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Executive Summary

This report details the process and outcomes of Cheshire East Council’s public engagement activities in March and April 2018 regarding the recommended route for the Middlewich Eastern Bypass.

Feedback regarding the recommended route was captured through a questionnaire, emails and letters. Between 14th and 19th March 2018 the brochure and questionnaire were hand delivered to all addresses in Middlewich, plus postal addresses within 2 miles of the scheme, reaching approximately 13,500 residents (circa 6,000 households). During this period the brochure and questionnaire were also sent to key stakeholders including 77 statutory, governmental, representative and other special interest groups. Copies of the brochure and questionnaire were also available at libraries, civic buildings and public events.

482 responses were received: 274 paper and 180 online questionnaires, plus a further 28 emails and letters. The majority of responses (247) were received from the CW10 0 postcode area, which is the proposed location of the Eastern Bypass. A further 158 responses were received from other CW10 postcode areas.

The demographic profile of respondents has been compared with 2011 Census data for Middlewich. The age profile of respondents is skewed relative to the profile of the wider area, likely reflecting the appetite to engage with consultations of this nature. Overall, 65 to 84 year olds (34%, 152 respondents) are over represented compared to the total population of Middlewich. Similarly, 45 to 64 year olds are over represented, accounting for 39%, 178 of respondents, compared to 28.6% of the population. In contrast, 18 to 24 year olds are under-represented, accounting for 1%, 6 respondents, compared to 7.2% of the general population. Whilst we are aware of these variances, there is no evidence to suggest the survey findings fail to reflect the views of Middlewich residents.

In terms of respondents’ relationship with Middlewich, 91% of respondents (412 responses) said they live in the local area, 97% (434 respondents) travel into or through Middlewich on a weekly basis and 93% (422 respondents) of respondents reported using a car to travel through Middlewich.

Analysis of the questionnaires highlights several key findings:

- 95% of respondents agree that Middlewich needs a bypass (433 respondents).
- 87% of respondents agree with the council’s proposed route (397 respondents).
- 88% of respondents agree the proposals would relieve congestion in the town centre (400 respondents).
- 83% of respondents agree the proposals would reduce road safety concerns in the town (377 respondents).
- 71% of respondents agree the proposals will minimise impacts of the scheme on the local environment (322 respondents).
- 75% of respondents agree with the proposals for pedestrian and cyclist provision (341 respondents).
Feedback regarding the proposed junctions between the bypass and existing roads highlighted the following:

- 84% of respondents agree with the North Roundabout proposal, joining Pochin Way to the bypass (380 respondents).
- 77% of respondents agree with the South Roundabout proposal, linking Booth Lane with the bypass (349 respondents).
- 69% of respondents agree a junction is needed on Cledford Lane (313 respondents), with 40% of respondents (85 individuals) providing further comments suggesting alternative junction designs (e.g. roundabout) should be considered.

Although the majority of respondents support the scheme, limitations regarding the proposed route were raised including:

- 9% of respondents commenting on the scheme being overdue and references to the length of time it will take for the proposals to become a reality.
- 9% of respondents commented on the effectiveness of the bypass to reduce congestion in Middlewich, with references made to the bypass not effectively addressing traffic to Winsford, Nantwich and Chester.

This is the final stage of engagement with the public prior to the submission of the planning application in Summer 2018. The outcomes of this engagement process, highlighted in this report, will help to inform further development of the scheme design.
1 Introduction and Background

1.1 Introduction

This Public Engagement report has been prepared by Jacobs UK Ltd on behalf of Cheshire East Council (CEC) to support the non-statutory engagement exercises carried out for the proposed Middlewich Eastern Bypass. The outcomes of the public engagement will be used to inform development of the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and form part of the evidence in a Town and Country Planning Act application to the local planning authority.

The requirement for an SCI is set out in Part 18 of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act[1]. Specifically, the purpose of this report and the SCI is to demonstrate how the public, organisations and other interested parties have been involved in the preparation of this planning application. This report has been produced in accordance with CEC’s Statement of Community Involvement (adopted October 2010) which:

- Encourages developers to carry out pre-planning application consultation with interested parties and community bodies for significant or major applications;
- Strongly encourages applicants to undertake pre-application discussions prior to the submission of planning applications (Paragraph 5.5);
- Notes the benefits that these discussions can bring (Paragraph 5.6);
- Sets out that for major planning applications, such as the proposed scheme, developers will be encouraged to carry out pre-application consultation with interested local parties and community bodies (Paragraph 5.7); and
- Sets out that the content and method of any pre-application consultation exercise should be agreed with Council planning officers beforehand.

Middlewich town centre experiences severe congestion due to its location at the junction of two major roads. Both the A54 which links the M6 to Winsford and Chester and the A533 from Northwich to Sandbach are heavily used at peak times. Traffic delays and congestion have negative impacts on the attractiveness of Middlewich and cause inconvenience to residents, business and visitors to the town.

Cheshire East Council have completed traffic surveys and modelling which show that the A54 / A533 junction in the centre of Middlewich is over capacity at peak commuting times; causing traffic congestion, delays and increasing journey times. Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) make up a large proportion of the traffic, with 6 out of the 7 roads in the town having higher levels of HGVs than the national average for their road type.

The 2011 census showed that the level of car ownership in Middlewich is significantly higher than the national average. 87% of households own one or more cars or vans compared to 74% in England overall. 77% of Middlewich residents use a car to travel to

work. This traffic, combined with traffic passing through the town to other destinations, is contributing to the town’s congestion.

The Council’s studies show that the best option to relieve congestion within the town is to build a bypass, which will provide an alternative route for traffic that is passing through the town via the Leadsmithy Street junction. Cheshire East Council’s assessments indicate that about 30% of the traffic currently passing through Leadsmithy Street/Town Bridge junction is expected to re-route onto the bypass.

Cheshire East Council held a public engagement between 19 March and 29 April 2018 as they are keen to understand the public’s views on the proposals for an Eastern Bypass. This is the final stage of engagement with the public prior to the submission of the planning application in Summer 2018.

1.2 Scheme Background

During the 1990s Cheshire County Council and local developers secured initial planning permission for an eastern bypass. This road was only partially completed, with the economic downturn limiting the availability of private funding needed to complete the scheme. Despite the economic downturn, the need for a bypass remained high. CEC took a leading role to pursue a solution in 2015. Since then EC have been reviewing and developing proposals for a Middlewich Eastern bypass and undertaking key surveys that will enable the scheme to be delivered.

CEC considered a broad range of options to reduce traffic congestion affecting the town, including improvements to the existing road network. The Council’s reviews showed that these options performed poorly, when compared to the benefits of a bypass.

The Council’s Options Assessment studies considered 8 potential routes for a bypass, all creating a new road between the A54 (Salt Cellar Roundabout), passing to the east of Middlewich to the A533 Booth Lane close to Tetton Bridge. The original scheme (Option 1) was included in the Council’s assessments, and several of the other options shared common sections with the original scheme.
The 8 options identified are shown below in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Middlewich Bypass Options
The Council compared each of the options against their key (strategic) objectives for the scheme, which led to a ranking of the options (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Total Weighted Score</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>7=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>7=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1. Ranking the Middlewich Bypass Options*

The assessment showed that Options 2, 3, 4, and 5 provided the best solutions to meet the defined objectives.

The Council also undertook traffic modelling and economic analysis for each option to identify which provided the greatest high economic benefits, with Options 1, 5, 7 and 8 providing the highest Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR).

In November 2016 Cheshire East Council’s Cabinet approved further development of Option 5 as the Preferred Option and Option 1 (the original scheme) as an Alternative Option. Using these options, the Council prepared an Outline Business Case (OBC), which assessed each option independently on the key objectives, costs, and economic benefits.

In March 2017, Cheshire East Council submitted an OBC to the Department for Transport making the case for funding. In November 2017, the Secretary of State announced that Government would provide £46.8m towards construction of the scheme. The remaining funding (20% of the total) for the scheme will come from developer contributions and CEC.
2 Scheme Objectives and Design

2.1 Objectives of the Scheme

The primary objective of the bypass is to reduce traffic congestion and support employment and housing growth in the town.

2.2 Description of the Scheme

The proposed Middlewich Eastern Bypass would be a 2.6 km single carriageway to the east of Middlewich. The preferred route is shown in Figure 2.

The route would begin on Holmes Chapel Road (A54) at the Salt-Cellar Roundabout, follow the existing Pochin Way before passing to the east of Midpoint 18 (known as Ma6nitude), crossing Cleford Lane and joining Booth Lane to the south of Middlewich. A bridge with embankments on either side will be required where the route crosses the Sandbach to Northwich Rail Line. At the southern end of the scheme Booth Lane is diverted with a bridge over the Trent and Mersey Canal to allow it to join the bypass via a new roundabout junction. A number of smaller crossings or ‘box culverts’ will be required to cross watercourses such as the River Croco, Sanderson Brook, and other minor streams.

Figure 2. Proposed Route for the Middlewich Eastern Bypass
The proposed speed limit along the bypass will be 50mph. A separate cycle way/footpath will be provided for non-motorised users along the length of the scheme. This will provide safe access to the proposed employment areas for cyclists and pedestrians. The Council are looking closely at how the scheme connects with existing footpaths, cycle routes, and public rights of way.

The majority of the scheme passes through open farm land. However, in some locations due to physical and environmental constraints, the route passes through small settlements and will require the demolition of four properties (three occupied and one derelict) and the removal of two static mobile homes. Cheshire East Council has contacted all the owners and occupiers of these affected properties and will continue to engage with them during the planning application.

Two new roundabouts will be created; one at the junction with Pochin Way (Figure 3) and another at the junction with Booth Lane (Figure 4).

![Figure 3. Roundabout 1 – Junction with Pochin Way](image)
The Council are proposing a staggered junction at Cledford Lane (Figure 5). To the west of the bypass, Cledford Lane will be upgraded by constructing a footway/cycle way on one side of the road, to segregate non-motorised users from the traffic. Passing bays will be created to improve vehicle access to/from the bypass to businesses on Cledford Lane, including the new ANSA depot. These improvements will enable much of the traffic associated with the depot to avoid Booth Lane and the town centre.
Figure 5. Cledford Lane Junction
3 Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This section describes how the consultation exercise was undertaken, the materials produced and made available to the public, along with the key consultation activities and how they were promoted. The section also looks at the profile of responses received to the consultation.

3.2 Consultation Approach

The consultation period ran from 19 March to 29 April 2018. The aim of the consultation was to allow the public to provide their views on the proposed Eastern Bypass. At this stage in the scheme development, the design will not change significantly, however, the feedback will be used to inform the final scheme design where applicable and practicable. The findings of this engagement will be reported to Cheshire East Council’s Cabinet.

If the scheme is approved by Cabinet, the Council will submit a planning application to Cheshire East Council Strategic Planning Board in Summer 2018. There will be an opportunity for members of the public to comment further on the scheme as part of the statutory planning process.

3.3 Consultation Materials

A 16-page brochure was produced for the public consultation, which included the following information:

- Details on the consultation process and associated events
- How to respond online, by email or by post
- Reasons for needing a bypass
- Scheme development history
- A description of the scheme design
- A summary of environmental considerations
- A timeline for the scheme up until completion

Between 14th and 19th March 2018 the brochure was hand delivered to all addresses in Middlewich, plus postal addresses within 2 miles of the scheme, reaching approximately 13,500 residents (circa 6,000 households) in total. During this period the brochure was also sent to key stakeholders including 77 statutory, governmental, representative and other special interest groups. A copy of the engagement brochure can be found in Appendix A.

There were 10 exhibition banners produced for the consultation events summarising the information in the consultation brochure. Copies of the banners can be found in Appendix B.
A feedback form was produced, which allowed respondents to give comment on the Middlewich Eastern Bypass proposal. It also included optional demographic questions. A copy of this form can be found in Appendix C.

### 3.4 Access to Engagement Materials

Copies of the Middlewich Eastern Bypass brochure were posted on Friday 16th March 2018 to residential and business addresses in close proximity, or directly impacted by the scheme. A map showing these areas can be found in Appendix D.

A web page was set up on the Cheshire East Council website with access to the consultation materials, and an online version of the feedback form. This website was launched on 19th March 2018 and is accessible at: [www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/middlewicheasternbypass](http://www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/middlewicheasternbypass)

Copies of the Middlewich Eastern Bypass brochure were posted on Friday 16th March 2018 to residential and business addresses in close proximity, or directly impacted by the scheme. A map showing these areas can be found in Appendix D.

A web page was set up on the Cheshire East Council website with access to the consultation materials, and an online version of the feedback form. This website was launched on 19th March 2018 and is accessible at: [www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/middlewicheasternbypass](http://www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/middlewicheasternbypass)

### 3.5 Publicity

A press release was issued on 14th March 2018 in the Middlewich Guardian and Crewe Chronicle with details about the Middlewich Eastern Bypass consultation. The press release was also aired on BBC Radio Stoke on 14th March 2018. A copy of the press release can be found in Appendix E.

### 3.6 Public Events

Three public events were held as part of this engagement to allow members of the public to view the information and ask questions of the project team.

Details of the public engagement events and attendance numbers are shown in Table 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time Attendance</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 28 March</td>
<td>2pm – 8pm</td>
<td>St Mary’s Church Hall, 2 King Street</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 14 April</td>
<td>10 am – 3pm</td>
<td>St Mary’s Church Hall, 2 King Street</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 19 April</td>
<td>2pm – 8pm</td>
<td>St Mary’s Church Hall, 2 King Street</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2. Details and Attendance Numbers for Public Engagement Events**

### 3.7 Political

Fiona Bruce MP (Congleton constituency) is close to the scheme and has attended briefings as well as the public events. Fiona has actively championed the scheme in Parliament and made the case for investment to DfT over the past 3 years.

The MPs for adjoining constituencies were also sent consultation materials as part of the engagement programme, including: Antoinette Sandbach MP – Eddisbury Constituency and Esther McVey MP – Tatton Constituency.

### 3.8 Emergency Services

There has been no engagement other than to include the police, fire service and ambulance service into the wider stakeholder consultation.

### 3.9 Responses Channels

Responses to the engagement exercise were accepted through the following channels:

- Paper feedback form at public events
- Online feedback form
- By email, to middlewicheasternbypass@cheshireeast.gov.uk
- By freepost address.

### 3.10 Response Analysis

Online and paper response forms were collated and processed by the project team. Questions inviting a written response from the respondent underwent a rigorous coding process to bring out the key themes. This includes questions: 6, 8, 10, 11a, 11b, 11c, 13, 15 and 16. The key themes for these questions are presented in Section 4, with references to actual responses received.

For each open-ended question, the top three themes will be presented in more detail, and the top three categories within the theme will be highlighted with references to comments made by respondents. Further details regarding comments made in relation to the top three themes for each question can be found in Appendix G.
4 Responses Received

This section sets out the feedback to the public engagement; the responses received via paper and online feedback forms, and also letter and email responses. It provides a breakdown of these responses by source (paper form, online or email), and by the demographic categories of age, gender, disability and ethnicity.

In total 482 responses were received to the engagement which ran between 19 March and 29 April 2018, a breakdown is provided in Figure 6.

The following sections look at the 454 responses to the engagement received on the feedback form, it does not include responses received by email or letter. Results from the paper and online forms are combined and discussed separately.

Of these 454 respondents, the majority (71%) did not attend one of the three exhibitions before completing the feedback forms, while a quarter of respondents did visit at exhibition prior to completion. 3% of respondents did not state whether or not they attended an exhibition.
Did you visit one of the exhibitions before completing this questionnaire?

- Yes: 26%
- No: 71%
- Not answered: 3%

*Figure 7. Attendance at Exhibitions*
4.1 Demographic Information

Figure 8 shows the breakdown of responses by the optional demographic questions included within the feedback form; it does not include responses received by email or letter. The figures show that the scheme received a range of responses across all characteristics, reflecting the demographic groups in Middlewich.

Figure 8. Gender, Age, Disability and Ethnic Origin Breakdown of Respondents

A full respondent profile for all demographic questions asked can be found in Appendix F.
4.2 Responses by Postcode

The feedback form asked respondents to provide postcode data to allow the geographical distribution of responses to be analysed. 445 respondents provided this information. The postcodes were then grouped into postcode sectors according to how many responses were received from each area. Figure 9 shows the geographical areas, and Figure 10 shows the responses received from each.

Source: https://www.freemaptools.com/uk-postcodemap
Figure 10. Responses Received by Postcode Districts

The majority of the responses (247) were received from the CW10 0 postcode sector, which is where the proposed Middlewich Eastern Bypass will be located.

A further 158 responses were received from other CW10 postcode areas (CW10 9 and CW10 unspecified). There were 19 responses from CW11 (Sandbach) postcode sectors (CW11 1: Sandbach, CW11 3: Warmingham and CW11 4: Hassall Green) and 21 from other postcode locations.

4.3 Travel Patterns in Middlewich

The feedback form included questions about respondents’ travel patterns within Middlewich. The questions asked were:

- How do you usually travel into or through Middlewich?
- Why do you normally travel into or through Middlewich?
- How often do you travel into or through Middlewich?

Almost all respondents (97%, 434 respondents) said they travel into or through Middlewich on a weekly basis, with nearly three quarters (74%, 331 respondents) travelling at least five days a week, 16% (73 respondents) travelling into Middlewich three or four times a week and 7% (30 respondents) only travelling into town once or twice a week (Figure 11).
The majority (93%, 422 respondents) of respondents said they drove through Middlewich, 48% (219 respondents) said they travelled by foot, 35% (158 respondents) said they travelled as a passenger in a car, and 18% (82 respondents) said they travelled by bicycle (Figure 12).

Figure 12. How Respondents Travel Through Middlewich

Figure 11. Frequency of Travel in Middlewich
Most respondents (91%, 412 respondents) said they lived in the local area, 63% (284 respondents) said they travelled into Middlewich to get to the local town centre/shops, 50% (229 respondents) said they travelled to access health and social care facilities, 31% (140 respondents) said they travelled to access leisure facilities and 19% (88 respondents) said they travelled into Middlewich to work or study (Figure 13).

**Figure 13. Why Respondents Travel into or Through Middlewich**

The questionnaire contained 8 closed questions and 9 open-ended questions where respondents could provide details on their responses. For the purpose of the open-ended questions, the responses received were analysed to draw out key themes and individual issues raised with regards to the scheme. The most prevalent themes arising from this analysis are identified, with the more detailed subject material for each discussed further.
4.4 Recommended Route

Respondents were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed that Middlewich needs a bypass (Question 5).

Figure 14 below shows a breakdown of the responses received. Nearly all respondents agreed that Middlewich needs a bypass (95%, 433 respondents), whilst a small minority disagreed (3%, 13 respondents).

Table 3 shows the postcode breakdown of the responses to question 5. Of the 433 respondents agreeing with the need for a bypass, 240 of those respondents live in the CW10 0 postcode region which is where the proposed bypass will be located, and 153 live in the CW10 9 postcode region. Of the 12 respondents disagreeing with the need for a bypass, 4 live in the CW10 0 region.
Question 5: How strongly do you agree or disagree that Middlewich needs a bypass?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postcode</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CW1 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW10 0</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW10 9</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW11 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW11 3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW11 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW12 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW12 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW12 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW2 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW4 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW4 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW5 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW7 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW8 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW9 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK11 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK11 8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST7 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST7 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA16 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>433</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Agreement on the need for a Bypass by Postcode
Question 6 asked respondents to provide more details on why they agreed or disagreed with the bypass. 287 respondents provided comments to this question. The responses were reviewed and coded to draw together the main themes and issues. The main themes mentioned were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number of respondents mentioning this theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HGVs</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6 - traffic / congestion</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrow roads and footpaths</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other routes</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further developments</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended route</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road condition</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Cellar roundabout</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Motorised Users</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4. Question 6- Key Themes*
The theme traffic received the most comments (129 respondents). Those most mentioned were:

- Issues relating to gridlock traffic (mentioned by 21 respondents)
  
  “As a Middlewich resident I am sick to the teeth of Middlewich being gridlocked twice a day by traffic that is just using Middlewich as a short cut to the bigger road / motorways and by doing so causing this congestion.” (Respondent 70, paper response)

  “As a full-time worker who commutes in and out of Middlewich at various times of the day, the traffic situation is gridlock at most times, not just at peak time” (Respondent 272, paper response)

  “Traffic is often very heavy and the town becomes gridlocked as soon as there’s a problem on the M6 or any of the local main roads” (Respondent 284, online response)

- Peak time traffic (mentioned by 15 respondents)
  
  “Traffic is abysmal at 5pm and especially if there is an accident on the M6.” (Respondent 94, paper response)

  The roads through the town are a nightmare especially rush hour, but even the hours between are still congested.” (Respondent 110, paper response)

  “Traffic within the town particularly at the traffic lights by St Michael's church is severe, particularly at peak times.” (Respondent 401, online response)

- Traffic volume (mentioned by 11 respondents)
  
  “The volume of traffic that travels through Middlewich has continued to grow over the last 20+ years.” (Respondent 158, paper response)

  “Traffic levels are totally unacceptable.” (Respondent 262, paper response)

  “Middlewich is growing in population, but gradually dying as a community, the lion's share of blame down to the huge volume of traffic that is throttling the life blood out of the town centre.” (Respondent 332, online response)

General comments regarding the bypass were mentioned by 86 respondents. The responses fall under the following themes:

- Scheme overdue (mentioned by 23 respondents)
  
  “Should have been built years ago for half the cost.” (Respondent 13, paper response)

  “Please get on with it, we have been waiting for this for 30 years.” (Respondent 371, online response)

  “This has been needed for decades and should be progressed as a matter of extreme urgency.” (Respondent 420, online response)
• Scheme support/Bypass needed (mentioned by 19 respondents)

“Strongly agree with a bypass because of the severe congestion through the town.” (Respondent 47, paper response)

“Much needed relief road.” (Respondent 201, paper response)

“Middlewich is definitely in need of a bypass as the traffic, especially at busy times leaves the centre of town very congested.” (Respondent 219, paper response)

• Increased journey time (mentioned by 16 respondents)

“The situation cannot continue like this, a simple trip to the doctor, dentist or shop has become an impossible task. I work in Bradford and sometimes my journey takes twice as long due to local gridlocked roads.” (Respondent 272, paper response)

“Traffic through the town is a nightmare and can take 20mins to travel less than a mile.” (Respondent 296, online response)

“I am employed in the town and travelling by car can take up to 35 mins for less than a three-mile journey.” (Respondent 324, online response)

Congestion was mentioned by 70 respondents. The responses fall under the following themes:

• Traffic congestion (mentioned by 21 respondents)

“Significant traffic congestion.” (Respondent 304, online response)

“The traffic congestion here is incredible. It is worse than Manchester which is known as suffering the worst congestion of any city in the UK.” (Respondent 314, online response)

“The traffic on the main road into and out of Middlewich is hugely congested at most times of the day and action is needed now.” (Respondent 370, online response)

• General comments relating to congestion (mentioned by 19 respondents)

“To free up Middlewich town from congestion.” (Respondent 55, paper response) “There is a ridiculous amount of congestion.” (Respondent 69, paper response) “Far too congested.” (Respondent 179, paper response)

• Town centre congestion (mentioned by 8 respondents

“Too much congestion in town centre.” (Respondent 197, paper response)

“The centre of Middlewich is consistently congested with traffic.” (Respondent 397, online response)
Respondents were asked specifically whether they agreed with the Council’s proposals for the Middlewich Eastern Bypass (Question 7). The majority of respondents agree with the proposals (87%) (397 respondents), whilst nearly a tenth of respondents disagree with the proposals for the Eastern Bypass (8%) (36 respondents) (Figure 15).

Figure 15. Agreement on the Council’s proposals for the Middlewich Eastern Bypass
Table 5 shows the response breakdown to question 7 by postcode. Of the 397 respondents agreeing with the proposals, the majority (224 respondents) live in the CW10 0 region where the proposed bypass will be located, and 143 of the respondents live in the CW10 9 region. Of the 36 respondents disagreeing with the proposals, the majority of respondents (15) live in the CW10 0 postcode location, with the CW10 9 region having the next highest number of respondents disagreeing with the proposals (8 respondents).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postcode</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CW1 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW10 0</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW10 9</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW11 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW11 3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW11 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW12 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW12 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW12 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW2 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW4 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW4 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW5 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW7 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW8 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW9 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK11 7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK11 8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST7 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST7 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA16 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>397</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5. Agreement with the Proposals for the Eastern Bypass by Postcode*
Question 8 asked respondents to provide more details on why they agreed or disagreed with the Council’s proposals for the bypass. 164 respondents provided further details. As above, the responses were reviewed and coding themes and issues. The main themes mentioned were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number of Respondents Mentioning Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General comments</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive impacts</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended route limitations</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other required routes</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junctions</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetton Lane</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further developments</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative impacts</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-motorised users</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HGVs</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed limit</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway station</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Question 8 - Key Themes
General comments regarding the proposals received the most mentions (69 respondents). Of the 75 comments made by these 69 respondents, the majority raised were positive (59%) (44 mentions), 28% (21 mentions) of the comments were neutral and 13% were negative (10 mentions). The most prevalent issues within this theme were:

- General comments supporting the bypass (44 mentions), typical comments included:
  
  “All options after looking at them seem to all have their benefits, but I do think the council’s preferred route is definitely the best option.” (Respondent 149, paper response)
  
  “We need a solution ASAP. The council has delayed and delayed this work. Get going!!!” (Respondent 449, online response)
  
  “Excellent plan with carefully thought out concepts. Very good all round.” (Respondent 423, online response).

- Scheme overdue (11 mentions):
  
  “Bypass has been needed for years.” (Respondent 42, paper response)
  
  “Please get on with it, we have been waiting for this for 30 years.” (Respondent 371, online response)
  
  “What took so long!” (Respondent 341, online response)

- Other comments (7 mentions):
  
  “Know better than to expect anything go to plan in our town, so will wait and see” (Respondent 357, online response)
  
  “Don’t see the proposed plan as an acceptable option.” (Respondent 262, paper response)

Comments relating to positive impacts of the proposals were raised by 36 respondents. The most mentioned comments were:

- Bypass will help relieve / control / reduce traffic in town (17 mentions)
  
  “The scheme will take the main traffic away from the town.” (Respondent 304, online response)
  
  “This will release traffic passing through Middlewich to Winsford.” (Respondent 336, online response)
  
  “The proposal should help to remove from the town centre the traffic that wishes to travel towards Sandbach.” (Respondent 428, online response)

- Bypass will divert ANSA traffic / HGVs from town (8 mentions)
  
  “We desperately need a bypass and the proposed route will take the ANSA traffic away from town.” (Respondent 222, paper response)
  
  “To reduce traffic flow along Lewin Street through to Booth Lane in particular HGV’s.” (Respondent 350, online response)
“A bypass should discourage the majority of HGVs away from the town centre.” (Respondent 332, online response)

- Bypass will alleviate / ease congestion in Middlewich (6 mentions)
  
  “Will help the congestion in Middlewich massively.” (Respondent 120, paper response)
  
  “Hopefully the bypass will ease congestion especially as Middlewich becomes gridlocked when there are issues on the M6.” (Respondent 324, online response)

- Bypass will improve safety in town / reduce accidents (6 mentions)
  
  “Just get on with it - people’s health and safety are at risk.” (Respondent 123, paper response) “The sooner a bypass is built the safer our town will be.” (Respondent 403, online response)

Comments regarding recommended route limitations were raised by 27 respondents.

- Scheme does not address traffic to Winsford – A54 (14 respondents)
  
  “The proposed bypass does not seem to cater for traffic passing through Middlewich on route to Winsford.” (Respondent 45, paper response)
  
  “My only reservation is that a large percentage of traffic through Middlewich is not going to Sandbach. Therefore, the Winsford traffic would continue to use the current roads through the centre of town rather than head on the bypass to Sandbach.” (Respondent 273, paper response)
  
  “Yes it needs a bypass but this scheme will not help the problems of through traffic M6 Junction 18 towards Winsford and reverse direction.” (Respondent 390, online response)

- Scheme unlikely to reduce current traffic levels significantly (8 respondents)
  
  “Proposed route is essential to reduce the impact of expected additional traffic due to new facilities, but is unlikely to reduce current levels significantly.” (Respondent 275, online response)
  
  “How much traffic comes along that route, how much relief would it give? Most of the traffic along that route seems to me to head towards Crewe\Nantwich not Sandbach.” (Respondent 373, online response)
  
  “The scheme is not sufficient to reduce traffic sufficiently through the town.” (Respondent 262, online response)

- Proposed scheme only takes away 30% of traffic / still 70% traffic going through Middlewich (5 respondents)
  
  “The proposed route will only take away 30% of the proposed traffic away, i.e. traffic from Northwich-Sandbach. What happens to the 70% of traffic left still going through the centre of Middlewich.” (Respondent 95, paper response)
“Whilst any form of bypass is to be welcomed, I am disappointed that the proposals will only reduce that 30% of traffic that comes into the town and leaves on the A533.”
(Respondent 400, online response)

4.5 Recommended Route Objectives

The next series of questions (within Question 9) focused on 8 different objectives, and how effectively the current proposals for the eastern bypass meet them. The question asked was: How strongly do you agree or disagree that our proposals will deliver each of the following objectives:

- Relieve traffic congestion in the town centre
- Reduce road safety concerns in the town centre
- Help deliver Local Plan commitments for new housing in Middlewich
- Help to create opportunities for new business and employment in Middlewich
- Help deliver future development opportunities
- Provide suitable access to Cledford Lane and Booth Lane from bypass
- Minimise impacts of the scheme on the local environment
- Provide facilities for pedestrians and cyclists.

4.6 Relieve Traffic Congestion in the Town Centre

The majority of respondents (88%, 400 respondents) believe the proposed bypass will relieve traffic congestion in the town centre. Just under a tenth of respondents (8%, 34 respondents) disagree, and do not believe the bypass will relieve traffic in Middlewich centre (Figure 16). 3% of respondents (15 respondents) neither agree or disagree and 1% (5 respondents) did not respond to this question.

Figure 16. Agreement on the Proposals Relieving Traffic Congestion in the Town Centre
4.6.1 Reduce Road Safety Concerns in the Town Centre

The majority of respondents (83%, 377 respondents) agree that the bypass will reduce road safety concerns in the town centre. Just under a tenth of respondents (7%, 30 respondents) do not believe this will be the case, while 9% (40 respondents) neither agree or disagree and 1% (5 respondents) of respondents did not answer this question (Figure 17).

Q9. How strongly do you agree or disagree that our proposals will reduce road safety concerns in the town centre

![Pie Chart]

Figure 17. Agreement on the Proposals Reducing Road Safety Concerns in the Town Centre
4.6.2 Help deliver Local Plan Commitments for New Housing in Middlewich

Nearly half of the respondents (220 respondents) agree that the proposals will help deliver local plan commitments for new housing in Middlewich. Just over a quarter of respondents (27%, 122 respondents) neither agree or disagree with this statement, and 14% (63 respondents) do not believe the proposals will help deliver the Local Plan commitments for new housing in Middlewich (Figure 18). 7% (33 respondents) of respondents expressed they did not know, and 3% (16 respondents) did not answer this question.

![Pie Chart](image)

**Figure 18. Agreement on the Proposals Helping to Deliver Local Plan Commitments for New Housing**
4.6.3 Help to Create Opportunities for New Business and Employment in Middlewich

Almost two thirds of respondents (61%, 281 respondents) agree that the proposals for the eastern bypass will create opportunities for new businesses and employment in Middlewich, while only a tenth of respondents (10%, 44 respondents) disagree with this statement. Just under a quarter of respondents (100 respondents) neither agree or disagree that the proposals will create new opportunities for businesses and employment, while 4% (16 respondents) expressed they did not know, 3%(13 respondents) did not answer this question (Figure 19).

---

Figure 19. Agreement on the Proposals Creating Opportunities for New Businesses and Employment

Q9. How strongly do you agree or disagree that our proposals will Help to create opportunities for new business and employment in Middlewich

- Strongly agree: 31%
- Tend to agree: 30%
- Neither agree nor disagree: 22%
- Tend to disagree: 6%
- Strongly disagree: 4%
- Not sure/Don’t know: 3%
- Not answered: 3%
4.6.4 Help Deliver Future Development Opportunities

Two thirds of respondents (66%, 298 respondents) believe the proposals will deliver future development opportunities in Middlewich, while just under a tenth of respondents (9%, 40 respondents) disagree this will be the case. Around a fifth of respondents (89 respondents) neither agree or disagree with this statement, 4% of respondents (18 respondents) did not know whether the proposals would have an impact on future development opportunities. 2% (9 respondents) did not respond to this question (Figure 20).

Figure 20. Agreement on the Proposals Delivering Future Development Opportunities
4.6.5 Provide Suitable Access to Cledford Lane and Booth Lane from the Bypass

The majority of respondents (83%, 377 respondents) believe the proposals provide suitable access to Cledford Lane and Booth Lane from the bypass, with only 7% of respondents (32 respondents) disagreeing this will be the case. 7% of respondents (30 respondents) neither agree or disagree that there is suitable access to Cledford Lane and Booth Lane from the bypass, 1% (6 respondents) are not sure if this will be the case. 2% (9 respondents) did not answer this question (Figure 21).

Q9. How strongly do you agree or disagree that our proposals will provide suitable access to Cledford Lane and Booth Lane from bypass

Figure 21. Agreement on the Proposals Providing Suitable Access to Cledford Lane and Booth Lane from Bypass
4.6.6 Minimise Impacts of the Scheme on the Local Environment

Just under three quarters of respondents (71%, 322 respondents) believe the proposals will minimize impacts of the scheme on the local environment, and a tenth of respondents (10%, 43 respondents) disagree with this statement. Just over a tenth of respondents (13%, 60 respondents) neither agree or disagree that the proposals will minimize the impacts of the scheme on the environment, while 3% (15 respondents) were not sure. 3% (14 respondents) did not respond to this question (Figure 22).

![Figure 22. Agreement on the Proposals Minimizing Impacts of the Scheme on the Local Environment](image-url)
4.6.7 Provide Facilities for Pedestrians and Cyclists

Three quarters of respondents (341 respondents) agree the proposals provide facilities for pedestrians and cyclists, while only 5% of respondents (22 respondents) do not agree. 15% of respondents (63 respondents) neither agree or disagree that the proposals provide facilities for pedestrians and cyclists, 4% (15 respondents) were not sure if this would be the case and 2% (13 respondents) did not respond to this question (Figure 23).

Q9. How strongly do you agree or disagree that our proposals provide facilities for pedestrians and cyclists,

Figure 23. Agreement on the Proposals to Provide Facilities for Pedestrians and Cyclists
Respondents were given the opportunity to provide comments to explain their response (Question 10). 130 respondents provided further comments. The main themes raised included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number of respondents mentioning this theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommended route limitations</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive impacts</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General comments</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-motorised users</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further developments</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HGVs</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junctions</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other required routes</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative impacts</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetton Lane</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposition</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6 – traffic / congestion</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transport</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 7. Question 10 - Key Themes*
Comments regarding the recommended route limitations received the most mentions (31 respondents).

The most prevalent issues regarding the recommended route limitations include:

- Scheme does not fully address congestion problems in Middlewich (mentioned by 10 respondents)
  
  “The eastern bypass will only relieve some traffic problems.” (Respondent 241, paper response)

  “While I fully support an eastern bypass, I feel that it is important to note that 70% of the traffic through Middlewich will not use the bypass so congestion will only be reduced slightly.” (Respondent 397, online response)

  “The bypass will not completely relieve the congestion problems in Middlewich as vehicles will still try and use the town as a cut through especially when there is a problem on the motorway.” (Respondent 405, online response)

- Scheme does not address traffic to Winsford (mentioned by 9 respondents)

  “Traffic from Winsford to Sandbach will still use Booth Lane as it’s the shorter route.” (Respondent 65, paper response)

  “The traffic going to Winsford will not be reduced.” (Respondent 425, online response)

- Questioning the effectiveness of scheme to relieve traffic (mentioned by 7 respondents)

  “This proposal will not help traffic in Middlewich” (Respondent 336, online response)

  “I don’t see any advantage to traffic | safety for the town centre traffic in the town is largely there because it needs to be, not passing through.” (Respondent 373, online response)

  “The problem is now much greater than the eastern bypass can solve on its own.” (Respondent 402, online response)

Respondents were vocal regarding their opinions on issues other than the proposal (classed as other issues), with 30 respondents making comments. The majority of comments in this theme were negative (84%) and 16% were neutral. The most prevalent issues mentioned within this theme were:

- Opposition to housing developments (mentioned by 10 respondents)

  “Although I agree strongly with the bypass, I feel that Middlewich has been over developed with housing in recent years.” (Respondent 76, paper response)

  “We do not want more houses in Middlewich. There are too many now in Middlewich.” (Respondent 115, paper response)

  “My concern is that new housing will pop up along the bypass. We are already having too many housing developments in Middlewich.” (Respondent 145, paper response)
• Comments regarding house building and the shortage of services (schools / doctors) (mentioned by 10 respondents)

“The medical facilities are struggling to cope now with the population so more houses would lead to a decline in all facilities and highways.” (Respondent 113, paper response)

“In regards to helping deliver new housing, Middlewich is under strain with new housing development. Further development should not be given planning permission without increase in school/doctor facilities.” (Respondent 227, paper response)

“There is no indication of where new housing will be delivered or how increased demand on local infrastructure will be satisfied.” (Respondent 442, online response)

• Shortage of services – doctors, dentists, shops (mentioned by 5 respondents)

“We are already short of doctors, dentists etc. And a shortage of good shops.” (Respondent 261, paper response)

“The focus needs to be on the towns infrastructure first. A new high school and improved leisure facilities are needed before new housing developments.” (Respondent 430, online response)

• Comments regarding levels of employment / employment opportunities (mentioned by 5 respondents)

“Don't know how this will create future business and employment as all spare land seems to be for housing. But we shall see!” (Respondent 47, paper response)

“I do not feel the bypass will affect job opportunities or housing plans.” (Respondent 403, online response)

General comments regarding the recommended route were raised by 24 respondents. Examples of typical comments raised were:

• General support for the scheme (mentioned by 12 respondents)

“The bypass is needed.” (Respondent 18, paper response)

“I agree with the preferred option.” (Respondent 299, online response)

“If everything in the proposal is true, then please get digging asap.” (Respondent 314, online response)

• Scheme overdue (mentioned by 6 respondents)

“This by pass is long overdue.” (Respondent 394, online response)

“This is LONG OVERDUE. Running out of patience for Middlewich.” (Respondent 129, paper response)

Positive impacts of the recommended route were raised by 24 respondents. Typical comments raised were:

• Reduce traffic in town / through Middlewich (mentioned by 8 respondents)
“The bypass is needed to reduce the current levels of traffic in Middlewich.”
(Respondent 161, paper response)

“Will reduce traffic in Middlewich centre.” (Respondent 305, online response)

- Lead to improvements to road safety on existing roads (mentioned by 5 respondents)

“Road safety improvement will be considerable on Lewin Street. This must be the most hazardous street for pedestrians in the whole of Cheshire!” (Respondent 104, paper response)

“I 100% agree that it will help with safety concerns as all the huge lorries squeezing down / thundering down Lewin Street / Leadsmithy Street it is only a matter of time before someone is injured or killed. I also agree it will help in other aspects.”
(Respondent 152, paper response)

4.7 Junction Types and Location

Stakeholders were asked to what extent they agree or disagree with the Council’s three proposals for the following junctions connected to the proposed Eastern bypass (Question 11).

4.7.1 Roundabout 1 Joining Pochin Way with the Bypass

The majority of respondents (84%, 380 respondents) agree with the proposal for roundabout 1 joining Pochin Way with the bypass, while only 3% of respondents (19 respondents) disagree with the proposals for this junction. Just under a tenth of respondents (8%, 38 respondents) neither agree or disagree with this junction. 1% (4 respondents) were not sure and 3% (13 respondents) did not answer this question (Figure 24).

![Figure 24. Agreement with the Proposal for Roundabout 1](image-url)
### Table 8. Question 11a - Key Themes

Comments regarding **junctons** were made by 22 respondents and fall into the following categories:

- **Junction support** (mentioned by 9 respondents)
  
  "*It looks very sensible and logical in the circumstances.*" (Respondent 306, online response)
  
  "*Yes this makes sense as it is already in place.*" (Respondent 403, online response)

- **Warehouse/Industrial access from junction** (mentioned by 4 respondents)
  
  "*Need to improve warehouse access to roundabout.*" (Respondent 100, paper response)
  
  "*Needs alteration to give access to large warehouse, presently a RH turn in, LH turn out that will be used in either direction once the bypass opens, so really should be an access off the roundabout*" (Respondent 101, paper response)

- **Needed for the best traffic flow** (mentioned by 2 respondents)
  
  "*There needs to be a roundabout to keep the best flow as possible.*" (Respondent 94, paper response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number of respondents mentioning this theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junction</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction design</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route other</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pochin Way</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMU</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Kinderton Park (mentioned by 2 respondents)

“It is good that there is a roundabout joining Pochin Way to the bypass, but I think that the roundabout should have another arm coming off it to go to Kinderton Lodge Farm. When I go school in the morning it is easy to get out of my drive from Kinderton Lodge Farm onto Pochin Way, but when the bypass is built there will be a lot more traffic and it will be much more dangerous for my mummy to take me to school in the morning. It would be much safer if my drive joined straight onto the roundabout, as roundabouts reduce the risk of road traffic accidents at junctions.” (Respondent 416, online response)

Comments regarding the junction design were made by 10 respondents and fall into the following categories:

• Should be a slip road access (mentioned by 2 respondents)

“There should be a slip road access pre-Salt Cellar or roundabout will not cope.” (Respondent 143, paper response)

• Adequate Lighting, and, smooth dropped kerbs (mentioned by 1 respondent)

“Ensure this has adequate lighting and smooth dropped kerbs.” (Respondent 7, paper response)

• Ensure roundabout design slows traffic on approach, and, Clear priorities (mentioned by 1 respondent)

“In response to all roundabout questions please ensure all approaches to the new roundabout are designed to ensure traffic slows on approach and priorities are clear.” (Respondent 20, paper response)

Comments regarding the theme route other sit under the following categories (mentioned by 9 respondents):

• Would prefer it near the M6 (mentioned by 2 respondents)

“Needs to be from M6. This plan just support[s] Pochins.” (Respondent 104, paper response)

• Scheme won’t replace congestion (mentioned by 2 respondents)

“But it will be congested. There should be a slip road access pre Salt Cellar or roundabout will not cope.” (Respondent 143, paper response)

• Use Cledford Lane (mentioned by 2 respondents)

“The road (Pochin Way) should be used, but not for the bypass. It should be JOINED TO Cledford lane ONLY, as it is virtually yards of being so as it stands. If enough savings are made anywhere, perhaps this small amount of roadway can be laid to join directly onto Cledford Lane and assist with dealing with congestion buy doubling available road leading to Cledford. With an alternate bypass route also in play, I feel that this would be used as the main route for the majority of users due to convenience, but would allow extra road surface fro if there were a backlog of traffic. This could also be a primary route for the lorries/traffic for the waste disposal site.” (Respondent 308, online response)
4.7.2 Cledford Lane Junction Crossing the Bypass West of Kinderton Park

Over two thirds of respondents (69%, 313 respondents) agree with the proposed Cledford Lane junction crossing the bypass west of Kinderton Park, while just over a tenth of respondents (11%, 52 respondents) disagree with the proposed junction. Around a tenth of respondents (12%, 54 respondents) neither agree or disagree, 3% (13 respondents) did not know and 5% (21 respondents) did not respond to this question (Figure 25).

Q11. How strongly do you agree or disagree with our proposal for each of the following junctions: Cledford Lane Junction crossing the bypass west of Kinderton Park

![Pie chart showing distribution of responses](chart.png)

Figure 25. Agreement on the Proposal for Cledford Lane Junction
Respondents were invited to provide reasons for their level of disagreement with the Cledford Lane junction. 85 respondents provided further comments which fall into the following themes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number of respondents mentioning theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junction</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction design</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cledford Lane</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMU</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Question 11b- Key Themes

Comments made regarding the **junction** theme fall into the following categories (38 respondents):

- Junction support (mentioned by 13 respondents)
  
  “*The staggered junction will be good and dedicated right hand turning.*” (Respondent 108, paper response)

  “Looks very sensible, with the increase in traffic coming into Middlewich via Cledford Lane.” (Respondent 312, online response)

- Access to ANSA (mentioned by 4 respondents)
  
  “*It should give better access and egress for the waste management company.*” (Respondent 33, paper response)

  “This should reduce impact of HGV and other vehicles travelling through Middlewich and allow for direct access to the ANSA site which would (will) cause a shocking impact on the town, roads and community.” (Respondent 73, paper response)
- Unclear plan (mentioned by 3 respondents)

  "Not clear where you mean? Please be clear? I've lived here 60 yrs no idea using them terms were you mean ??" (Respondent 357, online response)

- General comments against the proposed junction (mentioned by 3 respondents)

  "Why a staggered junction - this is a recipe for chaos. Build a bridge or tunnel." (Respondent 122, paper response)

- Traffic flow (mentioned by 3 respondents)

  "It remains to be seen whether this junction interrupts the flow of traffic on the 50mph highway to any significant degree." (Respondent 369, online response)

**Junction design** was commented on by 34 respondents and fall into the following categories:

- Roundabout would be preferred (mentioned by 19 respondents)

  "This junction appears to be the means of access to the ANSA waste site. The junction could be better with the roundabout option also seen at the Exhibition - a roundabout would introduce a requirement for traffic to slow down otherwise the by-pass could become a "race track". (Respondent 428, online response)

  "Roundabouts tend to keep a good level of traffic flow. The junction with Cledford Lane may not achieve the same outcome." (Respondent 444, online response)

  "I welcome the junction at Cledford Lane and the upgrade of Cledford Lane itself, but when there is a lot of North-bound traffic from Sandbach, it could take a while for South-bound traffic to turn onto Cledford Lane to cross. As this junction should be used by the ANSA waste vehicles, and residents, this could cause a queue back on to the bypass. A roundabout instead of a junction would address this, and also give residents of the Kinderton Mobile Home park easier access into Middlewich." (Respondent 453, online response).

- Traffic lights required (mentioned by 3 respondents)

  "If a 50 mph speed limit exists, traffic lights may be required." (Respondent 77, paper response)

- Build a bridge or tunnel (mentioned by 3 respondents)

  "Road bridge should be built to avoid slowing and inconveniencing traffic on the bypass." (Respondent 318, online response)

**Safety** was mentioned by 10 respondents. Comments fall into the following categories:

- Roundabouts are safer (mentioned by 5 respondents)

  "Roundabout option would be safer." (Respondent 100, paper response)

  "I think that the option showing a roundabout at Cledford Lane would be a safer option for heavy wagons turning south onto the bypass." (Respondent 189, paper response)
• Accident spot (mentioned by 3 respondents)

“Roundabout might be better here. Could see this becoming an accident black spot with all the Ansa traffic turning.” (Respondent 326, online response)

• Staggered junction safety concerns (mentioned by 2 respondents)

“Staggered junctions aren't very safe” (Respondent 100, paper response).

4.7.3 Roundabout 2 Linking Booth Lane (A533) with the Bypass

Over three quarters of respondents (77%, 349 respondents) agree with the proposed roundabout 2 linking Booth Lane with the bypass, while just under a tenth of respondents (7%, 33 respondents) disagree with this proposed junction. Only 2% (8 respondents) of respondents were not sure how they felt about this junction and 4% (20 respondents) did not answer this question (Figure 26).

[Figure 26. Agreement on the Proposals for Roundabout 2]
Respondents were invited to provide reasons for their level of agreement or disagreement with roundabout 3. 52 respondents provided further comments, which can be grouped into the following themes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number of respondents mentioning the theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junction</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetton Lane</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMU</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further development</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road conditions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 10. Question 11c - Key Themes**

Comments regarding the **junction** were made by 20 respondents and fall into the following categories:

- **Junction support** (mentioned by 8 respondents)
  
  “*If the bypass goes ahead as preferred then roundabouts at both ends look reasonable enough.*” (Respondent 409, online response)

  “*Makes absolute sense.*” (Respondent 423, online response)

- **Demolishing properties** (mentioned by 2 respondents)

  “*It is regrettable that people will lose their homes. They must be adequately compensated.*” (Respondent 369, online response)

- **Place junction south** (mentioned by 2 respondents)

  “*Could the roundabout of new road be moved slightly south to include side road junction*” (Respondent 100, paper response)

Comments regarding the **Tetton Lane** were made by 13 respondents and fall into the following categories:

- **Concerned about the impact on Tetton Lane** (mentioned by 7 respondents)

  “*As already stated I am concerned about the impact on Tetton Lane which currently cannot cope with increasing volume of traffic. Any further traffic on Tetton Lane is totally unacceptable. Please ensure any changes do not create additional volume of traffic on Tetton Lane.*” (Respondent 266, paper response)
“There is concern raised by our shareholders about the impact this roundabout will have on local traffic and in particular traffic on Tetton Lane. Assurance is required on the controls proposed to prevent this becoming a shortcut road.” (Respondent 383, online response)

- Encourages traffic to use Tetton Lane (mentioned by 5 respondents)

  “Very concerned about the potential increase in traffic on Tetton Lane and would like assurance that controls will be in place to ensure that citizens will be discouraged from using Tetton Lane.” (Respondent 395, online response)

  “Problems as it encourages traffic to use Tetton Lane as the 'Southern Eastern Bypass'.” (Respondent 183, paper response)

- More traffic on Tetton Lane is unacceptable (mentioned by 3 respondents)

  “Any further traffic on Tetton Lane is totally unacceptable. Please ensure any changes do not create additional volume of traffic on Tetton Lane.” (Respondent 266, paper response).

- Close Tetton Lane as through road (mentioned by 3 respondents)

  “Tetton Lane should be made a no through road and be for access only.” (Respondent 385, online response)

Comments regarding the benefits of the junction were made by 9 respondents:

- Removes Sandbach traffic from town centre (mentioned by 2 respondents)

  “Gets the Sandbach people away from the town centre.” (Respondent 129, paper response)

- Reduce traffic congestion (mentioned by 1 respondent)

  “To reduce traffic congestion.” (Respondent 76, paper response)

- Privacy for Booth Lane residents (mentioned by 1 respondent)

  “Good clear option. Also adds a bit of privacy to the residents living in that area of Booth Lane.” (Respondent 94, paper response)
4.8 Environmental Impacts of the Scheme

Respondents were asked how strongly they agreed the proposed Environmental Impact Assessment covers all relevant topics (Question 12).

The majority of respondents (70%, 318 respondents) agree that the proposed environmental impact assessment covers all relevant topics, while less than a tenth of respondents (7%, 31 respondents) do not agree that all relevant topics are included. 15% of respondents (69 respondents), neither agree or disagree, 5% (23 respondents) did not know and 3% (13 respondents) did not respond to this question (Figure 27).

Q12. How strongly do you agree or disagree that our proposed environmental impact assessment covers all relevant topics.

![Figure 27. Agreement with the Proposed Environmental Impact Assessment](image)
Question 13 asked respondents to provide more details on why they agreed or disagreed that the Environmental Impact Assessment covered all relevant topics. 51 respondents provided further comments. The most frequent themes in the response were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number of respondents mentioning the theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended route</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-motorised users</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further developments</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junctions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HGVs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. Question 13- Key Themes

Comments regarding the Environment were raised by 26 respondents. Examples of responses received include:

- Mentions of wildlife and habitats (mentioned by 8 respondents)
  “Perhaps some consideration could be given to inserting plastic ducting under the road width to allow wild animals safe crossing points along the new carriageway. This has been applied in other parts of the country with a good success rate in protection of wild life.”
  (Respondent 113, paper response)
  “Would like to see more on habitat creation.” (Respondent 316, online response)
  “No consideration is given to the environmental wildlife - just all about building.”
  (Respondent 385, online response)

- Noise pollution (mentioned by 7 respondents)
  “Noise and environment pollution will increase.” (Respondent 106, paper response)
“Reduce noise for residents on Lewin Street, Booth Lane.” (Respondent 108, paper response)

“As already said we currently have very little noise and pollution at present but the preferred route will increase noise drastically along with pollution from 30% of traffic that we don’t have at the moment, especially when we are advised that the bypass will be some 2/3 metres above existing ground levels.” (Respondent 409, online response)

- Air pollution / quality (mentioned by 6 respondents)
  “Addresses air quality issues on Lewin Street.” (Respondent 108, paper response)
  “There should be an overall indication of air quality throughout the borough and unless a measure reduces the overall emissions, it should be scrapped. Thus, for this bypass, unless it will reduce emissions across the borough, it should be scrapped.” (Respondent 327, online response)

Comments regarding the consultation were made by 13 respondents. The comments raised include:

- Comprehensive assessment / proposal (mentioned by 7 respondents)
  “By law and regulations I’m sure this has been all taken into account by all involved making these decisions.” (Respondent 147, paper response)

  “I am not fully conversant with all the regulations, but the assessment appears to be quite comprehensive.” (Respondent 245, paper response)

- Report is not transparent (mentioned by 4 respondents)
  “It is not clear what you have done, who has confirmed it and the science behind it being correct.” (Respondent 274, paper response)

  “It’s not clear from the brochure what the extent of the assessment was.” (Respondent 281, online response)

Other comments were raised by 10 respondents regarding the Environmental Impact Assessment. Many of these comments are general statements which do not fall into the other themes such as:

“We want what’s best for Middlewich.” (Respondent 147, paper response)

“I have not looked into the environmental impact assessment.” (Respondent 413, online response)

“The brochure states that ‘We are currently undertaking an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) …’ (page 14), so I cannot comment.” (Respondent 433, online response)
4.9 Pedestrian and Cyclists Provision

Respondents were asked to what extent they agree or disagree with the proposal for pedestrian and cyclists provision for the Middlewich Eastern Bypass (Question 14).

Three quarters of respondents (341 respondents) agree with the proposal for pedestrian and cyclists provision for the bypass, while only a twentieth (5%, 22 respondents) of respondents do not agree with this element of the proposal. Over a tenth of respondents (14%, 63 respondents) neither agree or disagree with the proposal for non-motorised user provision, 3% (15 respondents) were not sure and 3% (13 respondents) of respondents did not answer this question (Figure 28).

![Figure 28. Agreement on the Proposal for Pedestrian and Cyclists Provision](chart.png)
Question 15 allowed respondents to provide more details on why they agreed or disagreed with the pedestrian and cyclist provision. 72 respondents provided further comments which fall into the following themes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number of respondents mentioning the theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cycle and pedestrian proposal</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design of cycle/pedestrian provisions</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-motorised users</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Question 15– Key Themes

Comments regarding the **cycling and pedestrian proposal** were made by 33 respondents. The comments have been grouped into the following categories:

- **Support of proposal** (mentioned by 9 respondents)
  - “As a cyclist this is great news.” (Respondent 47, paper response)
  - “As a cyclist, I am pleased to see that the new bypass will include a cycle way.” (Respondent 195, paper response)

- **Dedicated cycle lane** (mentioned by 3 respondents)
  - “Cyclists should be given a dedicated cycle lane so as not reduce traffic flow on the single carriageway, thereby negating the benefits.” (Respondent 277, online response)

- **Proposed cycle route need to link with other routes across Cheshire East** (mentioned by 3 respondents)
  - “On their own the proposals are to be commended but they need to be linked to improved cycle provision across the local area.” (Respondent 307, online response)

Comments regarding the **design of cycle/pedestrian provisions** were made by 14 respondents. The comments fall into the following categories:

- **Position away from the road** (mentioned by 5 respondents)
“Definitely need a cyclist / pedestrian provision which must be safe. i.e. a small grass verge or large kerb separating it from the bypass.” (Respondent 379, online response)

“See details for the various junctions in the questions above and further considerations as below. Street furniture must be placed away from the shared footway/cycle way in line with details given in the Government’s Cycling Infrastructure Design Guidance., LTN 2/08. Likewise, the buffer zone as per Shared Use Routes for Pedestrian and Cyclists, LTN 02/95: ‘For routes alongside trunk roads, the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Vol 6 Section 3, Part 5, TA 90 (Highways Agency, 2005b) recommends a preferred separation between an NMU (Non-Motorised User) route and the carriageway of 1.5 metres, with an acceptable separation of 0.5 metres. It advises that a higher value of 1.5 metres should, where possible, be used on roads with speed limits in excess of 40 mph.). ‘Where existing rights of way, footpaths or bridleways cross the route, safe crossing points will be provided …’ (page 15). This is supported and I assume will be in the form of central pedestrian refuges. These however often result in dangerous ‘pinch points’ for cyclists using the carriageway. Please ensure carriageway width according to LTN 2/08.” (Respondent409, online response)

- Provisions needed on both sides of the bypass (mentioned by 2 respondents)

  “Must be in both directions (both sides of the bypass).” (Respondent 130, paper response)

Comments regarding non-motorised users were made by 8 respondents and fall into the following categories:

- NMU safety is being taken into consideration (mentioned by 3 respondents)

  “Safety for pedestrians and cyclist is key in this development.” (Respondent 308, online response)

  “Inadequate provision is made for non-vehicular users.” (mentioned by 2 respondents)

  “It is quite simply not good enough. If this is to be built, it should incorporate a shared footway, segregated from the road (i.e. with a hard kerb) to allow usage by cyclists and pedestrians.” (Respondent 303, online response)

Other comments mentioned relating non-motorised users include:

- Scary to see walkers/cyclists on Lewin Street (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Upgrade footpaths (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Impact of noise and traffic emissions for users (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Equestrian Access (mentioned by 1 respondent)

Comments regarding safety were made by 8 respondents and fall into the following categories:

- The pedestrian/cycle provisions will improve safety (mentioned by 3 respondents)
“I think the proposals take cyclists and pedestrians safety into consideration.”
(Respondent 323, online response)

Other comments mentioned relating to safety:

- The roads to the bypass are hostile for non-motorised users (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Volume of traffic is dangerous for cyclists (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Pedestrians should not be on a 40mph road (mentioned by 1 respondent)

### 4.10 Final Opinions Regarding the Proposals

Question 16 provided respondents with the opportunity to express any other comments they would like to make regarding the proposals. 162 respondents provided some final comments regarding the proposals, the most frequent themes were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number of respondents mentioning the theme</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number of respondents mentioning the theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General comments</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Positive impact</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other routes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Congestion</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended route limitations</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Non-motorised users</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Tetton Lane</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Opposition</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HGVs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further developments</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Train station</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junctions</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Public transport</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative impact</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Canal</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Speed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 13. Question 16- Key Themes*
The majority of comments (made by 68 respondents) raised were **general comments** made about the proposals fall into the following statements:

- General comments supporting the scheme (mentioned by 31 respondents)
  
  “I don't mind which way the bypass will go (all seem similar ways) so long as it is built as soon as possible. The situation is now desperate.” (Respondent 28, paper response)

  “On the whole a good scheme.” (Respondent 150, paper response)

  “In spite of my slight reservations on certain aspects the broad ambition of the project is excellent and it should go ahead as quickly as possible. Any change for the better is good and this is a change for the better.” (Respondent 281)

- Scheme overdue (mentioned by 29 respondents)
  
  “This bypass is far too long in the coming, and should have been completed decades ago. Changing the proposals now, only seems to be slowing up the process.” (Respondent 295, online response)

  “This is not rocket science, and should have been completed long before the extra traffic was put on our roads with the increase in housing over the last 25 years.” (Respondent 402, online response)

  “I think you will find that there is overwhelming support for a bypass. It is time to act and deliver on the promise which has been on the cards for all of the 29 years I have lived in the town.” (Respondent 429, online response)

- Other (mentioned by 9 respondents)
  
  “What lighting at what times?” (Respondent 27, paper response)

  “However you achieve it, make sure it is for the benefit of local residents not the borough council.” (Respondent 295, online response)

  “It’s needed, but it’s only part of the solution.” (Respondent 389, online response)

Comments regarding **other routes** were raised by 25 respondents. The types of comments raised fall into the following general statements:

- Other comments relating to the other routes (mentioned by 4 respondents)
  
  “Pochin Way should be used to join Cledford Lane only.” (Respondent 274, paper response) “Linking from King Street to Bostock area (top of Spittel hill where the Winsford and Northwich roads meet), makes much more sense.” (Respondent 377, online response)

- Support for Option 1 (mentioned by 4 respondents)
  
  “Option 1 may be cheaper because part of road is already there and nearer to the railway (we could have a station).” (Respondent 152, paper response)

  “Concerns over noise & pollution on preferred route Option 1 would be better.” (Respondent 409, online response)

- ANSA need a link to the bypass to alleviate HGVs from roads (mentioned by 3 respondents)
  
  “An alternative route to the ANSA site MUST be considered & the Booth lane route to the ANSA site must be banned.” (Respondent 403, online response)
Comments regarding **recommended route limitations** and **traffic** were each raised by 22 and 21 respondents, respectively. The types of comments regarding the **recommended route limitations** fall into the following statements.

- **Traffic going from M6 to Winsford not considered** (mentioned by 7 respondents)
  
  “This road is a link road from A54 (from M6) to A533 (Sandbach Road) and will not relieve traffic on A54 (Winsford Road).” (Respondent 336, online response)
  
  “Whilst understanding this is the Middlewich Eastern Bypass I fail to see how it will remove the major congestion which occurs because of through traffic, i.e. M6 Junction 18 towards Winsford and in the opposite direction.” (Respondent 391, online response)

- **Other** (mentioned by 6 respondents)
  
  “It will not reduce all of the town traffic congestion as it does not connect to the A54 from the west of Middlewich.” (Respondent 66, paper response)
  
  “This proposal will just halve the problem not rectify it.” (Respondent 252, paper response)

- **Capacity of bypass to cope with cars from future developments / increase in traffic** (mentioned by 5 respondents)
  
  “Proposed new housing & industrial units will surely impact on this & by the time the bypass is up and running it may be obsolete.” (Respondent 95, paper response)
  
  “Concerns over encouraging future developments in the town which will increase traffic and negate any savings made with the bypass.” (Respondent 409, online response)
5 Open Format Responses

5.1 Processing of Responses

This section looks at these themes and issues rather than at individual responses. Individual responses have been sent to those who commented by email.

In addition to the 482 responses received on the consultation response form, a further 28 responses were received from 26 respondents as emails or phone calls. These were reviewed, coded and analysed to understand the main issues and concerns raised.

The majority of responses received were from individuals including landowners (18 separate responses), 8 responses were on behalf of key stakeholders and local Parish Councils.

Table 14 below shows the organisations who responded by email or letter, for confidentiality purposes we have not listed the landowners and general public who responded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Type</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Name of Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Public/Business/Landowner</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>United Utilities Equality and Human Rights Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bradwall Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moston Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enovert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 14. Responses Received*
5.2 Themes and Issues Raised in Responses

The main themes raised in the responses are provided below:

- Consultation - mentioned in 21 of the 28 open format responses
- Proposal - mentioned in 6 of the 28 open format responses
- Impact of Bypass - mentioned in 5 of the 28 open format responses
- General - mentioned in 3 of the 28 open format responses
- Traffic - mentioned in 2 of the 28 open format responses
- Congestion - mentioned in 1 of the 28 open format responses
- Lewin Street - mentioned in 1 of the 28 open format responses

The main themes raised in the letters and emails are discussed in more details below:

- Comments about the consultation, 21 mentions. The main issues were:
  - Key stakeholder responses (11 responses)
  - Information Requests (5 responses)

  "Was an outline business case (OBC) prepared for the Middlewich Eastern Bypass and if so, please can I have a copy?"

- Comments about the proposal, mentioned 6 times by respondents. The main issues within this theme were:
  - Cledford Lane Staggered Junction (3 responses)

  "Agree with staggered junction with turn right lanes in the centre of the new road. But it must be much safer for traffic on Cledford lane going straight over to turn left onto the new bypass and then turn right rather than your plan of turning right across the traffic and then left. " (Respondent 23)

- Comments about the impact of the bypass, mentioned 5 times. The main issues within this theme were:
  - Lanes used as rat runs (2 responses)

  "There is considerable concern in the parish that many of our lanes will be used as rat runs when the bypass is completed." (Respondent 2)

- General comments were mentioned 3 times. The main issues include:
  - A54 traffic (1 response)

  "The pinch point in Middlewich is the traffic lights at the junction of the A54 and Booth Lane (A533). When the motorway is blocked traffic pours into Middlewich and backs up from those lights right back to the M6. High volume of traffic also joins this roundabout from Kings Street." (Respondent 9)
• Comments about traffic received 2 mentions. The main issues include:
  o Congestion throughout the day (1 mention)

“I use the A54 about twice a week and it can be congested at any time of the
day, especially at present as King Street is closed.” (Respondent 4)

• Comments about Lewin Street (1 mention) The main issues within this theme were:
  o HGVs on Lewin Street

“Parts of Lewin Street are very narrow and where two lorries pass I have
seen them mount the pavement on many occasions.” (Respondent 4)
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Middlewich is one of the Key Service Centres for Cheshire East, providing homes for over 13,500 residents, employment opportunities plus retail, education and health services. The Local Plan allocates strategic sites for future growth of the town, contributing to the prosperity of the Borough as a whole.

Middlewich town centre currently suffers from severe traffic congestion due to its location at the junction of two major roads; the A54 which links to the M6, Winsford and Chester, and the A533 to Sandbach and Northwich. This congestion is affecting the quality of life of residents within the town and reducing the attractiveness of the area to business.

There is a long-standing ambition for a bypass to the east of the town centre to reduce traffic congestion and support employment and housing growth in the town.

Cheshire East Council has conducted a number of studies which demonstrate the need to improve the road network. Since 2015, we have been reviewing and developing proposals for a Middlewich Eastern Bypass, undertaking key surveys that will enable the scheme to be delivered.

In November 2017, the Department for Transport committed to a major funding contribution towards the scheme, as part of the Large Local Major Schemes programme.

The Council is now preparing a new planning application for the scheme. To inform this, we are consulting locally on our preferred option.

The consultation will take place between 19 March and 29 April 2018. We are keen to understand your views on the proposals.

In this brochure you will find out more about the proposed scheme - its design, its main features and associated environmental factors. This information is intended to help you contribute to the consultation.
Consultation

We would like to hear your views on our proposals for Middlewich Eastern Bypass. This is your opportunity to tell us what you think about the scheme, to highlight any concerns you may have and to share with us any information that may help us improve it.

The consultation runs for 6 weeks, commencing 19 March 2018 and closing at midnight on 9 April 2018. We are holding three public consultation events where you can find out more about the plans. The Council’s project team will attend these events to answer any questions you may have. The events are:

Wednesday 28 March 2018, 2pm to 8pm
St Mary’s Church Hall
2 King Street
Middlewich
CW10 9EB

Saturday 14 April 2018, 10am to 3pm
St Mary’s Church Hall
2 King Street
Middlewich
CW10 9EB

Thursday 19 April 2018, 2pm to 8pm
St Mary’s Church Hall
2 King Street
Middlewich
CW10 9EB

YOU CAN RESPOND TO THE CONSULTATION IN THE FOLLOWING WAYS:

ONLINE: by visiting www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/middlewicheasternbypass
BY EMAIL: you can email us at middlewicheasternbypass@cheshireeast.gov.uk
AT THE EXHIBITIONS: visit us at one of our exhibitions listed above and complete a questionnaire
BY POST: using the freepost address
FREEPOST RTUK-RBLY-XUBT
Middlewich Eastern Bypass
5 First Street
Manchester
M15 4GU

All responses should be received by 11:59pm on 29 April 2018.

Any responses received after this date or to any other address may not be considered as part of the consultation process.
Need for the scheme

Middlewich is a well-located key business centre that is close to other towns and businesses in mid Cheshire, including Winsford and Northwich. Access to the M6 motorway at Junction 18 supports the town as a place for homes, jobs and economic growth. Wider links to Chester and North Wales mean that the A54 through Middlewich is an important, heavily-used traffic route. These opportunities led to the new Local Plan for Cheshire East reinforcing the importance of the employment site at Midpoint18 (known as Ma6nitude). Development at this site and elsewhere around Middlewich will unlock new growth, homes and employment opportunities.

Middlewich town centre experiences severe congestion due to its location at the junction of two major roads. Both the A54 which links the M6 to Winsford and Chester and the A533 from Northwich to Sandbach are heavily used at peak times. Traffic delays and congestion have negative impacts on the attractiveness of Middlewich and cause inconvenience to residents, business and visitors to the town.

We have completed traffic surveys & modelling which show that the A54 / A533 junction in the centre of Middlewich is over capacity at peak commuting times; causing traffic congestion, delays and increasing journey times. Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) make up a large proportion of the traffic, with 6 out of the 7 roads in the town having higher levels of HGVs than the national average for their road type.

The 2011 census showed that the level of car ownership in Middlewich is significantly higher than the national average. 87% of households own one or more cars or vans compared to 74% in England overall. 77% of Middlewich residents use a car to travel to work. This traffic, combined with traffic passing through the town to other destinations, is contributing to the town’s congestion.

Our studies show that the best option to relieve congestion within the town is to build a bypass, which will provide an alternative route for traffic that is passing through the town via the Leadsmithy Street junction. Our assessments indicate that about 30% of the traffic currently passing through Leadsmithy Street / Town Bridge junction is expected to re-route onto the bypass.

During the 1990’s Cheshire County Council and local developers secured initial planning permission for an eastern bypass. This road was only partially completed, with the economic downturn limiting the availability of private funding needed to complete the scheme. Further development of Midpoint18 (known as Ma6nitude) is constrained until a bypass is completed.

Pochin Way is designed to provide access to industrial premises and warehouses through a number of junctions. These junctions are likely to disrupt the flow of traffic along the bypass, reducing its benefit to Middlewich.
Need for the scheme

The need for the scheme has been highlighted in a number of our key documents including the Cheshire East Local Plan and Cheshire East Local Transport Plan. We held a Middlewich Transport Consultation over 6 weeks in Summer 2016, which showed that respondents’ highest priority for improving local transport was the delivery of an eastern bypass.

To inform the development of our proposals, a number of key objectives were agreed covering locally important issues and wider long-term strategic ambitions. These objectives are:

- Relieve traffic congestion and reduce road safety concerns in the town centre.
- Help deliver the Local Plan, to create opportunities for new business and employment in Middlewich.
- Help deliver the Local Plan sites for new housing in Middlewich.
- Help unlock more development opportunities in the future.
- Provide suitable access to Cledford Lane and Booth Lane from the bypass.
- Reduce any negative environmental impacts of the scheme.
- Provide facilities for pedestrians and cyclists.
Despite the economic downturn, the need for a bypass remained high. Cheshire East Council took a leading role to pursue a solution in 2015.

We considered a broad range of options to reduce traffic congestion affecting the town, including improvements to the existing road network. Our reviews showed that these options performed poorly, when compared to the benefits of a bypass.

Our Options Assessment studies considered 8 potential routes for a bypass, all creating a new road between the A54 (Salt Cellar Roundabout), passing to the east of Middlewich to the A533 Booth Lane close to Tetton Bridge. The original scheme (Option 1) was included in our assessments, and several of the other options shared common sections with the original scheme.

The 8 options identified are shown opposite.

We compared each of the options against our key (strategic) objectives for the scheme, which led to a ranking of the options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Total Weighted Score</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>7=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>7=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The assessment showed that Options 2, 3, 4, & 5 provided the best solutions to meet the defined objectives.

We also undertook traffic modelling and economic analysis for each option to identify which options provided the greatest economic benefits and value for money. The analysis showed that all options provided high economic benefits, with Options 1, 5, 7 and 8 providing the highest Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR).

In November 2016 Cheshire East Council's Cabinet approved further development of Option 5 as the Preferred Option and Option 1 (the original scheme) as an Alternative Option. Using these options, we prepared an Outline Business Case (OBC), which assessed each option independently on the key objectives, costs, and economic benefits.

The preferred option has the following significant benefits when compared to the alternative option:

- A reduced risk of flooding of the bypass
- A reduced impact on the floodplains for local watercourses
- Greater flexibility in the future to upgrade or add to the scheme.

We believe that the benefits associated with the preferred scheme outweigh the increased cost of the scheme, when compared to the alternative route.

In March 2017, we submitted an Outline Business Case to the Department for Transport making the case for funding. In November 2017, the Secretary of State announced that Government would provide £46.8m towards construction of the scheme. The remaining funding (20% of the total) for the scheme will come from developer contributions and Cheshire East Council.

We are working hard to complete the design and assessment to prepare for a planning application. Following this public consultation, all comments received will be reviewed to help us further refine and develop the design.

We expect a planning application will be submitted in Summer 2018.
The proposed Middlewich Eastern Bypass would be a 2.7 km single carriageway to the east of Middlewich.

The route would begin on Holmes Chapel Road (A54) at the Salt-Cellar Roundabout, follow the existing Pochin Way before passing to the east of Midpoint 18 (known as Ma6nitude), crossing Cledford Lane and joining Booth Lane to the south of Middlewich. A bridge with embankments on either side will be required where the route crosses the Sandbach to Northwich Rail Line. At the southern end of the scheme Booth Lane is diverted with a bridge over the Trent and Mersey Canal to allow it to join the bypass via a new roundabout junction.

A number of smaller crossings or ‘box culverts’ will be required to cross watercourses such as the River Croco, Sanderson Brook, and other minor streams.

The proposed speed limit along the bypass would be 50mph. A separate cycleway/footpath would be provided for non-motorised users along the length of the scheme. This will also provide safe access to the proposed employment areas for cyclists and pedestrians. We are looking closely at how the scheme connects with existing footpaths, cycle routes, and public rights of way.

The majority of the scheme passes through open farm land. However, in some locations due to physical and environmental constraints, the route passes through small settlements and will require the demolition of four properties (three occupied and one derelict) and the removal of two static mobile homes. Cheshire East Council has contacted all the owners and occupiers of these affected properties and we will continue to engage with them during the planning application.

Two new roundabouts will be created; one at the junction with Pochin Way and another at the junction with Booth Lane.

We are proposing a staggered junction at Cledford Lane. To the west of the bypass, Cledford Lane will be upgraded by constructing a footway/cycleway on one side of the road, to segregate non-motorised users from the traffic. Passing bays will be created to improve vehicle access to/from the bypass to businesses on Cledford Lane, including the new ANSA depot. These improvements will enable much of the traffic associated with the depot to avoid Booth Lane and the town centre.

The preferred route and further information on the design can be found in the following pages.
Preferred Scheme Junctions

Here, we have provided some diagrams to show what each of the roundabouts and junctions on the bypass may look like.

ROUNDABOUT 1 – JUNCTION WITH POCHIN WAY

The proposed three arm roundabout would link the Middlewich Eastern Bypass to Pochin Way. The roundabout would be constructed approximately 10m to the east of the existing road to reduce disruption during construction. Once completed traffic would be diverted onto the new roundabout. Access to Pochin Way and the surrounding businesses would be maintained at all times.
Preferred Scheme Junctions

The proposed Middlewich Eastern Bypass would cross Cledford Lane approximately 200m west of Kinderton Park. The section of Cledford Lane to the west of the scheme would be moved slightly northwards to create a staggered junction. The junction would include a central right-turning lane to enhance safe movement for non-motorised users. The old section of the lane would be closed to traffic.

During construction it is likely that access to Cledford Lane will be restricted for short periods of time to allow the junction to be constructed.
The proposed three-arm roundabout would be constructed approximately 100m north of the existing Booth Lane/Tetton Lane junction. We would need to demolish three properties and two static mobile homes to create a safe link to the existing Booth Lane (A533) and a suitable bridge crossing over the Trent & Mersey Canal.

Booth Lane traffic would be diverted to the roundabout once completed. The old section of Booth Lane located between the two new arms of the A533 roundabout would be closed to through traffic but retained as access for non-motorised users (NMU) and residential properties.

Access from the bypass to Tetton Lane will be provided through the creation of a new road with a right turn lane.
Environmental Considerations

We are currently undertaking an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), which will look at the likely environmental impacts the scheme has on the surrounding area. The EIA is progressing well and we have completed a number of the surveys and assessments that are needed to inform the Environmental Statement (ES). This ES will be submitted as part of the planning application to the planning authority.

The following sections provide further information on each of the environmental indicators which are being studied for the scheme, including information on the proposed or potential mitigation measures where impacts may be identified.

**AIR QUALITY**
- Air quality is a significant public health concern and traffic can be a major contributor to this. We are currently undertaking air quality monitoring within Middlewich to assess the existing air quality. This monitoring will be used to complete an air quality assessment. We currently believe that the town centre and nearby residential areas will experience an improvement in air quality, as traffic is moved away from the town centre onto the bypass. Temporary air quality issues during construction will be investigated as part of the assessment so that suitable measures to reduce impacts can be taken.

**NOISE**
- We are currently monitoring the existing noise levels at key locations around the bypass and in residential areas close to the town centre. We will model these current levels to help assess the noise levels after the scheme is complete and to understand any changes that may occur. A number of areas in Middlewich are likely to experience a reduction in noise levels as a result of the scheme, with traffic diverted onto the bypass and away from the town centre. Where noise levels are predicted to increase as a result of the bypass, mitigation measures such as noise reducing fencing and barriers will be investigated.

**LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACTS**
- We are assessing the effects of the bypass on the landscape of the local area. Where visual impacts are identified, we will aim to reduce these by designing earthworks and planting trees or shrubs to screen views where possible. Planting will be designed to integrate into the existing landscape.

**ECOLOGY AND NATURE CONSERVATION**
- Ecological surveys have been taking place since 2015 to identify all plant and wildlife species that may be affected by the bypass. Our surveys have found the presence of a number of protected species including bats, badgers, great crested newts, lesser silver water beetles and barn owls. Mitigation is likely to include a combination of habitat creation, habitat enhancement and habitat protection. A long term view is being taken on habitat disturbance based upon future development of Midpoint 18 (known as Ma6nitude), to avoid or reduce the risk of repeated disturbance to the natural environment.
EFFECTS ON PEOPLE AND COMMUNITIES (INCLUDING NON-MOTORISED USERS (NMU))

- We are conducting surveys to understand how people use local Rights of Way, especially where these cross the route of the bypass. We have included a shared footway and cycleway in the design to enable use of the bypass by pedestrians and cyclists. A shared footway/cycleway segregated from the roadway has also been included on Cledford Lane to the west of the bypass for users of Regional Cycle Route 71. Where existing rights of way, footpaths or bridleways cross the route, safe crossing points will be provided to ensure they are not severed, however it may be necessary to undertake some temporary diversions during construction. Alternative accesses for farmers and residential properties will be incorporated as required.

HEALTH IMPACTS

- An assessment will be undertaken to identify any effects on human health and wellbeing, including interactions between other environmental factors such as noise, air quality and landscape. This is to ensure local residents’ health is not compromised as a result of the proposed bypass.

WATER ENVIRONMENT

- The bypass will cross four watercourses, including the Trent and Mersey Canal. Flood risk modelling and water quality assessments are underway, ensuring that the bypass does not reduce water quality or increase the likelihood of flooding. Additional flood storage areas will be created, if necessary, to ensure there is no increase in flood risk. Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) will also help to slow run-off from the road and prevent discharges of silt and pollutants into local watercourses.

GEOLOGY, SOILS, MATERIAL RESOURCES AND WASTE

- Agricultural soil surveys and ground investigations are being completed to identify any potentially contaminated land. We are also assessing the impact of the proposed bypass on local ground conditions. The effects of historical brine pumping are being considered to identify what, if any, impacts this may have. Waste soils from the scheme are not expected to be significant and will be minimised by re-use during construction. Construction will require large volumes of material to be brought to site for embankments to the new bridges. Detailed planning and temporary traffic management will minimise the impact associated with the movement of materials during construction.

CULTURAL HERITAGE

- There are a small number of cultural heritage assets located within the vicinity of the bypass. Archaeological surveys will be made before and during the construction works to identify any archaeological remains. Measures will be put in place to avoid or reduce any impacts on heritage assets. If removal of archaeological remains is required, these will be recorded and preserved under the guidance of archaeological specialists.
NEXT STEPS

Once the consultation closes on 29 April, we will analyse your responses and prepare a consultation report which will be published on the Council’s webpage at www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/middlewicheasternbypass

Your responses will inform the final scheme design where applicable and practicable. The findings of this consultation will be reported to Cheshire East Council Cabinet.

If the scheme is approved by Cabinet, we will submit a planning application to Cheshire East Council Strategic Planning Board in Summer 2018. There will be an opportunity for you to comment further on the scheme as part of the statutory planning process. The figure below provides our current timeline for the scheme, following the closure of this consultation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>March / April 2018</th>
<th>Summer 2018</th>
<th>Spring 2019</th>
<th>Summer 2020</th>
<th>Autumn 2021</th>
<th>End of 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Route consultation</td>
<td>Submission of planning application</td>
<td>Commence advance environmental works on site</td>
<td>Begin highway construction</td>
<td>Complete construction</td>
<td>Road open to traffic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further Information

You can find out further information about the Middlewich Eastern Bypass preferred route, including the assessments undertaken to date for the scheme, by visiting www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/middlewicheasternbypass

The website will be updated regularly during scheme’s development and, should the planning application be successful, during construction of the scheme too.

Further copies of this brochure can be collected at:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middlewich Town Hall</th>
<th>Middlewich Library</th>
<th>Middlewich Leisure Centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Building, Lewin Street</td>
<td>Lewin Street</td>
<td>St. Ann’s Walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlewich, Cheshire</td>
<td>Middlewich, Cheshire</td>
<td>Off King Edward Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW10 9AS</td>
<td>CW10 9AS</td>
<td>Middlewich, Cheshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW10 9BU</td>
<td>CW10 9BU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opening Times

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opening Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mon: 10am to 3pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue: Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed-Thurs: 10am to 3pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri-Sun: Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon-Tues: 9.30am to 5pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed: Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs: 9.30am to 5pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri: 9.30am to 5pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat: 9.30am to 1pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun: Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon – Thurs: 9am to 10.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri: 9am to 9.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat-Sun: 9am to 7.30pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON PREFERRED ROUTE

Middlewich Eastern Bypass

Have your say...

www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/middlewicheasternbypass

19 MARCH UNTIL 29 APRIL 2018

Further information

You can find information at
www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/middlewicheasternbypass

By email:
middlewicheasternbypass@cheshireeast.gov.uk

By telephone: 0300 123 5020
Middlewich town centre experiences severe congestion due to its location at the junction of two major roads. Traffic surveys and modelling have shown that the A54 / A533 junction in the centre of Middlewich is over capacity at peak commuting times.

The new Local Plan for Cheshire East identifies Midpoint18 (known as Ma6nitude) as a key employer within the town. Development at this site and elsewhere around Middlewich will unlock new growth, homes and employment opportunities.

Our studies show that the best option to relieve congestion within the town is to build a bypass.

Our objectives for the scheme are to:

- Relieve traffic congestion and reduce road safety concerns in the town centre.
- Help deliver the Local Plan, to create opportunities for new business and employment in Middlewich.
- Help deliver the Local Plan sites for new housing in Middlewich.
- Provide facilities for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Provide suitable access to Cledford Lane and Booth Lane from the bypass.
- Reduce any negative environmental impacts of the scheme.
- Help unlock more development opportunities in the future.

We have received £46.8m towards construction of the scheme from the Department for Transport. The remaining funding (20% of the total) will come from developer contributions and Cheshire East Council.
Cheshire East Council considered a broad range of options to reduce traffic congestion. Our reviews showed that these options performed poorly, when compared to the benefits of a bypass.

An Options Assessment considered 8 potential routes for a bypass.

Each option was compared against key strategic objectives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Total Weighted Score</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>7=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>7=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposed Middlewich Eastern Bypass would be a 50mph, 2.7 km single carriageway running from Holmes Chapel Road (A54) at the Salt-Cellar Roundabout, to Booth Lane south of Middlewich.

Two new roundabouts will be created: one at the junction with Pochin Way and another at the junction with Booth Lane. We propose to create a staggered junction at Cledford Lane. This will improve access for businesses such as the ANSA Depot.

A separate cycleway/footpath would be provided for non-motorised users along the length of the scheme. We will create a footway/cycleway and passing points on Cledford Lane to the west of the bypass.
The preferred option has the following benefits when compared to the alternative option:

- An improved road layout which allows a 50 mph speed limit on the bypass.
- A limited number of junctions to major sites from the bypass, which reduces the traffic flow and safety impacts of turning traffic.
- The creation of a junction with Cledford Lane (allowing traffic from industrial units to avoid the town centre).
- A reduced risk of flooding of the bypass.
- A reduced impact on the floodplains for local watercourses.
- Greater flexibility in the future to upgrade or add to the scheme.
A new roundabout linking the bypass to Pochin Way will be built, approximately 10m east of the existing road. Access to Pochin Way and nearby businesses will be maintained during construction.

Cledford Lane, to the west of the scheme would be moved slightly northwards to create a staggered junction, with a dedicated central right-turning lane. The old section of the lane would be closed to traffic.
Proposed junctions

Roundabout 2 – junction with Booth Lane (A533)

The roundabout would be constructed approximately 100m north of the existing Booth Lane/Tetton Lane junction. Booth Lane traffic would be diverted to the roundabout once complete.

The old section of Booth Lane (dashed line) would be closed to through traffic but retained as access for non-motorised users (NMU) and residential properties.

We will provide a new road with a right turn lane to allow access from the bypass to Tetton Lane.
Environmental factors

We are currently undertaking the surveys and modelling needed for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the scheme.

Some of the key environmental indicators in the EIA are:

**Air quality:** We will complete an air quality assessment. We currently believe that the town centre and nearby residential areas will see an improvement in air quality.

**Noise:** We are monitoring existing noise levels to assess how the scheme affects noise in nearby areas. Where noise levels are predicted to increase, we will investigate noise-reduction measures such as fencing and acoustic barriers.

**Ecology and nature conservation:** We have been undertaking surveys since 2015 and have found protected species including bats, badgers, great crested newts, lesser silver water beetles and barn owls. We will reduce impacts on these species through protection, enhancement and creation of habitats.

**Effects on people and communities (including non-motorised users):** The scheme includes a shared path, including Regional Cycle Route 71 along Cledford Lane. Safe crossing points will be provided where rights of way cross the bypass. New access for farmers and residents will be provided.

**Geology, soils, material resources and waste:** Agricultural soil surveys and ground investigations are being completed, including the effects of historical brine pumping. Construction will require large volumes of material to be brought to site for embankments to the new bridges. Detailed planning and temporary traffic management will minimise the impact associated with this.

**Water environment:** Flood risk modelling and water quality assessments are underway. Additional flood storage areas will be created, if necessary, to ensure there is no increase in flood risk.

The full scope of our environmental assessment is available in the schemes brochure or online at: [www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/middlewicheasternbypass](http://www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/middlewicheasternbypass)
We will analyse your consultation responses to produce a report which will be available on the schemes website: www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/middlewicheasternbypass

Your responses will inform the final scheme design where applicable and practicable.

The indicative timeline for completion of the bypass is shown below:

- **Preferred route consultation**: March / April 2018
- **Submission of planning application**: Summer 2018
- **Commence advance environmental works on site**: Spring 2019
- **Begin highway construction**: Summer 2020
- **Complete construction**: Autumn 2021
- **Road open to traffic**: End of 2021
How to respond

You can provide your responses on the scheme through:

- **Exhibition:** filling out our questionnaire
- **Online:** [www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/middlewicheasternbypass](http://www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/middlewicheasternbypass)
- **Email:** middlewicheasternbypass@cheshireeast.gov.uk
- **Post your response using the free-post address:**
  FREEPOST RTUK – RBLY – XUBT,
  Middlewich Eastern Bypass,
  5 First Street, Manchester, M15 4GU

Comments can be made between:

19 March 2018 and 11:59pm on 29 April 2018.
Appendix C – Middlewich Eastern Bypass Feedback Form
Introduction

Purpose of this exercise

Cheshire East Council is seeking your views on our proposals for a Middlewich Eastern Bypass, which would pass to the east of Middlewich, between Holmes Chapel Road (A54) at the Salt-Cellar Roundabout, and Booth Lane.

You can find out more about the scheme by visiting the website at www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/middlewicheasternbypass. Your feedback on our proposal for the Middlewich Eastern Bypass will be analysed and used to inform the final design where applicable and practical. We will also produce a report which will be submitted as part of the planning application.

Submitting your comments

Please submit your comments by **11.59pm Sunday 29th April 2018**. You can give your feedback either by:

- Filling out this paper survey and returning it to FREEPOST RTUK-RBLY-XUBT, Middlewich Eastern Bypass, 5 First Street, Manchester, M15 4GU
- Visiting www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/middlewicheasternbypass and filling out this survey online
- Emailing middlewicheasternbypass@cheshireeast.gov.uk with your comments.

Contact us

For any queries about this consultation please contact Customer Services on 0300 123 50 20.

Your confidentiality is assured

Any personal information you supply will remain strictly confidential and will be held and used in line with the Data Protection Act 1998. The information you provide will be used for statistical analysis, management, planning and the provision of services by Cheshire East Council and its partners. We will not pass on your personal information to any third parties.

Section 1 – How you are responding to this consultation

1. Are you responding to this consultation as an individual, or on behalf of an organisation, group or club? Please tick one box only

   As an individual  [ ]  On behalf of an organisation, group or club  [ ]
2. If you are responding on behalf of an organisation, please name the organisation, your role within it and how the views of members were gathered: Please write in below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your role within the organisation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How the views of members of the organisation were gathered:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. What is your postcode? Please fill this in clearly and accurately, so that we can understand where people are responding from Please write in below

4. Did you visit one of our exhibitions before completing this questionnaire? Please tick one box only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 2 – Your views on a Middlewich Eastern Bypass

5. How strongly do you agree or disagree that Middlewich needs a bypass? Please tick one box only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Tend to agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Tend to disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Not sure / Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. If you wish to, please give reasons for your answer to question 5: Please write in below

7. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the council’s proposals for the Middlewich Eastern Bypass? Please tick one box only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Tend to agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Tend to disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Not sure / Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. If you wish to, please give reasons for your answer to question 7: Please write in below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Tend to agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Tend to disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relieve traffic congestion in the town centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce road safety concerns in the town centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help deliver Local Plan commitments for new housing in Middlewich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help to create opportunities for new business and employment in Middlewich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help deliver future development opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide suitable access to Cledford Lane and Booth Lane from the bypass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise impacts of the scheme on the local environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide facilities for pedestrians and cyclists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 3 – Proposed objectives

9. How strongly do you agree or disagree that our proposal will deliver each of the following objectives? Please tick one box only in each row

10. If you wish to, please give reasons for your answers to question 9: Please write in below
### Section 4 – Proposals for junctions

#### 11. How strongly do you agree or disagree with our proposals for each of the following junctions?

*Please tick one box only in each row*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Junction Description</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Tend to agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Tend to disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roundabout 1 joining Pochin Way with the bypass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you wish to, please give your reasons for this answer:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cledford Lane Junction crossing the bypass west of Kinderton Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you wish to, please give your reasons for this answer:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundabout 3 linking Booth Lane (A533) with the bypass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you wish to, please give your reasons for this answer:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 5 – Other comments

12. How strongly do you agree or disagree that our proposed environmental impact assessment covers all relevant topics? *Please tick one box only*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Tend to agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Tend to disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Not sure / Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. If you wish to, please give reasons for your answer to question 12: *Please write in below*

14. How strongly do you agree or disagree with our proposal for pedestrian and cyclist provision for the Middlewich Eastern Bypass? *Please tick one box only*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Tend to agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Tend to disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Not sure / Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. If you wish to, please give reasons for your answer to question 14: *Please write in below*

16. Are there any other comments you would like to make about our proposal? *Please write in below*
### Section 6 – Your travel in Middlewich

17. **How do you usually travel into or through Middlewich? Please tick all that apply**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Ticked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a car/van as the driver</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a car/van as a passenger</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In an HGV</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On a bus</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On a motorcycle</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please write in)</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On foot</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On a bicycle</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On a horse</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t travel into or through Middlewich</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. **Why do you usually travel into or through Middlewich? Please tick all that apply**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Ticked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I live in the local area</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work/study in the local area</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I visit the local and/or town centre shops</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use the health and social care facilities</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please write in)</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use the local leisure facilities, for example Middlewich Leisure Centre or library</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t live in the local area but travel into or through Middlewich to get to work</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t live in the local area but travel into or through Middlewich on business</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. **How often do you travel into or through Middlewich? Please tick one box only**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Ticked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least five days a week</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or four times a week</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once or twice a week</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once or twice a month</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once or twice a year</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less often than once a year</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 7 – About you

Cheshire East Council is committed to the principle that all our customers have the right to equality and fairness in the way they are treated and in the services that they receive. It would help us to check that we
are providing services fairly if you would answer the questions below. Information you give will be used to see if there are any differences in views for different groups of people, and to check if services are being delivered in a fair and accessible way. The information in this section will be used for no other purpose. We will follow our Data Protection Act guidelines to keep your information secure and confidential.

You do not need to answer any of the following questions if you do not wish to, and you will not be affected in any way if you choose not to answer any, or some, of the questions.

20. What age group do you belong to? Please tick one box only

- 18 - 24
- 25 - 34
- 35 - 44
- 45 - 54
- 55 - 64
- 65 - 74
- 75 - 84
- 85 and over
- Prefer not to say

21. What is your gender identity? Please tick one box only

- Male
- Female
- Prefer not to say
- Other (please write in)

22. What is your ethnic origin? Please tick one box only

- White English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/ Irish
- Black/African/Caribbean/Black British
- Any other white background
- Other Ethnic group
- Mixed: White and Black Caribbean / African / Asian
- Prefer not to say
- Any other mixed / Multiple background
- Other (please write in below)

23. If you are a woman, are you pregnant, on maternity leave or returning from maternity leave? Please tick one box only

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to say
- Not applicable

24. Are your day-to-day activities limited because of a health problem or disability which has lasted, or is expected to last, at least 12 months? Please tick one box only

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to say

25. Which of the following best describes your religious belief/faith? Please tick one box only

- Buddhist
- Christian
- Hindu
- Jewish
- Muslim
- Sikh
- None
- Other
- Prefer not to say

Thank you for completing this survey. If you require a copy in larger print please contact the council’s customer services on 0300 123 50 32.
Appendix D – Middlewich Eastern Bypass Engagement Area
News Release

14 March 2018

Public to have their say on plans for Middlewich Bypass

A six-week consultation will take place to get the public’s feedback on the preferred route for the Middlewich Eastern Bypass.

The scheme would, if approved, unlock key sites for housing and employment.

As part of the consultation, which begins on Monday 19 March, Cheshire East Council will also host three public engagement events, where the project team will be available to discuss the options and answer any questions.

The team will be keen to hear people’s views and any suggestions they may have for improving the project, which is intended to relieve the town of serious traffic congestion while also unlocking land for new homes and employment sites.

Completion of the road will be the realisation of a long-standing ambition to remove heavy through traffic from the narrow streets of the town centre.

A consultation brochure will be available at the events, at Middlewich Town Hall, the public library and the town’s leisure centre during normal opening hours. It can also be viewed online when the consultation opens.

The council secured £46.8m government funding for the £58m scheme, successfully competing against funding bids for similar projects in other parts of the country. The balance would be met from the council’s capital budget and from developer contributions.

Cheshire East Council proposes the construction of a 2.7km, 50mph, single carriageway from the Salt Cellar Roundabout, on the A54 to Booth Lane, to the south of Middlewich. It is hoped to see construction begin in 2020, with completion around the end of 2021.

The project will be subject to the normal planning process. The road would incorporate a cycleway and footway and a limited number of junctions to strategic sites, including improved access to the new waste transfer station at Cledford Lane.

Following a number of studies and surveys, the council is now in a position to make its preferred option available for public viewing. All comments and feedback received will help to refine the final scheme, which would be put before a planning committee in the summer of 2018.

Constructing the bypass would unlock key development sites that would have the potential to create 1,160 new homes and up to 6,500 new jobs.

Sean Hannaby, Cheshire East Council director of planning and environment, said: “Middlewich town
centre suffers from severe traffic congestion due to the growth in heavy vehicle traffic using the A54 and A533, which meet in the town centre.

“We are fully aware of the disruption and inconvenience suffered by residents and businesses in Middlewich as a result of this long-standing issue, which has been worsening over many years.

“Cheshire East Council is determined to address this problem through a bypass option to the east of the town and we would like the views and feedback of as many people as possible in order to arrive at a scheme that the council, local residents and the businesses of this busy town.

“A proposal for a Middlewich Eastern Bypass is included in the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy and the Cheshire East Local Transport Plan. The former Cheshire County Council secured initial planning permission for a scheme in the 1990s but, unfortunately, financial constraints halted its progress.”

Various surveys and assessments are already underway, including air quality, noise, ground investigations, ecological impacts and flood-risk planning.

The consultation period runs for six weeks starting 19 March 2018 and closing at midnight on 29 April. Any comments received before or after these dates will not be included in the consultation process.

Supporting information

Three public engagement events will take place at St Mary’s Church Hall, 2 King Street, Middlewich on:

- Wednesday 28 March 2018 (2pm–8pm)
- Saturday 14 April 2018 (10am–3pm)
- Thursday 19 April 2018 (2pm–8pm)

Members of the public can respond to the consultation at: www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/middlewicheasternbypass or email middlewicheasternbypass@cheshireeast.gov.uk

Or by post at FREEPOST RTUK-RBLY-XUBT, Middlewich Eastern Bypass, 5 First Street, Manchester, M15 4GU.

All responses must be received by no later than 11.59pm on 29 April 2018.
Appendix F – Demographic Profile

Demographic profile for the 454 respondents submitting paper and online responses.

What is your gender identity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender identity</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not answered</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>454</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What age group do you belong?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 and over</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not answered</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>454</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are your day-to-day activities limited because of a health problem or disability which has lasted, or is expected to last, at least 12 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability or health problem</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not answered</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>454</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is your ethnic origin?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic origin</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White English</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other white background</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other mixed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ethnic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not answered</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>454</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G – Paper and online coded responses

This section contains the breakdown of other responses to Questions 6, 8, 10, 11 a, 11b, 11c, 13, 15 and 16 which have not been mentioned in the body of the report as they fall outside of the top three themes for each question.

Question 6: Comments regarding why respondents agree or disagree with the need for a bypass

Other comments mentioned related to traffic include:
- Issues relating to through-town traffic (mentioned by 10 respondents)
- Traffic increasing (mentioned by 9 respondents)
- Issues relating to traffic delays (mentioned by 9 respondents)
- Issues relating to town centre traffic (mentioned by 8 respondents)
- Queuing traffic (mentioned by 7 respondents)
- New housing worsens traffic (mentioned by 7 respondents)
- Issues relating to ANSA traffic (mentioned by 7 respondents)
- Issues relating to Lewin Street (mentioned by 6 respondents)
- Infrastructure can’t cope with traffic levels (mentioned by 6 respondents)
- Issues relating to King Street (mentioned by 5 respondents)
- Traffic at all times/days (mentioned by 4 respondents)
- Rat running (mentioned by 4 respondents)
- Middlewich bottleneck (mentioned by 4 respondents)
- Issues relating to heavy traffic (mentioned by 4 respondents)
- Issues relating to Booth Lane (mentioned by 4 respondents)
- Issues relating to excessive traffic (mentioned by 3 respondents)
- A54 Traffic (mentioned by 3 respondents)
- Traffic other (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Traffic impacts local businesses (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Traffic at off peak periods (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Sandbach to Winsford traffic (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Issues relating to St Michaels Way (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Issues relating to Leadsmithy Street (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Duration of traffic (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Winsford traffic (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Wasted time for commuters (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Traffic calming measures - Booth Lane (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Sproston to Middlewich traffic (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Little through traffic in town (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Due to traffic alternative routes need to be taken (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Difficulty exiting Ashfield Street due to traffic (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Bostock traffic (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Actions by CEC has led to unacceptable traffic levels (mentioned by 1 respondent)

Other comments mentioned under ‘general’ include:
- Middlewich wasn’t built for this kind of traffic (mentioned by 7 respondents)
- Solution needed (mentioned by 6 respondents)
- Traffic in Middlewich needs to be reduced (mentioned by 3 respondents)
- Growing population (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Middlewich is unsuitable for HGVs (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Situation results in people avoiding Middlewich (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Traffic has been an issue for years (mentioned by 2 respondents)
Middlewich is growing and developing (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Scheme not needed (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Current situation insufficient (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Middlewich is a small town (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Increased number of vehicles per household (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Middlewich has a reputation for traffic (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Avoid town due to traffic (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Unsure of effectiveness (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Bypass will make Middlewich more attractive (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Traffic is reducing quality of life (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Reduce HGVs in Middlewich (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Delay in scheme completion (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Congestion needs addressing (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- General other (mentioned by 1 respondent)

Other comments mentioned in relation to congestion include:
- Issues relating to Lewin Street (mentioned by 7 respondents)
- Peak time congestion (mentioned by 5 respondents)
- Congestion throughout day (mentioned by 5 respondents)
- Issues relating to Booth Lane (mentioned by 3 respondents)
- Issues relating to A54 (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Issues relating to Holmes Chapel Road (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Congestion increasing (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Congestion other (mentioned by 1 respondent)

Question 8: Comments regarding why respondents agree or disagree with the Council’s proposals for the Middlewich Eastern Bypass.

Other comments under ‘general’ include:
- Comments relating to bypass not being located in the correct place – unspecified - mentioned by 4 respondents
- Bypass location will not solve problems – mentioned by 2 respondents
- Situation has changed since original plans - mentioned by 2 respondents
- General comment: Bypass only benefits businesses - mentioned by 1 respondent
- Bypass is for the benefit of ANSA traffic only - mentioned by 1 respondent
- Other local towns have a bypass - mentioned by 1 respondents
- Not in agreement with the creation of an additional bridge over the canal - mentioned by 1 respondent
- Current traffic levels do not warrant a bypass - mentioned by 1 respondent

Other comments mentioned relating to the positive impact of the scheme include:
- Scheme provides improved route to M6 Junction 18 – mentioned by 2 respondents
- Bypass will save roads / bridges from wear and tear - mentioned by 2 respondents
- Bypass will make it easier to travel in general – mentioned by 1 respondent
- Bypass eliminates need to go through Holmes Chapel - mentioned by 1 respondent
- Bypass eliminates need to go through Sandbach – mentioned by 1 respondent
- Bypass will support M6 traffic – mentioned by 1 respondent
- Bypass will not impact businesses - mentioned by 1 respondent
- Other - mentioned by 3 respondents
Other comments mentioned falling under recommended route limitations include:

- Scheme does not address the Crewe traffic (Including A530) – mentioned by 4 respondents
- Scheme does not address local traffic issues - road specified – mentioned by 3 respondents
- Scheme does not address traffic to Northwich – A533 – mentioned by 3 respondents
- Scheme does not address traffic from M6 to Middlewich – mentioned by 3 respondents
- Scheme only addresses Middlewich to Sandbach traffic – mentioned by 3 respondents
- Scheme does not address traffic to Nantwich – mentioned by 2 respondents
- Bypass design – dual carriageway more sustainable than single carriageway – mentioned by 1 respondent
- Scheme does not address traffic to Chester – mentioned by 1 respondent
- Other - mentioned by 2 respondents

**Question 10: Comments regarding how strongly respondents agree or disagree that the proposals will deliver each of the following objectives:**

- Relieve traffic congestion in the town centre
- Reduce road safety concerns in the town centre
- Help deliver Local Plan commitments for new housing in Middlewich
- Help to create opportunities for new business and employment in Middlewich
- Help deliver future development opportunities
- Provide suitable access to Cledford Lane and Booth Lane from bypass

Other comments mentioned relating to the **recommended route limitations**:

- Only addresses 30% of traffic / 70% of traffic will not use the bypass – mentioned by 3 respondents
- Scheme does not account for future traffic- mentioned by 3 respondents
- Scheme does not address traffic going to Chester – mentioned by 2 respondents
- Concern regarding single lane carriageway -mentioned by 2 respondents
- Scheme does not address Crewe traffic - mentioned by 2 respondents
- Scheme does not address ANSA HGV traffic - mentioned by 2 respondents
- Scheme does not address traffic to Winsford Industrial Estates - mentioned by 1 respondent
- Scheme does not address Winsford to Sandbach traffic – mentioned by 1 respondent
- Scheme does not address East-West traffic – mentioned by 1 respondent
- Scheme does not address traffic going to Nantwich – mentioned by 1 respondent
- Scheme does not address A54 traffic – mentioned by 1 respondent
- Other – mentioned by 1 respondent.

**Other comments mentioned include:**

- Negative impact of housing developments on highways – (mentioned by 3 respondents)
- Poor condition of existing roads – (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Need for new future developments / regeneration – (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Comments regarding the population size of Middlewich - (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Inadequate parking at schools - (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Not enough new houses - (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Traveller sites place stress on current infrastructure (schools, doctors) - (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Poor existing road conditions damaging vehicles - (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Inadequate disabled parking spaces - (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Object to waste site being built - (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Other - (mentioned by 4 respondents).

Other general comments mentioned:
- Other (mentioned by 4 respondents)
- Bypass needed to address current demand (mentioned by 3 respondents)
- Other towns have a bypass (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Too many new roads (mentioned by 1 respondent)

Other comments mentioned relating to the positive impacts include:
- Bypass will reduce congestion (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Improve quality of life in Middlewich (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Impact of bypass on economy (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Improve existing road conditions (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Reduce HGVs in town / supports traffic going to industrial area (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Scheme will improve Middlewich (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Help with safety concerns associated with HGVs on narrow roads (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Bypass supports traffic going to Sandbach (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Other (mentioned by 1 respondent).

Question 11a. Comments regarding how strongly respondents agree or disagree with the proposals for Roundabout 1

Other comments mentioned regarding junctions include:
- Traffic from retail park to town centre (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Early exit from town centre (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Junction will back up traffic coming into town (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Slow traffic joining the bypass (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Junction is positioned where congestion starts (mentioned by 1 respondent).

Other comments mentioned relating to junction design include:
- Should use original plans (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Control lights needed (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- With this design, traffic from M6 assumes priority doesn't give way (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Make junction wider at access (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Needs improved crossings (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Access roads will cause congestion (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Roundabout needs investment (mentioned by 1 respondent).
Other comments mentioned in relation to route other include:

- Divert traffic at the M6 (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Bypass is already in an industrial area (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Bypass needs to start further up Holmes Chapel Road (mentioned by 1 respondent).

**Question 11b. Comments regarding how strongly respondents agree or disagree with the proposals for the Cledford Lane junction**

Other comments regarding the theme junction include:

- Divert ANSA traffic from Booth Lane (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Kinderton Park concerns (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Insufficient junction (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Junction could cause traffic problems (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Would not be required if waste management company was not there (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Cause bottleneck on Booth Lane (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- If accident occurs bypass would be shut (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Junction should be located nearer to the railway on Cledford Lane (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Delays at the junction (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Disappointed to find that not all vehicles from waste site can use this road (mentioned by 1 respondent)

Other comments mentioned regarding junction design include:

- Junction for Cledford Lane should be south (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Don't like right and left turn design to continue on Cledford Lane (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Design causes congestion to/from Cledford Lane (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Long wait to turn right (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Dedicated right hand turning (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Stagger appears the wrong way (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Passing bays seems to be downgrading (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Must not be a roundabout (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Filter lanes for turning into and out of Cledford Lane (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Signs and restrictions needed (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Staggered Junctions create difficulties at peak times (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Right turn lane needs to be long enough for 2 HGVs (mentioned by 1 respondent)

Other comments mentioned regarding safety include:

- Staggered junctions increase accidents (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Dangerous point where lorries leave bypass (mentioned by 1 respondent)

**Question 11c. Comments regarding how strongly respondents agree or disagree with the proposals for Roundabout 2**

Other comments regarding the theme junction mentioned include:
- Not required (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Slow traffic from Sandbach (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Increased noise (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Place roundabout on existing road (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Create through traffic (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Comments that disagree with proposed junction (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Travellers Site (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Junction concerns to Booth Lane (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Can’t see any alternative (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Less congestion than traffic lights (mentioned by 1 respondent)

Other comments mentioned relating to **Tetton Lane** include:

- Tetton Lane Bridge (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Tetton Lane unsuitable for HGVs/Lorries (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Rat running (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Small, country road (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Tetton Lane is dangerous (mentioned by 1 respondent)

Other comments mentioned relating to **benefits** include:

- Cuts out Middlewich (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Helps M6 issues (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Separates local and through traffic (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Away from town centre (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Reduce HGV traffic on narrow roads (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Tidy up the southern approach to Middlewich (mentioned by 1 respondent)

**Question 13:** Comments regarding why respondents agree or disagree that the Environmental Impact Assessment covers all topics

Other comments mentioned relating to the **environment** include:

- Validity and quality of EIA (mentioned by 5 respondents)
- Structural integrity of canal (mentioned by 3 respondents)
- Environmental Impact Assessment – Canal (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Environment pollution (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Other (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Destroying the countryside (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Environmental impacts on Sandbach (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Pollution will be moved not reduced (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Light pollution (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Environmental impacts need to be given higher priority (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- More tree planting needed (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- EIA scope (mentioned by 1 respondent)

Other comments mentioned relating to the **consultation** include:

- Not an evidence based proposal (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Limitations of proposals (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- CEC will build the bypass regardless of a consultation (mentioned by 1 respondent)
Question 15: Comments regarding why respondents agree or disagree with the pedestrian and cyclist provision.

Other comments mentioned relating to the cycling and pedestrian provision include:

- Plan is unclear (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Plan should be based on the Dutch system (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Usefulness of provisions (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Pedestrian Crossings (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Improved cycling experience in Middlewich (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Waste of time (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- The bypass should be used by the cars and lorries causing congestion (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- A combined foot/cycle path should be a last resort (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Provision along the whole bypass (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- This may encourage people to enjoy the countryside (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- More people may choose to cycle to work (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Plan is insufficient (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Provisions for disabled users (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Should link to waterway corridor (mentioned by 1 respondent)

Other comments regarding the **design of cyclist / pedestrian provisions** include:

- Clearly marked (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- One side of the road is adequate (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Crossing at Cleford Lane should be an island (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Cyclists should not be sharing the road with vehicles (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Give cyclists priority at junctions (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- This design means a lot of crossing is required (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Vulnerability for pedestrians on the shared design (mentioned by 1 respondent)

Question 16: Final comments from respondents regarding the proposals.

Other comments mentioned include:

- Timescale to construct bypass is too long (mentioned by 7 respondents)
- General comments regarding bypass being in the wrong place (mentioned by 3 respondents)
- Considering moving away from Middlewich if bypass does not go ahead (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Currently not safe travelling through Middlewich (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Disruption associated with construction of bypass (mentioned by 1 respondent)
Comments mentioned relating to other routes include:

- Support for Option 5 (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Bypass needed from M6 to Winsford (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Northern bypass needed (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Western bypass needed (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Connect Brookes Lane to the bypass to remove HGVs from town centre (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Ring road is needed (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Bypass onto Nantwich Road needed (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Option 6 needed (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Comments regarding southern phase of bypass (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Should be a dual carriageway from M6 roundabout (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Bypass around Sandbach to Junction 17 should also be considered (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Need to link Mid Point 18 roundabout to Winsford Industrial Estate (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- British Salt need a link on to the bypass (mentioned by 1 respondent)

Other comments mentioned recommended route limitations are as follows:

- Traffic going east-west not considered (mentioned by 3 respondents)
- Traffic going to Crewe not considered (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Traffic going to Nantwich not considered (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Traffic to Chester not considered (mentioned by 2 respondents)
- Layby needed on bypass (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Bypass only deals with 30% of traffic / limitations of bypass (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Capacity of bypass to cope with cars increase in traffic caused by M6 closures (mentioned by 1 respondent)
- Traffic going to Northwich not considered (mentioned by 1 respondent)