and any events allowing visitors to be informed of any concerns.
- 4.34 It was agreed that a revised signage strategy will be developed in collaboration with the HA, CEC and other relevant Local Authorities. Changes to signing to be funded by the HA.
- 4.35 It was agreed that at the new Chester Road / Tabley Link roundabout on the de-trunked A556 the HA's designers would consider revised locations for NMU crossings east / south of the junction.
- 4.36 It was agreed that the width of the de-trunked road would be increased from 6 metres to 7.3 metres (if possible) between Tabley Roundabout and Mere crossroads.
- 4.37 It was agreed by all parties that speed limits for the proposed de-trunked Chester Road and affected side roads should be as described below;
- Tabley Roundabout to Chester Road Roundabout – 40mph
  - Chester Road Roundabout to stopped up A556 – 30mph
  - Chester Road Roundabout to Mere Junction – 40mph
  - Mere Junction to Bucklow Hill – 30mph
  - Bucklow Hill to Millington Junction – 40mph
  - Millington Junction to Cherry Tree Lane – 30mph
- 4.38 The HA's scheme designers to produce a layout detailing the above, for acceptance and approval by all parties.

- 
- 4.39 It was agreed that the de-trunked section of road will become adopted by CEC subject to the agreement of a suitable level of commuted sum.
- 4.40 It was agreed that the two existing speed cameras on the A556 will be decommissioned.
- 4.41 It was agreed that existing CCTV units at Mere and Bucklow Hill should be retained and passed from the HA to CEC.
- 4.42 It was agreed by all parties that a revised layout should be developed for the Cherry Tree lane bend to remove the roundabout that was previously proposed.
- 4.43 It was agreed that a signage strategy would be developed by the HA's scheme designers in conjunction with the HA and CEC. Implementation to be funded by the HA.
- 4.44 It was agreed that the opportunity would be taken to de-clutter existing street furniture (removing unnecessary signage etc).
- 4.45 It was agreed that CEC would apply for a new route number designation to be used in the sign design.
- 4.46 It was agreed that the street lighting strategy would see lighting limited to the two key junctions on the de-trunked A556 at Mere Crossroads and Bucklow Hill.
- 4.47 It was agreed that the detailed design specification for lighting would be the subject of a meeting between the scheme designers and CEC street lighting engineers.
- 4.48 It was agreed that the only minor road structure across the new A556 suitable for narrowing was Bentleyhurst Lane which will require a priority give way arrangement.
- 4.49 It was agreed that Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) are likely to be required on the southern link to discourage on street parking in the vicinity of M6 junction 19. This is particularly important in the turning heads where Old Hall Lane is stopped up.

## 5.0 PLANNING ISSUES

- 5.1 CEC have no outstanding issues with regard to planning associated with the scheme.
- 5.2 The proposals are consistent with current local and national planning policies.
- 5.3 It is agreed that there are no outstanding planning issues as outlined above.

DRAFT

## 6.0 DRAINAGE AND FLOODING

- 6.1 CEC has identified that the HA need to demonstrate that detailed drainage and flood risk impacts have been considered.
- 6.2 It is evident from the scoping documents associated with this scheme that the importance of assessing potential flood risk impacts has been captured. The scheme is highly likely to impact on a number of locally important non main river (ordinary) watercourses and other water features. It is evident that there are local surface water flood risk areas potentially affected by the proposed route of this improvement scheme. It will be essential that detailed drainage design and any associated local flood risk impacts are fully assessed and approved by Cheshire East as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) and in the interests of managing flood risk to ensure no adverse impacts off site.
- 6.3 Formal consents may be required under Land Drainage Act 1991 for certain works affecting non main river or ordinary watercourses .Similarly, consents may be required from Environment Agency for works affecting Main River under Water Resources Act 1991.
- 6.4 Proposals for the detailed drainage design should be discussed with Cheshire East Flood Risk Management at the appropriate stage. A meeting was held between CEC officers and the HA's designers on 06/08/2013 to discuss the latest details of the scheme.
- 6.5 It is agreed that from a Flood Risk Management perspective the following areas of the existing strategy need to be refreshed by the HA's designers to reflect legislative changes now in place notably to reflect :-
- Flood and Water Management Act 2010 - new duties and responsibilities for Cheshire East as Lead Local Flood Authority (notably consents and approvals associated with non main river and ordinary watercourses from April 2012 )
  - Dealing with surface and ground water risk issues (latest EA and LLFA Flood risk information/data)
  - Modelled impacts associated with latest allowances for Climate Change and agreed allowable discharges from new works (attenuated pond sizes)
  - General Infrastructure adaption considerations for Climate Resilience (Preparing for a changing climate)

## 7.0 PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY

- 7.1 The PROW unit of the Council is generally supportive of the proposed scheme, subject to the final detailed scheme design and accommodation works arrangements, in particular in relation to NMU facilities on affected PROW and at junctions, overbridges and the underpass.
- 7.2 The PROW unit have also expressed interest in NMU facilities along the de-trunked A556, the Old Hall Lane NMU underpass and connections, and the continuity of minor roads, new side roads and the Regional Cycle Route.
- 7.3 The HA will continue to involve the CEC PROW team throughout the development of the detailed design of the scheme, to ensure that any concerns are resolved.
- 7.4 CEC PROW unit would seek to be consulted on the final draft text relating to PROW and the Rights of Way Access Plans prior to any DCO being made.
- 7.5 It is agreed that the PROW unit will be consulted on the final wording to be used prior to the DCO being adopted.
- 7.6 It was agreed at the value engineering workshops in July 2013 that the Non Motorised User route would be designed based on the following parameters:
- 1.5m wide equestrian track
  - Designers to investigate equestrian friendly surface treatments
  - 2.5m shared footway / cycleway using existing surface and drainage maintained
  - Wooden bollards and plaques (based on a CEC design) to be used to prevent illegal use by motor vehicles
  - Keys to bollards to be held by CEC to allow emergency access by vehicles with contact telephone number on plaque
  - Private access across route to fields / properties to be maintained
  - The bund between the de-trunked road and the NMU route would be tailored to low maintenance
  - Planting will vary according to the location with different planting appropriate near to houses / away from houses
  - Minimum height for the bund 0.5m with a maximum planted height of 1.0m to 1.2m
  - Existing verge and footways to be retained for service access

- 7.7 It was agreed that the NMU underpass design should take the following issues into account:
- Headroom of 2.8m
  - Dismount blocks to encourage equestrian users to dismount
  - Structural clearance width and adjoining footways 4m minimum
  - Lighting provision to be agreed during detailed design
  - 4% gradient on access ramps
  - Access restrictions to use bollards as per the NMU route (para 7.7)
  - Smooth faced finish to underpass walls
  - Signing on approaches for Non Motorised Users to direct them to the underpass from connecting routes
- 7.8 The design details currently under discussion between the HA and CEC will also be agreed prior to the closure of the examination of the scheme so that it can be included in the Inspectors report.

DRAFT

## 8.0 LANDSCAPING, NATURE CONSERVATION AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT

- 8.1 CEC is in principle supportive of the scheme, but there are potential issues concerning built heritage, landscape and visual impact, nature conservation and impact on trees that CEC may wish to raise during the examination process. In summary:
- 8.2 The new road affects two grade II listed properties and a historic parkland of local significance.
- 8.3 There is a moderate adverse impact on ecology at opening and a slight/neutral adverse impact at design year, locally significant adverse impacts are anticipated on otter, bats, barn owls and running water. Residual adverse impacts could potentially be off set and secured by legal agreement.
- 8.4 There are potentially significant landscape and visual impacts within this area of green belt, designated area of county value and local visual amenity impacts.
- 8.5 Impact on trees has not been assessed at this time.
- 8.6 It is agreed that the reduced lighting principle along the de-trunked route and the new A556 should be a major benefit to ecological and environmental issues.
- 8.7 It is agreed that a focused landscape working group should be organised to consider the detailed planting requirements.
- 8.8 It is agreed that the revised design for the NMU track and bund require careful drainage design to ensure that the bund doesn't dry out in summer and become waterlogged in winter. The detailed design of drainage and bund will be agreed prior to the closure of the examination so that it can be included in the Inspectors report.
- 8.9 It is agreed that all hedgerows removed during construction are to be replaced on a like for like basis, as stated in the environmental statement.

## 9.0 CONCLUSION / SUMMARY

- 9.1 This SoCG has been prepared in respect of the Scheme by the Highways Agency (“HA”), as the Applicant, and Cheshire East Council (“CEC”).
- 9.2 This SoCG considers issues submitted in Relevant Representations by the appropriate departments across the whole of CEC.
- 9.3 CEC has actively engaged and challenged the Highways Agency on the alternative options for the scheme including the proposals for the M6 J20. CEC are generally supportive of the scheme as it improves strategic access to the Motorway network for both CEC residents and businesses as it relieves significant congestion issues along the A556 between the M6 at junction 19 and junction 7 of the M56.
- 9.4 A number of environmental issues have been identified by CEC associated with air quality in the wider area that CEC will seek to mitigate using a commuted sum from the HA. This commuted sum will be agreed prior to the closure of the examination of the scheme so that it can be included in the Inspectors report.
- 9.5 CEC have raised a number of issues with regard to the design of junctions on the de-trunked A556 (at Mere crossroads and Bucklow Hill) and the A50 / new A556 roundabout, which the HA are investigating. The detailed designs will be agreed prior to the closure of the examination so that they can be included in the Inspectors report.
- 9.6 CEC will take over responsibility for the de-trunked A556 from the HA. This is subject to the agreement of a commuted sum for maintenance. This commuted sum will also be agreed prior to the closure of the examination of the scheme so that it can be included in the Inspectors report.
- 9.7 Agreement has been reached between CEC and the HA on the design of the de-trunked A556 (including widths, speed limits, street lighting and most aspects of the new NMU route).
- 9.8 The HA have been in discussions with Tatton Park to gain their views on the proposals and a number of amendments to the scheme have been made. Tatton Park is fully engaged in the progression of the scheme and this will continue throughout project construction. It is agreed that revised access arrangements to

---

major events at Tatton Park will be finalised in collaboration with the HA and CEC.

- 9.9 A commuted sum is sought by CEC to mitigate potential impacts on the wider CEC road network. This commuted sum will also be agreed prior to the closure of the examination of the scheme so that it can be included in the Inspectors report.
- 9.10 Flood risk and drainage is the subject of on going discussion, with assurance sought from CEC that all relevant guidance has been followed.
- 9.11 The Public Rights of Way team have agreed design criteria for the new NMU route and underpass. The final design details currently under discussion between the HA and CEC will be agreed prior to the closure of the examination of the scheme so that it can be included in the Inspectors report.
- 9.12 CEC have identified potential issues concerning built heritage, landscape and visual impact, nature conservation and impact on trees that need to be resolved.
- 9.13 It is agreed that a number of proposed mitigation measures will address the remaining environmental issues.
- 9.14 There are issues around the design of the bund between the NMU route and the de-trunked A556 that will be addressed in the final design. The final design details currently under discussion between the HA and CEC will be agreed prior to the closure of the examination of the scheme so that it can be included in the Inspectors report.

**APPENDIX 1: NOTES OF MEETING BETWEEN CEC, HA AND JACOBS 15/06/2010**

<b>Meeting Location</b>	CEBC Lyme Green Depot, Macclesfield, Cheshire	<b>Client</b>	Highways Agency
<b>Meeting Date/Time</b>	15/06/2010 2pm to 5pm	<b>Project</b>	A556 Environmental Improvement
<b>Subject</b>	A556 De-Trunking Work and Side Road Geometry	<b>Project No.</b>	B1076602
<b>Participants</b>	HA: Mohammed Swapan (MSw)  CEBC : John McGowan (JM) Rob Cramer (RC) Simon Davies (SD)  Jacobs: Simon Begley (SB) Simon Hayton (SH) Chris Black (CB)	<b>Notes Prepared By</b>	Simon Begley Jacobs

**File**

B1076602/03/02

**cc:** As above plus:

 Manuelle Salathé, Highway Agency  
 David Cattley, Jacobs  
 Kate Oram, Jacobs  
 Martin Clarke, Jacobs  
 John Ryde, Jacobs

	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Introductions</b>  All attendees provided introduction.	
<b>2.</b>	<b>Financial Overview and Scheme Update</b>  MSw described the current drive for reducing costs/improving	

	<p>value on the A556 scheme due to the uncertainty of scheme status pending the spending review due October 2010.</p>	
<p><b>3.</b></p>	<p><b>Scheme Design / Changes</b></p> <p>SH explained scheme changes since last meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scheme now avoids Tabley Parish Hall</li> <li>• Old Hall Lane re-alignment and overbridge provision           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2m footway on one side only, 0.6m verge on other, 5.5m carriageway width</li> </ul> </li> <li>• A50 junction now narrowed to S2 spec           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- provide footway on northern side to match existing, actual dumb-bell is now a “squashed” gyratory, no need to replace lay-bys on A50 as have history of “mis-use”, no lighting intended for the A50</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Off-line Chapel Lane re-alignment and bridge construction           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- approach gradients of 8%, keep lighting extents as is, NSL maintained</li> </ul> </li> <li>• s/b diverge – new compact style layout, compliant design as much as practically possible – would need to agree signing strategy with CEBC “local traffic only” etc</li> <li>• Rostherne Lane – NMU only overbridge</li> <li>• NMU strategy - Yarwood Heath farm access to proposed roundabout</li> <li>• Possible bypass routed behind back of Rangemore Nursing Home, north of “Millington Bend”           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- to remove land-take from Rostherne Mere SSSI, could save scheme £3m (less temporary works etc).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p><b>Departures</b></p> <p>SH described a departure example to CEBC. Due to workload and staff leave, CEBC will be content with summary sheets for departure submissions. Jacobs have to submit to CEBC for approval prior to submission to HA Netserv.</p> <p>Currently 5 departures for CEBC to consider. SH to send an example to CEBC (RC) before August so CEBC would know what to expect.</p>	<p><b>Jacobs</b></p>
	<p><b>5. NMU Strategy</b></p> <p><b>M56 Junction 7 end</b></p> <p>SH explained the strategy. Major problem was how to move NMUs across the M56 as the A556 Chester Road bridge will</p>	

not have any available width for footway provision.

Proposal is to use “old” roundabout with a controlled signal on demand, so don’t need to use the proposed roundabout. Use Coe Lane overbridge (west of A556) and build new NMU track to link to Millington Hall Lane. This would be an additional 1.5km to the current route but would be more of a leisure route. Only alternative is to build a bridge parallel to Chester Road bridge but this would be too costly and disruptive.

SB asked if CEBC would adopt Tom Lane (south of Yarwood Heath Farm) to link the farm to the local side network. CEBC don’t want to get involved with access issues and would not want to adopt extra side road lanes. JM explained a private agreement could be negotiated to only permit access for YHF and Cherry Tree Lane vehicles – either upgrade the lane as part of accommodation works or HA to offer a sum to obtain rights of way in perpetuity.

### **M6 J19 end**

SH explained the facilities proposed to allow passage of NMUs from south of M6 J19 across the roundabout on existing facilities and to an off-road facility to link to the proposed Old Hall Lane re-alignment and overbridge.

### **General Issues**

CEBC prefer to have tactile paving if installing dropped crossing facilities but no guard-railing.

<b>6.</b>	<b>De-Trunking Proposals and Geometry</b>
-----------	---

	<b>Proposals</b>
--	------------------

	SH described the white lining and hatching proposal designed by Jacobs as directed by the HA. 2m cycleways, 3.0m trafficked lanes and approx. 4m of central hatching.
--	---

	JM dissatisfied with the proposal as it would leave too much carriageway space and would be an unacceptable solution. Hatching/lining would need to be re-newed every 2/3 years. CEBC would prefer a one-side of carriageway trafficked option kerbing laid on the crown line of the A556, with the other side perforated and soiled as verge. Also rejected idea of inserting pedestrian refuges in the hatching.
--	--

	JM explained that the hatching proposal would need a commuted sum for re-newal of hatching every 2/3 years for 20
--	---

	<p>years, which would not be needed for the kerbed option.</p> <p>Msw explained that the HA wanted to develop a good value, low cost scheme.</p> <p>Jacobs to develop a kerbed option as described by JM and to issue to CEBC for comment/review.</p> <p>Agreed that lighting would need to be dismantled as the current specification could be down graded to suit the future nature of the road. Mere to M6J19 section could probably remain unlit – JM to check with CEBC lighting engineers.</p> <p><b>Geometry</b></p> <p>CB explained the overtaking issues on the sections of the current A556 carriageway on the Mere to M6J19 section. Hidden dips and blind crests would be present, dependant on overtaking distance/design speed.</p> <p>Jacobs to develop further when design speed/speed limit and scheme details agreed with CEBC.</p>	<p><b>Jacobs</b></p> <p><b>CEBC</b></p> <p><b>Jacobs</b></p>
<p><b>7. AOB</b></p>	<p><b>Value Management Workshop Attendance</b></p> <p>Msw asked if any representatives from CEBC would be able to attend the VM Workshop on 24/25 June 2010. CEBC hope to send someone to represent the views of CEBC.</p>	<p><b>CEBC</b></p>
<p><b>8. Next Meeting?</b></p>	<p>TBA</p>	

**APPENDIX 2: NOTES OF MEETING BETWEEN CEC, HA AND JACOBS 12/01/2010**

<b>Meeting Location</b>	HA Manchester	<b>Client</b>	Highways Agency
<b>Meeting Date/Time</b>	12/01/2010 1:30pm to 4:00pm	<b>Project</b>	A556 Environmental Improvement
<b>Subject</b>	A556 De-Trunking Works	<b>Project No.</b>	B1076602
<b>Participants</b>	<b>HA:</b> Mohammed Swapan (MSw) Anna Pickering (AP) Christian Marsh (CM)  <b>CEBC :</b> Paul Griffin (PG) John Grey (JG) Phil Myson (PM)  <b>Jacobs:</b> Simon Begley (SB) Simon Hayton (SH) Rob Mullin (RM)	<b>Notes Prepared By</b>	Rob Mullin Jacobs
		<b>File</b>	B1076602/02/01 B1076601/11/01

**cc:** As above plus:

- Tony Caccavone, DFT
- David Riley, Jacobs
- John Ryde, Jacobs
- Mike James, Jacobs
- Matthew Clark, Jacobs – Croydon
- Ashley Stratford (ASt), Jacobs
- David Neal (DN), Jacobs

	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Introductions</b>  All attendees provided introduction.	
<b>2.</b>	<b>Deliverables update</b>	

	<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-ECI contract to be awarded in March, Highways Agency currently considering tender returns.</li> <li>-PCI included in Tender Docs</li>   <li>- Supplementary Consultation Report, EIA Scoping Report and Strategic Assessment Report ongoing.</li> </ul>	<p>Jacobs</p>
<p><b>3. Scheme Update</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SH highlighted amendments to the A556 Alignment and tabled A50 design options for comment. JG commented that the desired option would likely be the one with least local impact and highest capacity and that local opinion should be sought – Mere Residents Association.</li>   <li>- PM stated that the A50 junction options should be included in the EIA scoping report.</li>   <li>- SH outlined design amendments to avoid impinging on an existing aviation fuel pipeline. Elevations of the A556 and Mereside Road have been increased to avoid the pipeline which is currently 2m below existing ground level.</li>   <li>- SH queried the requirement for a merge at Millington Lane onto the new A556 as the link road between Millington Lane and Millington Hall Lane has been removed and Millington Lane is a low quality low trafficked lane. JG agreed that there seemed to be no requirement for a high spec merge, though SH to investigate the history behind the local link road being dropped.</li>   <li>- JG stated that Mereside road traffic counts are required to analyse potential speed limits and traffic impact caused by the new A556 along this road. Jacobs currently progressing with traffic assessments.</li>   <li>- SH outline the NMU links to be provided at Old Hall Lane and Rostherne Lane. SH highlighted issues in regards to the Old Hall Lane NMU facility in that a pump may be required with the underpass proposal to provide adequate drainage. SH queried if this would be acceptable and who would be responsible for its maintenance.</li>   <li>-SH stated that under the current proposals all roads north of Rostherne Lane would be severed and access to the weighbridge and The Cheshire Lounge would be provided from</li> </ul>	<p>SH</p> <p>Jacobs</p>

	<p>Lymm Road (A56)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SH stated that a NMU survey would commence Spring 2010.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>4. De-Trunking</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- JG outlined that although he would provide discussion/comment on de-trunking proposals at the meeting he would have to discuss any proposals formally with local residents and CEBC executive members.</li> <li>- SB queried whether there should be a residential/rural split in terms of speed limit signing and street lighting along the existing A556.</li> <li>- JG stated that any proposed speed limits would have to be checked against the National Guidance for Local Speed Limits to ensure they were appropriate.</li> <li>- JG intimated that there should be local input into the de-trunking strategy and consultation held with interest groups.</li> <li>- AP highlighted concerns about having another round of public consultation for the de-trunking following so close to the previous consultation period. AP stated it could cause public annoyance with many questioning why de-trunking was not included in the previous consultation questionnaire.</li> <li>- All parties agreed that an initial discussion should take place between the relevant parties present and stakeholders before any form of public consultation is considered. PG and SH to organise a meeting to discuss PRoW's and the de-trunking works.</li> <li>- Jacobs to provide NMU cross section options prior to meeting noted above.</li> <li>- RM tabled and discussed potential design options for the junctions along the existing A556 as part of the de-trunk works. No issues regarding the options were provided.</li> <li>- General approval was given for providing a residential access lane to segregate property entrances from the A556.</li> <li>- General consensus towards providing on road cycleways and retaining existing kerb lines and drainage wherever possible.</li> <li>- PG stated that Mere Golf Club should be included in the development of the de-trunking works due to the locations of</li> </ul>	<p>PG/SH</p> <p>Jacobs</p>

	<p>their access and egress points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SH queried whether CEBC were opposed to the use of traffic calming. JG stated that vertical traffic calming should be avoided.</li> </ul>	
<b>5. Drainage</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SB stated that as the de-trunking works would be reducing the existing A556 carriageway and traffic volumes there would be reduced surface water run-off and pollutants. SB stated Jacobs would be highlighting this to the Environment Agency and that large drainage remediation works may not be required.</li> <li>- CM commented that if an environmental assessment was produced it may highlight that extensive remediation is not required.</li> </ul>	
<b>6. Statutory Undertakers</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Jacobs currently collating Statutory Undertaker information.</li> </ul>	Jacobs
<b>7. Air Quality</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PM stated that the AQMA would be commenced in May.</li> <li>- PM highlighted current areas of concern are the motorway roundabouts and adjacent properties as they are within the AQMA boundary</li> <li>- PM stated that the red route would be more beneficial in terms of air pollution as on-line routes would have greater impact on the residences along the existing A556</li> <li>- PM highlighted that the AQMA boundary is 20m either side of the A556 though this boundary may reduce after further survey assessment as the exceedance area is currently 15m back from the A556.</li> <li>- PM requested Jacobs environmental assessment report when complete to judge air quality effects particularly at the A50 junction</li> </ul>	Jacobs
<b>8. Tabley Parish Council</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PG tabled Tabley Parish Councils concerns regarding the A556 design, specifically querying whether a link can be provided from Old Hall Lane to the A556. Jacobs to research this further</li> <li>- MS stated that the HA will respond to these concerns at a meeting with Tabley Parish Council and inform CEBC of any conclusions/solutions to these concerns prior to the meeting.</li> </ul>	<p>Jacobs</p> <p>MS</p>

---

9.	AOB  None	
----	-----------------	--

---

DRAFT

**APPENDIX 3: NOTES OF MEETING BETWEEN CEC, HA AND JACOBS 09/02/2010**

<b>Meeting Location</b>	CEBC Lyme Green Depot, Macclesfield, Cheshire	<b>Client</b>	Highways Agency
<b>Meeting Date/Time</b>	09/02/2010 2:30pm to 5:30pm	<b>Project</b>	A556 Environmental Improvement
<b>Subject</b>	A556 De-Trunking Works	<b>Project No.</b>	B1076602
<b>Participants</b>	<b>Highways Agency:</b> Mohammed Swapan (MSw)  <b>CEBC:</b> Andy Buckley (AB) John McGowan (JM) Rob Cramer (RC)  <b>Jacobs:</b> Simon Begley (SB) Simon Hayton (SH) Chris Black (CB)	<b>Notes Prepared By</b>	Simon Begley Simon Hayton
		<b>File</b>	B1076602/03/02

**cc:** As above plus:  
 Manuelle Salathé, Highway Agency  
 Martin Clarke, Jacobs

	Notes	Action
1	<b><u>INTRODUCTIONS</u></b>  All attendees provided introduction.	
2	<b><u>SCHEME UPDATE</u></b>  SH outlined recent progress and summarised the recent supplementary public consultation exercise, which focussed on the three options for the tie-in of the southern end of the A556 scheme to M6 J19.	

	<p>Two of those routes are being developed for preliminary design purposes:</p> <p>Brown Option, which is the current preferred route, would tie-in to the existing A556, 600m north of M6 J19.</p> <p>Red, an offline option which connects directly to M6 J19 without tie-in to the existing A556.</p> <p>The Red Option is preferred by approximately 75% of the questionnaires returned from the consultation exercise.</p> <p>The objective of the meeting was to discuss side roads design philosophy and establish any particular design standards CEBC may wish to adopt. SH noted that the design has been developed in accordance with HA DMRB and departures assessed accordingly. This was based on previous telephone conversations with RC. SH noted that the current strategy for all side road diversions is to provide a network of 'country lanes' in keeping with surrounding local roads. Based on this many local road diversions would require departures from standards. SH explained the departure submissions process which would require both CEBC and HA Netserv to review and ultimately approve any departures from standards to allow their implementation within the design.</p> <p>CEBC confirmed that they adopt DMRB.</p> <p>The meeting would also provide an update on the de-trunking proposals following the previous meeting (12/01/10, HA City Tower, Manchester) and present some indicative layout options at Bucklow Hill and Mere Junctions for comment.</p>	
<p><b>3. <u>DESIGN STANDARDS REPORT</u></b></p>	<p>SH explained that Jacobs were currently compiling a DSR and would hope to issue CEBC a copy shortly to allow CEBC to review and consider side road design issues.</p> <p><b><i>POST MEETING MINUTE – Due to issues in achieving design fixity and the likelihood of changes to the design as presented in the draft Design Standards Report it is proposed to submit the Final Design Standards Report together with the Draft Departure Submission Forms after the election purdah period. The design team will look to arrange a meeting at this time also.</i></b></p>	<p><b>Jacobs</b></p>

#### 4. GENERAL DISCUSSION

SH outlined the proposed side roads design in general, starting at the southern end at M6 J19. SH explained that the traffic modelling (Stage 2) model was not detailed enough to provide side road flows but a variable demand model is currently being validated and will include forecast traffic flows on the local road network. This is programmed to become available in May 2010 when the design will be reviewed and amended accordingly. CEBC are keen to see existing/proposed flows before final agreement of all side road proposals.

**Design Speeds** – Design speeds have been assessed by checking the ‘bendiness’ of the existing route in accordance with TD 9/93 (Highway Link Design) and moreover by assessing the existing curve radii, sight distance (by site inspection), level of access and speed restrictions. The design speeds adopted for new diversions are either 50kph or 60kph (excluding the A50 and de-trunking works).

**Cross-Section** - Jacobs currently propose to provide a similar cross-section to that of the existing highway at tie-in. This would include the cross-section provision over the structure. Existing cross-sections range from approximately 3 to 5m carriageway width plus verges (max. 1.5m). The minimum standard proposed by DMRB (TD27/05 Cross-Sections and Headrooms) would be 7.3m single carriageway plus 1m hardstrips (S2).

Jacobs/CEBC agreed that an S2 cross-section to DMRB standards would be inappropriate and agreed in general with the current strategy, subject to confirmation of verge width and NMU facilities.

**Road Markings** - General comment from CEBC that if new road widths are below 5.5m, then centre-line markings should not be applied as this would suggest a higher standard, resulting in increased speed.

**Transitions / Superelevation** - Discussions were held over the application of superelevation, inclusion of transitions and the impact on driver speed / safety. Two opposing options were tabled;

1. **Include transitions / superelevation to max. 5%:** may increase the speed at which bends could be negotiated, resulting in inappropriate speeds on returning to the existing network.
2. **No transitions / superelevation to remove the effects of adverse camber only:** may result in loss of control at the bend itself.

Currently the design is capped at a maximum of 5% superelevation for all side roads. Transitions have been introduced where necessary on all but Burleyhurst Lane based on the anticipated traffic flow and the assessed standard of adjacent roads. Burleyhurst Lane which is a non-through route for vehicles and of a very poor standard. CEBC agreed that superelevation and transitions on Burleyhurst Lane should not be provided.

Without details of traffic flow CEBC could not comment on their preference on superelevation and/or transitions. Jacobs are to continue on the assumption that 5% superelevation and transitions (on all but Burleyhurst Lane). **Jacobs** to review following receipt of Stage 3 traffic forecasting.

**Gradient** – Discussions were held regarding acceptable gradients. Jacobs noted that in accordance with TD9/93, the design currently regards 4% as the desirable maximum, extended to an absolute maximum of 6% in exceptional circumstances. CEBC were content that 7 – 8% is acceptable over short lengths.

**Pavement** - RC noted that CEBC would not except SMA (Stone Mastic Asphalt) as part of the pavement specification for local roads. Despite its increased road noise CEBC would request HRA (Hot Rolled Asphalt) in place of SME. Jacobs to consult environmental team and consider as part of the spec.

## **5 DETAILED DISCUSSION**

### **5.1 OLD HALL LANE (RED OPTION)**

50 kph design speed assumed, to suit the existing nature of the road.

Transitions and max. 5% superelevation provided where required.

Currently propose 5.5m wide carriageway with 2m verges.

Culverting of a watercourse needed. Pond access is likely to be

### **5.2 required from OHL.**

#### **BURLEYHURST LANE**

Adopted by CEBC but essentially a farm access track of poor condition (heavily rutted and partially surfaced), generally around 2.5m wide carriageway with 2m verges.

Currently propose 2.5m wide carriageway and 2m verges, widening to 4m and 2m respectively on the structure.

- 5.3 CEBC wish to have lane kerbed over bridge extents and add passing bays either side of bridge.

### **A50 WARRINGTON ROAD / JUNCTION**

Currently WS2 width to tie-into the adjacent network.

SH tabled the current proposal of a compact grade separated junction. SH noted that traffic analysis result in queuing along connector roads onto the A556 in certain conditions. The design team are developing a dumbbell roundabout arrangement (SH tables a working sketch of the proposed layout).

**POST MEETING MINUTE:** *The design has been developed to incorporate the grade separated dumbbell roundabout. This will be reviewed against the Stage 3 traffic information once available.*

CEBC reported issues with speed along the current A50. The general consensus was that a junction would improve this issue, providing it's presence is suitably conveyed to the motorist.

CEBC suggested that the patch of the dumbbell carriageway is raised and filled to form a single gyratory – **Jacobs** to discuss with HA Netserv.

SH noted that although the lighting design has yet to be completed, there is an environmental drive not to light the dumbbell roundabout. RC suggested that CEBC would support this due to the reduction in maintenance subject to no marked increase in accidents. CEBC suggested an initial trial period without lighting after which (if accidents occur as a result of the new junction form in its unlit state) the HA would accept liability to install the lighting on the local road. MSw to consider.

- 5.4

**POST MEETING MINUTE:** *The design has been amended to reduce the cross-section width from WS2 (10m + 1m hardstrips) to S2 (7.3m + 1m hardstrips). This would reduce driver speeds approaching the new junction and also approaching the junction with the de-trunked A556 which would be reconfigured to give the A50 priority.*

### **A556 TO DE-TRUNKED A556 SOUTHBOUND DIVERGE**

SH/SB described the design iterations involving the n/b merge and the Chapel Lane / Millington Hall Lane Link. The current strategy is to omit the merge due to the very low standard of MHL and retain the CL/MHL link for local trips only.

The emergency services have expressed a desire for the inclusion of such connections to ensure rescue response times are not affected by the scheme. Consequently, the southbound diverge to the de-trunked A556 has been retained. Jacobs are to undertake Stage 3 consultation to validate this requirement.

**Alignment** – Jacobs tabled a compliant single lane taper diverge design generally meeting the requirements set by the 120kph mainline design speed and 85kph connector road design speed (proposed standard within 1 design speed step)

CEBC considered that the provision of such a high standard would represent a safety issue as traffic would enter the local road network at high speed. CEBC also suggested that this would be abused by vehicles heading towards Knutsford who would use Mereside Road as is the current situation. CEBC requested a more clear and phased reduction in design standards following the diverge. CEBC suggested the introduce of a chicane formed by tighter radii of opposing hand coupled with a reduction in SSD to forcibly slow down the traffic. **Jacobs** to develop additional options.

**Cross-Section** – CEBC question the short length of hardshoulder and requested its removal as it would only serve to generate additional speed.

A possible gateway feature was suggested by CEBC.

**5.5** ***POST MEETING MINUTE** – Jacobs have developed a compact style diverge which employs the philosophy of introducing clearly tight radii (to approximately 30kph standards), reducing the speed of diverging vehicles. The compact solution would not develop a hardshoulder. Jacobs to consult CEBC.*

Jacobs noted that Knutsford and similar long distance destinations would be signed only from the A50 junction. Jacobs agreed to liaise with CEBC regarding a suitable signing strategy.

**5.6**

## **CHAPEL LANE / MILLINGTON HALL LANE LINK**

5.0m wide, 2m verges to 60kph standard

- 5.7 The new link has been located on the boundary between landowners / occupiers to minimise severance. MSw noted the existence of HA land in the area previously purchased for an alternate scheme. **Jacobs** to confirm location of HA land.

### **BUCKLOW HILL LANE**

To be stopped up either side of the new bypass. The details of the point at which the road is stopped up and any turning facilities are to be confirmed.

### **CHAPEL LANE**

Existing lane is approximately 5m wide with 1m verges and on a very straight alignment at the proposed crossing.

Jacobs have assumed a 60kph design speed with 5m carriageway and 2m verges each side of the road.

Designed with a crest curve 1 step below standard in accordance with TD 9/93 to ensure ominous overtaking visibility is avoided and a clear non-overtaking section is provided.

Discussed possible introduction of speed limit (either 30mph or 40mph) on western approach to bridge. Confirmation by the police and consistency with the de-trunking proposals is required. **Jacobs** to consult police authorities.

Drainage gullies seem to feed into ditches on each side of road.

During the Stage 2 design the alignment of Chapel Lane was at approximate ground level with the bypass in deep cutting. The presence of the aviation fuel pipe has resulted in the need for the bypass to be at ground level and Chapel Lane bridge raised up and over the bypass. Design to date indicates that land from adjacent properties should not be needed to accommodate the embankments for the bridge approaches.

- 5.8 **POST MEETING MINUTE:** *Following receipt of more detailed survey access to properties east of the new bypass was found to be unachievable. The alignment has been changed horizontally to run offline to the north of the existing Chapel Lane. Whilst being able to provide access to property, the curved alignment is considered to provide a safer solution as drivers would clearly be able to visualise the change in direction as the road ahead would climb onto its approach embankments. This is considered safer when compared the previous proposal which introduced a reduced SSD crest on a straight road. Jacobs to re-consult CEBC.*

## **ROSTHERNE LANE / MILLINGTON LANE**

- 5.9** NMU only overbridge proposed – no vehicular crossing or access to the new road.

Designed with approach gradients of 5 and 7%.

4m width proposed.

- 5.10** Access to the “Rangemore” nursing home would be maintained.

**POST MEETING MINUTE:** *Alignment amended to reduce approach grades to <5%. Jacobs to re-consult CEBC.*

## **CHERRY TREE LANE**

To be stopped up either side of the new bypass. The details of the point at which the road is stopped up and any turning facilities are to be confirmed.

## **A56 LYMME ROAD / A56 DUNHAM ROAD / BOWDON RBT**

- 5.11**

A56 Dunham Road and Lymm Road to be diverted to connect into the new roundabout.

Discussed possible options for relocation of the existing VOSA site either on land to the southeast of the existing Bowdon roundabout or by utilising the redundant road pavement within the existing roundabout once replaced. CEBC would not wish to adopt any access tracks to the VOSA site/Cheshire Lounge Pub. CEBC would prefer the VOSA site to use the existing roundabout area.

## **YARWOODHEATH LANE**

Currently a PROW / private access only with no access for public vehicles.

Jacobs are developing possible route of a private means of access (PMA) which connects YHL to the A56 Lymm Road via an underpass under the A556 embankment (M56/Chester Road bridge) and use of the existing old road adjacent to the Cheshire Lounge.

**POST MEETING MINUTE:** *Despite significant optioneering the preferred solution of the project team is to provide direct access onto the new roundabout. Jacobs to re-consult CEBC.*

## **6 DRAINAGE**

SH outlined the current strategy to replace side-road drainage on a like-for-like basis. Therefore, where a local road is currently positively drained this would be replaced and where possible tied back into the existing network. If no outfall is available it is proposed to discharge into the A556 drainage network, subject to agreement by the Highways Agency.

It is acknowledged that replacing existing systems on a like-for-like basis would not meet drainage standards as laid out in DMRB for surface/sub-surface and pre-earthworks drainage. For example, the use of over the edge drainage would be employed where no existing positive drainage exists as per the current situation. Another example would be for the A50 which appears to have isolated gullies which outfall through the shallow embankment onto adjacent land. Jacobs may look to retain this system.

CEBC were satisfied with the principle of replacing drainage like-for-like.

CEBC to provide all as-built drainage records for affected side-roads.

## **7 DE-TRUNKING PROPOSALS**

Jacobs are developing a two-lane carriageway with separate cycleway facility using the residual carriageway width but retaining the existing kerblines to minimise new kerbing and avoid costly drainage works.

Discussed possible need to down-grade the road lighting to suit the de-classification of the A road.

Jacobs will submit more detailed proposals to CEBC for consideration when the draft design is complete.

### **7.1 BUCKLOW HILL JUNCTION (A556/A5034)**

Agreed that CEBC would prefer to remove signals from the junction if possible.

CEBC suggested the possible stopping-up of A5034 Mereside Road so that traffic coming off the new A556 and accessing the de-trunked A556 could not fork left to get to Knutsford but would have to either stay on the new A556 and use the A50 junction, or if travelling on the de-trunked A556, use the A50

junction to travel towards Knutsford. CEBC to consider further.

#### **A50/A556 Mere Junction**

SH reported that Jacobs are developing junction layouts that amended the signal layout and also removed signals, but making the A50 the priority route as the flow on the old A556 will be a lot lower.

#### **De-trunked A556 – Mere to Old Hall Lane Section**

Agreed that this section of road has a “rural” feel to it, so speed limit and road cross-section needs to reflect this.

<p><b>6. <u>TRAFFIC FLOWS</u></b></p>	<p>Jacobs to determine what traffic flows are currently available from the Stage 2 model (developed by Capita Symonds) to support side roads design philosophy.</p> <p>Jacobs to report when forecast flows are available from new Stage 3 modelling work, forecast to be April/May 2010.</p>	<p><b>Jacobs</b></p> <p><b>Jacobs</b></p>
<p><b>8. <u>NEXT MEETING?</u></b></p>	<p>Agreed for 1:30pm Tuesday 16<sup>th</sup> March 2010 at Lyme Green.</p> <p><b><i>POST MEETING MINUTE: The above meeting was postponed as the project team took the view that CEBC should only review the Final Design Standards Report that has been first approved by the Highways Agency. Contact with CEBC is to be reignited following the election purdah period.</i></b></p>	

**APPENDIX 4: : NOTES OF MEETING BETWEEN CEC, HA AND JACOBS 05/08/2010**

<b>Meeting Location</b>	Cheshire East BC Office, Lyme Green, Macclesfield	<b>Client</b>	Highways Agency
<b>Meeting Date/Time</b>	05/08/10 9:30am to 11:30am	<b>Project</b>	A556 Environmenta l Improvement
<b>Subject</b>	A556 De-Trunking and Junction Strategy Meeting	<b>Project No.</b>	B1076602
<b>Participants</b>	Mohammed Swapan (MS) HA  John McGowan (JMcG) CEBC Rob Cramer (RC) CEBC  Simon Begley, (SB) Simon Hayton (SH) Jacobs	<b>Notes Prepared By</b>	Simon Begley, Jacobs
		<b>File</b>	B1076602/?? /01

**cc:** As above plus:  
David Cattley, Jacobs  
Kate Oram, Jacobs

	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Scheme Update</b>	
<b>1.1</b>	MS explained that the A556 Project Team is aiming to reduce scheme costs to give a good chance of surviving the Government Comprehensive Spending Review in October 2010.	
<b>1.2</b>	MS reported that the aim is to save possible approx 10% from the scheme budget (of £174m) but this does not include the savings forecasted for revising the M56 J7/8 junction layout.	
<b>1.3</b>	Incorrect recent Press articles discussed (Manchester	

<p>1.4</p> <p>1.5</p> <p>1.6</p> <p>1.7</p> <p>1.8</p>	<p>Evening News, Knutsford Guardian) – MS explained that there was no truth in either the scheme being “axed” or construction starting.</p> <p>MS explained why recent Value Management workshop was undertaken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To achieve cost reduction</li> <li>• To improve environmental impacts reduction</li> </ul> <p>Key outcomes were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To appease Mere residents regarding predicted increased traffic on A50</li> <li>• To reduce value of compensation risk to service area/businesses at southern end mitigation by providing some form of junction</li> </ul> <p>1.6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revise junction strategy from March 2010 Preferred Route</li> </ul> <p>1.7</p> <p>SH explained how scheme has moved on since with preferred overall layout. Less traffic on A50 but more traffic on Mereside Road.</p> <p>1.8</p> <p>Jacobs Traffic team currently working on flow forecasting to determine revised junction strategy works.</p> <p>All agreed that throughout the scheme proposals, there is a net reduction in local road maintenance.</p>	
<p>2</p> <p>2.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.2</p> <p>2.1.3</p> <p>2.1.4</p> <p>2.1.5</p>	<p><b>2 Value Management (VM) Workshop</b></p> <p>2.1 Key outcomes and changes from the VM workshop were:</p> <p>2.1.1 Re-alignment of A556 Mainline to west of Rangemore NH owners prefer route behind back of home as access would be better than with March 2010 Preferred Route.</p> <p>2.1.2 Rationalisation of Chapel Lane and Rostherne Lane bridges to one bridge crossing, near Millington.</p> <p>2.1.3 M56 Junction 7/8 – re-assessing layout options.</p> <p>2.1.4 A50 options. Team currently considering north facing slips at an A50 junction but Millington Lane junction preferred, which combines with (2.1.2) above</p> <p>2.1.5 Southern end junction. A possible £10-£12m saving in compensation for claims from businesses from service facilities (Little Chef etc) near</p>	

<p>2.1.6</p> <p>2.1.7</p> <p>2.1.8</p> <p>2.2</p>	<p>M6 J19 is being targeted, by providing reasonable access if compared to the March 2010 Preferred Route.</p> <p>Old Hall Lane. Team considering removal of vehicular connection from de-trunked A556 to Old Hall Lane, added after March 2010 Preferred Route but NMU underpass included.</p> <p>Over Tabley Residents consideration. Reduced length of route for Over Tabley residents to reach hall, St. Paul's church and service areas if they use the looped junction compared the current layout to use Old Hall Lane connection proposal.</p> <p>A556 Southbound diverge removal. If the March 2010 Preferred Route scheme was to be progressed, then the team would remove the A556 southbound diverge facility. CEBC would prefer not to include it.</p> <p>Discussed police issues regarding incident management.</p>	
<p><b>3</b></p> <p>3.1</p> <p>3.2</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>3.3.1</p> <p>3.3.2</p>	<p><b>Junction Strategy &amp; Layout Options</b></p> <p>Although JMcG initially unhappy with proposed junction strategy, RC would not be adverse to two junction strategy and understands the logic of how it would operate. JMcG concerned about Millington Lane junction layout but can be detailed/re-assessed during design.</p> <p>All agreed that Knutsford bound traffic should not be signed from new A556. The existing A556 to be de-trunked would likely be re-classified to a B road. SH reported approx 800 vehicles/hr in peak hour – this approximates to 10,000 vph on old A556.</p> <p><b>A50 – No-junction, 3 options.</b></p> <p><b>Offline north of A50.</b> Option would take less land and be aligned away from Belt Wood but impacts increased on Hulme Barns Farm.</p> <p><b>Offline south of A50.</b> Locates re-aligned A50 closer to Belt Wood but takes land mainly from smaller land parcel so impact is less. Impact on Hulme Barns Farm is minimal apart from visual impact.</p>	

- 3.3.3 Online:**  
 CEBC state that an A50 closure would need a temporary diversion so that would be the least favoured option by the team due to local disruption and additional cost.
- 3.3.4** RC feels that only the dumbbell roundabouts junction layout would be an effective speed deterrent on the A50 and there is no preference for any of the A50 no-junction layouts by CEBC.
- 3.4** CEBC.
- 3.4.1 Southern loop junction proposal.**
- SH explained the issue of the proximity of the proposed loop layout to the existing roundabout of M6 J19. CEBC
- 3.4.2** had no adverse comments to make on the proposal.
- RC queried if the scheme would include interactive Variable Message Signs (VMS). MS replied that only ducting for future signing would be included within the scheme, unless th HA Communications team could provide funds for sign inclusion.
- 3.5** RC explained that this would be a good warning system for Tatton Park events but permanent hinged plated types not suitable.
- 3.5.1 ML north facing slips junction.**
- 3.5.2** JMcG feels that “Give Way” layout is clumsy. SH explained that junction layout details will be developed further if the proposal is accepted and progressed.
- 3.5.3** All agreed that this layout should deter through traffic but will be more busy than originally anticipated – this is the only route to get to Knutsford.
- 3.5.4** Agreed that Project team need to interrogate Bucklow Hill and Mere junction traffic flow forecasts to determine if traffic signals will be required to control residual traffic flows.
- 3.5.5** RC concerned Mere Heath Lane not suitable as a route into Knutsford – felt that some traffic may use this unsuitable lane as traffic already uses it.
- 3.5.6** CEBC would prefer an A50 north facing slips junction layout to a Millington Lane north facing slips junction layout.
- JMcG had queuing concerns at Millington Lane junction

3.6	proposal. Design team haven't detailed junction layout yet. Concerns of rat-running down Hulse Heath Lane not suitable with this layout.	
3.6.1	<b>M56 Junction 7/8 options:</b>	
3.6.2	Option 3a new roundabout to form dumbbell arrangement with existing Bowdon roundabout. Option previously rejected but re-considered – cheapest of the 3 currently being considered.	
3.6.3	Option 4 new roundabout to form grade separated junction. This is the current proposal – possibly to be removed as is the most expensive and most difficult to construct.	
3.6.4	Option 6 as developed in the VM workshop.	
3.7	RC concerned by number of arms proposed on existing Bowdon roundabout. RC would prefer traffic signal control to stay.	
3.7.1	CEBC prefer not to adopt any de-trunked roundabout carriageway if possible.	
3.7.2	<b>Cherry Tree Lane/Yarwoodheath Farm access options:</b>	
3.7.3	Accommodation bridge and local road network upgrade to cater for Cherry Tree Lane businesses and Yarwoodheath Farm.	
3.7.4	A556 alignment shifted westwards by Mereside Farm to allow parallel local road on existing A556 southbound carriageway. 600m of new local road would need to be adopted by CEBC to connect to CTL junction	
	CEBC comments:	
	Need landowner consent to dedicate the private road to public use. Need purchase or dedication rights. If rights gained, CEBC would adopt the new road lengths into the local road network.	
4	<b>Detrunking Proposals/NMU Strategy</b>	
4.1	De-trunking proposals from VM workshop:	
4.1.1	Remove half of road width	

<p><b>4.1.2</b></p> <p><b>4.1.3</b></p> <p><b>4.1.4</b></p> <p><b>4.1.5</b></p> <p><b>4.1.6</b></p>	<p>Use the southbound side of the existing A556 carriageway instead of current proposed northbound side – reduces private access construction.</p> <p>Perforate redundant carriageway and topsoil “verge” area with excess topsoil from scheme.</p> <p>Extruded asphalt kerbing (EAK) suggested, on the A556 crown line, in VM Workshop. CEBC not satisfied that EAK performs in the long-term so would be a maintenance problem. RC wants a kerb, 45° splay kerb, 115mm kerb face JMcG suggested not kerbing and leaving as a country lane; all agreed that this was probably not feasible.</p> <p>Traffic signals to remain at Mere junction as A50 to be major route. The previous accident problem to the south of the junction has not been re-occurring. Jacobs need to assess flows to determine what is suitable.</p> <p>A fatality occurred at right-hand bend past the Kilton PH. CEBC suggested widening road out to improve. Jacobs to check location and if needed. Proposed 7.3m wide cross-section for A50. RC reported a substantial population at High Legh (northwest of A556) which may use A50/Hulse Heath Lane as route.</p>	<p>Jacobs</p>
<p><b>5</b></p> <p><b>5.1</b></p> <p><b>5.2</b></p>	<p><b>AOB?</b></p> <p>Another consultation exercise is required as part of IPC process so will need to consult again, probably in the new year of 2011.</p> <p>Tatton Park manager heard rumours of junction layout change (via Cheshire Police) and is concerned. RC sees logic in splitting traffic to Tatton Park. Agreed that scheme cannot be designed around Tatton Park events but project team will consider their Traffic Management requirements.</p>	
<p><b>6.</b></p> <p><b>6.1</b></p>	<p><b>Next Meeting</b></p> <p>To be confirmed.</p>	

**APPENDIX 5: NOTES OF MEETING BETWEEN CEC, HA AND JACOBS 22/08/2011**

<b>Meeting Location</b>	Cheshire East Council, Delamere House, Delamere Street, Crewe	<b>Client</b>	Highways Agency
<b>Meeting Date/Time</b>	22/08/2011	<b>Project</b>	A556 Environmental Improvement
<b>Subject</b>	CEC Technical Design/Departures Workshop – DTW and LRN	<b>Project No.</b>	B1076602
<b>Participants</b>	Arun Sahni (HA) – AS Simon Hayton (Jacobs) – SH Thomas Berriman (Jacobs) – TB John Addis (Capita) - JA Paul Griffiths (CEC) – PG Kevin Melling (CEC) – KM Robin Sawczyn (CEC) – RS John McGowan (CEC) – JMcG Genni Butler (CEC PROW) – GB	<b>Notes Prepared By</b>	Thomas Berriman, Jacobs
	<b>File</b>		B1076602/03/02

cc: As above plus:

Mohammed Swapan – Highways Agency  
 Anna Pickering – Highways Agency  
 Graeme Willis - Jacobs  
 Kate Pickup – Jacobs

	Notes	Action
1, 2	<p><b>Assemble / Introductions / Review of Agenda</b>            All present introduce themselves and SH outlines the agenda for the meeting as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Assemble</li> <li>2. Introductions / Review of Agenda.</li> <li>3. Scheme Update:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scheme Status/Programme Update/Consultation (AS).</li> <li>• Design – Main Works, Local Road Network and De-trunking Works (SH).</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. Previous Consultation Summary (SH).</li> <li>5. Review / Re-confirm general design approach (SH)</li> <li>6. General Design Feedback (Open)</li> <li>7. Individual Departure Review (Open)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design Proposal</li> <li>• Design Parameters</li> <li>• Safety Risks</li> <li>• Proposed Mitigation</li> <li>• CEC Feedback/Actions</li> </ul> </li> <li>8. Comments/Actions/Way Forward – SH               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Process/Timescales for formal departure submissions</li> <li>• CEC Input</li> </ul> </li> <li>9. AOB.</li> </ol>	

### 3 Scheme Update

PG provides an update of CEC's main interests/concerns related to the design of the De-trunked and Local Road Network. These include 3 main areas:

- Strategic Concepts (junctions, tourist attractions, etc)
- Treatment of De-Trunked A556 (Design issues. footpaths, lighting, etc)
- Safety audit of minor roads.

#### AS Update – Status/Consultation/Programme

AS gives a brief summary of the current status of the scheme, programme and consultation process. Key points include:

- Scheme budget = £174m
- Public Consultation scheduled for November 2011 and to last approximately 3 months (12 weeks). Anna Pickering (Highways Agency) is leading the preparation of the Statement of Community Consultation and has been in consultation with separate members of CEC.
- Informal consultation with Parishes is currently ongoing to gauge initial reaction prior to formal consultation.
- Initial feedback is that Millington and Rostherne Parishes are unhappy with the proposed changes junction strategy (e.g. concerns Millington Junction will be used for rat running and also increase in events traffic accessing Tatton Park). Tabley Parish are concerned with access arrangements to the Village Hall and severance issues within the community. Ideally, an all-purpose link across the new A556 would be desirable and ease the pressure that would result at Pickmere Lane junction. This would have particular benefits during Cheshire show,
- Following consultation and preparation of consultation report, planning application to the IPC is planned to be submitted in Autumn 2012. IPC process is expected to last approximately 1 year although this timescale could be an over or underestimate due to uncertainty over the process, particularly for road schemes.
- The ECI Contractor (Costain) was appointed earlier this year with Capita Symmonds to complete detailed design. Jacobs will continue to develop the preliminary design up until development consent.
- Anticipated to start construction in June 2014, with a 2 year works programme.

#### KM Update – Organisational Changes within CEC

- Majority of Highways staff transferred to new integrated business unit, Ringway Jacobs.
- Small number of Highways staff to remain in CEC. PG to remain at CEC within Strategic Highways unit. KM to lead Highways unit.
- Key contacts within CEC remain PG and KM.
- JMcG to leave CEC this Christmas.
- No major changes planned in other business units (e.g. Public Rights of Way)

#### SH Update - Design

SH summarises the current scheme position, outlining any changes since the pre VM design fix. These include:

CEC

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Split Junction strategy (Millington Junction/Tabley Junction) instead of single A50 Junction;</li> <li>- Double roundabout layout at the M56 Junction, utilizing existing Bowdon roundabout;</li> <li>- Introduction of Cherry Tree Lane link to retain access to Cherry Tree Lane and Rostherne Lane and provide important link for non-motorised users.</li> </ul> <p>SH notes that he would appreciate feedback on location of turning heads at stopped up local roads. Current proposals are shown on the Side Roads Orders, but would benefit from input from the Local Authority.</p>	
4	<p>SH summarises key points/issues raised in previous consultation to confirm that the following assumptions were still valid:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CEC do not have their own bespoke design standards, and design should be carried out in accordance with the DMRB.</li> <li>• Superelevation to be capped at 5%</li> <li>• Maximum gradient between 7-8 and kept to as shorter lengths as possible.</li> <li>• Introduction of departures from DMRB standards to remain in keeping with the surrounding road network (e.g. narrow cross-sections, substandard horizontal/vertical alignment).</li> </ul> <p>All agreed that the points listed above were still applicable.</p>	
5	<p><b>General Design Feedback</b></p> <p><u>Local Roads</u>        PG/KM express a main concern is the lack of vehicular access between Old Hall Lane (OHL) and the De-trunked A556. They note the importance of this link in the Traffic Management of the Tabley/Cheshire Show and local access to the Village Hall.</p> <p>AS notes that the Village Hall may be relocated on Crown Estate land located close by. AS explains the importance of minimizing costs and that a vehicular overpass/underpass at Tabley is difficult to justify with the current budgetary constraints. Provision of vehicular access at OHL is to be revisited following outcome of public consultation.</p> <p>PG would like to see proposed traffic management plans for Tatton Park and the Tabley/Cheshire Show. SH/TB to originate plans and forward to CEC.</p> <p>PG notes that a speed limit assessment is to be carried out on the A50 due to high speeds on the existing link. SH remarks that the new A50 Diversion incorporates measures to reduce the speed along the link. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Narrower cross-section (WS2 to S2).</li> <li>• Curved offline alignment providing minimum 85kph standards.</li> <li>• Reduced visibility over the crest.</li> </ul> <p>PG to provide further information on the A50 speed limit assessment within CEC's post meeting feedback. However, it was noted that any change in design speed would likely reduce the required standard of the A50 Diversion, resulting in reduced land take and cost. Therefore, the current landtake is likely to be a worst case assessment.</p> <p><u>De-Trunking Works</u></p>	<p>Jacobs</p> <p>Jacobs</p> <p>PG</p>

CEC agree with provision of a narrow (sub-standard in terms of min. DMRB requirements) single carriageway along the link. However, the straight alignment of the De-trunked A556, in particular the Southern Link, is highlighted as a concern. JMcG believes that the straight alignment would induce high speeds along the link. He suggests a series of chicanes/bends along the link to mitigate the problem and reduce the maximum speed a vehicle could travel to between 40-50mph. He notes that speed limit reductions or local narrowing would not be sufficient as they are ignored by many road users. CEC's view is that the best form of mitigation is to design the road so that it is drivable at low speed only, forcing road users to drive to the conditions.

SH has concerns that this may cause the following issues:

- Additional drainage works where the road would move away from existing kerb lines. Currently the majority of the existing edge detail is combined kerb and drainage units, therefore could get blocked where the road is realigned away from the kerb.
- unable to retain the level of the existing road due to superelevation requirements resulting in additional pavement works.
- additional construction work, and potentially land take required to reconstruct private accesses
- safety issues with continually crossing the crown line of the existing road (should the existing road surface be retained).
- All of the above would result in significant cost increases which may not be possible to contain within the scheme budget.

Jacobs

JMcG suggests that provision of a filter media/geotextile beneath the landscaping covering the CKDs would enable existing drainage to be retained at crossover points. Jacobs are to review current design proposals and consider the potential to incorporate bends/chicanes in to the De-trunked road. It was noted that, due to the straight alignment, the currently proposed departures along this link are unlikely to be approved by CEC. This is due to the increased risk of inappropriate speed and/or overtaking leading to head on collisions. Additional comments/suggestions on how to best remove the straight alignment to be provided by CEC within post meeting feedback.

CEC

It was also noted that retention of existing footways behind landscaping (remote) would be difficult to maintain, as well as restricting natural surveillance. This could also become a security issue with the threat of anti-social behavior. CEC to provide further information on this within post meeting feedback. Outcome of consultation (public preference) is likely to be deciding factor on how strong CEC push for removal of existing footways.

CEC

CEC also explain that retention of existing lighting (as proposed along the central link) is undesired due to future maintenance requirements. Also, CEC would request that any retained lighting be downgraded to a specification more suitable to the future environment. Jacobs are to review the lighting proposals to assess the implications of removing lighting along the central link as this has previously been noted as a safety concern.

Jacobs

KM requested more information on the life expectancy of the existing road as CEC are concerned that they will inherit an asset with high maintenance requirements. Jacobs / Costain to source/review existing

Jacobs /  
Costain

	<p>pavement inspection/condition surveys etc and forward to CEC.</p> <p>CEC are to form a comments schedule following the meeting to provide more information on the above issues and any further concerns they may have. It was agreed that a number of issues raised related to detailed design and would not be addressed at this stage, but should be scheduled for consideration later. Jacobs to provide standard comments schedule for CEC to populate.</p>	CEC / Jacobs
7A	<p><b>Individual Departure Review (Local Roads)</b></p> <p>Note, all agreements were based on the information provided at that time and are therefore subject to the details provided within the ultimate departures submission forms.</p> <p><u>DfS/BHL/01 – Burleyhurst Lane Substandard Cross-Section</u>          CEC content with the proposal to match the existing cross-section (2.5m min) and agree with proposed mitigation measures. The departure was agreed in principal - Jacobs to complete formal submission.</p> <p><u>DfS/BHL/02 – Burleyhurst Lane Substandard Horizontal Alignment</u>          CEC accept in principle the proposed alignment of Burleyhurst Lane (non-provision of superelevation and transitions). The Departure was agreed in principal – Jacobs to originate formal submission</p> <p><u>A50 Diversion – No departure</u>          Due to high speeds along the existing link, it may be necessary to reduce the design speed of the A50 Diversion or introduce departures to lower the standard of road (see Section 6). CEC to review accident data and provide further information within post meeting feedback. Jacobs to provide CEC with accident data.</p> <p>JMcG agrees in principle with removal and not reinstating the existing lay-by on the A50.</p> <p><u>DfS/MCL/01 – Chapel Lane Diversion Substandard Cross-section</u>          CEC agree with substandard cross-section approach, provided the link is of sufficient standard to accommodate buses that would use the route. Departure agreed in principal – Jacobs to submit formal submission, incorporating plans of bus swept paths along the link.</p> <p><u>DfS/MCL/04 – Millington Junction Dumbbell Link Road</u>          CEC have no major concerns with the proposals. JMcG does note that over signing in attempt to mitigate the departure can often result in driver confusion. Jacobs to consider this further.</p> <p>JMcG believes an up-stand on the proposed overrun area (as required in DMRB) would not be required (reduces maintenance/drainage requirements). Use of rough cropped sets for overrun area may also be beneficial.</p> <p>RS recommends that the proposed 2.5% fall towards outer edge of the circulatory carriageway should vary as the vehicle navigates around the roundabout otherwise adverse camber may result in discomfort. To be considered further at detailed design. Jacobs are also to provide RS with more detailed information on Millington Junction before departure is approved in principal.</p> <p><del>It should also be noted that this departure has already been formally</del></p>	<p>Jacobs</p> <p>Jacobs</p> <p>Jacobs/CEC</p> <p>Jacobs</p> <p>Jacobs</p>

	<p>submitted to the Highways Agency due to its interaction with the trunk road. Jacobs to forward outcome/response from the HA on to CEC once received.</p> <p><u>DfS/CTL/01 – Cherry Tree Lane Link Substandard Cross-Section</u>          CEC agree with matching the existing cross-section (5m min) and agree with proposed mitigation measures. The departure was agreed in principle - Jacobs to originate formal submission.</p> <p><u>DfS/CTL/02 – Cherry Tree Lane Link Substandard Horizontal Alignment</u>          CEC have no major concerns with the proposed alignment (substandard horizontal curvature, non-application of transitions and substandard superelevation) along Cherry Tree Lane Link. PG noted that he would have applied superelevation as proposed.</p> <p>JMcG suggest provision of high PSV surface course, with a potentially coloured finish at Cherry Tree Lane tight horizontal bend. Jacobs to consider this further.</p> <p>PG also enquired about the retaining wall adjacent to Cherry Tree Lane, and whether there are any other structures CEC will have to maintain. SH confirms it is the only structure CEC will have to maintain and Jacobs will send through specification drawings of proposed retaining wall.</p> <p>This departure was agreed in principle – Jacobs to originate formal submission.</p>	<p>Jacobs</p> <p>Jacobs</p> <p>Jacobs</p> <p>Jacobs</p> <p>Jacobs</p>
<p><b>7B</b></p>	<p><b>Individual Departure Review (De-trunking Works)</b></p> <p><u>DfS/DTW/01-04 – De-trunked A556 (Southern Link) Substandard SSD/Vertical Curvature on Approach to a Junction</u></p> <p>CEC have no major issues with the proposed reductions in SSD and vertical curvature. However, as mentioned in Section 6, CEC are unlikely to approve these departures due to the straight horizontal alignment and poor vertical profile. JMcG reiterates that the proposed warning signs are not sufficient mitigation and that bends/chicanes would be required. Jacobs to review the alignment of the De-trunked A556 (Southern Link) to implement additional measures to reduce speeds along the link. CEC to also offer suggestions within post meeting feedback.</p> <p><u>DfS/DTW/05 – De-trunked A556 (Southern Link) Substandard Cross-section.</u>          CEC raise no major issues with provision of a substandard cross-section along the De-trunked A556 (Southern Link), citing the proposal as beneficial in reducing speed. This departure was agreed in principle, subject to provision of a horizontal alignment that will sufficiently reduce speed along the link.</p> <p><u>DfS/DTW/06 – De-trunked A556 (Central Link) Substandard Cross-Section</u>          CEC raised no major issues with provision of a substandard cross-section along the De-trunked A556 (Central Link), citing the proposal as beneficial in reducing speed. However, similar issues were raised as with the Southern Link due to the near straight alignment of the road. CEC would like to see additional bends/chicanes to reduce the standard of horizontal alignment.</p>	<p>Jacobs/CEC</p> <p>Jacobs</p>

	<p>The provision of lighting along the link was again raised as undesirable. RS requires plan showing lighting proposals across the scheme before giving response on safety implications of removing lighting within post meeting feedback, Jacobs to provide.</p> <p>Jacobs also to assess the implications of removing the existing lighting along the De-trunked A556 Central Link, as well as implementing a horizontal alignment that would reduce vehicular speeds. CEC to also offer suggestions within post meeting feedback.</p> <p>This departure was agreed in principal, subject to provision of a horizontal alignment that will sufficiently reduce speed along the link.</p> <p><u>DfS/DTW/07 – De-trunked A556 (Northern Link) Substandard Cross-Section</u>          CEC raise no major issues with provision of a substandard cross-section along the De-trunked A556 (Northern Link). This departure was agreed in principle – Jacobs to originate formal submission.</p> <p><u>DfS/DTW/08 – Substandard SSD on Approach to Mere Junction</u>          CEC suggest tightening horizontal radii to provide full SSD through the junction. Jacobs stress the importance of remaining within the existing Highway boundary, and that tightening the horizontal radii would likely result in additional land take (severe cost/programme implications) or removal of the proposed equestrian crossing. CEC to provide further thoughts on this matter within post meeting feedback.</p> <p><u>DfS/DTW/09 – Substandard Ghost Island Lengths at Mere Junction</u>          CEC agree with provision of signals at Mere Junction and that, due to the low proportion of right turn traffic, there would likely be no major issues with the substandard right turn lengths. This departure was agreed in principle – Jacobs to originate formal submission.</p>	<p>Jacobs</p> <p>Jacobs/CEC</p> <p>Jacobs</p> <p>CEC</p> <p>Jacobs</p>
--	---	--

**7C Individual Departures Review (Summary)**

CEC stress that any agreement/consent to the above departures would be subject to additional comments provided within the post meeting feedback.

CEC also note that traffic flow information along all link roads is required in order to make informed decision on the above departures. Jacobs to provide.

Jacobs

SH/AS note that, at this preliminary design stage, it is likely a number of departures will be issued and approved on the basis that comments are to be actioned at the detailed design stage.

## 8 Comments/Actions/Way Forward

AS/SH explain the submission process for formal departures:

- Completed using standard HA departure submission form
- Submission form Issued to CEC
- CEC to reject, approve or approve with comments and return to Jacobs;
- Following comments, Jacobs to either amend and resubmit to CEC or, if approved, submit to the HA WebDAS system along with confirmation of approval from CEC (ideally in letter form).

AS/SH note that all departures are currently programmed for submission by the end of October 2011. CEC to provide Jacobs with timescale of when post meeting feedback will be received.

Jacobs

Following the meeting, Jacobs are to provide CEC with the following information:

- Forecast traffic flows
- Traffic management proposals for Tatton Park and the Table/Cheshire Show
- Pavement inspection/condition surveys (if available)
- Accident data
- DfS/MCL/04 submission
- Specification drawings for CTL retaining wall
- Plans showing current lighting proposals, route status and speed restrictions.

Following the meeting, CEC are to provide post meeting feedback (comments schedule) to Jacobs on the following issues, as well as any other concerns:

- Preferred location for turning heads at stopped up side roads.
- Further information relating to the A50 speed limit assessment.
- Recommendations/Suggestions to reduce the standard of horizontal alignment of the De-trunked A556.
- For each departure, confirmation of approval or rejection (in principal, following receipt of formal departure submission form).

Following the meeting, Jacobs are to consider the following design amendments when completing formal departure submissions:

- Provision of vehicular access between OHL and the De-trunked A556.
- Reducing the standard of horizontal alignment along the De-trunked A556, specifically the Southern Link.
- Consideration given to remove lighting along the De-trunked A556 (Central Link)
- Consideration given to amend the circulatory carriageway cross fall at Millington Junction
- Provision of high PSV and potentially coloured road pavement around Cherry Tree Lane tight horizontal bend.

## APPENDIX 6: NOTES OF MEETING BETWEEN CEC, HA AND JACOBS 24/09/2012

Cheshire East Council Meeting 24/09/12

Attendees:

Simon Hayton (Jacobs)  
Peter Shaw (Jacobs)  
Arun Sahni (Highways Agency)  
Paul Griffiths (Cheshire East Council)  
Genni Butler (Cheshire East Council)  
Kevin Melling (Cheshire East Council)  
Pryce Evans (Cheshire East Council)  
Rachael Ellison (Costain)

- Introductions
- AS provided scheme update.
  - Little formal negative feedback from consultation. General support for scheme
  - Expected Planning Inspectorate submission February/March
- SH provided Mainline Design Update
  - Chester Road roundabout
  - A50 merge on-slip
  - Millington mainline alignment and Millington Lane Overbridge
- SH provided De-trunked Design Update
  - Old Hall Lane underpass
  - Segregated multiuser provision along length of route
  - Side Road stopping up strategy
- SH explained the proposal for some informal crossing along the de-trunked route in relation to the NMU facility. Conveying that the HA accessibility Officer had expressed concerns about the application of DMRB, particularly, visibility to crossing points. CEC agreed that applying DMRB, and therefore moving the crossing position remote from the desire line would discourage usage. CEC also agreed that providing signals would not be in keeping with the surroundings
- CEC generally in support of scheme as presented. CEC had 3 concerns;
  - Impacts of scheme on wider local road network
  - Details of NMU proposals on de-trunked section including surfacing proposal and deterrent for unwanted access
  - Legal standing and Council Liability for NMU route proposal
- SH enquired as to CEC requirements regarding retaining current lighting along the proposed de-trunked section of the works. CEC stated that generally they promote removing lighting away from junctions and heavily vehicular/pedestrian used routes.
- SH enquired if the side road stopping up strategy was acceptable. CEC re-confirmed that they support the stopping up of severed side roads at the earliest opportunity
  
- **ACTION** – Costain (RE) to provide participants with Heysham scheme example of Statement of Common Ground
- **ACTION** – CEC and Jacobs to seek advice regarding the order application for the NMU facility and any legal standing assigned to parties
- **ACTION** – CEC (GB) to provide detail relating to NMU proposal from SEMS scheme to Jacobs.
- **ACTION** – Jacobs to provide CEC (PG) with traffic modelling data / Road Safety Audit and NMU Audits when complete
- **ACTION** – CEC to review traffic data in advance of issue of consultation report to identify potential issues
- **ACTION** – CEC to arrange a meeting with the local portfolio holder and follow up progress meeting

**APPENDIX 7: NOTES OF LOCAL ROAD DEPARTURES MEETING 14/03/2013**

 1 City Walk, Leeds  
 West Yorkshire, UK  
 LS11 9DX  
 +44.(0)113.242.6771 Fax +44.(0)113.389.1389

**Meeting Notes**

<b>Meeting Location</b>	Delamere House, Crewe	<b>Client</b>	Highway Agency
<b>Meeting Date/Time</b>	14 March 2013	<b>Our Ref</b>	B1076602/3
<b>Subject</b>	Local Road and De-trunking Departures CEC queries	<b>Your Ref</b>	N/A
<b>Participants</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paul Griffiths (PG) (Cheshire East Council)</li> <li>Naresh Madhavan (NM) (Cheshire East Council)</li> <li>Peter Shaw (PS) (Jacobs)</li> <li>Arun Sahni (AS) (Highways Agency)</li> </ul>	<b>Notes Prepared By</b>	Peter Shaw
<b>Chair</b>	Paul Griffiths	<b>cc</b>	Graeme Willis Andy Thompson Simon Hayton Michael Birkett (Jacobs)  Warren Rocca (Capita Symonds)
<b>Date of Distribution</b>	18 March 2013		
	<b>Notes</b>		<b>Action</b>
1	<b>Introductions</b>		
2	<b><u>A50 Junction</u></b>  PG explained that they had undertaken an ARCADY capacity assessment on the proposed A50 roundabout from traffic data released by Jacobs in March 2013. PG expressed that their assessment showed significant operational difficulties in the Design Year for the A50 Roundabout. PG conveyed that the roundabout should provide adequate capacity; given the risk of strategic traffic using the junction if/when the M6 became congested.  PS explained that due to the way the junction had been modeled, there was potential for the wrong turning movements to be used in the assessment because of the relocation of the northbound on slip from the north of the roundabout to the south. PS also queried the traffic data used in the assessment and explained that with the latest refined traffic he had received, that through sensitivity testing, it had been shown that the roundabout had acceptable capacity. PS also explained that the preliminary design of the roundabout could be developed through detailed design and that there was opportunity of improvements due to available land to the north and south.		

 Jacobs Engineering U.K. Limited, Registered Office: 95 Bothwell Street, Glasgow G2 7HX, Scotland  
 Registered in Scotland Number 141100

## Meeting Notes

Continued

Page 2 of 3

	<p>PG enquired if a major minor priority junction with nearside diverging taper had been considered to better accommodate flows at the A50 junction. PS responded by stating that the flows would put the recommended junction type firmly as a roundabout in accordance with Figure 2/2 in TD42/95.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> Jacobs to re-confirm ARCADY assessment of the A50 Junction and consider alternate junction layout.</p> <p><b>(POST MEETING NOTE):</b> The traffic data released to CEC in March 2013 was from Summer 2012. It should be noted that this traffic data is unrefined and would be different than the refined traffic model currently being developed that is considered to be more accurate.</p>	Jacobs
3	<p><u>DfS/DTW/05 De trunked A556 (Southern Link) sub standard horizontal curve fig 6 (Concern of restricted SSD to NS signal head)</u></p> <p>PS explained that full SSD for the Design Speed of the road would be achieved to the preliminary position of the signal head.</p> <p>NM and PG conveyed that they were content with this proposed departure.</p>	
4	<p><u>DfS/DTW/06 De trunked A556 Cross Section fig 7A-D</u></p> <p>A discussion was held as to whether the 6.0m (2x 3.0m carriageways) proposed for the de-trunked Chester Road was adequate.</p> <p>NM expressed that 7.0m (2x 3.5m carriageways) would be preferred as it was felt that 6.0m may be too restrictive.</p> <p>PS explained that the proposal for the de-trunked Chester Road was to return it to a rural style road and that widening the road may encourage higher speeds and would reduce separation to the adjacent NMU facility.</p> <p>It was agreed that both a 6.0m and 7.0m wide carriageway would be feasible due to use of the existing southbound carriageway. The width of road to be developed at detailed design.</p>	
5	<p><u>DfS/DTW/07 Sub standard horizontal curve on approach to Millington Lane fig 8</u></p> <p>PS explained the constraints involved in the providing a connection from the De-trunked Chester Road to Millington roundabout (proposed off line for buildability) and providing a connection from the proposed A556 southbound mainline. PS stated that the reduced horizontal curve was on the immediate approach to the roundabout and therefore speeds would be anticipated to be low. Also full SSD to the roundabout would be provided through verge widening. PS stated that traffic on approach to Millington Roundabout from the De-trunked Chester Road would be very low (22 vehicles AADT on the latest traffic forecast) and therefore the risk of an incident occurring also very low.</p> <p>NM and PG were generally happy with the proposal.</p>	
6	<p><u>DfS/DTW/09 Mere junction ghost islands layout fig 10</u></p> <p>PG stated that they could not comment on the substandard ghost island layout without traffic data presenting the number of turning vehicle movements at the junction.</p>	

## Meeting Notes

Continued

Page 3 of 3

	<p>PG asked if Jacobs could consider removing the A50 westbound access into Mere Golf Club, to maximize the right turn lane deceleration and turning length from A50 westbound to De-trunked Chester Road northbound. People wishing to gain access to the golf club would then have to travel to the A50 Roundabout, do a u-turn and enter from the A50 eastbound access only.</p> <p>PS stated that his concern would be drivers still entering the golf club from the A50 westbound due to the introduced diversion route and then them making a potentially unsafe inappropriate maneuver.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> Jacobs to consider alternate layout proposed by PG at mere junction.</p>	Jacobs
7	<p><u>DfS/OHLW/02 Old Hall Lane West Link cross section fig 12</u></p> <p>PG stated that due to the substandard horizontal curve of Old Hall Lane (West) link he would advise carriageway widening on the bend. This was to aid passing of heavy good vehicles at this point which may occur during Tatton Park events.</p> <p>PS noted the request and stated that widening can be provided within proposed land take. To be developed at detailed design.</p>	
8	<p><u>DfS/CTL/02 Cherry Tree Lane link horizontal alignment fig 17</u>  <u>DfS/CTL/03 Cherry Tree Lane link SSD reduction fig 18</u></p> <p>NM stated that CEC had some reservations relating to the proposed geometry of Cherry Tree Lane Link. PG stated that he understood the constraints of the area and agreed in principle to providing a link from the De-trunked Chester Road to Cherry Tree Lane to avoid severance and for NMU connectivity. PG also understood the constraint of Rostherne Mere SSSI.</p> <p>PG asked if a mini roundabout could be considered for the change in direction from the bearing of the existing A556 to Cherry Tree Lane. PS enquired if a mini roundabout was any safer than the proposed substandard bend with mitigation.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> Jacobs to consider mini roundabout on Cherry Tree Lane Link.</p>	Jacobs
9	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>PS asked how CEC's outstanding queries could be closed out. Agreement was made for Jacobs to respond formally to the queries, addressing the comments made at this meeting. This formal response would be appended to OD/094 A556 Knutsford to Bowdon Improvement – Departures from Standard Report – De-trunking Works &amp; Local Road Network for formal acceptance by CEC.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> Jacobs to re-issue OD/094 with response to CEC queries appended</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> CEC to formally respond/accept the re-issue of OD/094</p>	Jacobs CEC

**APPENDIX 8: DEPARTURES REPORT AUGUST 2013**


**A556 Knutsford to Bowdon Improvement**  
**Departures from standards report**

This report considers the proposed changes to the local road network as a result of the A556 Knutsford to Bowdon improvement scheme. The report identifies departures from standard and whether these are acceptable to CEC officers.

The report has been completed with reference to the DfT publication the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (various sections), and recommends that the Authority be granted to approve and authorise for departures from standards on the lengths of roads summarised in the table below (and as shown for illustrative purposes on Plan CEH/NM/A556/01 dated June 2013 attached):-

<b>Departure</b>	<b>✓</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>DfS/DTW/01</b> A556 Chester Rd (Tabley Link) Vertical Crest fig 2	✓		
<b>DfS/DTW/02</b> A556 Chester Rd (Southern Link) SSD fig 3	✓		Possible speed management issues – Rumble strips?
<b>DfS/DTW/03</b> A556 Chester Rd (Southern Link) SSD fig 4	✓		
<b>DfS/DTW/04</b> A556 Chester Rd (Southern Link) Vertical crest fig 5	✓		
<b>DfS/DTW/05</b> De trunked A556 (Southern Link) sub standard horizontal curve fig 6	✓		Concern of restricted SSD to NS signal head
<b>DfS/DTW/06</b> De trunked A556 Cross Section fig 7A-D	✓		Increase carriageway width to 7.0m
<b>DfS/DTW/07</b> Sub standard horizontal curve on approach to Millington Lane fig 8	✓		
<b>DfS/DTW/08</b> Sub standard SSD through Mere junction fig 9	✓		
<b>DfS/DTW/09</b> Mere junction ghost islands layout fig 10	✓		Revised junction design under development
<b>DfS/OHLW/01</b> Old Hall Lane West Link horizontal alignment fig 11	✓		
<b>DfS/OHLW/02</b> Old Hall Lane West Link cross section fig 12	✓		Generally accepted however widening on bend to DMRB req'd
<b>DfS/OHLE/01</b> Old Hall East cross section fig 13	✓		

<b>DfS/BHL/01</b> Bentleyhurst Lane cross section fig 14	✓	
<b>DfS/BHL/02</b> Bentleyhurst Lane horizontal alignment fig 15	✓	
<b>DfS/CTL/01</b> Cherry Tree Lane cross section fig 16	✓	Initial concerns have been addressed in revised design
<b>DfS/CTL/02</b> Cherry Tree Lane link horizontal alignment fig 17	✓	Initial concerns have been addressed in revised design
<b>DfS/CTL/03</b> Cherry Tree Lane link SSD reduction fig 18	✓	
<b>DfS/MLD/01</b> Millington Lane Diversion horizontal transitions fig 19	✓	
<b>DfS/MLD/02</b> Millington Lane Diversion vertical crest fig 20	✓	
<b>DfS/MLD/03</b> Millington Lane Diversion cross section fig 21	✓	
<b>DfS/MCL/01</b> Chapel Lane Diversion Cross Section fig 22	✓	

## REASONS FOR THE DECISION

**DfS/DTW/01 – A556 Chester Road (Tabley Link) - ACCEPTED** - This departure relates to the sub-standard vertical crest curve on the De-trunked A556 (Tabley Link) on the immediate approach to Chester Road Roundabout – This is an existing problem and Officers feel that in consideration of the reduction in flow and anticipated speeds, this should not be an issue.

**DfS/DTW/02 – A556 Chester Road (Southern Link) - ACCEPTED** - This departure relates to the sub-standard SSD (Stopping Sight Distance) on the De-trunked A556 (Southern Link) northbound carriageway on the immediate approach to Mere Junction. This is an existing problem and Officers feel that in consideration of the reduction in flow and anticipated speeds, this should not be an issue.

**DfS/DTW/03 – A556 Chester Road (Southern Link) - ACCEPTED** - This departure relates to the sub-standard SSD on the De-trunked A556 (Southern Link) northbound carriageway on approach to Mere Junction. This is an existing problem and Officers feel that in consideration of the reduction in flow and anticipated speeds, this should not be an issue.

**DfS/DTW/04 – A556 Chester Road (Southern Link) - ACCEPTED** - This departure relates to the sub-standard vertical alignment on the De-trunked A556 (Southern Link) on approach to Chester Road Roundabout. This is an existing problem and Officers feel that in consideration of the reduction in flow and anticipated speeds, this should not be an issue.

**DfS/DTW/05 – A556 Chester Road (Southern Link) - ACCEPTED** - This departure relates to the sub-standard horizontal radius on the De-trunked A556 (Southern Link) on approach to Mere Junction. This is an existing problem and Officers feel that in

consideration of the reduction in flow and anticipated speeds, this should not be an issue.

**DfS/DTW/06 – A556 Chester Road (Southern Link) - ACCEPTED** - This departure relates to the reductions in cross-section of the De-trunked A556. The links included within this departure are as follows:

- Tabley Link
- Southern Link
- Central Link
- Northern Link.

This was initially questioned by Officers as a 6.0 metre wide carriageway width was specified but thought to be inadequate in consideration of possible rear end shunts involving right turning vehicles into private driveways. Furthermore, a narrow carriageway is more likely to result in head on conflict should overtaking errors occur. With this in mind, at the request of Officers, the carriageway cross section has been widened to 7.0 metres which is still considered sub-standard, however thought to offer the best compromise between controlling speeds and providing safe refuge for right turning traffic. Whilst this has been agreed in principal by the HA and Designer, the cross sections will only be amended at the Detailed Design stage.

**DfS/DTW/07 – Millington Junction approach - ACCEPTED** - This departure relates to reductions in desired minimum horizontal radii on the approach to the proposed Millington junction from the De-trunked A556 Northern Link. Officers initially questioned this as it is a new-build section of carriageway and should be designed to standard. However, it has been deemed necessary to provide an offline roundabout for build-ability and to minimise environmental impacts. Given that vehicular approach speeds approaching and exiting the roundabout should be relatively low, this departure has been accepted.

**DfS/DTW/08 – Mere Junction - ACCEPTED** - This departure relates to the sub-standard SSD on the A50 (eastbound) approach to Mere Junction brought about by constraints due to existing boundaries. As this Departure is only a single step below when assessed against a design speed of 85kph, and reflects a stopping sight distance consistent with a 40mph approach speed, this is deemed to be acceptable.

**DfS/DTW/09 – Mere Junction ghost island – ACCEPTED** - This departure relates to the sub-standard deceleration and direct taper lengths associated with the originally proposed ghost island right turn lanes at Mere Junction for a design speed of 85kph, which has been necessitated by the requirement to access the Mere Golf Club. Officers were originally concerned that this substandard length may result in vehicle overshoots as drivers failed to slow down sufficiently within the ghost island. Officers requested further turning flow data from the designer before an assessment could be undertaken to determine whether this layout is the most appropriate given the anticipated traffic flows. The revised layout is the subject of a safety audit by the designers which will be agreed between the HA and CEC prior to the closure of the examination of the scheme so that it can be included in the inspectors report.

**DfS/OHLW/01 – Old Hall Lane West Link - ACCEPTED** - This departure relates to the sub-standard horizontal radius on Old Hall Lane West Link brought about by the tie-in

alignments at either side. Mitigation measures proposed include full SSD around the sub standard bends, suitable signage, appropriate lining in advance and implementing a sub-standard cross-section to match the existing road and encourage lower vehicular speeds.

**DfS/OHLW/02 – Old Hall Lane West Link - ACCEPTED** - This departure relates to the sub-standard cross-section for Old Hall Lane West. Whilst this is accepted in principal due to the anticipated low traffic flows (AADT of 210 vehicles during 2032) and speeds, Officers would comment that additional widening around the bend will be required which the HA and The Designer have agreed to in principal.

**DfS/OHLE/01 – Old Hall Lane East - ACCEPTED** - This departure relates to the sub-standard cross-section for Old Hall Lane East and reflects the cross section that is currently provided. Furthermore all the surrounding network in this area is of a similar standard so may be considered inappropriate in this instance to provide a full standard cross section.

**DfS/BHL/01 – Bentleyhurst Lane - ACCEPTED** - This departure relates to the sub-standard cross-section for Bentleyhurst Lane. It is proposed that a 4 metre wide carriageway is provided in this location. It is noted that the lane is not a through route and provides access to only 2 private dwellings. As such this is deemed to be acceptable in this instance.

**DfS/BHL/02 – Bentleyhurst Lane - ACCEPTED** - This departure relates to the sub-standard radius curve for Bentleyhurst Lane. In mitigation, full SSD for a 50kph design speed is proposed and a wider than needed 4 metre carriageway cross-section. It is noted that the lane is not a through route and provides access to only 2 private dwellings. As such Officers deem this to be acceptable in this instance.

**DfS/CTL/01 – Cherry Tree Lane Link - ACCEPTED** - This departure relates to the reduction in cross-section from the proposed Cherry Tree Lane Link which it is proposed to match the existing cross section. This is acceptable however, it may be noted that this departure relates to DfS/CTL/02 below with reference to the tie-ins and curve alignment.

**DfS/CTL/02 – Cherry Tree Lane Link – ACCEPTED** - This departure relates to the sub-standard horizontal radii, non provision of horizontal transitions and the non-application of super-elevation on certain sections of the proposed Cherry Tree Lane Link although Officers concerns relate specifically to the sharp deviation in horizontal alignment at the northern end of Cherry Lane which could lead to loss of control collisions as a result of the severity of the bend following on from a long straight section of carriageway. However, it is appreciated that the available land take is constrained due to the SSSI site to the east of the proposed alignment, and the A556 mainline to the west, and that all alternative options have been investigated. Officers will require the approval a comprehensive signing and lining strategy before the works are delivered and a Stage 2 Safety Audit on these proposals undertaken..

**DfS/CTL/03 – Cherry Tree Lane Link – ACCEPTED** - This departure relates to the sub-standard stopping sight distance around the sharp bend at the northern end of

Cherry Tree Lane. Officers express the same concerns and recommendation as DfS/CTL/02 above.

**DfS/MLD/01 – Millington Lane - ACCEPTED** - This departure relates to the sub-standard geometry of the proposed Millington Lane diversion, in particular the sub standard length transitions between different horizontal alignments. Whilst the departure is thought to represent a significant cost saving (approximately £1 million), the alignment proposed will match the existing alignment to encourage lower vehicular speeds. Furthermore, mitigation measures in the way of full SSD provision to the structure and junction, appropriate warning signs, widened verges for visibility and a similar sub-standard cross section as mentioned in DfS/MLD/02 below.

**DfS/MLD/02 – Millington Lane - ACCEPTED** - This departure relates to the sub-standard vertical geometry of the proposed Millington Lane diversion. The alignment proposed will match the existing alignment to encourage lower vehicular speeds. Furthermore, mitigation measures in the way of full SSD provision to the structure and junction, appropriate warning signs, together with widened verges for visibility.

**DfS/MLD/03 – Millington Lane - ACCEPTED** - This departure relates to the sub-standard carriageway cross-section of the proposed Millington Lane diversion. The alignment proposed will match the existing alignment to encourage lower vehicular speeds. Furthermore, mitigation measures in the way of full SSD provision to the structure and junction, appropriate warning signs, together with widened verges for visibility.

**DfS/MCL/01 – Chapel Lane - ACCEPTED** - This departure relates to the sub-standard carriageway cross-section of the proposed Chapel Lane diversion. The alignment proposed will match the existing alignment to encourage lower vehicular speeds.

---

**Appendix 9: NOTES OF VALUE ENGINEERING WORKSHOPS 10/07/2013****CAPITA SYMONDS** **HIGHWAYS**  
AGENCY

Meeting: Value Engineering Meeting (De-trunking No.1)  
Venue: Delemere House, Crewe  
Date: Wednesday 10 July 2013  
Time: 09:30

---

**Attendees:**

Name	Organisation
David Knight	Capita Symonds
Andrew Brown	Capita Symonds
Anthony Bennett	Capita Symonds
Paul Williams	Capita Symonds
Tabatha Boniface	Capita Symonds
Amy Grenaghan	Capita Symonds
Lucinda Weymouth	Capita Symonds
Ian Darlington	Capita Symonds
Rachel Ellison	Costain
Jayne Geary	Costain
Jonathan Turner	Highways Agency
Mohammed Swapan	Highways Agency
Stuart Robinson	Atkins
Paul Griffiths	Cheshire East Council
Hugh Graham	Cheshire East Council
Simon Davis	Cheshire East Council
Andrew Spittlehouse	Cheshire East Council/Jacobs
Gennie Butler	Cheshire East Council

Introduction to the current status of the scheme and general overview by Rachel Ellison and Jayne Geary followed by Value Engineering methodology given by David Knight.

***General Introduction***

- There are 16 Value Engineering sessions ongoing within the period.
- The Cheshire East Council (CEC) sessions are slightly different as they are multi-disciplinary and the agenda's split into elements rather than discipline such as cross-section and junctions.
- At the end of each workshop there will be actions to take away.
- There will nominally be a two or three weeks at the most to go through the actions however this will be agreed within the CEC sessions if specific information is required for the programme.

 **HIGHWAYS**  
AGENCY

Those opportunities (actions) which are agreed on at the close out session in two or three week's time will be incorporated into the design which Capita Symonds will produce along with Costain and the Supply Chain.

A formal VE report will be developed at the end of the VE process which will cover all 16 meetings.

#### Notes of Meeting

##### *Cross Sections and NMU facilities*

- Andrew Brown gave overview of de-trunking cross section to the group highlighting that the current design principle is that as much of the existing infrastructure as possible will be retained (kerbs, drainage etc...)
- Paul Griffiths believes that a 6m cross section between Tabley and Mere is too restrictive as this will most likely have a higher speed limit and would prefer a section closer to 7.3m wide. Capita to progress and update revised cross sections from Tabley Roundabout to Mere Junction.

##### *Bund*

CEC had issues generally with the proposed bund construction details proposed. The main concern was regarding the placement of soils directly onto the existing carriageway. Ideally they would prefer the carriageway beneath the bund to be fully fractured and if possible excavated.

After discussion regarding potential disruption, explanation of the cost and practicality implications this would generate other options were discussed.

Various alternatives were reviewed within the group and it was agreed that if the bund was sited in a trench milled from the existing surface, this may allow the passage of excess water to drain to the low points in the current profile and also provide a good key to interface the 2 surfaces.

To support the proposal further design consideration and option development covering the following aspects is to be progressed by Capita/Costain:

- The planting strategy for the bund must be tailored towards low maintenance;
- General planting options to differentiate between rural & urban sections;
- Bund must segregate NMUs from traffic however consideration of NMU route safety is required;
- Capita to review the benefits of using a geotextile layer beneath the bund to assist in providing a reservoir and pathway within the bund structure;
- Minimum 0.5m height for the bund to be combined with a maximum of 1.0 to 1.2m planted height;

##### *NMU track*

Following discussion of the cross-section the group discussed the current proposals for the NMU and Equestrian track details and interfaces. The following actions were agreed to be progressed and developed by Capita/Costain.

**CAPITA SYMONDS** **HIGHWAYS**  
AGENCY

- Agreed that the Equestrian track is to be 1.5m wide in accordance with the cross-section tabled;
- Agreed by all that the Equestrian track to remain as a hard surface, this will discourage galloping by the horses;
- Capita to look into potential equestrian friendly surface treatments for the track to improve texture;
- Shared cycleway/footway to be 2.5m wide with the existing carriageway, surfacing and drainage principles to be maintained. Segregation from equestrian track to be considered however potential for combined surfacing. If segregation proposed opportunity to re-use the existing lane markings to be considered.
- Existing verge/footways to be retained for service access. Access strategy to be considered in conjunction with existing property/bellmouth treatments.

#### *Access to NMU facilities for maintenance*

- Capita to develop layout and access strategy highlighting how vehicles will be prevented from accessing the NMU area whilst allowing maintenance access.
- It was agreed by all parties that bollards were the most effective solution. Keys to be provided to CEC with phone numbers displayed on each bollard. CEC to provide Capita with preferred phone number and bollard and plaque details for review.

#### *Private Accesses*

- Agreement from Capita/Costain to provide at least similar arrangement as current/present infrastructure when providing access into field's properties.
- Capita/Costain to develop schedule of accesses and layouts/treatments for CEC and Stakeholder consultation

#### *A556 De-trunking Extents Speed Limit Strategy*

- Discussion between all parties as to the proposed strategy for all CEC roads including primary routing. Agreement reached by all parties on speed limits for proposed the New Chester Road and affected side roads as described below;
  - Tabley Roundabout to Chester Road Roundabout – 40mph
  - Chester Road Roundabout to stopped up A556 – 30mph
  - Chester Road Roundabout to Mere Junction – 40mph
  - Mere Junction to Bucklow Hill – 30mph
  - Bucklow Hill to Millington Junction – 40mph
  - Millington Junction to Cherry Tree Lane – 30mph
- Capita to produce layout detailing above for acceptance and approval by all parties.

#### *Signage Strategy*

Current design status discussed initially highlighting that de-trunked and local road signage strategy to be developed by Capita in conjunction with CEC and the Highways Agency. Aspects and actions discussed:

- Detailed strategy does not currently exist and is to be developed. Capita will be completing a survey of all existing signage on all routes that interface or may be affected by the works. Survey will be utilised to develop initial strategy for further discussion;
- Local attractions to be included as tourist attractions in accordance with current provision;
- CEC have no objections to de-cluttering of existing street furniture;
- CEC to apply for new route number designation with DfT, Capita to then incorporate into detailed design of signs;
- Proposals for use of passive posts for signs to be finalised in detailed design. It was noted that the A50 currently used passive posts although there was no clear directive going forward. Existing provision to be identified by Capita as part of survey. CEC's approach and potential maintenance implications to be confirmed with Costain and CEC;
- Potential for bespoke Gateway Signs for "village road" (Mere to Bucklow Hill) to be reviewed and developed by Capita/Costain for discussion with HA and CEC;

#### *Street Lighting*

- General strategy explained to group that the de-trucked A556 is to be unlit except for Mere & Bucklow Hill Junctions i.e. conflict zones only.  
This strategy was generally agreed although CEC reiterated that this was the first time they had seen drawings showing the extents of the proposals.
- Simon Davis & Ian Darlington to confirm specification although it was advised that CEC will require all new lighting units to be LED.
- Agreed that further meeting to be organised to review detailed aspects of the lighting strategy including potential re-use of existing columns, location of proposed new columns and infrastructure suitability and renewal. Capita/Costain to organise with CEC.

#### *Side Road Cross Sections*

- Paul Williams discussed each cross section in turn. In general all parties agreed that the current proposals were acceptable. Capita to progress design on this basis.
- A narrow cross section was tabled as an option over the less used structures (Bentleyhurst and Millington/Chapel Lane Overbridges) which would require a priority give way arrangement. This was accepted in principle but agreed that the only suitable location to progress the design principle for further review was Bentleyhurst Lane – Capita to progress in conjunction with Costain and HA Netserv.

#### *General Comments*

- Paul Griffiths explained that his team was currently preparing a Local Impact Report (LIR) to issue to the Council Members in August/September. Understood by the group that it was the intention to include all the proposals and agreements relating to the de-trunking in the report to act as a formal agreement from Cheshire East Council were possible.
- Costain/Capita to support and provide information in accordance with confirmed deadlines to support LIR completion as practical within the timeframe.

- Jayne Geary to coordinate Costain/Capita inputs to LIR.

Meeting: Value Engineering Meeting (De-trunking No.2)

Venue: Delemere House, Crewe

Date: Wednesday 10 July 2013

Time: 13:00

---

Attendees:

Name	Organisation
David Knight	Capita Symonds
Andrew Brown	Capita Symonds
Anthony Bennett	Capita Symonds
Paul Williams	Capita Symonds
Tabatha Boniface	Capita Symonds
Amy Grenaghan	Capita Symonds
Lucinda Weymouth	Capita Symonds
Ian Darlington	Capita Symonds
Rachel Ellison	Costain
Jayne Geary	Costain
Jonathan Turner	Highways Agency
Mohammed Swapan	Highways Agency
Stuart Robinson	Atkins
Paul Griffiths	Cheshire East Council
Andrew Spittlehouse	Cheshire East Council/Jacobs
Jenny Butler	Cheshire East Council

Introduction to the current status of the scheme and general overview was completed in the afternoon session (VE Session 2).

**Notes of Meeting**

*Environment / Ecology and Landscaping*

- Tabatha Boniface explained the current extent and detail of the Environmental proposals for the de-trunking section of the works.
- Discussed within the group that the reduced lighting principle should be a major benefit to the ecological and environmental issues.
- Discussed within group – follow on from concerns in morning session regarding the “plant pot” effect of the landscaping bund design.
- Following discussion it was accepted by all that a 100mm channel/trench may provide a suitable tie in detail to assist in preventing the issue of water logging of the bund and would also prevent seepage across the NMU tracks which could be problematic in winter. It was

accepted though that this would not alleviate the issue of drying out in warm conditions. Plant species will need careful selection to accommodate this – to be developed by Capita.

- It was pointed out that ‘lighter’ soils have a greater ability to retain moisture, Capita to provide Costain with specific requirements to ascertain if such materials are available on site.
- Capita to provide detailed layout of proposed bunds including water management proposals – including geotextile, baffles and gradients.
- Capita to provide details of bund planting proposals for the rural (40mph) and the urban (30mph) sections – to consider differing treatments with regard to road environment.
- Discussed an idea of replacing de-commissioned lamp columns with trees in some locations utilising the existing column foundations. Tabled that this kind of innovation may be seen as quite innovative and good PR for the project.
- Agreed that a more focused Landscaping working group should be organised and meet to discuss the finer details of the planting requirements. Capita to confirm with Costain (Jayne Geary) to arrange.
- CEC stated that all hedgerows removed are to be replaced on a like for like basis. Tabatha confirmed this had been covered in detail in the ES and would be adhered to.
- AB confirmed with the group their acceptance for 1 in 2 side slope on the bund. Where possible shallower slopes will be employed however understood that the available width is a guiding factor in order to develop the bund height. Capita to develop in conjunction with bund detailed sections.

#### *NMU Underpass*

- Andrew Brown introduced and described the current the proposals to the group. Proposals currently based on Jacobs’s preliminary design.
- Current proposals include provision of 2.8m headroom with mounting blocks to be provided to encourage riders to dismount prior to both portals.
- The structural clear width and adjoining footways are to be a minimum of 4.0m.
- Discussed that lighting is to be provided within the structure. Various aspects to be considered including security of NMU’s in conjunction with the environmental and ecological mitigation. Lighting proposals to be developed by Capita/Costain and discussed with CEC – initial considerations are could the lighting be on demand or permanent.
- Current proposals include 4% gradients on access ramps which was accepted by the group as a an acceptable principle. Current proposals do not include intermediate landings as gradient is sufficient for DDA access.
- Highlighted by CEC that further consideration should be made within the design for security and vandal measures such as access refuges.
- Measures should also be considered with respect to prohibiting/limiting motorised user access – similar principles to bund/access track proposals. Capita/Costain to develop as part of detailed design.
- Capita to review and look to flatten the access ramp side slopes where practicable to improve visibility and also in consideration of landscaping, planting and maintenance.

**CAPITA SYMONDS**

- Current proposals show a potential for a patterned finish to the portal walls however in discussion and agreement in the group it was accepted smooth faced/finish will be acceptable. Capita/Costain to develop as part of detailed design.
- Agreed between all parties that local NMU signage will be necessary to ensure users are aware of the underpass and directed from the surrounding network accordingly. Consideration of SWAINS route also required. Linkages and facilities provided at Chester Road Roundabout will be most prevalent and need to be coordinated. Capita to develop as part of detailed design.

DRAFT

Appendix 10: NOTES OF VALUE ENGINEERING WORKSHOPS 11/07/2013

DRAFT

Meeting: Value Engineering Meeting (De-trunking No.3 and 4)

Venue: Municipal Buildings, Crewe

Date: Thursday 11 July 2013

Time: 09:30

---

Attendees:

Name	Organisation
David Knight	Capita Symonds
Andrew Brown	Capita Symonds
Anthony Bennett	Capita Symonds
Paul Williams	Capita Symonds
Ian Darlington	Capita Symonds
Rachel Ellison	Costain
Jayne Geary	Costain
Jonathan Turley	Highways Agency
Mohammed Swapan	Highways Agency
Stuart Robinson	Atkins
Paul Griffiths	Cheshire East Council
Andrew Spittlehouse	Cheshire East Council/Jacobs
Graham Walters	Cheshire East Council
Pryce Evans	Cheshire East Council
Wayne Ashdown	Cheshire East Council

Introduction to the current status of the scheme and general overview was completed the previous day's session (VE Session 1 & 2).

**Notes of Meeting**

*Junctions*

- Andrew Brown (AMB) presented and reiterated the premise and agreement from yesterday's meeting regarding the proposed speed limits for the various sections of the network that are to be de-trunked.

*Mere Junction/A50 Junction*

- Paul Griffiths (PG) expressed concern at the current Preliminary Design proposals for Mere. CEC have completed some initial modelling of the preliminary design with the traffic flow information provided which shows the junction to be at 90+% saturation at opening year and will therefore have practically no reserve capacity.
- PG tabled an alternative proposal which CEC had developed which kept the A556 east/west movements as more of a balanced the priority as appose to the prelim design. CEC stated that they would like to develop their proposal further and then issue for review by Capita/Costain/HA and potential inclusion into the detailed design.

- Considerations with regards to the junction layout including equestrian facilities, crossing locations, potential use of “existing cut through link” and extent of turning pocket capacity were discussed and are to be addressed in the development of the finalised junction layout.
- Land boundaries were also discussed and potential impact on the new layout – appreciation required by all parties.
- CEC (PG) to consult with local members for preferred options at Mere when reviewed and available.
- PG hoped to issue CAD version of layout for comments on the WC 15<sup>th</sup> July.

#### *Bucklow Hill Junction*

- AMB explained the current proposals to the group, and went on to explain that, based on previous discussions that it may be preferable to make the priority movement from Chester Road to Mereside Road as this will most likely be the desirable route into Tatton.
- Question asked if it was possible to remove the crossing on the southern side of junction and move to the island (island would require enlarging). Capita to review and develop.
- Discussion within group as to consideration of single extended crossing of Mereside Road to allow one movement due to the low footfall numbers anticipated. Capita to review.
- Capita to develop priority junction layout for consideration encompassing a revised crossing and island arrangement to simplify movements if possible.
- Capita to develop twin roundabout option for Bucklow Hill for consideration.
- Consideration required in signals sequencing/layout for access/egress to Chapel Lane. Chapel Lane movements include bus and cycle links. Potential safety and operational concerns with respect to blocking back within junction for right turn manoeuvres. To be addressed in option development and detailed design by all parties.
- Capita/Costain to review junction layouts with HA and then seek further agreement from CEC.

#### *Chester Road Roundabout*

- Based on currently preliminary design proposals CEC’s initial thoughts were that the proposed ICD looked large. Capita advised that they are to review with respect to DMRB standards and the relevant traffic/capacity analysis.
- Concerns were discussed with respect to the premise of offsetting the NMU facilities too far away from the desire line and in conjunction with the widened verge and earthworks footprint. Agreed by all that consideration and development of the design is required to ensure the connectivity provided is practical for users and within the constraints. Capita to review proposals and consider secondary option of intermediate crossings to the southern verge.
- It was accepted the non provision of dropped kerbs or facilities would be sufficient deterrent from NMU crossing at undesirable points at junction.
- Capita to review possibility of re-siting NMU provisions to eastern side of junction.

#### *A50 Roundabout*

- Paul Griffiths stated that in principle, CEC have no objection to the principle features of the preliminary design layout.
- CEC have completed a review of the capacity of the layout based on the traffic information supplied (similar to the A50/Mere junction) and modelling suggests that northbound and southbound entry flaring would need to be increased to avoid significant queues. Capita to develop entry lengths to optimum where possible however to consider with the structural features such as deck, parapet alignment and transitions.
- PG to issue their preliminary VISSIM model for Capita review - ideally 90m flare required on southern arm.

#### *Millington Roundabout*

- CEC has no concerns in principle to the preliminary design layout.
- David Knight asked as to the relevance of the widened verge on the mainline offslip and if this could be reduced and any potential departure. Capita to develop and submit proposals to Jonathan Turley for initial review and consideration.

#### *Cherry Tree Lane - Bend*

- Discussion as to current proposals and potential options in terms of speed management.
- Consideration of roundabout junction form. Agreed within group option wasn't appropriate.
- Consideration of straightening the southern alignment/arm however potential safety implications.
- Consideration of cross-section restrictions to assist safety. Capita to review.
- Review of departures that are currently identified and would be developed with proposals – to be completed by Capita.
- Capita to produce a detailed layout options (limited to two) highlighting all safety measures for current proposals and issue to CEC for approval. HGV tracking for both options.

#### *General Comments*

- Andrew Brown requested pavement, traffic signal & lighting specs from CEC which will be provided through Jayne Geary.
- CEC expressed that they may want to keep the existing CCTV units at Mere & Bucklow and have them routed to CEC management centre. CEC to review and advise for Capita/Costain to develop if required.
- Noted and agreed that the existing 2 No speed cameras are to be decommissioned.

#### *Traffic Management*

- Discussed and agreed that there is a fundamental need to ensure that the signing strategy is wide enough to fully encompass the whole scheme, side roads and operational routes.
- TROs will most likely be required on southern link to discourage on street parking.
- Wayne Ashdown has no concerns at present with current proposals however would like to be involved as the scheme detail develops.

**Appendix 11: CEC'S RELEVANT REPRESENTATIONS DATED 19TH JUNE TO 2ND JULY 2013**

**A556 Knutsford to Bowdon Scheme**

Representation No. **13**  
Received **19 June 2013**  
From **Cheshire East Council (Public Protection and Health)**

***Representation***

**//**

Representations will be made on the following aspects of the development;

Air Quality  
Noise and Vibration (Construction and operational)

**//**

Contaminated Land

**A556 Knutsford to Bowdon Scheme**

Representation No. **16**  
Received **19 June 2013**  
From **Andrew Spittlehouse** on behalf of **Paul Griffiths, Principal Transportation Officer, Cheshire East Council**

***Representation***

**//**

A556 Knutsford to Bowdon improvement – Cheshire East Council representation to the national infrastructure planning body - June 2013.

CEC will submit representations to the NIPB on a departmental basis. The following comments relate to Highways and Transportation issues.

CEC are generally supportive of the scheme as it removes traffic from sensitive locations and relieves significant congestion issues along the A556. However CEC have some concerns over the impact on the local road network that the new road may have, that as yet have not been resolved.

Revised and new junction designs

1) A50 / new A556 – CEC have concerns over the design of this new junction that have not yet been resolved. Initial assessments by CEC using flows supplied by the HA indicate that significant queues would be generated in the morning peak on the southbound A50 approach to the roundabout in the 2032 design year – this is without additional traffic stress caused by Motorway incidents

2) The A50 / de-trunked A556 at Mere – the proposed junction arrangement may not be adequate. CEC are looking for network resilience to cater for additional traffic that might be generated by events at Tatton Park and during incidents on the M6 that force traffic to divert onto the A50 / de-trunked A556. The proposed revised junction layout is not expected to operate effectively in these instances. CEC are working with the HA to devise alternative signal timings to be instigated when incidents occur on the M6, that may be able to address these concerns.

3) Agreement on some aspects of the treatment of road safety issues on the local road network has not yet been reached – discussions are ongoing on the outstanding points

Committed sums from the Highways Agency to CEC.

1) There are issues re committed sums to pay for the future maintenance of the de-trunked A556 road. The condition of existing assets and proposals for lighting and so on need to be agreed.

2) Potential unforeseen issues on the wider local road network that may arise when the new A556 has opened. Committed sums need to be agreed to pay for any of these issues. Traffic volumes on the minor / local roads may be higher than forecast, as the model is strategic in

//

nature and may not accurately model traffic on more minor roads in the network.

## A556 Knutsford to Bowdon Scheme

Representation No. **27**

Received **26 June 2013**

From **Cheshire East Council**

### **Representation**

//

Cheshire East Council will submit representations and Spatial Planning will contribute to that submission. Regard should be taken of the current planning policies and full details will

//

be given in the CEC statement.

## A556 Knutsford to Bowdon Scheme

Representation No. **28**

Received **26 June 2013**

From **Cheshire East Council - Highways**

### **Representation**

//

It is evident from the scoping documents associated with this scheme that the importance of assessing potential flood risk impacts has been captured. The scheme is highly likely to impact on a number of locally important non main river (ordinary)

watercourses and other water features. It is evident that there are local surface water flood

Planning Inspectorate Scheme Ref: TR010002 (A556 Knutsford To Bowdon Improvement Scheme)

Document Name: SoCG HA CEC

risk areas potentially affected by the proposed route of this improvement scheme. It will be essential that detailed drainage design and any associated local flood risk impacts are fully assessed and approved by Cheshire East as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) and in the interests of managing flood risk to ensure no adverse impacts off site.

Formal consents may be required under Land Drainage Act 1991 for certain works affecting non main river or ordinary watercourses .Similarly, consents may be required from Environment Agency for works affecting Main River under Water Resources Act 1991.

Proposals for the detailed drainage design should be discussed with Cheshire East Flood Risk

//

Management at the appropriate stage

## **A556 Knutsford to Bowdon Scheme**

Representation No. **41**

Received **2 July 2013**

From **Cheshire East Council (Development Management)**

### ***Representation***

//

CEC is in principle supportive of the scheme, but there are potential issues concerning built heritage, landscape and visual impact, nature conservation and impact on trees that we may wish to raise during the examination process. In summary:

The new road affects two grade II listed properties and a historic parkland of local significance.

There is a moderate adverse impact on ecology at opening and a slight/neutral adverse impact at design year, locally significant adverse impacts are anticipated on otter, bats, barn owls and running water. Residual adverse impacts could potentially be off sett and secured by legal agreement.

There are potentially significant landscape and visual impacts within this area of green belt, designated area of county value and local visual amenity impacts.

//

Impact on trees has not been assessed at this time.