RESPONSE BY CPRE CHESHIRE BRANCH TRANSPORT CAMPAIGN GROUP TO CHESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL'S 'HAVE YOUR SAY' QUESTIONNAIRE ON CHESHIRE'S NEW LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN (LTP) FOR 2006 - 20011

What do you think?

Question	**Response**	**Qualification/ Explanation**
Do you agree that our Local Transport Plan objectives are the right ones?	Yes	
Do you think that there are additional objectives that should be included?	No	BUT there is a need to expand commitments within the existing objectives, eg. **Objective 1** should include 'healthier living' not just lifestyles, **Objective 2** should include a commitment to increasing public transport accessibility to key services from rural areas**,** **Objective 3** should address 'danger reduction', **Objective 4** should include some reference to sensitive design of interchanges, **Objective 5** should amend the wording of its wide-sweeping sixth aim/bullet point which implies a 'predict and provide' approach, **Objective 6** should include landscape character assessments and **Objective 7** should emphasise the important part which soft measures can play.
Do you agree with the CC proposals for tackling congestion?	No	BECAUSE there is no definition of what is meant by 'minor' highway improve-ments, not all the complementary measures recommended by the multi-modal and roads-based studies have been included, there is no mention of impacts on rural areas and unsuitable routes of urban traffic control proposals, CPRE does not agree with the 'Increasing Capacity' priority which again implies 'predict and provide' and new road schemes. There is a need for a commitment to reduce road freight journeys by publicity and initiatives into journey planning and for a more pro-active response to providing public transport services for commuters.

Do you agree with the CC's proposals for making our roads safer?	No	BECAUSE annual analysis of problem areas is inadequate, there is no reference to sensitively designing engineering solutions, sparcity in road signage and no commitment to blanket speed limits (ie. a more holistic approach).
Do you agree with the CC's approach to improving air quality?	No	A more pro-active - instead of the indicated reactionary - involvement should be undertaken.
Do you agree with the CC's approach to improving access to jobs and services	Yes	BUT, it should be noted, there are conflicting statements and emphases in the LTP consultative document.
Are there other measures which we should consider to improve accessibility?		CPRE would like to see a long-term commitment to exploring Metrolink extension into Cheshire from: (i) Manchester Airport (ii) Stockport Bus Station (iii) Altrincham (as suggested by MIDMAN)
Do you agree with the proposed measures to improve our quality of life?	Yes	BUT, it should be noted that: (i) home zones are not mentioned in the consultative document whereas they are in the supporting document (ii) the Quiet Lanes commitment for the Peckforton Hills has not been carried forward from the previous LTP – it should be – and there should be an aspiration to create a network of Quiet Lanes and Greenways throughout the County (iii) there is no mention of a landscape strategy and (iv) it is unclear how the statement regarding CO2 emissions will be judged.
Indicate three quality of life priorities (no particular order required)		Climate change and greenhouse gases Landscape and bio-diversity Quality of public spaces and better streetscapes

Top three local priorities (from suggestions listed) for each District		Chester (i) Chester Station Gateway project (ii) Further development of local walking and cycling networks (iii) The creation of an education and health transport partnership Congleton (i) Enhance Congleton railway station (ii) Public transport improvements (iii) Improved access to Cheshire Cycle Network Crewe & Nantwich (i) Introduction of improved cross-district and cross-boundary bus links (ii) Improved local bus services to link Nantwich town centre with new housing development (iii) Development of a cross-town strategic cycle network Ellesmere Port & Neston (i) Major improvements to Hooton rail interchange (ii) Improve local bus services (iii) Improve local bus links to Neston Macclesfield (i) Introduction of real-time bus information system (ii) Pilot personalised journey planning initiative (iii) Continued expansion of Macclesfield cycle network Vale Royal (i) Improved cross-town bus services and links identified (ii) Develop Parish Partnerships to address specific transport issues – but not just in communities identified, also in smaller rural ones (iii) A phased strategy to improve safety and bus passenger facilities in the Over Estate

Are there other local priorities not listed?		Chester (i) Re-opening of Beeston Station (ii) Commitment to support Peckforton Quiet Lanes project (iii) Commitment to develop other Quiet Lanes projects, eg. to west of Delamere Forest (iv) Commitment to follow V.R's lead in establishing greenways network Congleton (i) Re-opening of Middlewich Railway Station (ii) Carrying forward of Quiet Lanes commitment from LTP 1 (iii) Commitment to follow V.R's lead in establishing greenways network Crewe and Nantwich (i) Carrying forward of commitment made in LTP 1 to support Peckforton Hills Quiet Lanes project (ii) Developing other Quiet Lanes projects (iii) Commitment to follow V.R's lead in establishing greenways network Ellesemere Port & Neston (i) Contribution to North West Coastal Trail project (ii) Commitment to follow V.R's lead in establishing greenways network Macclesfield (i) Declaring areas suffering air quality problems, eg. King Street in Knutsford and Warrington Road, Knutsford (ii) Extending Macclesfield Forest Quiet Lanes project (iii) Commitment to follow V.R's lead in establishing greenways network Vale Royal (i) Committing to Norley Quiet Lanes project (ii) Committing to other Quiet Lanes projects (iii) Declaring areas suffering from air quality problems such as Sproston

Do you agree with the priority order we have given to our proposed major schemes?	No	Equal top priority should be Crewe Rail Gateway and the Chester Railway Station regeneration part (only) of the Chester Transport Strategy Second should be the Northwich Vision Third should be the Alderley Edge Bypass The non-public transport parts of the Chester Transport Strategy and the non public transport SEMMMS Schemes are not sustainable and should be dropped.
Targets		
Restrain traffic growth	Too Low	Less than the governments targets
Ensure there is no reduction in the ratio…..	Too Low	Considering the forecast reduction in 'under 15' population
All schools to possess a travel plan by 2011	About right	No comment
All businesses with more than 500 to have a travel plan by 2011	About right	Not sufficiently stretching
A 40% reduction in killed or seriously injured between 1994/98 and 2010	About right	These are in line with Government shared targets
A 50% reduction in child killed or seriously injured between 1994/98 and 2010	About right	
No increase in slight casualty rates	Too Low	Although it could be argued that increased journeys will result in higher absolute numbers this does not seem to be a stretching target. Also no period is given.
To reverse the decline in passenger patronage	Too Low	A simple reversal of decline is not in line with the Government shared target of +12% between 200 & 2011
To meet 90% punctuality for timetable services within 10 years	About right	Starting when? If it is from 2005 then the period for achievement is excessive and interim milestones should be set.
To secure bus satisfaction in excess of 75%	Too low	Over what period? Also the target is lower than the trajectories from the last LTP, once again barely stretching.
To ensure no overall reduction in cycling levels between 2003/4 and 2010/11	Too Low (much)	These are not in line with the shared target of tripling cycle journeys nor is the first supportive of the requirement to increase cycling for health and well being.
To double the number of cycle trips on the Chester-Ellesmere Port multi-user path between 2001 and 2011	Too Low	

To ensure an overall improvement in the condition of our roads by 2011	Too low	No real improvement as a 0.1% improvement is an improvement. An absolute figure should be quoted.
Are there any other LTP activities that you think should be set a specific target or performance indicator?	Yes	Some measurement of accessibility, especially for rural areas.
Are there any other issues concerning our LTP proposals that you wish to comment on	Yes	Overall the LTP proposals do not give confidence • That accessibility by public transport, especially in rural areas, is being seriously addressed. It is recognised that there is limited direct action that can be taken to increase bus usage but a more pro-active approach of publicity and campaigns for say commuter journeys would be useful. Also, the appointment of a dedicated rail officer would have a positive effect on rail outcomes. • That increased cycle, and walking, journeys are being encouraged (no dedicated cycling and walking officers at present) • That the area of freight movement and goods delivery are being investigated • That major road schemes will be the last resort to solve congestion problems and that innovative transport packages will be put forward for Government funding and/or partnership. NOTE: ALL THE ABOVE COMMENTS ARE TO BE READ IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE MORE DETAILED SUBMISSION MADE BY CPRE CHESHIRE TRANSPORT CAMPAIGN GROUP

CPRE Cheshire Branch, Victoria Buildings, Lewin Street, Middlewich, Cheshire, CW10 9AT. Tel/fax: 01606 835046