

**CAMPAIGN TO PROTECT RURAL ENGLAND (CPRE)
CHESHIRE BRANCH TRANSPORT CAMPAIGN GROUP**

**INVITED RESPONSE TO CHESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL'S
'SETTING OUT OUR PROPOSALS' CONSULTATION ON
CHESHIRE'S LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN FOR 2006 - 2011**

April 2005



CONTENTS

WHAT CHESHIRE NEEDS – A ROBUST RURAL TRANSPORT STRATEGY

DETAILED COMMENTS ON ‘SETTING OUT OUR PROPOSALS’ LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN CONSULTATION

KEY POINTS

WHAT CHESHIRE NEEDS – A ROBUST RURAL TRANSPORT STRATEGY

The Transport Campaign Group (TCG) of the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) * Cheshire Branch were very heartened that their input to the first five-year Cheshire Local Transport Plan (LTP) resulted in the inclusion in the plan of commitments to ‘Quiet Lanes’ areas in the County. Several likely schemes were flagged up but only one small one has been instigated (and will be delivered) within the plan period. Nonetheless, this initiative is extremely welcome and CPRE would like to see commitments to more Quiet Lanes - and Greenways - schemes in the second LTP.

As stated in the Scott Wilson Strategic Environmental Assessment on Cheshire’s LTP 2 (April 2005), 40% of its residents live in rural areas or market towns. In line with the Countryside Agency’s LTP good practice guidance (June 2003), Cheshire County Council need to give greater emphasis to rural transport needs in the next LTP than was afforded in the last one and to produce robust rural transport strategies based on sound evidence which take account of different local environmental, social and economic circumstances. Instead of taking forward any new road schemes, which would only encourage more and longer road journeys and further reduce air quality, in the period 2006 to 2011, CPRE would like to see Cheshire County Council:

- **establishing** a rural road hierarchy as part of a speed management policy with Quiet Lanes at the bottom of the hierarchy
- **establishing** rural ‘home zones’ and a programme of quality village traffic calming schemes such as that in Prestbury
- **giving more priority** to the need for sustainable tourism policies, particularly in areas ‘under siege’ such as the Peckforton Hills
- **giving more priority** to ‘soft measures’ such as home working, car clubs and green travel plans (including travel plans for individuals)
- **providing** high quality school transport such as well-equipped yellow school buses and assisting the adoption of more school travel plans
- **providing** more and well-designed interchanges which enable seamless links and help encourage modal shift
- **improving** public transport choices in consultation with local communities and particularly placing much more emphasis on facilitating the re-opening of rail stations, notably Middlewich and Beeston, and carrying out rail enhancements (preferably through a dedicated rail officer)
- **improving** conditions for walking, particularly by taking forward measures outlined in the walking strategy and not forgetting the needs of horse riders (preferably through a dedicated walking and equestrian officer)
- **continuing** to develop better conditions for cycling (preferably through a dedicated cycling officer)
- **continuing** to improve the level of road maintenance without affecting the characteristic of rural roads
- **ensuring** that any demand management measures introduced in urban areas do not impact on rural areas
- **ensuring** that the landscape impacts and air pollution effects of transport schemes are given a high priority as well as biodiversity impacts

Most importantly, transport policies should be integrated with land-use policies, mindful of air pollution and climate change consequences of proposed actions, focused on reducing the need to travel and protecting the built and unbuilt environment and they should be rural-proofed.

* CPRE exists to promote the beauty, tranquillity and diversity of rural England by encouraging the sustainable use of land and other natural resources in town and country.

CPRE Cheshire Branch, Victoria Buildings, Lewin Street, Middlewich, Cheshire, CW10 9AT. Tel/fax: 01606 835046. E-mail: info@cprecheshire.org.uk.

DETAILED COMMENTS ON ‘SETTING OUT OUR PROPOSALS’ LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN CONSULTATION

Section	Text/ref. in CCC’s Consultation Document	CPRE Comments
LISTENING TO LOCAL CONCERNS - Page 2		
Introductory paragraph	<i>“The preliminary round of stakeholder participation and community consultation that we held between October and December 2004 was very useful in helping us to begin work on our new LTP”.</i>	CPRE took part in the initial scoping consultation by meeting with CCC’s Environment Policy Manager and making a written submission in November 2004. CPRE were unhappy that only 20,000 copies of the initial consultation were printed (the population of Cheshire is 673,800) and they were not widely distributed. The questions were stilted and there has been no detailed feedback from that consultation. CPRE hopes that detailed feedback will be given to this consultation stage.
Key Issues	<p>Points nos. 1 & 2. <i>“Dealing with traffic growth”</i> and <i>“Tackling traffic congestion”</i></p> <p>Point no. 5. <i>‘Supporting Town Centre improvements and regeneration in Northwich and Chester’.</i></p>	<p>CPRE does not support addressing these issues through the provision of more highway capacity and would point out that to do so in this way would act contrary to ‘key issue’ point no. 8 <i>“Improving our quality and the environment”</i>.</p> <p>In the ‘actions’ section improvements to Crewe town centre are also indicated. Is its omission here a mistake?</p>
Other notable issues	<p>Bullet 1: <i>“support for increased Park & Ride capacity in Chester”.</i></p> <p>Bullet 3: <i>“Support for Quiet Lanes initiatives and improvements to our public rights of way network”</i></p>	<p>A breakdown of the specific support for P &R in the Green Belt would be useful in view of the fact there were over 1,000 objectors to the CDTS Phase 1 and six registered supporters.</p> <p>Wholehearted support from CPRE but desire to see firm commitment to expanding Quiet Lanes network, including carrying forward a scheme in Peckforton Hills.</p>
OUR VISION - Page 3		
The vision for the Cheshire and Warrington Sub-Regional Economic Strategy	<i>“By 2014 Cheshire and Warrington will strengthen its position as a top five performing sub-region where everyone can access opportunity in work and will enjoy a high quality of life”</i>	It should be noted that the vision for this economic strategy makes no mention of the environment and the sub-region is not one identified in the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy. It is not clear which sub-regions CCC recognises.

Section	Text/ref. in CCC's Consultation Document	CPRE Comments
OUR OBJECTIVES - Pages 4 & 5		
1. Enhance the quality of life of those who live or work in Cheshire	Bullet 1: <i>“Take steps to ensure that the ‘liveability’ agenda is central to our thinking and actions”</i>	What is the definition of the word “liveability”? As it is central to all thinking and actions a clear understanding is needed. Does it mean for example that the health and well being of its residents will take precedence over pure economic growth?
	Bullet 2: <i>“Enhance the [socio-economic] characteristics that contribute to Cheshire’s success and make it an attractive place to live, work and visit;</i>	The omission of the words socio-economic from the ‘Setting out our proposals’ consultation document changes the thrust of this statement. Without them CPRE would argue that the emphasis is on the wider characteristics including environment and look and feel, not just simply those relating to social or economic factors. The wording of the background papers and consultation documents should be explicit and consistent.
	Bullet 3: <i>“Introduce measures to improve our public spaces and streetscapes”</i>	Public open spaces and green lungs in built-up areas are crucially important for health – not just visual enjoyment.
	Bullet 4: <i>“Act to promote personal security and reduce fear of crime”</i>	Fear for personal safety is one of the arguments put forward by motorists for not using public transport. Security on buses and trains and whilst using waiting facilities must be addressed.
	Bullet 5: <i>“Promote healthier lifestyles not least by encouraging walking and cycling”</i>	CPRE believe that this statement should include “healthier living” not just “lifestyles”. Actions aimed at enhancing quality of life should include reducing transport pollution, air quality and noise intrusion not simply providing encouragement to a more healthy lifestyle (although we agree that this is extremely important).

Section	Text/ref. in CCC's Consultation Document	CPRE Comments
<p>2. Promote social inclusion and accessibility to everyday services for all, especially those without a car</p>	<p>Bullet 1: “<i>Respond to the accessibility agenda and seek to improve access to jobs and key services including employment, education and health</i>”</p>	<p>This is especially important in rural areas where access, other than by car, to services is generally poor. More mixed use developments and better public transport are key.</p>
	<p>Bullet 2: “<i>Provide and promote real choice in how people choose to travel</i>”</p>	<p>Agree but there should also be a commitment to encourage reducing the need to travel by for example by providing mobile facilities to rural communities.</p>
	<p>Bullet 3: “<i>Improve access to the countryside and leisure opportunities</i>”</p>	<p>Agree providing that the emphasis is on sustainable tourism, and access by public transport, cycle and foot.</p>
	<p>Bullet 4: “<i>Reduce the cost of transport and widen travel horizons in order to assist people access job and training opportunities</i>”</p>	<p>Does this mean reduce the cost of public or all transport including cars? Reducing the cost of the latter would not encourage modal shift.</p>
	<p>Bullet 5: “<i>Respond to the need to tackle social exclusion in both urban and rural areas</i>”</p>	<p>The supporting papers reference to the use of Parish Plans and Market Town Action Plans to identify problems affecting rural communities is good. We would suggest that some analysis of accessibility is needed and should be a firm commitment.</p>
	<p>Bullet 6: “<i>Meet the specific needs of those who have no or limited access to cars</i>”</p>	<p>Fully supported. Car clubs would be useful as well as more community transport.</p>
	<p>Bullet 7: “<i>Improve physical accessibility and remove barriers to mobility wherever possible with particular emphasis placed on meeting the needs of the disabled</i>”</p>	<p>Support</p>

Section	Text/ref. in CCC's Consultation Document	CPRE Comments
<p>3. Improve safety for all travellers</p>	<p>Bullet 1: <i>“Maintain our commitment to meeting national targets for improving road safety”</i></p>	<p>Note: The majority of road deaths are on rural roads and casualties are falling slowest on minor roads. CCC should extend their commitment to include ‘danger reduction’. Fear caused by the volume and speed of traffic has a negative impact on walking, cycling and quality of life.</p>
	<p>Bullet 2: <i>“Ensuring we maintain our road network in good condition in order to reduce and prevent road traffic accidents and improve overall safety”</i></p>	<p>Due to changing measurement and data capture regimes, past APRs have not been able to support that this is being achieved. What will be different during this LTP period?</p>
	<p>Bullet 3: <i>“Meet the specific needs of delivering road safety improvements within disadvantaged communities”</i></p>	<p>Support and CPRE would point particularly to disadvantaged rural communities.</p>
	<p>Bullet 4: <i>“Introduce appropriate road safety strategies and campaigns to meet the differing needs of urban and rural communities”</i></p>	<p>CPRE fully support this, rural locations have differing road safety problems. However, the solution does not lie in a plethora of signs creating clutter in the countryside.</p>
	<p>Bullet 5: <i>“Develop effective speed management strategies to reduce the problem of speeding as a contributory factors in traffic accidents”</i></p>	<p>Agree but other examples of dangerous driving, eg failing to stop at red lights, give way to pedestrians etc, which are becoming more commonplace, also need addressing.</p>
	<p>Bullet 6: <i>“Deliver education and awareness campaigns to encourage safer attitudes & behaviour for all road users”</i></p>	<p>Support</p>
	<p>Bullet 7: <i>“Tackle crime/ fear of crime to make our streets safer as part of our wider Community Safety agenda”</i></p>	<p>Support</p>

Section	Text/ref. in CCC's Consultation Document	CPRE Comments
	<p>Bullet 8: <i>“Ensure that, wherever appropriate, work is taken forward in partnership to meet shared objectives”</i></p>	<p>Why does CPRE not have a seat on Cheshire's Local Strategic Partnership?</p>
<p>4. Promote the integration of all forms of transport and land use planning, leading to a better, more efficient transport system</p>	<p>Bullet 1: <i>“Work with and maintain effective dialogue with District Council partners and developers to guarantee that the planning process delivers sustainable land use and transport solution”</i></p>	<p>Once again the wording in the document and supporting paper differ. Work with infers a contributory participation, Maintain effective dialogue means talk to. Which is correct, if indeed either?</p>
	<p>Bullet 2: <i>“Work with partners to ensure that all new development is located in appropriate locations and is fully accessible by all modes of transport”</i></p>	<p>Why the change of 'sustainable' to 'appropriate' in this point? CPRE would suggest that 'appropriate' gives a different emphasis to the sustainable approach being put forward in the Cheshire Vision Statement.</p>
	<p>Bullet 3: <i>“Build on existing partnerships to improve the quality and attractiveness of alternatives to the car to ensure genuine choice in how journeys are undertaken”</i></p>	<p>Support</p>
	<p>Bullet 4: <i>“Continue work to enhance transport interchanges and transport gateways”</i></p>	<p>This is absolutely essential to achieve seamless journeys and modal shift but the design and layout of interchanges must be appropriate to their locations.</p>
	<p>Bullet 5: <i>“Work towards our goal of securing a fully integrated passenger transport network in Cheshire”</i></p>	<p>Support</p>
	<p>Bullet 6: <i>“Raise awareness and inform people to make them aware of the choice available when making decisions about how they travel”</i></p>	<p>Individual green travel planning exercise have proved to be very successful in achieving modal shift</p>

Section	Text/ref. in CCC's Consultation Document	CPRE Comments
<p>5 Contribute to an efficient economy and to support sustainable economic growth and regeneration in appropriate locations</p>	<p>Bullet 1: <i>“Deliver schemes which stimulate and contribute towards sustainable economic growth in Cheshire”</i></p>	<p>The supporting paper states that developments for manufacturing, storage and distribution uses should be located on sites which have access to a railway line, commercial waterway or pipeline. The consultative statement, whilst quoting sustainability, is not as prescriptive. Which is correct?</p>
	<p>Bullet 2: <i>“Work with the business sector and other key stakeholder such as the NWDA to support partnerships to deliver local economic growth”</i></p>	<p>Note: The five guiding principles of the government's new sustainable development strategy – Securing the Future – are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Living within environmental limits • Ensuring a strong, healthy and just society • Achieving a sustainable economy • Promoting good governance and • Using sound science responsibly
	<p>Bullet 3: <i>“Encourage workplace travel plan and welfare to work projects”</i></p>	<p>Support</p>
	<p>Bullet 4: <i>“Contribute to the sub-regional agenda and work in partnership with neighbouring authorities to address cross-boundary commuter problems”</i></p>	<p>Again the wording in the document and supporting papers differ giving a change of emphasis. Also, note the CPRE Cheshire Branch critique of the evolving West Cheshire/ North East Wales Sub-Regional Strategy (March 2005)</p>
	<p>Bullet 5: <i>“Enhance the attractiveness and viability of our town centres”</i></p>	<p>Agreed but believe it should also include <i>village</i> centres</p>
	<p>Bullet 6: <i>“Meet the needs of the longer distance business traveller, commuter & freight haulage sector by providing an efficient transport network & by tackling congestion”</i></p>	<p>This wide-sweeping statement implies a ‘predict and provide’ approach which CPRE does not support. CCC should not be encouraging long-distance commuting or poor freight logistics.</p>

Section	Text/ref. in CCC's Consultation Document	CPRE Comments
	<p>Bullet 7: <i>“Seek to maximise external funding and partnership arrangements to deliver transport schemes to gain maximum added value in the delivery of our transport strategy”</i></p>	<p>PFI (private finance initiative) arrangements which cynically support planning gain and result in unnecessary environmental damage (as in the case of the Middlewich Bypass) are not acceptable and will be opposed by CPRE.</p>
	<p>Bullet 8: <i>“Develop further programmes such as Business and Employment Support Scheme (BESS) project to create better links between areas of job opportunities and areas of deprivation through improved transport links, training and business start up opportunities”</i>.</p>	<p>This statement is very similar to one in the ‘Northern Way’ documentation. Job opportunities should be taken to areas of deprivation and there should be more mixed use communities. Strategies which facilitate commuting over long distances are unsustainable.</p>
<p>6. Protect and enhance the built and natural environment</p>	<p>Bullet 1: <i>“Respond, [and take into full account] as appropriate, to the outcomes of the Strategic Environmental Assessment”</i></p>	<p>Again the wording in the document and supporting papers differ, giving a change of emphasis. Note: The SEA report of April 2005 flags up the fact that since 1999 the NW has seen an increase in greenhouse gas emissions and Cheshire emits 10% more CO2 than other County averages in the NW.</p>
	<p>Bullet 2: <i>“Take steps to protect the Cheshire Landscape and promote biodiversity”</i></p>	<p>Wholeheartedly support. CPRE would also like to see mention of landscape character assessments.</p>
	<p>Bullet 3: <i>“Reduce the impact of traffic on the wider environment by</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>tackling climate change and greenhouse gases</i> - <i>reducing traffic noise and pollution;</i> - <i>reducing the adverse effects of traffic on air quality;</i> - <i>reducing community severance; and</i> - <i>reducing the use of non-renewable resources”</i> 	<p>Full support for these aims which, if taken seriously, ought to result in a moratorium on road-building.</p> <p>CPRE believe that the reductions of traffic noise and air pollution are significant contributors to a community’s health and well being. As previously indicated these should be included in that section</p> <p>Also see response to bullet 2 in section 5.</p>

Section	Text/ref. in CCC's Consultation Document	CPRE Comments
<p>7. Manage a well-maintained and efficient transport network.</p>	<p>Bullet 1: <i>“Take steps to optimise the capacity and efficiency of our transport network to help reduce traffic congestion”</i></p>	<p>CPRE supports making best use of existing highway capacity and sustainable demand management methods</p>
	<p>Bullet 2: <i>“Target the journey to school and the journey to work as an effective way of tackling and reducing peak hour traffic problems”</i></p>	<p>‘Targeting’ through green travel plans and other soft measures such as ‘safe routes to school’ is fully supported by CPRE but not ‘targeting’ through building more roads</p>
	<p>Bullet 3: <i>“Provide and promote practical alternatives to the car in order to reduce traffic growth”</i></p>	<p>Fully support</p>
	<p>Bullet 4: <i>“Respond to the requirements of the Traffic Management Act and Road Traffic Reduction Act to help reduce levels of congestion on our local road network”</i></p>	<p>No comment</p>
	<p>Bullet 5: <i>“Address our responsibilities for highway and bridge maintenance as a priority activity”</i></p>	<p>CPRE supports maintenance being made a priority</p>
	<p>Bullet 6: <i>“Use the Transport Asset Management Plan to inform effective decision making and best value solutions for local maintenance priorities”</i></p>	<p>No comment</p>
<p>CONSIDERING THE WIDER CONTEXT - Page 6</p>		
<p>Key National and Regional Transport Issues and Proposals</p>	<p>New Mersey Crossing M6 widening SEMMMS road schemes</p>	<p>CPRE does not support any of these schemes. It believes they would all wreak significant environmental damage, bring only short term relief, generate more traffic movements and result in poorer air quality and a poorer quality of life. Also, in the case of the New Mersey Crossing, two deprived communities would have to pay to connect to each other.</p>

Section	Text/ref. in CCC's Consultation Document	CPRE Comments
RESPONDING TO NATIONAL AND SHARED PRIORITIES FOR TRANSPORT - Pages 7 & 8		
Tackling Congestion by: 1. Making Best Use of the Network	<i>“Manage the maintenance of the existing network in the most efficient way to minimise traffic delays that may contribute to congestion”</i>	
	<i>“Develop programmes to implement minor highway improvement schemes to address issues of isolated congestion”</i>	CPRE said in its response to the scoping study that an indication of what is meant by ‘minor’ would be useful (it has still not been provided). CPRE also believe that a sustainable approach should be included in any highway improvement.
	<i>“Develop programmes to implement the complementary measures identified within the recommendations of the multi modal studies carried out in Cheshire”.</i>	Note: Not all the complementary measures recommended by the multi-modal and roads-based studies are included
	<i>“Develop urban traffic management and control systems across Cheshire to manage the traffic flow efficiently with priority being given to schemes for Macclesfield, Northwich and Crewe”</i>	Care must be taken to ensure that traffic does not divert to unsuitable routes.
	<i>“Work with partners, particularly the Highway Agency to address specific problems on Cheshire’s motorways and Principle Road Network and the consequences of diverting into Cheshire’s own network to avoid motorway congestion or as the result of traffic accidents”</i>	There is a need to identify alternative routes for when there are problems on the motorways.

Section	Text/ref. in CCC's Consultation Document	CPRE Comments
2. Promoting Travel Choice	<i>"Encourage the adoption and development of travel plans by schools and business, and personalised journey planning projects".</i>	Most welcome. CPRE have been advocating individual travel plans for some time.
	<i>"Promote and develop the public transport network to provide real travel choice and reduce congestion through efficient use of all modes of transport"</i>	Fully support
	<i>"Encourage alternatives to the car, particularly for shorter journeys, and ensure all parts of the network are fully utilised from the road network to the public rights of way network"</i>	Fully support
3. Demand Management	<i>"Promote the efficient use of on-street and off-street parking in conjunction with the District Councils"</i>	No comment
	<i>"Guide new development to locations in or on the edge of suitable towns through Structure Plan policies"</i>	No comment, although CPRE believe that this is a Development Control objective that the LTP should support not guide.
	<i>"Contribute to the Government led debate on the use of charging methods to address the congestion problem"</i>	CPRE is supportive of the principle of universal road-user charging in place of road tax
	<i>"Progress the decriminalisation of car parking"</i>	No comment

Section	Text/ref. in CCC's Consultation Document	CPRE Comments
4. Increasing Capacity	<i>“Consider the development of major transport schemes to provide relief from known and identified issues of congestion, and which provide wider social, economic and environmental improvements”</i>	<p>CPRE believe that road schemes only exacerbate congestion by increasing or diverting traffic from other routes. The DfT's Smarter Choices paper suggests that 'soft options' can be equally as effective in reducing congestion and other CC policies support this approach. Promotion of major road building should be a last resort.</p> <p>CPRE also contends that this proposed policy conflicts with the previous comments about 'minor schemes'.</p>
SPECIFIC MEASURES TO TACKLE THE JOURNEY TO SCHOOL – Page 8		
<p>The initiatives outlined are warmly welcomed.</p>		
MAKING OUR ROADS SAFER – Page 9		
Approach to safer roads: 1. Research, analysis and project development	<i>“Undertake detailed analysis of the existing highway network on an annual basis to identify problem road casualty locations and review options to address the problems identified”</i>	<p>Traffic patterns are changeable; a more responsive (real time) approach is needed.</p>
	<i>“Undertake road safety audits for all new highway schemes and improvement schemes to the existing network to improve the safety of highway proposals”</i>	<p>Support</p>
	<i>“Monitor and evaluate our work programmes and methods to review their overall value and benefit so as to inform future initiatives”</i>	<p>This implies some kind internal methodology study but the wording is obscure.</p>

Section	Text/ref. in CCC's Consultation Document	CPRE Comments
	<p><i>“Review the introduction of route management strategies to Cheshire’s roads to co-ordinate safety schemes, maintenance, speed management and other improvement works on routes between urban areas”</i></p>	<p>CPRE has been advocating that highways authorities should carry out RMSs on all their major routes. This would be a positive step forward.</p>
	<p><i>“Investigate the underlying causes of road casualties in disadvantaged areas and develop and implement programmes to tackle any identified problems”</i></p>	<p>This was indicated in the last APR, when will this be undertaken? Accident reduction in these areas was a major requirement of Government policy.</p>
	<p><i>“Develop and implement co-ordinated programmes focussing on work to reduce the number of adults and children killed or seriously injured including motorcyclists casualties”</i></p>	<p>Support</p>
	<p>General comment</p> <p>Some analysis of the effect of all accidents (i.e. road closure time, vehicle trips affected etc) on congestion and the local economy would be useful. These could be related to other sections.</p>	
<p>Engineering solutions and local safety schemes</p>	<p><i>“Develop programmes to implement engineering interventions specifically targeted towards casualty reduction (i.e. Local Safety Schemes) on Cheshire’s roads”</i></p>	<p>Interventions must be sensitively designed to blend with the local environment and should not be any more excessive than absolutely necessary.</p>
	<p><i>“Develop programmes to implement other minor traffic and transportation improvements to achieve accident reductions on Cheshire’s roads”</i></p>	<p>In Cheshire, minor traffic improvements tend to mean coloured splashes (eg. ‘gateways’) on road surfaces and more signage and they often diminish the local environment</p>

Section	Text/ref. in CCC's Consultation Document	CPRE Comments
	<p><i>“Manage and maintain the existing network in the most efficient way with due regard to road safety and all road users”</i></p>	<p>Support so long as this does not involve excessive signage, ie. ‘clutter’, particularly in rural areas.</p>
	<p><i>“Ensure that the safety of all road users is given full consideration in the design of all integrated transport improvement schemes”</i></p>	<p>The road user hierarchy should apply, ie. with pedestrians at the top and HGVs at the bottom.</p>
	<p><i>“Co-ordinate highway improvement and maintenance schemes to minimise disruptions and ensure best value for money solutions”</i></p>	<p>Included in the supportive notes but not in consultative document, it does appear inappropriate to this section</p>
<p>Education and awareness</p>	<p><i>“Utilise recorded casualty data to develop and deliver programmes of education, training and publicity”</i></p>	<p>CPRE would support all these initiatives</p>
	<p><i>“Support and promote national road safety campaigns and develop and implement locally relevant road safety campaigns”</i></p>	
	<p><i>“Develop programmes to promote safety on the journey to school and encourage and assist schools to develop school travel plans”</i></p>	
	<p><i>“Develop existing and new partnerships and ensure close collaborative working to achieve casualty savings”</i></p>	

Section	Text/ref. in CCC's Consultation Document	CPRE Comments
Speed Management and Enforcement	<i>"Undertake detailed analysis of the highway network on an annual basis to identify locations that would benefit from the introduction of safety cameras and provide these at sites approved by the DfT as part of the Cheshire Safety Camera Partnership project"</i>	Once again CPRE would advocate that the dynamic nature of road use and avoidance of known safety camera locations results in the need for more responsive initiatives. ie Mobile speed indicator displays
	<i>"Undertake speed limit reviews across Cheshire in accordance with our Speed Management Strategy and implement revised speed limits as appropriate"</i>	CPRE believes it is safer and less confusing for motorists to have blanket speed limits, eg. 40 mph on all country lanes and 30 mph in all villages except some with appropriate traffic calming measures where it should be 20 mph.
IMPROVING AIR QUALITY - Page10		
Our proposals	<i>"...the County Council will ensure that any requirement to respond to the declaration of an AQMA will be addressed within our 5 year Area Programmes..."</i>	The supporting papers suggest that action plans will be included in the APR in full within 12-18 months of the AQMA being designated and not wait for the next LTP draft, this appears to conflict with the timescales quoted in the consultation document. Also, it is inexcusable that Macclesfield B.C. has not submitted information.
IMPROVING ACCESSIBILITY TO JOBS AND SERVICES - Page11		
Introductory paragraph	<i>"It is recognised that local bus services will play a central role in helping to deliver our Accessibility Strategy"</i>	Metrolink extensions into Cheshire from Manchester Airport and Stockport should be explored as long-term possibilities and the role of heavy rail should be given a higher priority. Car clubs could be appropriate for some communities and schemes such as Cumbria's 'wheels to work' should be explored.
Our proposals	<i>"We are already working on a number of pilot projects and reviews as part of this process ..."</i>	CPRE supports the pilot schemes indicated and notes the proposals and programme for an Accessibility Strategy. It would like to be amongst those participating in the stakeholder consultation during Autumn 2005.

Section	Text/ref. in CCC's Consultation Document	CPRE Comments
OTHER QUALITY OF	LIFE ISSUES – Page 12	
<p>Quality of public spaces and better streetscapes</p>	<p><i>“Our proposals include many examples of schemes that will enhance public spaces and streetscapes, such as Home Zones. We will also consider the impact of transport within sensitive locations such as conservation areas.</i></p> <p><i>Quiet lanes and greenway strategies will also be developed. A pilot scheme will be taken forward in the Macclesfield Forest area. Proposals are also being considered for a scheme centred around Norley that will link with the Vale Royal Greenways Strategy. Work on Greenway and Quiet Lane initiatives will be closely linked to our Rights of Way Improvement Plan and the development of an interim County Equestrian Strategy”</i></p>	<p>The Supporting document refers to proposals for more home zones. This has not been carried forward into the consultative document, is this an error?</p> <p>The Macclesfield Quiet Lanes scheme will be underway by the time this LTP comes into being. Is this referring to an extension to the scheme?</p> <p>CPRE support the proposal for the Norley area but question why the proposal to bring forward a scheme in the Peckforton Hills not been carried forward to this LTP? This is an area particularly in need of a Quiet Lanes scheme.</p>
<p>Landscape and Biodiversity</p>	<p><i>“A Biodiversity Strategy will be prepared to inform the County Council on how it carries out its transportation activities in relation to habitats and wildlife. Actions will include understanding the conflicts between roads, people and wildlife, proposals to reduce these and improvements to the environmental quality and image of Cheshire’s roads and Public Rights of Way”</i></p>	<p>The supporting papers give a give the impression a lot of work has already been carried out on this subject but neither they nor this consultative document give a timescale for the completion of the strategy.</p> <p>There is no mention of a landscape strategy. The two types of strategies are in fact closely related. Biodiversity stems from landscape. It is understood that the County’s landscape assessment will be available for consultation later this year. There should be a reference to it in the LTP.</p>
<p>Community Safety, personal security and crime</p>	<p><i>“Area Programmes and actions to deliver our Road Safety agenda will help deliver safer communities. Well designed transport interchanges and well lit footways and cycleways will also play a key part in addressing fear of crime”</i></p>	<p>Qualified support. Any extra lighting should be directed downwards and should not spill upwards.</p>

Section	Text/ref. in CCC's Consultation Document	CPRE Comments
<p>Healthy communities</p>	<p><i>“The 2004 Cheshire Community Survey revealed that access to hospitals was a particular concern especially for those without a car. Our accessibility strategy will also pay close attention to how people access health services and hospitals as well as opportunities to access sources of healthier food. Measures to encourage more cycling and walking (including wider access to our Public Rights of Way network) are also proposed to help boost levels of physical activity and promote healthier lifestyles”</i></p>	<p>The phrase “<i>pay close attention to...</i>” does not convey any action will be undertaken. A commitment to ensuring <i>all</i> people can access health services and hospitals by public transport, walking and cycling would be more appropriate.</p> <p>There needs to be significant effort put into achieving robust green travel plans for hospital employees and visitors.</p>
<p>Sustainable and Prosperous Communities</p>	<p><i>“The LTP will play a central role in ensuring the continuing success of Cheshire as a sustainable and prosperous location to live and work. Reducing congestion, improving accessibility to jobs and services and measures to complement regeneration projects are key themes that will support this objective. Particular attention will be paid to tackling issues and providing greater opportunities in more disadvantaged communities especially those identified which fall within the top 10% most deprived areas in England. This includes parts of Chester, Crewe, Ellesmere Port, Northwich and Winsford”</i></p>	<p>CPRE support the sustainable commitment but would again refer back to the response to bullet point no. 2 in section 5.</p>
<p>Noise</p>	<p><i>“Measures to mitigate noise are designed into all aspects of our LTP programme. The County Council will act to produce a Noise Action Plan by 2008 in response to the European Noise Directive”</i></p>	<p>Good, a firm commitment to a date for production.</p>
<p>Climate change and greenhouse gases</p>	<p><i>“Activities designed to reduce congestion and encourage more sustainable modes of transport will help control total CO2 emissions in Cheshire”</i></p>	<p>Whilst the statement is valid how will we judge the results?</p>

Section	Text/ref. in CCC's Consultation Document	CPRE Comments
OUR MAJOR SCHEME PROPOSALS - Page13		
<p>Priority One: A34 Alderley Edge and Nether Alderley Bypass</p> <p>Priority Two: Crewe Gateway</p> <p>Priority Three: SEMMMS Schemes</p> <p>Priority Four: Northwich Vision</p> <p>Priority Five: Chester Transport Strategy</p>	<p><i>“Schemes which will be approved must deliver best value for money and must demonstrate how they will contribute towards the delivery of the National Shared Priority for Transport Objectives”</i></p>	<p>Major schemes will also need to be cognisant of the government’s new sustainable development strategy (ref. response to bullet point 2 of section 5) and accord with regional planning policies and they will have to be subject to the new transport priority methodology which the North West Regional Assembly are developing.</p> <p>In addition, they should comply with the set of criteria proposed by the Cheshire Structure Plan Panel. The Panel said: <i>“The use of the car is to be managed and controlled rather than catering for growth in car use”</i> (para. 7.14 of the panel report). The panel also agreed with CPRE that the schemes proposed for inclusion in the Structure Plan had not been reassessed in the light of PPS 11 and regional planning policies (para. 7.33).</p> <p>As far as Chester Transport Strategy was concerned, the Panel were critical of the fact that it was <i>“difficult to pin down”</i> and yet it was being proposed for inclusion in the Structure Plan. (paras. 7.21 and 7.50). Also, both the Highways Agency and CPRE objected to the Chester Western Relief Road at the EIP.</p> <p>The Panel recommended the deletion of S.P. Policy T3 which lists major schemes. They said it should be <i>“replaced by a new policy which introduces the need for improvements to the transport network and which sets out a series of criteria ... to be used in assessing specific schemes and to assist in the process of prioritisation”</i>. They also asked for an indication of the level of commitment to each scheme (p.185).</p> <p>Of the schemes proposed. CPRE can support the Crewe Gateway and the Chester Station part of the Chester Transport Strategy. RPG 13 recognises both as important gateways.</p>

Section	Text/ref. in CCC's Consultation Document	CPRE Comments
LOCAL PRIORITIES - Page 14 & 15		
<p>Chester Further expansion of the city's park & ride scheme</p> <p>Congleton Work in partnership with developers to progress the Middlewich Bypass</p> <p>Crewe & Nantwich Package of measures to tackle access into and around Crewe town centre</p> <p>Macclesfield A pilot personalised journey planning initiative</p> <p>Vale Royal Northwich Vision</p>		<p>CPRE'S opposition to further expansion of Chester's park and ride scheme is well known and has a sound evidence base which is well documented.</p> <p>CPRE has officially registered as an objector to the current Middlewich Bypass scheme. It is entirely inappropriate that a developer should be allowed to dictate the alignment of a road to the worst advantage of the environment.</p> <p>The 'package of measures' should be spelt out in more detail. It is not possible to determine how sustainable or otherwise these proposals are.</p> <p>This sounds very commendable to CPRE. A full report and analysis would be appreciated on it.</p> <p>CPRE supports urban regeneration and cautiously welcomes the principle of this scheme, whilst awaiting further details about the extra road capacity and new bridge involved.</p>

Section	Text/ref. in CCC's Consultation Document	CPRE Comments
MAINTENANCE – Page 15		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance of roads should not include ‘improvements’ which do not fit with the characteristics of the local area • Whilst maintenance is underway signage audits should be conducted to keep signage should be kept to a minimum in scale and number. • As lighting is replaced, down-lighters should be used so that light pollution is reduced. • Particular attention should be paid to repairing verges in rural areas and cutting of them should be co-ordinated with Parish Councils. 		
TARGETS - Page 16		
Tackling Congestion	<i>“To restrain growth in Cheshire, Chester and other urban areas”</i>	These have been carried forward from LTP 1. As previously commented CPRE cannot reconcile them with the Shared Government target of restraining congestion to 2000 levels.
The Journey to School	<i>“To ensure that there is no reduction in the ratio between the total number of pupils and the total number of car journeys to school between 2003/4 and 2010/11”</i>	Supporting papers indicate that between 2002 and 2021 the number of children under the age of 15 is forecast to decrease by 24%. If so then CPRE would suggest this is hardly a “stretching” target.
The Journey to work	<i>“All businesses employing more than 500 staff to possess travel plans by 2011”</i>	<p>Wording should be <i>“All employers with more than 200 staff to produce travel plans by 2011”</i>. This is a little more demanding and encompasses local government & health staff</p> <p>General</p> <p>Within the supporting papers it is stated that <i>“Cheshire and Warrington Sub-Regional Economic Strategy sets out aspirations to improve strategic transport connections into and through the sub-region it recognises the importance of improving connections within the sub-region so that the average journey time to work does not increase from the current level of 21 minutes”</i></p> <p>Surely this would be a more suitable indicator for this section.</p>

Section	Text/ref. in CCC's Consultation Document	CPRE Comments
Road Safety	<i>Reduction in fatalities or seriously injured</i>	These follow Government Shared priorities.
Accessibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>To reverse the decline in bus passenger patronage</i> - <i>To meet 90% bus punctuality</i> - <i>To secure levels of bus satisfaction in excess of 75%</i> - <i>To double the number of cycle trips on Chester to Ellesmere Port multi user path</i> - <i>No overall reduction in other cycle trips</i> 	The quoted targets do not give a true indication of access to healthcare, education, work and major retail centres. Hopefully some form of accessibility mapping will be part of the Autumn review.
Maintenance	<i>Overall improvement in road condition.</i>	During the LTP 1 period CPRE was critical of the changing data capture and recording of road maintenance indicators, hopefully a more stable environment will exist during this period and allow a realistic appraisal of performance and/or improvement.

KEY POINTS

Cheshire County Council, in the production of its second LTP, needs to take account of the many new influences which have come into play since it produced its first one.

- A core development principle of RPG 13 is “*Reducing the need to travel by focusing major generators of travel demand in city, town and district centres and near to public transport interchanges*”.
- The multi-modal studies (MIDMAN and SEMMMS) recommended a range of non-road measures, not all of which have yet been fully explored, let alone taken forward.
- The roads-based studies (Deeside Park Junctions & A5/A483 Shrewsbury-Chester) recommended public transport studies should be conducted.
- The government’s new sustainable development strategy – Securing the Future – has as its goal “*to enable all people throughout the world to satisfy their basic needs without compromising the quality of life for future generations*”. It has five guiding principles which should be adhered to: living within environmental limits, ensuring a strong, healthy and just society, achieving a sustainable economy, promoting good governance and using sound science responsibly and four priority areas for action: sustainable consumption & production, climate change & energy, natural resource protection & environmental enhancement and sustainable communities. These themes should apply to all policies and programmes.
- The panel report from the Cheshire Structure Plan Alteration Examination in Public has recommended that certain criteria should be applied to major transport schemes.
- PPS 11 also sets down a modus operandi relating to transport schemes.
- It would be inappropriate for major transport schemes to be taken forward which would hinder the improvement of air quality and which would contribute to climate change.
- The government has confirmed in its most recent Transport White Paper that ‘predict and provide’ is no longer acceptable.
- The DfT requires LTPs to be aimed at the delivery of economic, social and environmental outcomes and to set transport in a wider context.

Major scheme bids for the following would all comply with the above: (1) the regeneration of Crewe and Chester Railway stations and their environs, (2) the re-opening of Middlewich and Beeston stations, (3) a Quiet Lanes & Greenways network, (4) a package of village speed management schemes.

What do you think?

Question	Response	Qualification
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	Yes	A commitment to increasing public transport accessibility to key services from rural areas.
Do you agree with the CC proposals for tackling congestion	Yes	A commitment to reduce road freight journeys by publicity and initiatives into journey planning. 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	Yes	A more holistic approach rather than focusing on speed.
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	There are however conflicting statements and emphasis in the LTP Consultative document.
Do you agree with the proposed measures to improve our quality of life	Yes	
Priorities		No comment but if asked locally would say <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sustainable and prosperous communities 2. Climate change and greenhouse gases 3. landscape and bio-diversity
Local Priorities		No comment
Major schemes		No comment
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	No comment

Question	Response	Qualification
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?		Some measurement of accessibility, especially for rural areas.
Are there any other issues concerning our LTP proposals that you wish to comment on		<p>Overall the LTP proposals do not give confidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • that increased cycle, and by default walking, journeys are being

Question	Response	Qualification
		<p>encouraged.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.