

CONGLETON TOWN COUNCIL

COMMITTEE REPORTS AND UPDATES

COMMITTEE:	Community Committee		
MEETING DATE AND TIME	29 February 2024	LOCATION	Congleton Town Hall
REPORT FROM	Jackie MacArthur, Communities and Marketing Manager/Deputy Chief Officer		
AGENDA ITEM REPORT TITLE	Item 13. Response to CEC Consultation on Crossing Points		
Background	<p>Cheshire East Council (CEC) is consulting on a proposal to change the way it assesses and prioritises road crossing requests. CEC believes its current means of evaluating crossings, which was approved in 2011, is too simplistic and CEC is seeking views on a new priority matrix for assessing crossings. The closing date for comments on this consultation is 10 March 2024</p> <p>The purpose of this paper is</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• To establish if CTC Community Committee wishes to respond to this consultation• To establish how the Town Council wishes to respond. <p>To aid this debate I have created a table of the 34 proposed considerations and their proposed marking scheme. This can be seen in appendix 14a. I have also given some suggestions for comments that you may wish to make – this can be added to either before or during the committee.</p> <p>The Cheshire East Consultation is asking for comments on the proposed way of evaluating crossings. It is not the opportunity to request new crossings, although it may be an opportunity to list the crossing points that have already been raised as needed in Congleton. The list included at the end of this paper has been taken from various documents or action plans of the Council.</p> <p>Cheshire East Council has warned that it is introducing the new policy because demand for pedestrian crossings exceeds the council’s available funding each year.</p> <p>More about the CEC Consultation can be seen here (Click here – you will be taken to the consultation on Cheshire East Council’s website.)</p>		
Detail	<p>The updated draft strategy uses a prioritisation matrix to assess where new crossings are needed. This prioritisation matrix consists of 34 considerations spread across 8 topic areas. The marking system is given for 32 of the measures. Two measures relate to the ‘tartan rug’ and points are allocated based on population demographics for the ward of over 65s and under 16s. It doesn’t say how many points this attracts.</p> <p>For each measure in each section CEC asks if the consultee agrees with the measures and if they agree with the scoring. There is also an opportunity to raise concerns.</p> <p>Below are initial observations from officers that Councillors may wish to include in the consultation:</p> <p>Section A Casualty Reduction:</p>		

<p>1. This measure only considers actual casualties and claims on a road. When local people are aware that an area is dangerous, action needs to be taken ahead of casualties occurring.</p> <p>2. Is it right to give so many more points to accidents where there has been a claim, rather than acknowledging all actions. Most claims are settled out of court – would these count?</p> <p>3. Is it right to ignore collisions where the driver was under the influence of alcohol or drugs.</p> <p>Section B – Sustainable Travel</p> <p>3. It's a bit of chicken and egg if there were more safe crossings more people may choose to cycle? This measure is weighted to help those areas where cycling is already well established. Does that need to be commented on?</p> <p>4. Not sure why if there is a shared path they are marked down for a crossing point compared to where there is no shared path?</p> <p>Section C: Accessibility and Capacity</p> <p>5. The section on footpaths assumes that there are appropriate footpaths in the area. There are some places in Congleton where there is a crossing needed but also a path needs to be installed to create a safe walking/ cycling route in an area that was rural and is now built-up due to the expansion of housing estates.</p> <p>Section D Amenity</p> <p>6. There is no sense of scale with the amenities – which makes it very simplistic. The footfall will be very different for a small parade of shops versus a supermarket.</p> <p>7. The section is biased towards schools, not a bad thing as safe routes to school need to be encouraged – but potentially 23 points in this sections for schools – with more points in other sections too.</p> <p>8. Would like CEC to reconsider giving a bit more emphasis to the hospitality industry. Hospitality venues attract many visitors to our towns during the day and evening and their requests for safe crossing points are valid.</p> <p>9. No definition given to 'close proximity' - is this within ¼ mile, 200m? 5 minutes walk?</p> <p>Section E: Neighbourhood Engagement</p> <p>10. Disappointed to see so little weight given to the views of Town and Parish Councils - if 3 people express concerns over a three year period it is worth 10 points. If the Town Council supports an application it is worth 3 points. If the ward member supports it is worth 5. Does this mean if all 3 ward members support it is worth 15 points?</p> <p>Section F: Local Concern</p> <p>11. It would be useful to know the weighting given for the age demographics.</p>
--

	<p>12. The number of people with mobility issues and visually impaired should be considered in addition to the characteristic of being under 16 or over 65.</p> <p>Section H – Protects and Improves the Environment</p> <p>13. Not sure about the relevance of the AQM zones – I assume that the aim is to stop more traffic from idling– but is it right that pedestrians and those wishing to cross the road are penalised?</p> <p>14. There is 10 points if there is a school crossing in operation. Maybe this should be has there been a school crossing point in operation in the past 10 years? It’s something that seems to have been lost in many places and not sure how many are still operational?</p> <p>Overall</p> <p>Due to the financial state of Cheshire East Council, it feels as though the whole exercise is a bit futile as it appears that there will be very little funding available for crossings across the borough. Due to changes in the law, the Pelican crossings are being phased out and replaced with either PUFFIN or ZEBRA – which will also require funding.</p> <p>Getting correct crossings in place at the time of planning applications when new estates are being added to towns seems to be the most likely way to help create crossings to help create safe walking and cycling routes within our towns.</p>
	<p>What happens if a crossing scores highly in the Prioritisation Matrix</p> <p>When Cheshire East has an approved Prioritisation Matrix, all crossing requests will be assessed against it. The top percentile of locations will be determined annually and taken forward for further investigations as the annual program. Locations that are then progressed to detail design and implementation will be informed by the budgets available. Specific locations will only be prioritised once every three years unless there is a material change</p>
<p>Crossing points that Congleton would like to see.</p>	<p>(add from LTP, TV, Walking and Cycling Strategy, Committee papers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CO66 – Introduce a pedestrian crossing at the A34 Clayton Bypass near the fire station and Dane Street. • CO124 – Installation of a pedestrian crossing on Rood Hill close to the junction of Daisybank Drive • CO127 – Pedestrian Crossing at Mossley Traffic Lights • CO130 – Controlled crossing at Eaton Bank • CO132 - Pedestrian crossing at the Mount, A34 Newcastle Road • CO133 – Improved surface and lighting at Tommy’s Lane and a pedestrian crossing on Brook Street <p>Requests have also been made for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mill Street from the Antrobus Street Car Park to Duke Street. • Mill Street to Antrobus Street near Able World/entrance to the Market Quarter

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where West Street meets Antrobus Street • To cross Market Street near Morrisons • To cross Worrall Street when walking along Mountbatten Way. • Jackson Close – when the pavement runs out down the hill from Eaton Bank • Park Lane – to cross the Railway station
Financial Implications	None at present – responding to a CEC consultation
Environmental Implications	Good crossing points across the town would encourage more people to walk, cycle and use active travel methods more frequently.
Equality and Diversity	Cheshire East’s strategy should be designed to take on board inclusivity and access for all for residents.
Decision Requested	To discuss if Congleton Town Council wishes to respond and if some or all of the points raised (1-13) should be included in the response along with other issues raised by Councillors.

No	Prioritisation Consideration Measure	How it is scored	Max			
A: Casualty Reduction (13)						
1.	Have there been any collisions (excluding driving under the influence) that have involved pedestrians or cyclists crossing the road?	scoring: Yes = 3, No = 0	3	0		
2.	Have there been any claims at this location?	Yes = 10, No = 0	10	0		
B: Sustainable Travel (13)						
3.	On a cycle route in the Transport Development Plans?	Yes in the TDP = 2, Cycle route but not in the TDP = 1, No cycle route = 0	2	1	0	
4.	A propensity for cycling in the local area www.pct.bike	>30% = 5, 20% - 30% = 3, < 20% = 1	5	3	1	
5.	Is there a shared use path at this location?	Yes = 1, No = 0	6	1		
C: Accessibility and Capacity (23)						
6.	Footway provision	No footways = 0, Footway on 1 side only = 1, Footway on both sides with 1 side wider than the other = 2, Footway on both sides equal width both sides = 3	3	2	1	0
7.	Is the road one way or 2 way?	One way = 1, 2 way = 2	2	1		
8.	Is the road divided?	Yes = 3, No = 1	3	1		
9.	How many lanes are there?	Up to 2 = 1, Up to 4 = 3, Up to 6 = 5	5	3	1	
10.	Are there any obstructions to the footways (e.g. street furniture)?	Yes = 0, No = 4	4	0		
11.	Are there any civil engineering constraints at this location?	Yes = 0, No = 6	6	0		
D: Amenity (42)						
12.	How many retail facilities are in close proximity (e.g. shops, supermarkets, hair & beauty establishments)?	Under 3 = 0, 4 to 12 = 1, 13 or more = 2	2	1	0	

13.	How many education facilities are in close proximity (e.g. nurseries, schools, colleges, universities)?	0 = 0, 1 to 2 = 5, 3 or more = 10	10	5	0	
14.	How many health care institutions are in close proximity (e.g. doctors, hospitals, care homes, dentists)?	0 = 0, 1 to 3 = 5, 4 or more = 10	10	5	0	
15.	How many hospitality facilities are in close proximity (e.g. cafes, restaurants, takeaways, bars, hotels)?	0 = 0, 1 to 10 = 1, 11 or more = 2	2	1	0	
16.	How many places of worship are in close proximity?	0 = 0, 1 to 2 = 1, 3 or more = 2	2	1	0	
17.	How many tourist attractions or leisure facilities are in close proximity (e.g. museums, garden centre, gardens, historic Houses, gyms, parks, etc)?	0 = 0, 1 to 3 = 1, 4 to 6 = 2, 7 or more = 3	3	2	1	0
18.	Would a crossing facility provide access to an educational establishment?	Yes = 10, No = 0	10	0		
19.	Is this location on a route to a Primary School?	Yes = 3, No = 0	3	0		
E: Neighbourhood Engagement (20)						
20.	Is there evidence of political support from a ward member?	Yes = 5, No = 0	5	0		
21.	Is there evidence of stakeholder support from a town or parish council?	Yes = 3, No = 0	3	0		
22.	Is there evidence of other political support?	Yes = 2, No = 0	2	0		
23.	Is there evidence of support from other organisations (e.g. resident associations, disability groups)?	Yes = 5, No = 0	5	0		
24.	Is there a school travel plan to support a crossing facility?	Yes = 5, No = 0	5	0		
F: Local Concern (20+)						
25.	Number of unique recorded resident and/or stakeholder concern for vulnerable road user safety on CONFIRM? (in past 3 years)	0 = 0, 1 to 2 = 5, 3 or more = 10	10	5	0	

26.	Does this location directly link into existing or proposed active travel schemes?	Links to an existing scheme = 10, Links to a proposed or scheme in design = 7, Links to a scheme on a 'wish list' = 4, Does not link to any active travel scheme = 0	10	7	4	0
27.	Score for the population in the ward 65 and over	Matrix score has been derived from the tartan rug. * see note 1				
28.	Score for the population in the ward 16 or under	Matrix score has been derived from the tartan rug. * see note 1				
G: Supporting Growth (10)						
29.	Will a crossing facility at this location help improve or provide a link to a town or village centre?	Yes = 5, No = 0	5	0		
30.	Will a crossing facility in this location help improve or provide a link to an employment site?	Yes = 5, No = 0	5	0		
H: Protects and Improves the Environment (20)						
31.	No. of other active travel measures the location ties into or links to	No other active travel measure = 0, 1 other active travel measure = 1, 2 other active travel measures = 2, 3 or more active travel measures = 3	3	2	1	0
32.	Would a crossing facility provide access to a transport hub e.g. railway or bus station, bus stop, cycle hub or taxi rank?	Yes = 5, No = 0	5	0		
33.	Is there a school crossing in operation at this location?	Yes = 10, No = 0	10	0		
34.	Is location an AQMA site?	Yes = 0, No = 2	2	0		

Tartan Rug link: <https://www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/pdf/jsna/ward-profile-tartan-rug/tartan-rug-2022.pdf>

https://www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/council_and_democracy/council_information/jsna/overviews-of-health-and-wellbeing.aspx