Introduction

Background and Methodology

Between 14 March and 12 April 2018 Cheshire East Council conducted a survey as part of the ‘Issues and Options’ phase of refreshing the South East Manchester Multi-Model Strategy (SEMMS Strategy) to gather views on the key issues affecting transport in the SEMMM Strategy area of Cheshire East shown to the right and the possible options to improve how people travel.

The survey was advertised through a press release, communication to Town / Parish Councils and on the Cheshire East Website. A drop in event was also held in Poynton on Tuesday 27th March 2018 for stakeholder to speak with staff about the SEMMM Strategy.

In total 56 completed questionnaires were returned either via paper or through the online survey link. In addition, 6 e-mail/ letter responses were received. These can be seen in appendix two.

Respondents were asked to read through the draft SEMMS Issues and options paper for Cheshire East before answering the questions. All questions asked were open comment questions. This report summarises and groups the open comments received into themes. Verbatim/ specific comments have been sent to the relevant department to ensure that they feed directly into the revised strategy.
Analysis of Results

A total of 54 respondents left a valid comment for Q1a. The top two key issues identified were concerning traffic congestion/roads not built for capacity or HGVs (referred 32 times) and a need for better public transport links in particular to Manchester airport, to and from Manchester Town Centre, from East to West and to rural areas (referred 21 times).

The other key issues identified are shown in the table below; many of the issues identified interrelate to the top issues mentioned above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic congestion/roads not built for capacity or HGVs</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require better public transport links to and from Manchester airport, Manchester Town Centre from East to West, to rural areas</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor air quality/ carbon emissions/ noise pollution</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More frequent public services (train &amp; bus) / longer trains</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking issues/ more affordable parking needed at stations and town centres</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transport too expensive</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many roadworks causing delays/ complete roadworks quicker &amp; without delay</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much house building without infrastructure to support</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Maintenance Inc. potholes/ flooding</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling networks – expand and/ or widen</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other key issue</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of references</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A total of 56 respondents left a valid comment for Q1b. The top two improvements mentioned were more frequent public services (train & bus) / longer trains (referenced 20 times) and a requirement for better public transport links to Manchester airport, to and from Manchester Town Centre, from East to West and to rural areas (referenced 20 times).

The other improvements mentioned are shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More frequent public services (train &amp; bus) / longer trains</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require better public transport links to and from Manchester airport, Manchester Town Centre, from East to West, in rural areas</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific improvement to road mentioned/ suggested (e.g. A34, A538, A537, A523)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher quality/ better maintained infrastructure - requires more funding/ investment</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous/ direct/ safe cycle routes &amp; wider cycle lanes</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking issues/ more parking required near town centres and/ or train stations/ park and ride</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transport too expensive/ reduce cost of public transport/ provide free buses from stations into towns/ free local community buses</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand metro link into CE</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make buses more convenient/ desirable - e.g. contactless payments/ smartcards/ USB charging / better access for disabled</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic congestion/ poor air quality/ pollution/ safety concerns</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More co-ordination on roadworks/ faster completion</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage cycle to work &amp; school / lift share schemes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No more house developments in already overflowing areas/ no more until measures put in place</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once A6/MARR is complete redirect HGV's / through traffic onto this route</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other improvement</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of references</strong></td>
<td><strong>130</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A total of 49 respondents left a valid comment for Q2. The top two priorities mentioned were a requirement for better and/or more frequent public transport/consider a metro link/ need better public transport links to Manchester airport, to and from Manchester, Town Centre from East to West, in rural areas (referenced 17 times) and a need for infrastructure to be put in place before any new developments occur (referenced 10 times).

The other priorities mentioned are shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Require better and/or more frequent public transport/consider a metro</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>link/ need better public transport links to and from Manchester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>airport, Manchester Town Centre from East to West, to rural areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure needs to be put in place before any new developments</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider &amp; safer footpaths and cycle paths / more cycle paths linking</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to key employment and rail sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less traffic congestion</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality and/ or noise pollution concerns/ introduce traffic calming</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No more large developments/too much developments impacting greenbelt</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require more parking near town centres and/or train stations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage people to walk/ cycle instead of using cars</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better maintained/ safer roads and footpaths</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make railways more accessible to disabled/ those with pushchairs/</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mobility scooters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete planned roadworks quicker &amp; without delay</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions viable - could be funded using a mixture of sources Inc.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 106 funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other priority</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of references</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A total of 41 respondents left a valid comment for Q3. The top two other comments mentioned were improve infrastructure/ infrastructure needs to be in place before any further developments take place (referenced 15 times) and transport too expensive/ not enough bus routes/ public transport needs to be frequent and punctual/ better transport links (referenced 14 times).

The other comments received are shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve infrastructure / infrastructure needs to be in place before any further developments take place</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport too expensive/ not enough bus routes / public transport needs to be frequent and punctual/ better transport links required</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking issues/ need more parking near town centres/ rail stations/ park &amp; ride</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road maintenance/ too many roadworks - not co-ordinated/ take to long to complete</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic congestion</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage people to walk/ cycle to work school etc./ pedestrianised areas / make cycle lanes safer</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality/ pollution concerns/ traffic calming measures</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of references</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Demographics**

The majority of respondents were male, 38 (70%) compared to 12 (22%) female respondents. Respondents were more likely to be aged between 55 and 74, 24 (44%) respondents or aged between 35 and 54, 17 respondents (31%). 3 respondents (5%) stated that they had a long term limiting illness/ disability that limited their day to day activities is some way. Full demographic tables can be seen in appendix one.
Summary and conclusions

In total 56 completed questionnaires were returned either via paper or through the online survey link. All questions asked were open comment questions which have been grouped into themes for the purpose of this summary report. Verbatim/ specific comments have been sent to the relevant department to ensure that they feed directly into the revised strategy.

The key issues, improvements and/or priorities for respondents for the SEMMM area can be categorised into four top level themes:

1. **Traffic congestion**; this includes those concerned that roads are not built for capacity or the weight of HGVs. Comments concerning poor air quality/ noise pollution and those stating there are many roadworks/ roadworks need to be co-ordinated/ take less time to complete are also closely related to this top level theme.

2. **Improved public transport**; this includes those requesting more frequent, affordable, convenient, desirable & accessible public transport. It also includes those stating that there is a requirement for better transport links especially to and from Manchester airport, Manchester, Town Centre from East to West and in rural areas.

3. **Investment in infrastructure**; this includes comments requesting an improvement/ more investment in infrastructure and those stating that infrastructure needs to be in place before any further developments take place.

4. **Other**; this includes comments received regarding parking issues especially near railways and at town centres, a need for better maintained/ safer cycling & walking routes and encouraging people to walk/ cycle instead of using cars.

Next steps

The information gained from this exercise has been used to inform the draft SEMMM Strategy which will be consulted on in full as part of the next phase of the project.
## Appendix One – Respondent Demographics

### Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Age Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White British / English / Welsh / Scottish / Northern Irish / Irish</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other White background</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian / Asian British</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Disability/ long term limiting illness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability/ long term limiting illness</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Religion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix Two – Email & Letter Responses

SEMIMM Strategy Refresh 2020

The comments below are submitted on behalf of the Butley Town, Ashtree Close, Lincombe Hey, and London Road, Prestbury Community, by the following five representatives of the community:

Mr G J Leary, Engr, AMICE, MCIHT; Dr D C Stubbings, MA, PhD; Mr Guy Rigby, BSc (Eng) (Hons) AICG; Mrs C G Pickering; Mr A Jones; Mr G R. Broadhead

Cheshire East Transport Issues and Options Paper

The SEMIMM strategy must adopt a co-ordinated and balanced approach to the transport issues in the north of the Borough if it is to be successful. It is essential that Macclesfield has excellent links to the major transport network to the north, to gain access to Greater Manchester, the “Northern Power House” Initiative, Manchester Airport, HS2; the docks at Liverpool and the east coast, and not to forget the implications of BREXIT.

The major changes to the highway network currently under construction and those proposed for Paynton and Stockport Bypasses will both create opportunity for better links to the north but will significantly increase traffic on the A523 as indicated in the Jacobs analysis of the likely impact of the Paynton Bypass proposal.

Improvements to public transport, whilst these are supported and must form part of any co-ordinated strategy, will have only a marginal effect in reducing vehicular traffic on the A523, in particular on the length of the A523 between Bons Hall Lane and The Silk Road. Cheshire East Council predicts that this section of road will carry some 32000 vehicles per day on the opening of the Paynton Bypass increasing to 40700 vpd in 2032 i.e. only half way into the 20 years of the proposed SEMIMM refresh strategy. These figures show a 23.4% and 70% increase over the 2009 base year flow of 23900 vpd; this on a road approximately 6 metres wide at its narrowest with a design capacity of some 15000 vpd and which provides significant access to domestic property and two farms.

It is important to note that in the Jacobs report commissioned by Cheshire East, the predicted traffic increase ignored the impact of Manchester Airport planned growth in passenger traffic from 25 million to 45 million passengers; the impact of the Airport City development, and the proposed A6 Stockport Bypass.

These developments in addition to the above will cause a significant increase in traffic growth along the A523.

The provision of the Stockport Bypass linking the M60 to the A555, together with the Cheshire East proposals to improve the highway network between Macclesfield and Crewe and those around Macclesfield town centre will provide a very attractive alternative route between the M60 and the M56 and, to Stoke/Derby and the M1 avoiding the congested M60/M56 link leading to further significant increased traffic on the A523.

Public transport improvements will only marginally reduce traffic since, for example, a doubling of the patronage of Macclesfield railway station from 1.6 million users to 3.2 million users per annum, i.e. an increase averaging approximately 5,000 users per day, would be both costly and difficult to achieve. Even if it is assumed that a large proportion of these users will have a direct impact on the A523 this will at best reduce predicted traffic to some 37000 vpd ignoring the above omissions from the Jacobs report.

Public transport improvements will have no impact on the commercial vehicle, van and business trips, which must form a substantial proportion of trips.

It is essential therefore that the A523, in particular between Bons Hall Lane and The Silk Road which section carries the highest volume of traffic along the route south of Paynton to the Silk Road, is improved “off line” to safely carry these predicted increased traffic in traffic and safely serve the local Butley Town, Ashtree Close, Lincombe Hey, and London Road community. The consultation document does not recognise the danger on this section of road. It highlights congestion north of Paynton, caused by A555 construction works and the premature construction of the Paynton “Shared Space Scheme”. The report prescribes local junction improvements on the A523 with the possibility of longer term “off line” bypass to address issues south of Paynton. The previously proposed junction improvement scheme for the Bons Hall Lane junction will undoubtedly improve flows on the A523, increasing speed and volume of flow to the detriment of the Butley Town/London Road community. The proposal for improvement of the Well Lane junction will simply replicate the existing junction at Prestbury Lane which has a poor accident record, and will not improve access for the community. Both proposals take no account of the junctions at Ashtree Close and Lincombe Hey.

An “off line” bypass of London Road between Bons Hall Lane and The Silk Road must be included in the SEMIMM Refresh for the strategy to have credibility and to successfully address the traffic capacity and access issues along this section of the existing road.

Response from: Butley Town, Ashtree Close, Lincombe Hey and London Road, Prestbury Community
From reports and statistics we have read we understand that eventually a new off-line will have to be built in the not too distant future so... why waste money altering road junctions and the like when eventually a new road will have to be built whereby if you design a system now that will last but do it once and do it right.

Response from: Local residents
Poynton Town Council’s response to the SEMMMS consultation, April 2018.

SEMMS Issues and Options Paper

1 The refreshed SEMMMS strategy will be looking at all aspects of transport provision in the area.

What are the key issues for transport in the Cheshire East part of the SEMMMS strategy area?

- Traffic congestion, air and noise pollution, poor public transport and delays to the A598 and Poynton Relief Road schemes.

Traffic Congestion

Cheshire East and neighbouring authorities are allowing significant development in the Green Belt without commensurate infrastructure improvements. The Town Council and residents have consistently expressed their concerns which have been ignored by Cheshire East Council and the Cheshire East Local Plan Planning Inspector, Mr Stephen Pratt.

Air and Noise Pollution

Cheshire East Council refuse to carry out adequate air quality monitoring in Poynton. Recent research in the Lancet

http://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(16)30399-9/fulltext

suggests that living near busy roads can increase the incidence of dementia. While the mechanisms that cause this are still unclear, they could include noxious exhaust gases, particulates from exhaust (especially diesel) and continuous low-level noise.

Each new house in Cheshire East will put at least two more cars on the road, with inevitable increases in pollution.

Poor Public Transport

Few if any new roads are planned and most new developments are far from railway stations and often with no bus routes nearby. At the development in Woodford Garden Village, which is in Stockport, but bordering Cheshire East, no buses pass the site and it is too far to walk to Poynton or Bramhall railway stations. In addition, bus services have been cut including the loss of the local bus service (196) connecting Poynton to Bramhall.

Delays to schemes

There have been significant delays to the construction of the A598. The Poynton Bypass was first proposed in 1948 but half the scheme is still only half built and is continuing administrative delays with the Poynton Relief Road.

b) And what do you think should be done to improve things across all types of transport in this area?

The Town Council would refer you to the comprehensive Movement Study undertaken as part of the Neighbourhood Plan process which identifies several improvements which could be made in Poynton.

2. We believe that new developments should contribute towards extra infrastructure, to make sure they are safe and sustainable. What are the priorities for your community?

There are currently three housing land sites allocated in the recently adopted Cheshire East Local Plan. These allocations account for 450 new homes, though total number of new homes to be allocated in the study area will increase to 650.

In addition to allocated housing provision it is proposed that there is an increase in employment land at Adlington Business Park. This will be delivered through an extension of the existing business park to provide around 10 hectares of additional employment land. This is some way from most local housing with no bus service, travel to the site will overwhelmingly be by car.

For each of the three strategic sites the local plan stated that there should be: “Pedestrian and cycle links to new and existing residential areas, employment areas, shops, schools and health facilities, including improved pedestrian links to the town centre; and the railway station”

It is noted however that none of the schemes, as currently set out, propose off-site improvements in accessibility to and from the site on foot, by cycle or by public transport. There are no “improved pedestrian links to the town centre; and the railway station”.

The Town Council believes that all the proposed new developments should contribute towards infrastructure such as the Poynton Relief Road but also pedestrian and cycle links.

3. Do you have any other comments about transport and other types of infrastructure in this part of Cheshire East?

The major housing developments approved across Cheshire East will generate massive amounts of traffic – with two cars per household, probably at least another 50,000 cars. Many of these developments, including the so called East Cheshire Growth Village near Handforth and the major strategic sites around Macclesfield, will increase traffic through Poynton and on to the A34. Current strategies will not prevent increasing congestion, pollution and damage to the environment and public health.

Increasing rail services from Macclesfield, Prestbury, Audley and Poynton (Stoke Line) and Crewe – Goostrey – Alderley Edge – Wilmslow (Crewe line) and the Knutsford – Mobberley – Altrincham - Stockport lines into Manchester may help reduce congestion. Cheshire East should consider whether subsidies to reduce fares, as used in Greater Manchester, may have a positive effect.

The increased development will also greatly increase the pressure on public services, including GP’s surgeries, hospitals, clinics, schools and other facilities. Improvements must be paid for by developers.

The Town Council have received complaints from residents about inadequate utility infrastructure, especially sewers and electricity main supplies. This is before the additional strain caused by large developments. Again, these should be upgraded fully, at the cost of the developer, before work starts on any new houses.

The strategy therefore needs to include neighbouring councils. When the A6 Manchester Airport Relief Road is finally built, it will feed onto the already congested A34, which will also take traffic from the thousands of new houses. The Poynton bypass will not be effective if it is used to justify the building of more housing next to it without considering the wider implications of getting those people and cars out of the developments and into Stockport/Manchester.
Prestbury Parish Council

Mrs Georgina Ryder
42 Kenilworth Road
Macclesfield
Cheshire
SK11 8PE
Tel: 01625 267171
Email: clerk@prestburyparish.com
www.prestburyparish.com

Cheshire East Council,
Delamere House,
Crewe.

Wednesday, April 11th, 2018

Dear Sir or Madam,

South East Manchester Multi Modal (SEMMM) Strategy: Issues & Options Consultation
Prestbury Parish Council's responses to the current SEMMM consultation questions are as follows:

Q.1 The refreshed SEMM Strategy will be looking at all aspects of transport provision in the area.
   a) What are the key issues for transport in the Cheshire East part of the SEMMM strategy area?
   Answer
   The SEMMM strategy area includes all of the Parish of Prestbury (which has a boundary with Greater Manchester at the former Woodford Aerodrome site). Prestbury Parish Council has attempted to engage with the SEMMM strategy since it was first launched by the Integrated Transport White Paper over 20 years ago. It was apparent from the outset that if the proposed SEMMM network of roads were built, there would be impacts on Prestbury and the Parish Council has consistently sought to discover what these would be.

We have asked to be furnished with details of how traffic flows would alter, not only on the A533, the former trunk road, but on the other through-roads in the village and we have also asked for information on how the historic environment and the quality of life, including impacts on air quality, would be affected. Very little information has ever been forthcoming. We learnt, when the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road (A6 MARR) was mooted, that this would cause an increase in traffic on B2350 (Styal Hill Lane) of over 1,000 vehicles per day. Then, when the Ponton Relief Road planning application was processed, we discovered that there were projections for a further 1,000 vehicles per day on B2350. However, we have never received the "full picture" we have sought. Consequently, for us, the key issues relating to transport is a lack of detailed information.

We are using this consultation response to ask yet again – as the first tier of local government – to be apprised of what the impacts on Prestbury would be if all the SEMMMS roads (including the A6 Styal Hill Bypass) were built. We attach, as an appendix, our response to the Ponton Relief Road planning application which contains many unanswered questions.

b) What do you think should be done to improve things across all types of transport in this area?
   Answer
   Prestbury Parish Council has only just reaffirmed, at its most recent Council meeting, that it wants to see upgrades to Prestbury railway station. We are well aware that many of the improvements we seek lie within the purview of the train operating company and/or Network Rail, but some could lie with the principal authority – if only the will were there.

The current SEMM consultation is tagged as being aligned to the refresh of the Local Transport Plan. The current one is notable for its lack of rail initiatives. We would like to see commitments to improving access to railway stations and to ensuring all of them have secure cycle parking facilities.

Prestbury railway station used to have a direct access to its southbound platform via a path from the eastern side of the railway bridge. It is still possible to see where it used to be. Re-building that would be a significant move towards enabling those with mobility problems to use Prestbury railway station. Currently, the only way of moving between the southbound and northbound platforms is via two long sections of steps on each side.

Q2. We believe that new developments should contribute towards extra infrastructure to make sure they are safe and sustainable. What are the priorities for your community?
   Answer
   By far the most major infrastructure granted planning permission in the last decade in Prestbury has been the new school buildings and internal roads for King's School at Four Lane ends. When permission was granted, the Parish Council were told that an agreement had been reached between Cheshire East Council and King's for the school to fund highway improvements that included double roundabouts. No plans of this scheme were made available at the time and none have been made available since. Consequently, here again, (as with our response to question 1a), the priority for the Parish Council is information. We would like to see the detailed plans for the area around the junctions of Macclesfield Road, Alderley Road, Prestbury Road and Priory Lane.

Q3. Do you have any other comments about transport and other types of infrastructure on this part of Cheshire East?
   Answer
   Prestbury Parish Council's transport priorities have always been road safety and the maintenance of the highway corridors. On road safety, our priority is the parish's accident "hot spot" – the A533 junction with Prestbury Lane (see appendix). On maintenance, we have a number of issues relating to the fabric of the roads, gullies, traffic signs and verges – all of which we have communicated to Cheshire East Council and to its arm's length bodies responsible for these issues. In making sure safety and maintenance are our main focus, we are not alone. In survey after survey of the general public, their top priorities are always maintenance and road safety = not new highway capacity 1.


* (1st priority: enhanced safety, 2nd: journey time predictability, 3rd: improved surface quality)
APPENDIX 1

 Prestbury Parish Council submission on the Poynton Relief Road planning application

 Prestbury Parish Council is not able to support this planning application because:

- As with the case of the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road (A6 MARR), this road and the case for it being made in relative isolation. We asked at the time the A6 MARR was being promoted to see a full and robust case for all the SEMMMS network of roads, along with up-to-date traffic projections for the wider area and a strategic environmental assessment for the concept in its entirety (i.e. including the A6 Stockport North-South Bypass). We have never received this.

- We have consistently expressed our fears that any off-line “improvements” or bypasses to the A523 would be likely to generate development along it within the Green Belt and lead to the joining up of settlements. This is now happening with the latest modifications to the Cheshire East Local Plan with a strategic housing allocation (for safeguarding and removing from Green Belt) on the Woodford Aerodrome site and a strategic employment land allocation attached to the Arlingham Business Park. Both strategic sites adjoin our parish borders.

- We question the assumption that new highway capacity automatically produces economic benefits, despite evidence accepted by government in the 1990s that this was not necessarily the case. (SACTRA: Transport & the Economy). We remain to be convinced that the environmental benefits outweigh claimed economic benefits.

- During the options consultation on the Poynton Relief Road and potential improvements to the A523 to the south of it, we expressed a preference for a roundabout at the Bons Hall Lane junction and specifically requested a significant improvement to the Prestbury Lane junction with the A523, which is the junction in Prestbury with the highest accident record. As usual, our preferences have been ignored.

Here are our more detailed comments:

We recognise that the Poynton Relief Road (formerly called the Poynton Bypass) appears in the emerging Cheshire East Local Plan. This has yet to be endorsed.

We recognise that the South East Manchester Multi Modal Study (SEMMMS) final report endorsed a Poynton Bypass (following a different alignment) when it was published in 2001. We would point out, however, that this endorsement was based on very high traffic growth projections which did not materialise. What we needed before progressing a new version of the scheme was a totally new, up-to-date modelling exercise using a more bespoke traffic model which looked at the entirety of the SEMMMS proposals over 15 years on from when that previous work was undertaken and which took into account a more realistic traffic growth scenario.

We do not concur that the proposal we are asked to comment upon constitutes “very special circumstances” for building in Green Belt and would maintain that the scheme is contrary to Policy PG3 (Green Belt) and Policy H3 (Protection of Local Landscapes) in the emerging Cheshire East Local Plan. The claimed social and economic benefits appear to be based on marginal time savings which will be lost to traffic increases and high because new roads generate new traffic movements (SACTRA: Traffic: Roads & the Generation of Traffic). The journey time saving for morning peak travel from Hazel Grove to Audlem is just 1.25 minutes – two minutes – at the opening of a scheme that would cost £30m. Where is the detailed business case to support this scheme?

The statement is made that this proposal is part of a 20-year strategy. Yet the strategic environmental impact assessment which has been carried out relates only to the Poynton Relief Road (PRR) and not the A6 MARR. It does not take into account the effects of the A6 Stockport North-South Bypass, which Stockport Borough Council are still promoting and wish to build within the next 20 years. So, for instance, the air quality predictions relate only to the imposition of the PRR on the status quo. Consequently, it is not possible to judge the impacts of the construction of the full SEMMMS network of roads on Prestbury Parish or its citizens.

The claimed mitigation measures beyond the southern end of the proposed PRR are not, in our opinion, adequate. North-south traffic passing through an improved signalised junction at Bons Hall Lane (with extra through lanes) could travel through at speed when the signals are on green. However, all traffic arriving at a roundabout here would have to slow down but, that said, it would move consistently smoothly. Also, a roundabout could be planted and made an attractive feature in itself as has happened with the new roundabout at Tytherington on Manchester Road.

However, a key point here is that the Bons Hall Lane junction is not currently an accident hot spot. The Prestbury Lane junction is. To the astonishment of Prestbury Parish Council, the only enhancements proposed for the junction of Prestbury Lane with the A523 are ‘visibility and signing improvements’. This is not good enough. It demonstrates inadequate respect for human life.

It is also unclear what “safety improvements” are proposed for the Well Lane junction with the A523.

In the Transport Assessment, much is made of commuting movements between North east Cheshire and Manchester. No mention is made of all the facts that a record number of people are now working from home and the figures are rising steeply. According to the Office for National Statistics, almost 24% of employed people now work from home all or part of the week in the North West – and this tends to be higher in areas with a profile such as that in Cheshire East. We would argue, therefore, that assumptions that commuting rates will rise are very far off the mark. The trend is actually in the opposite direction.

Also, we note that there is a proposal to introduce “quiet lanes” status on some of the quieter roads in Alsington and Holt Shrigley. Why are there no similar proposals for less trafficked roads in Prestbury?

While the scheme may well “reduce traffic flows within Poynton”, we fear that new traffic will be drawn through Prestbury village and through the wider Parish (particularly via Bons Hall Lane) to access the new road. We have not forgotten the impacts of changed traffic patterns on Prestbury when the A34 Wilmslow Bypass opened. There were impacts then which were not expected and they were felt within weeks of it opening.

We note that the impacts on the historic environment are deemed to be “minor to major adverse effects” and the Planning, Design and Access Statement admits that, overall, there would be adverse impacts on the historic environment.

We do not agree that the scheme is “consistent with the aims and objectives of conserving the natural environment”.

We do not endorse the scheme tabled as a planning application for the reasons we have outlined.

Response from: Prestbury Parish Council
Transport Activists' Roundtable
North West
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Dear Sir/Madam,

South East Manchester Multi Modal (SEMMMS) Strategy Refresh – Issues & Options Consultation

The North West Transport Roundtable (NW TAR), which operates under the auspices of the Campaign for Better Transport (CBT), represents sustainable transport and land use and healthier lives. We espouse ‘Smart Growth’ and reducing the need to travel.

Over-arching comments

It is something of a puzzle to the NW TAR that Oshiere East Council (CEC) are conducting a consultation on the SEMMMS strategy refresh in the SEMMMS area. We have assumed that the initial consultation on the refresh which they conducted is on October 7th, 2017 is the whole SEMMMS area. However, we are aware there is no consultation outside of CEC.

We note, however, that this consultation does focus on the part of the SEMMMS area which falls within Oshiere East and that CEC are developing, in parallel with this process, a new Local Transport Plan.

NW TAR has interacted with SEMMMS – the South East Manchester Multi Model Study – since the study first came into being, being promoted by the Integrated Transport White Paper: ‘A New Deal for Everyone’, in 1996. The first NW TAR Convener, Stuart Murray, was the sustainable transport/environmental NGO representative on the SEMMMS steering group and over the years NW TAR has engaged with the SEMMMS process when opportunities have presented themselves. In those 20 years, our basic messages have been consistent, (unlike government transport policy). In a nutshell these have been:

1. A championing of the two major transport reports of the 1990s, by SACTRA – the Standing Advisory Committee on Road Transport, the Transport and Environment, Transport and the Region (DfT). It said: ‘We could not go on as before building more and more new roads to accommodate the growth in traffic. With our new obligations to meet targets on climate change, the need for a new approach is urgent’. Also: “Better public transport will encourage more people to use it”.

2. Instead of encouraging more travel, we should be reducing the need to travel via better planning. Notably we should be building on brownfields first, concentrating on urban regeneration and developing genuinely sustainable communities.

3. We should be doing everything in our power to tackle climate change (and meet our international obligations) and reduce carbon and other harmful emissions.

4. We should be striving to improve public health, notably by making it easier and safer to walk and cycle more, by improving air quality and by ensuring that robust health impact assessments are conducted on all major infrastructure projects.

5. We should be delivering improvements to public transport and the public realm first and only building new highway infrastructure on greenfields as a last resort.

BACKGROUND

Even since the SEMMMS final report was published, it has been referenced by the local authorities promoting the road schemes within its (Stoke Park M6, Manchester City Council and Oshiere East Council) as though it is a reliable resource/piece of evidence that should be regarded as the foundation blocks for building upon. NW TAR has provided analysis previously demonstrating that this was not the case—when making submissions on the first of the SEMMMS network of roads to be built – the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road (A6 NARR). The general points still stand and many of the findings of the professionals who examined the case for the A6 NARR are relevant to the A635 Poynton Relief Road and to the preparatory work underway now for an A6 to M60 Relief Road at A6 Stockport North-South Bypass as it was historically known.

In January 2013 the North West Transport Roundtable (NW TAR) and the Campaign for Better Transport (CBT) published ‘A Folly in the Making: SEMMMS A6 Manchester Airport Relief Road’ which is downloadable from the NW TAR website: (https://www.nwтар.org.uk/consultations/SEMMMS-A6-Manchester-Airport-Relief-Road-NW-TAR-Report.pdf). The report included papers by transport commentators Keith Bunihan and Alan Weisbun-Smith and by officers from the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) (Jackie Copland) and Friends of the Earth (FOE) (Hein Kremmer). The key findings from that first report of January 2013 were:

Traffic & public transport modelling

Of no picture had been presented by the modelling of current or future travel conditions. However, even if we factor in the modelling predicted additional congestion and increased carbon emissions. It was apparent that building the new road would not restore conditions to what they were then. In other words, the scheme would not achieve anything. Other key points were:

- Due to major changes since the SEMMMS final report was produced, the modelling carried out then and therefore the findings are no longer relevant.
- Currently, modelling and forecasting is based on the road scheme alone and is not capable of comparing solutions across different modes of transport.
- The model is inconsistent and pre-dated the recession and many public transport initiatives such as the Northern Hub.
- The majority of traffic model projections are due to longer distance traffic, not local traffic as was the stated purpose of the scheme.
- There were unanswered questions about what problems new and revisited developments had been included in the traffic model.
- There was a lack of genuine sensitivity testing relating to assumptions about land use, parking, smarter travel and traffic management forecasts.
- There were major questions over whether the “Area of Influence” was too small and therefore whether longer distance impacts were picked up.
- New forecasts and traffic models were needed to properly reflect the actual traffic growth that had taken place and the availability of new policy instruments since 2001.

Cont. on next page
The Economics of the Major Scheme Business Case

The business case had serious weaknesses. They were:
- The approach was based upon peripheral development (e.g., unsustainable growth strategy). This was predicted to have serious impacts on surrounding centres.
- Better economic results had been achieved in continental cities through a combination of urban regeneration and investment in public transport.
- There was no guarantee that the Manchester Airport City Enterprise Zone would attract an identified niche market, i.e., occupiers that were both airport-dependent and Greater Manchester-based.
- Even if there was a determined strategy to limit users to the narrowest audience, there was no mechanism for doing so either through planning or as landlords. (And, in reality, the early occupiers of the Enterprise Zone have been national and international logistics businesses).
- The SEWMMS strategy was designed within the context of the NW Regional Strategy which focused development on urban areas and on regeneration. That context has been lost.
- The £800m of economic benefits attributed to the A6-MARR was not well founded.
- Time savings accounted for 95% of economic benefits but their value was highly questionable.
- The benefits were derived from comparing future projections – one with the scheme and one without. So the time savings in this case were compared with doing nothing.
- The value of time savings disappeared over time. In any event, other forms of economic benefits and any traffic growth were predicted to gradually cancel each other out and then convert into time losses.
- Under both scenarios presented – build the scheme or do nothing – congestion was due to increase and the economy decline. In other words, both represented deteriorations from the present, satisfying the implicit claim to real economic gain from the scheme.
- 70% of the scheme benefits accrued after 2012 which did not inspire confidence.
- The management/delivery case was complex with many potential opportunities for it to materialise.
- The Barn Back model of financing depended on the infrastructure being delivered but there was a delay between the call for money (during construction) and it coming on stream (following occupation of developments).
- The anticipated timescale between the two was 10 years, which was optimistic.
- It was expected that there would be a hit on the existing business value from business rates as a result of businesses relocating to the Manchester Airport City Enterprise Zone.

The Environmental Scoping Report

The environmental scoping report was deficient for the following reasons:
- It made no reference to the Regional Spatial Strategy which was extant at the time (and a legal entity).
- The approach was not one that was likely to tackle all possible effects on the environment and on social and economic factors as required by the National Planning Policy Framework.
- It was not based on up-to-date information (much of it dated back to 2006).
- It had not drawn on the River Basin Management Plan as required by the WFD.
- It had not called for the Sustainability Appraisal to follow DEFFRA’s Specific Impact Test.
- It lacked the detail required by the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB).
- It made no reference to the DfT’s transport suppression system.
- It presented no evidence to indicate that several options had been analysed in detail and these had been whittled down from a longer list of potential solutions to identify problems. Investigative work appeared to have been conducted on one road option and one alignment.
- Only some of the potential landscape impacts are acknowledged and Natural England’s National Character Area profiles received no mention.
- Eight lines were asked for.
- Only one of the Green Belt five purposes was mentioned. There was no attempt to quantify Green Belt loss.
- There was no requirement for a breakdown of the grade of agricultural land to be lost.
- There was no requirement for an assessment of the amount of hedgerows that would be removed or, particularly, for the amount of ancient hedgerows that would be lost.
- The subject of light pollution was inadequately covered.
- The subject of air quality was inadequately covered.
- The approach to the Health Impact Assessment was inadequate.
- Nature conservation and ecological requirements were approached in a less than robust manner.
- The Peak District National Park Authority did not appear to have been involved, contrary to the duty to co-operate.
- Many agreed and proposed developments of substantial scale did not appear to have been taken into consideration.
- The area covered by the Environmental Scoping Report was not sufficiently extensive.

Climate Change and Air Quality Impacts

- The cumulative climate change and air quality impacts (of all SEWMMS roads) had not been assessed.
- There was a lack of up-to-date traffic generation forecasts for the Manchester Airport City.
- The A6-MARR should not have been assessed in isolation from other linked major development.
- There were instances in Air Quality Management Areas in the south of Greater Manchester and Derby where the proposed road would worsen air quality levels that were already in breach of EU legal limits.
- The business case took insufficient cognisance of potential effects on human health.
- The financial risk of the local authorities being fined for exceeding EU legal limits relating to air quality had not been taken into account in the business case.
- The business case admitted that the scheme would increase carbon emissions. Greater Manchester’s carbon reduction commitment was 48% by 2030.

After producing the above report, the NW TAR team members involved with it met with key SEWMMS team members and confirmed that their case for building the A6-MARR was predicated to a large extent on the SEWMMS findings that were published in 2003. The SEWMMS team were relying on evidence from the 1990s and traffic growth predictions which had not materialised. The environmental NGOs who attended that meeting were asked to catalogue the case they were making. They did so in a follow-on report entitled “More reasons why the A6-MARR should not be commissioned”, which they submitted in July 2013 as their contribution to the second stage consultation. This is also available on the NW TAR website at: http://www.nwtar.org.uk/consultations/NWTA2013SEWMMSresponse.pdf.

The July 2013 NW TAR submission reminded the SEWMMS team of the following list of public transport recommendations which were contained in the SEWMMS final report and analysed what progress, if any, had been made on them. The record was abysmal in respect of the non-road transport proposals. Only two of the 22 SEWMMS final report recommendations could be said to have definitely moved in the direction of the recommendations. One was the main road building proposal and the other was in respect of rail freight. The remainder had been removed or put aside by the three promoting authorities despite major changes in the surrounding circumstances but without the mitigating effects that were considered to be essential and the latter had come about as a result of brownfield. Just three other recommendations could be considered as work in progress. Yet the much-vaunted SEWMMS final report said: “Finally, it is stressed once again that the strategy recommended by this study should be implemented in its entirety, if its benefits are to be realised. It is not possible to pick and choose elements from the strategy because they are essentially the most cost-effective and easy to implement and to implement. The full benefit of the strategy will only be seen when it is implemented as a whole”. (Para. 10.13)

The July 2013 NW TAR report also included an analysis of the policy changes that had taken place in the 12 years since the SEWMMS report had been published and highlighted the fact they had not had any obvious impact on the determination of the local authorities to deliver the SEWMMS road schemes.

The conclusion to the NW TAR analysis described the SEWMMS traffic growth projections as “spectacularly wrong”. It was particularly critical of the fact that a one-road traffic model had not been set up for the complex network of SEWMMS road schemes and that, as far as could be established, extensions to the Metrolink system and promises to deliver heavy rail improvements had not been factored into the modelling. There was also no plan to reassign road space and ‘lock in’ benefits, despite this being a ‘ sine qua non’ of the SEWMMS final report and despite warnings in it that this meant the strategy would fail.
There was also a follow-on report by Keith Buchan in that submission in which he concluded:

- The fundamental criticism that the consultation depends upon the 2002 SE/MM/MS report had not been answered.
- The evidence for change was weak and ignored other elements in the SE/MM/MS package
- The modelling and forecasting had several serious omissions and
- The carbon forecast showed a deterioration as a result of the scheme and no data had been supplied to assess the proposals against carbon targets.

In December 2013 NW TAR and CBST produced yet another report, this time in response to the planning application for the A6 MARY. Entitled ‘A reasoned objection’ it was downloadable from and viewable on the NW TAR website: http://www.merger.org.uk/documents/A_Reasoned_Objection_NW_TAR_CBST_MARY_A6_121125.pdf

This included an evidence paper from Sam Berry CBST’s roads campaigner, on traffic trends and forecast, one from Keith Buchan on the scheme’s justifications and use of traffic data, one from Helen Allmer, North West Campaigner for Friends of the Earth on air quality and climate change, one from David Butler, NW TAR core group member and CTC ‘right to ride’ representative on health impacts and one from Janet Cuff, NW TAR core group member and Ramblers Association spokesperson reviewing the public transport impacts of the scheme. It also included as an appendix an objection letter to the scheme from Dr. Anne Robinson of Friends of the Real District. The conclusions and findings from that joint submission were:

- Traffic growth had been flattening out
- There were flaws in many assumptions behind the traffic flow data
- There were many questionable aspects to the modelling which did not model cycling and walking
- The economic model was overly optimistic and speculative
- The health impact assessment was wrong as there would be additional benefits from the scheme, based on assertions about economic opportunities
- Properly conducted tests or alternatives to road building were not carried out
- The scheme would not meet its objectives
- Modal split in the target area was already dominated by car and would not be hastened
- Insufficient attention had been paid to air pollution and impacts on health
- Overall, harmful emissions would rise, breaching EU standards
- Building the roads would effectively drive a horse and cart through sustainability and carbon reduction plans and policies that the promoting LGs were signed up to
- The impacts on people’s health of increased noise and air pollution
- The big populations with easy access to the roving countryside would lose a previous and very convenient resource on the urban fringe where it is currently possible to get away from the stresses of modern day life and enjoy some tranquillity
- The Green Belt would be breached between Greater Manchester and Cheshire East.

The catalogue of evidence listed above (under ‘Background’) was drawn together by NW TAR to try and prompt a rational evaluation of the first of the SE/MM/MS road. It was not given due weight by the promoting authorities at the time and the construction of the A6 MARY was now well under way. NW TAR believes this is a travesty for all the reasons stated. It will merely create more pressures for more roads.

Contact within which the SE/MM/MS Strategy Refusal is being undertaken

Included in the bullet point list of issues in the current CEC consultation document on page 3 are:
- Delivering modal shift to reduce the impact of travel demands and encourage healthy lifestyles and
- Increasing investment in cycling and walking

These are areas we can wholeheartedly support but we question how CEC is going to achieve modal shift when it continues to favour investment in road building, and to pull funding from subsidised bus services. And we are obliged to point out the inadequacy of its historic investment in cycling and the lack of adequate support for cycling and walking. In other words, making non-specific promises about increased investment is meaningless. The increase needs to be substantial and there should be some indication of how this will be done.

Air quality, carbon and school and commuter traffic

Last year Cheshire East Council admitted it had manipulated air quality data. The council confessed to falsifying air quality data readings between 2012 and 2014. An independent report revealed that in some areas of the Borough figures were altered to give a false sense of compliance with legal air pollution limits. We would also point out that Client Earth have repeatedly taken the UK Government to the Supreme Court over its lamentable approach to air pollution, harmful emissions and climate change.

Air quality in Cheshire East will not be improved if the principal authority persists in promoting road schemes – which will only encourage more trips by car. It would be irresponsible – and in contravention of existing commitments and new requirements – for the SE/MM/MS strategy to progress without much more robust evidence being collected in respect of air quality and the results feeding into ongoing work.

Similarly, Cheshire East needs to seriously address the issue of carbon reduction. The UK is signed up to international commitment on carbon reduction but is doing very little about it. Much more needs to be done on reducing the need to travel and on providing ‘right routes to schools’ which would enable more children to get to and from school on foot and on bicycles, thereby reducing the ‘school run’ traffic.

The consultation document flags up travel-to-work patterns, highway congestion and overcrowded trains and clearly raises the question as being the provision of more road space. It will not be. We would like to draw attention to the continuing,依法追究 travelling. Three years ago this was recorded by the Office for National Statistics as averaging 12% in the North West – and the graph is steeply rising.

The NW TAR note that Transport for the North are developing a Northern Transport Demand Model which will cover both road and rail. We would suggest it is imperative that the SE/MM/MS work is fed into this model before progressing to the testing and options development stage.

Concluding Remarks

NW TAR would like to highlight the excellent report published in March last year by the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) – “The end of the road: Challenging the road building consensus”. It travels that road building is failing to provide congestion relief and the economic boost which is always promised in parallel. (http://www.cpere.org.uk/campaigns/transport/roads/client/55698.html?link=publications/challenging-the-road-building-consensus)

We would also like to remind CEC of its own commitments to ‘deliver modal shift and encourage healthy lifestyles’ and to increase cycling and walking investment and of an original SE/MM/MS recommendation – that a cycle network should be established. We now have a National ‘Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy’ in place which asks Councils to plan high quality, comprehensive cycling and walking networks.

We would also like to appeal to CEC to be more concerned about the outstanding environment which assists its On Our Doorstep in the form of the Rosel District National Park. Realising more visitors to access the Park by car is not a good thing. Nor is depleting the Green Belt between Greater Manchester and CEC.

Finally, we would point to the fact that other developed countries are pressing forward with plans for non-car-based transport solutions in order to make their built-up areas more liveable and we would like to emphasise the need for CEC to consider climate change in everything it plans for.

We would like to keep apprised of the SE/MM/MS strategy and progress on the Local Transport Plan.

Yours sincerely,

Lillian Burns, Convener, NW TAR E: 861611@gmail.com Tel: 01362 829492

Response from: Transport Activists’ Roundtable North West
Dear LTP Team,

South East Manchester Multi-Modal (SEAMMA) Strategy Refresh to 2040 - Cheshire East Transport Issues and Options - Paper March 2018

The Friends of the Peak District is the national park society for the Peak District managed by the Peak District and South Yorkshire Branch of the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE). With a geographical area covering the Peak District National Park (PDNP) and the High Peak Borough we are concerned with the impact that the SEAMMA strategy would have on these areas. In 2011, we objected to the A6 Manchester Airport Relief Road because of its impacts on the Peak District, particularly on the A6 through the PDNP. We responded to stage 1 of the SEAMMA strategy refresh last year. Our letter is attached and should be read alongside this note, as the comments made then are still pertinent. We fully endorse the response from NW TAR made by the Conver Wimmer Burn.

A small part of Cheshire East lies within the PDNP and is covered by the SEAMMA strategy study area. Cheshire East Council therefore has a duty under section 62 of the Environment Act 1995 to have regard to the purposes of National Parks when considering or deciding to carry out its activities relating to or affecting land within the Park.

Economic objective
We support sustainable economic growth and urban regeneration providing the principles of smart growth are applied. The importance of economic activity in the countryside should be recognized. In 2013 the Peak District National Park was worth more than £1bn annually and supported over 40,000 jobs across 2,500 businesses. A recent update of this activity shows that National Parks continue to grow their economies, with for example the turnover-based GVA estimate in the PDNP having risen by 65%.

President: Doreen Flora Reynolds

CPRE South Yorkshire and Friends of the Peak District are run by the Campaign to Protect Rural England, Peak District and South Yorkshire for the countryside, for communities, for the future

www.friendsatthepark.org.uk • www.cpre-southyorkshire.org.uk
Registered Charity No. 2991179 • Registered Company No. 649175


Smart Growth is a sustainable approach to planning that emphasizes compact and accessible urban communities and which opposes urban sprawl and car dependency. It builds on traditional ways of planning towns based around local services, ease of walking and cycling and public transport, especially rail based.

2. www.phe.gov.uk/media/phe-24666-enあたりの情報リリース文書に使用されている情報は、BRIのための提供にない可能性があります。
We welcome the ‘last mile’ approach proposed in rural areas for residents. To this should be added a strategic approach towards sustainable access for leisure and recreation in the countryside for visitors.

The SEALAM strategy should aim to support the ‘Better Outside’ theme of the South West Peak Landscape Partnership. We note that the SEALAM study area covers the PDPN only in the parish of Lyne Hamdley and specifically excludes the parishes of Port Shrigley, Kibworthshulme, Rainow, and Marclefield and Wildboarclough, all or parts of which lie within the south west peak of the Park, adjacent to surrounding urban areas. These areas should be included if they are to receive the same attention from the SEALAM strategy as other rural areas.

We object to the High Lane - Disley A6 bypass.

Yours sincerely,

Anne Robinson
Campaigner

Road schemes have long lasting impacts on landscape and biodiversity, according to the four case studies.

The roads completed between 1920-20 years ago were not ‘the answer’ to the problems that they were supposed to solve. The case for more road building was (and is) partly justified on the basis that existing roads cannot take the strain any longer, and partly on the basis that increased road capacity will magically unlock the economic potential of the area. However, provision of more road capacity does not deliver a stable situation - the more capacity is increased, the more capacity increases are ‘needed’. In all four case studies, there were plans to enlarge junctions, or widen the road, or create a new off-line dual carriageway at one end. The roads -- car-based development -- traffic growth -- roads model of economic development had not delivered even on its own terms. It has not solved Blackburn’s economic problems: unemployment is high and wage levels are low. It did not bring more jobs to the Standed to Bratstone A120 corridor. The ribbon-development of homes and businesses along supposedly ‘strategic’ corridors is self-strangling: any revolt from congestion provided by a new or widened road is temporary.

NE needs to learn the lessons from the outcomes of its own schemes and apply these to future development.

Anne Robinson
March 2018

4 http://www.southwestpeak.co.uk/prodcts/communities/better-outside

APPENDIX A
The End of the Road? Challenging the road building consensus
Report for CPRE; March 2017, Woman et al

This research examined the outcomes of widening of existing roads and building new roads and by-passes.

The research drew on the short term impacts (between one and five years after scheme completion) from over 80 road schemes published by HE through its past opening project evaluation (POPE) and long term evidence from 4 road schemes completed between 13 and 20yrs ago (424 Newbury bypass, MK5 Blackburn Southern Bypass, A446 Newark-Lincoln dualling: A1101 Stanned to Braintree dualling).

Its conclusions are:

Road schemes generate traffic. Average increases over the short term were -7% and over the long run (8-20 years) were -47%. These were increases over and above background traffic growth (measured by county and regional trends), and in most cases were across a screen line, to rule out reassignment effects. Through generating traffic road schemes also cause substantial increases in carbon emissions, probably systematically and significantly underestimated by the POPE process because of its failure to recognise generated traffic.

Road schemes do not benefit the economy. Of 25 road schemes justified on the basis that they would benefit the local economy, only five had any evidence of any economic effects. Even for these five, the economic effects may have arisen from changes incidental to the road scheme, or involved development in an inappropriate location, or involved changes that were as likely to suck money out of the local area as to bring it in. Where a road scheme was justified on the basis that it would support regeneration of an area with a struggling economy, it was common for economic development following completion of the road scheme to be slower than expected, or not to materialise at all, or to be of a type which offered little benefit to the area concerned.

Where a road scheme was justified on the basis that it was needed to cater for current and future traffic in a ‘pressure cooker’ area with a buoyant economy, it was common for the scheme to be followed by much development in car-dependent locations, causing rapid traffic growth and congestion on both the road scheme and the pre-existing road network.

There was no evidence of measurable economic benefit from road schemes that were justified on the basis that by reducing journey times, they would increase the number of jobs that were accessible to local people, or increase the potential workforce able to access major employment sites, or create thousands of new jobs.

Road building is associated with a highly car-dependent pattern of land development. In all four case study schemes increased road capacity was “consumed” in the form of housing developments in the countryside, from which the vast majority of trips were by car. Road schemes were also associated with development of business parks and retail parks, generating large numbers of vehicle movements, and causing serious congestion. These sites included businesses and retailers that would be better located in a town centre, where they would be more accessible by public transport, cycling and walking. This pattern of road building and associated land development is leading to a semi-industrial / urban landscape in the countryside, and the erosion of Green Belt that was originally designated to prevent sprawl. It is a major cause of the high levels of traffic growth associated with road schemes in the long term.

Response from: Friends of the Peak District and CPRE South Yorkshire