

STOCKPORT COUNCIL
EXECUTIVE REPORT – SUMMARY SHEET

Subject: Cheadle Towns Fund - Accelerated Measures

Report to: (a) Cheadle Area Committee,
Cabinet Member (Communities and Housing)

Date: Tues, 30th Nov 2021

Report of: (b) Corporate Director for Place Management & Regeneration

Key Decision: (c) **NO / YES** (Please circle)

Forward Plan General Exception Special Urgency (Tick box)

Summary:

The Area Committee is asked to comment on this report and give approval to the cycling and walking proposals and the legal advertising of the associated Traffic Regulation Orders relating to Local Distributor and Local Access Roads (contained in Appendix C).

Recommendation(s):

The Area Committee are asked to recommend that the Cabinet Member (Economy and Regeneration) gives approval for a planning application to be submitted for the Cheadle Station Proposal, approval for the cycling and walking proposals for:

Newland Road to Oak Road (including Queens Gardens);

Oak Road to Brookfield Park;

Brookfield Park to Shiers Drive;

Shiers Drive to Bruntwood Lane;

and the legal advertising of the associated Traffic Regulation Orders relating to Strategic Highways and District Distributor Roads (contained in Appendix C) and subject to no objections being received within 21 days from the advertisement date, the subsequent making of the orders.

Relevant Scrutiny Committee (if decision called in): **(d)**

Communities & Housing Scrutiny Committee

Background Papers (if report for publication): **(e)**

There are none.

Contact person for accessing
background papers and discussing the report

Officer: Katy Farrer
Tel: 0161-474-4907

'Urgent Business': (f) **YES / NO** (please circle)

Certification (if applicable)

This report should be considered as 'urgent business' and the decision exempted from 'call-in' for the following reason(s):

The written consent of Councillor _____ and the Chief Executive/Monitoring Officer/Borough Treasurer for the decision to be treated as 'urgent business' was obtained on _____ /will be obtained before the decision is implemented.

Cheadle Towns Fund - Cheadle Railway Station and Cycling and Walking Consultation Results

Report of the Corporate Director for Place Management & Regeneration

1. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 In November 2019 Cheadle was selected to put forward proposals under the Government's Towns Fund initiative. A Town Board was established to put together a Town Investment Plan for Cheadle with the aim of promoting long term economic growth. The Board comprises representatives from local business and community groups, the local MP, Stockport Council (Councillors and Officers) and Transport for Greater Manchester.
- 1.2 During 2020, the Cheadle Towns Fund Board (CTFB) held an extensive consultation where the public and businesses were asked about the issues facing Cheadle and how the area could best be improved. This showed strong support for sustainable travel, better connectivity and measures to tackle congestion. 76% of respondents suggested that accessibility to the wider rail network should be a priority, and specifically, that a new railway station should be provided. Traffic movement/management, new or improved retail space and improved cycle ways and facilities were also in the top 4 areas for improvement.
- 1.3 £13.9m was awarded earlier this year, for the development of a new railway station for Cheadle, walking and cycling proposals to improve connectivity to Cheadle High Street/the new station, and a low carbon Eco Business Park to boost job opportunities locally. In addition, some funding was made available in advance for the delivery of a package of schemes which provided a pedestrian and cycle link on Ashfield Road (currently under construction), a new parklet on Cheadle High Street and improvements for Councillor Lane (both now completed). A package of improvements to Diamond Jubilee Park is also nearing completion.
- 1.4 A public consultation was held in October 2021 to gauge public opinion on the new railway station and the wider walking and cycling infrastructure. This report details the results of this consultation and provides further information with regards to how the schemes will be developed.

2. INFORMATION

- 2.1. A public consultation exercise was undertaken with key stakeholders in the vicinity of both the proposed railway station and the walking and cycling proposals between Friday 18th October and Sunday 7th November 2021.
- 2.2. Full details of the consultation methods and results are contained within 'Cheadle Town Fund Station and AT Consultation Report' in Appendix A.

2.3. A description of the proposals is provided below:

Cheadle Railway Station

2.4. It is proposed the new railway station for Cheadle will be located on the Chester to Manchester (Mid Cheshire) rail line, approximately 100 metres north of Cheadle High Street and accessed from Manchester Road. It is proposed to comprise:

- A single 100m-long platform with covered waiting facilities, live departure boards and ticket machines which caters for trains in both directions – located to the north of the existing Chester to Manchester train line and accessed from the station car park.
- A safe access route and covered parking for cycles.
- 100 parking bays with a proportion of spaces dedicated for disabled users as well as provision for electric vehicle charging points.
- A new vehicular access priority junction on Manchester Road, opposite but offset from the existing access into Ashlea public house car park.
- Footway provision on Manchester Road north and south of the site access.
- Ramped and stepped access into the station car park and onto the platform.
- A package of improvements to existing pedestrian and cycle facilities within Cheadle, including the construction of new routes that connect into the station.

Walking and Cycling Proposals

2.5. To provide access to the new railway station and High Street and to connect to wider cycle routes on Manchester Rd and in Abney Hall Park, a package of walking and cycling measures has been developed. The package includes:

- A new access junction for the railway station along with new signalled crossing for pedestrians and cyclists on Manchester Road. A pedestrian and cycle route will be provided from the crossing to the new access to the station.
- A shared footway/cycleway on the eastern side of Manchester Road from Newlands Road to the new crossing, underneath the railway bridge.
- A new cycle route and separate footway through Queens Gardens from Stockport Road to Newland Road with associated parking restrictions and new parking bays. The proposals do not include any changes to Cheadle Green.
- Access to Queens Gardens is changed to allow for a parallel 'Sparrow' pedestrian and cyclist signalised crossing on Stockport Road. Access to Queens Gardens will be via Bank Street with improvements to the junction with Stockport Road and additional waiting restrictions on Bank St / Queens Gardens.
- A signed on-carriageway cycle route, and pedestrian improvements, from Oak Road to Brookfield Park including some junction improvements.

- Improvements to the existing bridge and footpaths within Brookfield Park to accommodate shared footway/cycleways, including re-surfacing and the provision of lighting. Vehicle access controls will be reviewed to ensure that it is accessible for all users whilst still preventing car access.
- A shared footway/cycleway on the western side of Shiers Drive including junction works at the access to The Village to improve the crossing point.
- A new signalised crossing for pedestrians and cyclists on Cheadle Road between the Shiers Road junction and Bruntwood Lane, with a new shared footway/cycleway to Bruntwood Lane.

2.6. Plans of the scheme proposals, as consulted upon, are provided within the 'Cheadle Town Fund Station and AT Consultation Report' in Appendix A.

2.7. A summary of the responses to the consultation are provided in the next section.

3. CONSULTATION RESULTS

3.1. The public consultation exercise invited members of the public and stakeholders to answer an online survey and provide comments on both the new railway station and the walking and cycling proposals. A summary of the responses to the consultation questions and more detailed comments are provided below.

Proposed Railway Station

Question 1

3.2. The public were asked 'To what extent do you agree or disagree with the railway station proposal?' There were 485 responses.

3.3. Out of the 485 respondents 356 strongly agreed (72%), 86 agreed (17%), 11 disagreed (2%), 17 strongly disagreed (3%) and 15 (3%) did not answer this question.

Question 2

3.4. The public were asked 'Would you use a railway station at Cheadle?' There were 483 responses:

3.5. Out of the 483 respondents 392 said 'yes' (81%), 24 said 'no' (5%), 62 said 'maybe' (13%) and 5 said 'don't know' (1%).

Question 3

3.6. The public were asked 'If yes, how often would you expect to use the station?' There were 467 responses:

- 76 said 'less than once per month' (15%),
- 148 said '1-2 times per month' (30%),
- 103 said '1-2 times per week' (21%),
- 52 said '3-4 times per week', (11%)
- 36 said '5-6 times per week' (7%),
- 15 said 'every day' (3%),

- 37 said 'don't know' (8%) and
- 26 (5.%) didn't answer the question.

Question 4

- 3.7. The public were asked 'If yes, how would you intend to travel to and from the new station?' There were 462 responses:
- 326 said 'by foot' (66%),
 - 64 said 'by bicycle' (13%),
 - 36 said 'by car/van as a driver' (7%),
 - 8 said 'by car/van as a passenger' (2%),
 - 8 said 'by bus' (2%),
 - 0 respondents said 'by motorcycle',
 - 12 said 'don't know' (2%),
 - 8 said 'other' (2%), and
 - 31 (6%) did not answer.

Question 5

- 3.8. The public were asked 'Are there any routes you would like to see upgraded or created to improve access to the station?' There were 206 responses. The responses are summarised within 'Cheadle Town Fund Station and AT Consultation Report' in Appendix A. A review of these suggestions will be undertaken by officers and considered for inclusion, subject to funding.

Question 6

- 3.9. The public were asked 'Would a new station in Cheadle encourage you to use rail travel instead of other modes of travel?' There were 483 responses.
- 3.10. Out of the 483 respondents 391 said 'yes' (79), 38 said 'no' (8%), 47 said 'maybe' (10%), 7 said 'don't know' (1%) and 10 (2%) did not answer.

Question 7

- 3.11. The public were asked 'If yes, what is/are the main reason(s) that you would use the proposed station instead of your current mode of transport?' There were 438 responses:
- 90 said 'cost' (18%),
 - 218 said 'time' (44%),
 - 363 said 'convenience' (74%),
 - 55 said 'safety' (11%),
 - 8 said 'poor health/disability' (2%),
 - 266 said 'environmental reasons' (54%),
 - 16 said 'other' (3%), and
 - 55 (11%) did not answer.

Question 8

- 3.12. The public were asked 'What other modes of transport would you typically use for those journeys?' (Multiple choice). There were 468 responses,
- 84 said 'on foot' (17%),
 - 77 said 'bicycle' (16%),
 - 350 said 'car/van as a driver' (71%),
 - 135 said 'car/van as a passenger' (27%),

- 128 said 'bus' (26%),
- 7 said 'motorcycle' (1%),
- 5 said 'don't know' (1%),
- 45 said 'other' (9%) and
- 25 (5%) did not answer.

Question 9

3.13. The public were asked whether, with regards to the station proposals, they had any other comments to make. There were 227 comments made. These are summarised below. The project team have reviewed the comments and provided a response beneath each comment (in italics):

- **A lack of support for the proposed service frequency of one train per hour which many respondents believe won't be sufficient (35 comments);**

The current timetabled service on the Mid-Cheshire line is one train per hour in each direction. There is an aspiration from the Council to see this increase in the future but this is outside of the scope of this project.

- **Queries relating to the proposed station car park (33 comments) with the majority of the opinion that it's too large and some believing that the level of electric vehicle charging is inadequate;**

The design team is undertaking detailed modelling on the demand for the station car park which will be available in time for the submission of the planning application. The project has not yet identified the exact number of electric charging spaces required but is subject to ongoing work.

- **References to infrastructure provision for cyclists (25 comments) with concerns that the proposals for cycle parking / storage at the station aren't sufficient;**

The proposals include for a cycle route from the village to the station via Manchester Road and further work is ongoing to determine the viability of a walking and cycling link between Brook Road and the station. Cycle parking and storage provision at the station will be reviewed in line with the comments received by respondents

- **Concerns relating to the decline of Cheadle High Street (23 comments) with references to excessive levels of traffic**

The proposals for a station in Cheadle aspire to reduce the demand on car journeys which create excess traffic within the village. The consultation had a large number of responses suggesting that a new station would reduce the number of car journeys made.

- **References to Metrolink (22 comments) with some respondents stating that an extension of the East Didsbury line would be preferable;**

Whilst a Metrolink extension is not part of the project scope, the design of the station does not prohibit the introduction of tram/train services in future.

- **A desire for the proposals to be more ambitious (16 comments) in terms of passive provision for a second line / platform and encouraging active travel**

The scope of this project is to allow for passenger services to stop on the Mid-Cheshire line at Cheadle under the current service pattern, which is just one train per hour. Work is ongoing outside of this project to look at the future demand and capacity along this line. The project

will not prohibit the introduction of a second line and platform in future if they are required.

- **A focus on the proposed station facilities, design, and layout (16 comments) with some respondents believing that more shelter will be required;**

The station facilities, design and layout are under review and will be presented in the planning application. The comments from the consultation will feed into the ongoing design work.

- **The importance of considering safety (15 comments);**
Safety is of paramount importance and as part of the design process we will ensure that safety of passengers and staff is considered fully in the designs for the station itself and the links to the station.

- **General lack of support for the scheme (10 comments) with respondents believing that the proposals aren't needed or consider them to be a waste of money**

The Strategic Outline Business Case submitted to government outlines the need for this station and there is an ongoing piece of work to provide further justification using the Department for Transport's TAG approach for the Outline Business Case due in Spring 2022.

- **A desire for integration between modes (20 comments) with suggestions to form a hub;**

The scope of the station project includes the creation of cycle and walking routes to the station. There are no plans to form a 'hub' as part of this project.

- **Issues with traffic congestion (20 comments), particularly on the High Street and Manchester Road and general comments relating to the surrounding road network (11 comments);**

The intention of the project is to remove traffic from roads within Cheadle by providing a safe and reliable alternative to the car.

- **A general view that the cycle parking is inadequate with regards to the quantity of stands and level of security as well as enabling non-standard bikes to be stored (14 comments);**

Cycle parking and storage provision at the station will be reviewed in line with the comments received by respondents.

3.14. Further comment was received from Manchester Road occupant whose property is located to the south of the railway station scheme. The landowner raised concerns regarding the loss of privacy increased noise and increased footfall . The proposals themselves do not include for an intensification of usage of the route but there will be a new platform on the opposite side of the track. The station designer is undertaking a range of surveys which will assess the environmental and noise impact from the addition of a platform to the site and the results of these surveys will influence the design and will be referenced in the planning application for the railway station.

3.15. Walk Ride Cheadle also provided a response to the consultation which included five areas for consideration:

- **A desire for the proposals to be more ambitious, including more shelters similar to Heaton Chapel with more drop off spaces or taxi rank.**

The platform furniture requirements will be subject to further consideration during the detailed design process and will be

appropriate for the level of demand. In terms of drop off and taxi rank spaces, the demand requirements are currently under review and the design will take these comments into consideration.

- **Lack of frequency in service one train an hour is not enough**
As detailed above, the current timetabled service on the Mid-Cheshire line is one train per hour in each direction. There is an aspiration from the Council to see this increase in the future but is outside of the scope of this project
- **Requirement for a link to/from the hospital which also include cycling provisions.**
The council are in detailed conversations with the hospital regarding the scheme and the inclusion of walking routes to the hospital will be included in the scheme.
- **Further walking route from Brook Road**
This is a piece of work which is currently being undertaken and will form part of the planning application if it is considered to be achievable.
- **Infrastructure provision for cyclists needs to be more secure with provision for non-standard bikes**
Cycle parking and storage provision at the station will be reviewed in line with the comments received by respondents.

3.16. Members of the South East Manchester Community Rail Partnership and the Crewe to Manchester Community Rail Partnerships both commented on the possibility of creating a Community Rail Partnership or Station Adoption / Friends Group for the station. The council will look to work with interested parties as the project progresses. Members also suggested that the project should set aside a budget for social value and work with Network Rail (NR) to co-design the station. The council are working with NR, TfGM and Northern to co-design the station and social value will be a significant inclusion within the project. Members also commented that the shared path should be audited against LTN1/20. This will be reviewed as part of the ongoing design.

Walking and Cycling Proposals

- 3.17. Respondents were asked a number of questions relating to the package of measures developed to enhance walking and cycling accessibility. The first two questions were general questions, the first asked to what extent the public agreed or disagreed with the principle of all proposed walking and cycling measures.
- 3.18. Of the 476 responses 223 strongly agreed (47%), 153 agreed (32%), 54 disagreed (11%), 24 strongly disagreed (5%) and 5 (1%) didn't answer this question.
- 3.19. Reasons for these responses and the responses to the second question, which asked the public which other routes they would like to see upgraded in Cheadle, are shown in detail within 'Cheadle Town Fund Station and AT Consultation Report' in Appendix A.
- 3.20. The public were then asked for their opinions on specific elements of the walking and cycling proposals from north to south. These are provided in more detail below. Any amendments are included within the plans for approval provided in Appendix B.

New railway station to Newland Road

Question 1

- 3.21. The public were asked 'To what extent do you agree/disagree with the installation of a toucan crossing on Manchester Road and widening of footways to create shared footways?' There were 471 responses to this question.
- 3.22. Of the 471 responses, 211 strongly agreed (45%), 133 agreed (28%), 63 neither agreed nor disagreed (13%), 31 disagreed (7%), 20 strongly disagreed (4%) and 13 didn't know (3%).
- 3.23. Respondents were asked to provide reasons for their answer. 151 responses were received and the key issues raised included:
- Concern that the proposed toucan may worsen congestion with many respondents stating that there are already crossings nearby (31 comments);
 - A preference for segregated infrastructure or respondents are anti-shared space (29 comments);
 - An overall lack of support for widening footways due to concerns that carriageway narrowing would lead to further congestion (18 comments); and
 - Suggestions or alternative or additional proposals (16 comments) such as removing dedicated right turn lanes for motor traffic to accommodate a segregated cycle track.
- 3.24. Although concerns were raised with regards to the potential increase in congestion as a result of the installation of a toucan crossing on

Manchester Road, Greater Manchester's Urban Traffic Control Unit (GMUTC) were consulted as part of the feasibility design process and did not highlight any anticipated issues. It is necessary to provide a controlled crossing close to the proposed railway station access, as, without this facility, motorists may collide with pedestrians and cyclists attempting to cross Manchester Road to reach the railway station unaided.

- 3.25. Comments received regarding the preference for segregated infrastructure have been noted by the design team. Unfortunately, due to the restricted width under the existing railway bridge there is no scope to provide segregated cycle lanes on Manchester Road beneath the bridge or to the south of the bridge.
- 3.26. In addition to the comments received online, the project team received two objections to the proposed location of the toucan crossing on Manchester Road, from adjacent landowners. The landowners felt the proposal was "not sympathetic to the heritage nature of the street scene...and that with Manchester Road being overwhelmingly non-residential, it is inconsiderate to suggest the only possible location for the crossing is directly outside one of only two residential addresses". In addition they felt the noise and light glare from the crossing would be unacceptable and would negatively impact their lives.
- 3.27. The landowners suggested that pedestrians travelling from Cheadle towards the station could use the "new (and extensive) network of pedestrian crossings in all directions outside/opposite The George & Dragon Pub - just a few seconds walk down the road". Or alternatively, if travelling from East Didsbury/Parrswood to the station the crossing could be located further up Manchester Road (i.e between The Ashlea Pub and The Alexander Hospital."
- 3.28. In addition the landowners requested that the trees facing their properties are retained to screen them from the proposed 100 space car park.
- 3.29. Comments were also received from the Walk Ride Cheadle group regarding these proposals. They commented that:
- The bollards located within the shared use footway/cycleway narrow the usable width of this section by up to 1m. Appropriate enforcement and "no waiting at any time" restrictions would be a better solution to the parking issues.
 - There is no onward connection to the existing infrastructure on Manchester Road, where it turns into Mill Lane (in direction of red arrow). This is major flaw in the scheme and a solution must be found. It would be preferable for road space to be reallocated to extend the existing Manchester Road cycleway, but an alternative would be to work with the BMI Alexandra Hospital to provide a connection from Mill Lane through their grounds and connecting to the station access road.

Question 2

- 3.30. The public were asked 'To what extent do you agree/disagree with restrictions on large vehicles using Newland Road and widening of the footway to a minimum of 1.2m between Manchester Road and the railway bridge?' There were 468 responses to this question.
- 3.31. Of the 468 responses, 193 strongly agreed (41%), 140 agreed (30%), 77 neither agreed nor disagreed (16%), 17 disagreed (4%), 21 strongly disagreed (4%) and 21 didn't know (5%).
- 3.32. Respondents were asked to provide reasons for their answer. There were 98 responses and some of the key issues raised included:
- Newland Road is dangerous at present;
 - Suggestions of alternative or additional proposals (9 comments) such as widening Newland Road, providing a link to Cromer Road, adding a modal filter, or creating a route through Cheadle village instead;
 - Concerns regarding the width of Newland Road with some believing it's too narrow to accommodate the proposals (9 comments);
 - A preference for segregated infrastructure or respondents are anti-shared space (7 comments); and
- 3.33. An objection was received from a landowner adjacent to the Manchester Road/Newlands Road junction on the basis that the proposal to widen the footway to provide a shared use footway/cycleway and bollards could be unsafe due to vehicles being driven across the shared footway/cycleway into their property and the bollards restricting their ability to operate their business. The reduced carriageway width also means that loading/unloading of vehicles from a car transporter would block the southbound traffic lane on Manchester Road.
- 3.34. Comments were also received from the Walk Ride Cheadle group regarding these proposals. They commented that:
- Newland Road is quite narrow and there is concern that this will put cyclists into conflict with other vehicles.
- 3.35. The design team have now reviewed the comments received from both the online questionnaires and adjacent landowner's relating to the proposals between the proposed railway station and Newland Road. The comments will feed into the ongoing design work as the scheme develops.
- 3.36. As a consequence of the further scheme development that is required, this report does not seek approval for the proposals on Manchester Road between the railway station and Newland Road. These proposals will be submitted for approval at a later date as part of the planning application for the railway station.

Newland Road to Oak Road (including Queens Gardens)

Question 1

- 3.37. The public were asked 'To what extent do you agree/disagree with a new segregated cycleway and footway through Queens Gardens to Stockport Road?' There were 460 responses to this question.
- 3.38. Of the 460 responses, 189 strongly agreed (41%), 127 agreed (28%), 85 neither agreed nor disagreed (18%), 19 disagreed (4%), 19 strongly disagreed (4%) and 21 didn't know (5%).
- 3.39. Respondents were asked to provide reasons for their answer. There were 98 responses and key issues included:
- Concerns relating to the impact of the proposals on residents of Queens Gardens with queries as to whether they had been involved in the consultation (14 comments);
 - Mixed views in relation to the A560 (14 comments) with many respondents of the opinion that the proposals will enable cyclists and pedestrians to avoid Cheadle High Street, but others are worried about the impact on traffic;
 - Congestion is a problem in Cheadle (7 comments) and some respondents believe the proposals will worsen the situation while others believe giving pedestrians and cyclists an option to avoid busy roads will be beneficial.

Question 2

- 3.40. The public were asked 'To what extent do you agree/disagree with the proposed parking restrictions and replacement layby within Queens Gardens?' There were 456 responses to this question.
- 3.41. Of the 456 responses, 146 strongly agreed (32%), 117 agreed (26%), 124 neither agreed nor disagreed (27%), 18 disagreed (4%), 17 strongly disagreed (4%) and 34 know (7%).
- 3.42. Respondents were asked to provide reasons for their answer. There were 98 responses and key issues raised included:
- Concerns that the proposals will be abused in terms of layby parking being used by non-residents and restrictions being ignored (9 comments);
 - Capacity of layby inadequate (7 comments). One commented that due to the proximity of the layby to the cycle track cyclists it would be unsafe for cyclists.
 - Residents, carers, and visitors should still be able to park on Queens Gardens (5 comments).
- 3.43. With regards to the comments received that relate to the use of the bays by non-residents and insufficient parking capacity, the design has been reviewed and an additional parking bay has been added to the scheme on the western side of the access road, see Drawing Reference

F/0292/C/100/002 in Appendix B. It is anticipated that the closure of the access road from Stockport Road will also reduce the likelihood of non-residents parking within Queens Gardens. Should non-resident parking be an issue upon completion of the scheme a residents parking scheme could then be investigated, however, anecdotal evidence from the consultation events highlighted that this had been attempted previously but a consensus was not reached by residents due to the financial impact of such a scheme.

3.44. Comments were also received from the Walk Ride Cheadle group regarding these proposals. They commented that:

- The cycle lane goes straight through the “car-door zone” of the parking bays. Either, they should be placed on the opposite side of the road, or, there should be a sufficiently wide buffer strip between the parking bays and the cycle lane.

3.45. A buffer zone has been provided between the contra-flow cycle lane and the parking bay on the eastern side of the access road to reduce the likelihood of motorists opening their car doors into the path of cyclists. See amended plan (Drawing Ref F/0292/C/100/002) in Appendix B.

Question 3

3.46. The public were asked ‘To what extent do you agree/disagree with the proposals to close the Queens Gardens access road to vehicular traffic?’ There were 459 responses to this question.

3.47. Of the 459 responses, 153 strongly agreed (33%), 105 agreed (23%), 123 neither agreed nor disagreed (27%), 18 disagreed (4%), 23 strongly disagreed (5%) and 37 didn’t know (8%).

3.48. Respondents were asked to provide reasons for their answer. There were 73 responses and key issues raised include:

- A need to maintain access for residents, their visitors, carers and especially the emergency services (12 comments);
- Negative impact on residents (9 comments);
- Concerns that the proposals will negatively affect Bank Street (5 comments);
- Issues relating to inconsiderate parking (4 comments);

3.49. With regards to the concerns about emergency access to Queens Gardens, access will be retained from Bank Street and removable bollards will be provided at the stopped up Queens Gardens access for emergency vehicles to access the estate, should Bank Street ever be blocked.

3.50. Access to the Queens Gardens estate will be via Bank Street, and whilst it is accepted that traffic levels will increase marginally on Bank Street, the measures proposed to prevent parking issues at the Bank Street/internal access road junction and the measures to improve visibility when exiting Bank Street should mitigate these issues.

3.51. During the face to face consultation events held at Cheadle Library and the Village Hall several residents of Queens Gardens attended and raised issues with regards to:

- Preservation of mature trees;
- privacy of residents, route through gardens / 'under our windows'
- inconvenience to residents;
- health and safety risk posed by cyclists travelling at speed;
- security for residents; and
- residents 'imprisoned by proposed fencing'.

3.52. The scheme requires the removal of 2 trees in Queens Gardens as shown on Drawing Reference F/0292/C/100/002 in Appendix B. These will be replaced on a 2 for 1 basis within the site.

3.53. To ensure safety the cycle routes will be segregated or on the carriageway which will minimise any possible conflict with pedestrians. To assist pedestrians footways will be improved and dropped crossings with tactile paving provided to modern standards. In respect of proximity of the fence to windows the fence line proposed past 65-72 Queens Gardens will be a minimum of 4m from any window.

3.54. To further address the concerns raised by the Queens Gardens residents the design team intend to hold a further meeting specifically for these residents. Any additional mitigation measures identified will be incorporated into the detailed design.

Question 4

3.55. The public were asked 'To what extent do you agree/disagree with the installation of a segregated signalised crossing for pedestrians and cyclists on Stockport Road between the newly stopped up Queens Gardens access and Oak Road?' There were 462 responses to this question.

3.56. Of the 462 responses, 186 strongly agreed (40%), 131 agreed (28%), 81 neither agreed nor disagreed (18%), 17 disagreed (4%), 22 strongly disagreed (5%) and 25 didn't know (5%).

3.57. Respondents were asked to provide reasons for their answer. There were 94 responses and key issues raised included:

- Issues relating to the volume of traffic and congestion (23 comments) with some respondents concerned that an additional crossing might worsen the situation;
- Mixed views with regards to existing provision (10 comments) with respondents querying whether another crossing is needed;
- Suggestions of alternative or additional proposals (9 comments) such as considering a yellow box or syncing the crossing to the B5095 / A560 junction;
- Concerns relating to the A560 (6 comments) and particularly traffic congestion and driver behaviour.

3.58. Although concerns were raised with regards to potential increased congestion as a result of the installation of a sparrow crossing on Stockport Road, Greater Manchester's Urban Traffic Control Unit (GMUTC) were consulted as part of the feasibility design process and did not highlight any anticipated issues. A controlled crossing is necessary in this location to provide a safe place for cyclists and pedestrians to cross the carriageway and connect the wider cycle route on each side of Stockport Road. The design team will consult further with GMUTC to identify if linking the crossing to the junction would be beneficial to traffic operation and if it is then this will be implemented as part of the scheme.

3.59. Comments were also received from the Walk Ride Cheadle group regarding these proposals. They commented that:

- The south side of the Sparrow crossing will require pedestrians to have to cross over the cycle track twice in a short distance if they wish to turn down Oak Road).

3.60. The layout of the segregated cycle track has been designed such that cyclists entering/leaving the cycle track on Oak Road can do so away from the radius of the junction where motorists are undertaking turning manoeuvres. This means that pedestrians crossing between Oak Road and Queens Gardens must cross the cycle track.

3.61. Following the overall positive feedback from the consultation exercise, the proposed works for Queens Gardens are recommended to be progressed to detailed design for construction based on Drawing Ref F/0292/C/100/002 in Appendix B which has been amended in response to the consultation comments to incorporate an additional parking bay on the western side of the Queens Gardens access road and a buffer zone adjacent to the contra flow cycle lane.

Oak Road to Brookfield Park

Question 1

- 3.62. The public were asked 'To what extent do you agree/disagree with the development of a signed, on-carriageway cycle route from Oak Road to Brookfield Park?' There were 457 responses to this question.
- 3.63. Of the 457 responses, 174 strongly agreed (38%), 131 agreed (29%), 89 neither agreed nor disagreed (19%), 19 disagreed (4%), 23 strongly disagreed (5%) and 21 didn't know (5%).
- 3.64. Respondents were asked to provide reasons for their answer. There were 121 responses and key issues raised included:
- On-street parking may make the proposals unsafe (19 comments);
 - Suggestions of additional or alternative proposals (18 comments) including making Oak Road one-way, using Ashfield Road and Whitegates Road instead or installing a modal filter;
 - A desire for maintenance (15 comments) and particularly in relation to pot holes;
 - Dangerous driving (15 comments), especially speeding;
 - Additional traffic calming measures are required (15 comments);
 - A belief that Oak Road is too narrow to accommodate the proposals (10 comments).
- 3.65. Comments were also received from the Walk Ride Cheadle group regarding these proposals. They commented that:
- This narrow road can feel quite intimidating to cycle along. Hopefully the reduced corner radii of some junctions will address some of the aggressive driving and speeding issues. The surface quality issues must be fully addressed however. It would be useful to investigate whether there is a significant rat-running issue using Oak Road and Brookfield Road to avoid Councillor Lane and the A560.
- 3.66. Following the comments received regarding the on street parking, existing waiting restrictions will be reviewed for possible provision of junction protection No Waiting At Any Time (NWAAT) restrictions. These will be subject to a separate report at a later date. Pot holes will also be repaired. Where junction radii are reduced the wider footway areas will be protected by bollards to prevent obstruction and damage by vehicles driving onto the widened footway.
- 3.67. A speed survey has been requested and will be reviewed as part of the detailed design however there is currently no scope within the budget to amend or replace the existing traffic calming.
- 3.68. Following the overall positive feedback from the consultation exercise, the proposals for Oak Road and Brookfield Rd are recommended to be progressed to detailed design for construction based on Drawing Ref F/0292/C/100/003 in Appendix B.

Brookfield Park to Shiers Drive

Question 1

- 3.69. The public were asked 'To what extent do you agree/disagree with improvements to the existing bridge and footpaths within Brookfield Park to accommodate shared footways / cycleways, including resurfacing and the provision of lighting?' There were 459 responses to this question.
- 3.70. Of the 459 responses, 182 strongly agreed (40%), 156 agreed (34%), 72 neither agreed nor disagreed (16%), 16 disagreed (3%), 14 strongly disagreed (3%) and 19 didn't know (4%).
- 3.71. Respondents were asked to provide reasons for their answer. There were 108 responses and key issues raised included:
- References to conflict between modes with a preference for segregation (17 comments);
 - A range of views with regards to lighting (17 comments) with some believing its needed to improve safety while others are concerned about wildlife; and
 - Suggestions of additional or alternative proposals (5 comments) including providing a route via main roads, linking with Ladybridge Road, and positioning the cycle track on the other side of the trees in Brookfield Park.
- 3.72. Although segregated cycle facilities are desirable, to provide these within the park would result in the loss of more trees and an increased ecological impact. A shared path is considered adequate subject to the provision of improvements to visibility splays, access controls and surfacing. Due to budget constraints on this programme it is likely that the current bridge will need to be retained with replacement being a longer term aspiration.
- 3.73. The hours of operation of the lighting is to be agreed in discussion with Ecology Officers, but is not expected to be operational between midnight and 5am. The lighting will be of suitable luminosity and directed to the path to minimise overspill into adjacent areas. It will be of a type that minimises any possible harm to bats.
- 3.74. As part of the A34 MRN proposals a new crossing is proposed on Wilmslow Road to from Brookfield Park to Broadway and hence via a new subway under the A34 to Gatley. Further walking and cycling links in the area are likely to come forward as part of future programmes.
- 3.75. Following the overall positive feedback from the consultation exercise, it is recommended that the proposed works to Brookfield Park should be progressed to detailed design for construction based on Drawing Ref F/0292/C/100/004 in Appendix B.

Shiers Drive to Bruntwood Lane

Question 1

3.76. The public were asked 'To what extent do you agree/disagree with the proposal to install a shared footway / cycleway on the western side of the leisure centre access road?' There were 456 responses to this question.

3.77. Of the 456 responses, 179 strongly agreed (39%), 148 agreed (33%), 76 neither agreed nor disagreed (17%), 20 disagreed (4%), 14 strongly disagreed (3%) and 19 didn't know (4%).

3.78. Respondents were asked to provide reasons for their answer. There were 78 responses and key issues raised included:

- A preference for segregation to reduce modal conflict (18 comments);
- There is a need for a wider path (3 comments).

Question 2

3.79. The public were asked 'To what extent do you agree/disagree with the proposal to install a shared footway / cycleway on the western side of Shiers Drive?' There were 459 responses to this question.

3.80. Of the 459 responses, 173 strongly agreed (38%), 146 agreed (32%), 79 neither agreed nor disagreed (17%), 25 disagreed (5%), 15 strongly disagreed (3%) and 21 didn't know (5%).

3.81. Respondents were asked to provide reasons for their answer. There were 88 responses and key issues raised included:

- A preference for segregation to reduce modal conflict (21 comments);
- A desire for cyclists and pedestrians to be prioritised over motorists (4 comments); and
- Warnings with regards to the gradient, curve in the road and awkward cambers (4 comments).

Question 3

3.82. The public were asked 'To what extent do you agree/disagree with the proposal to install a shared signalised crossing on Cheadle Road between the Shiers Drive junction and Bruntwood Lane?' There were 455 responses to this question.

3.83. Of the 455 responses, 182 strongly agreed (40%), 155 agreed (34%), 69 neither agreed nor disagreed (15%), 16 disagreed (4%), 13 strongly disagreed (3%) and 20 didn't know (4%).

3.84. Respondents were asked to provide reasons for their answer. There were 87 responses and key issues raised included:

- Cheadle Road is busy (11 comments) and there are concerns that the proposed crossing could worsen congestion;
- A preference for either a sparrow or a zebra crossing (6 comments);

- Reports of dangerous driving and particularly speeding (6 comments);
- Cheadle Road has a blind bend (6 comments) and so crossing can be dangerous;
- A preference for segregation to reduce modal conflict (5 comments); and
- Suggestions of alternative or additional proposals (5 comments) such as improving the junction of Schools Hill / Cheadle Road.

Question 4

- 3.85. The public were asked 'To what extent do you agree/disagree with a shared footway/cycleway to Bruntwood Lane?' There were 455 responses to this question.
- 3.86. Of the 455 responses, 179 strongly agreed (39%), 145 agreed (32%), 73 neither agreed nor disagreed (16%), 24 disagreed (16%), 14 strongly disagreed (3%) and 20 didn't know (5%).
- 3.87. Respondents were asked to provide reasons for their answer. There were 79 responses and key issues raised included:
- A preference for segregation to reduce modal conflict (18 comments);
 - References to safety (14 comments) with respondents stating that Bruntwood Lane is dangerous at present;
- 3.88. In response to the comments received regarding the proposals for Brookfield Park to Bruntwood Lane there is inadequate highway space to provide a segregated facility on the leisure centre access road, Shiers Drive or Bruntwood Lane without the need for acquisition of third party land and construction of structures for the necessary widening. This is beyond the scope or budget of this project but might be considered in future if the route is well used. The proposed shared footway/cycleways have been provided at the maximum width available with the carriageway reduced to the minimum necessary for the current vehicle use which does include coaches and service vehicles.
- 3.89. In order to address concerns about visibility on the approach to the crossing it will be necessary to remove two trees on the northbound approach. One is mature and the other a sapling. These will be replaced in the vicinity on a two for one basis. The locations of the trees to be removed are shown on Drawing Ref F/0292/C/100/005 in Appendix B.
- 3.90. Following the overall positive feedback from the consultation exercise, it is recommended that the proposed works to Shiers Drive, Cheadle Road and Bruntwood Lane should be progressed to detailed design for construction based on Drawing Ref F/0292/C/100/005 in Appendix B.

3. FUNDING

- 3.1. The cost for implementing the measures will be funded from the Cheadle Towns Fund.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1. The Area Committee is asked to comment on this report and give approval to the proposals for:

- Newland Road to Oak Road (including Queens Gardens);
- Oak Road to Brookfield Park;
- Brookfield Park to Shiers Drive;
- Shiers Drive to Bruntwood Lane;

as shown in Appendix B and the legal advertising of the associated Traffic Regulation Orders relating to Local Distributor and Local Access Roads (contained in Appendix C) and recommend that the Cabinet Member (Economy and Regeneration) gives approval for the legal advertising of the associated Traffic Regulation Orders relating to Strategic Highways and District Distributor Roads (contained in Appendix C) and subject to no objections being received within 21 days from the advertisement date, the subsequent making of the orders.

Background Papers

There are no background papers to this report.

Anyone wishing further information please contact Katy Farrer on telephone number 0161 474 4810 or by email on katy.farrer@stockport.gov.uk