## Agenda Item 8

Μ

MOTT

MACDONALD

Page 1





# Cheshire East TCVP Report of Consultation All Towns

January 2023



## Contents

| 1.0  | Introduction             | 1   |
|------|--------------------------|-----|
| 2.0  | Feedback from Alsager    | 4   |
| 3.0  | Feedback from Congleton  | 13  |
| 4.0  | Feedback from Handforth  | 28  |
| 5.0  | Feedback from Knutsford  | 36  |
| 6.0  | Feedback from Middlewich | 52  |
| 7.0  | Feedback from Nantwich   | 63  |
| 8.0  | Feedback from Poynton    | 78  |
| 9.0  | Feedback from Sandbach   | 90  |
| 10.0 | Feedback from Wilmslow   | 103 |
| 11.0 | Overall Feedback         | 117 |

## Appendices

- Appendix A Example Summary CE TCVP Report used in the public consultation
- Appendix B Example Questionnaire
- Appendix C List of Organisations Notified about the TCVP Consultations

## 1.0 Introduction

#### The Town Centre Vitality Plans

- 1.1 Cheshire East Council (CEC) recognises that every town centre across the borough is an important hub for the residents and businesses in its catchment, and is committed to supporting the health of town centres as indicated in the Corporate Plan. However, with challenges around funding and resources, the Council has to prioritise where it focuses that support.
- 1.2 To ensure that Cheshire East is a thriving and sustainable place, the Council is committed to working with partners and key stakeholders to understand what is important to their towns and produce town centre recovery plans for key centres<sup>1</sup>. In addition, when opportunities to apply for funding for town centre improvements arise, such as from Central Government, it is beneficial to have clear town centre plans already in place to support bids for funding.
- 1.3 To support this CEC commissioned an expert team to produce bespoke Town Centre Vitality Plans (TCVP) for each of the borough's nine Key Service Centres (KSC).
  - Alsager
  - Congleton
  - Handforth
  - Knutsford
  - Middlewich
  - Poynton
  - Sandbach
  - Wilmslow
- 1.4 The TCVP have been prepared over the last 18 months with input from officers, Town Councils and other stakeholders. The TCVP:
  - Are bespoke in nature, based on a thorough analysis of individual circumstances affecting the health of each Town Centre, local stakeholder views and any local specific policy considerations
  - Are cross functional and holistic and recommend a practical, realistic set of priority actions for supporting the vitality and viability of each Town Centre
  - Are informed and tested by existing relevant national and local public policy and strategies, local stakeholders views, relevant research and a thorough understanding of commercial markets and spatial considerations
  - Identify a set of recommended clear priority physical and other (e.g. marketing) interventions/ actions to support the vitality and viability of each Town Centre both in recovery from Covid-19 impacts and beyond to enhancement
  - Recommend deliverable actions including who should be involved in delivery of each action identified, to enable Town Councils, community groups, occupiers, property owners, etc, to all work towards a common vision
  - Take account of proposals developed/being developed by Town Councils and develop such plans further.
- 1.5 It should be noted that these Plans are about establishing an agreed set of priorities and are not a commitment to finance the delivery of proposals funding would need to be sought once plans are agreed as and when opportunities for funding arise and resources allow. Having an agreed set of priority projects is however generally an important step in being able to bid for funding. It is also

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Other than Crewe and Macclesfield which already have town centre regeneration strategies in place

important to ensure that any resources which can be identified are used on actions that will have the greatest impact and that all parties with an interest in supporting town centres can work towards a common set of ambitions.

#### Preparing the TCVPs and Consultations

- 1.6 The intent from the outset of these TCVP was to involve town councils in the formative stages of plan development with a view to fostering a sense of shared ownership of the final plans. Involvement with Town Councils prior to Aug 2022:
  - Summer 2020 virtual workshops for each town centre (attended by representatives of the local town council and their invited key stakeholders). These workshops focused on identifying local issues and opportunities in the nine town centres.
  - Baseline reports were produced following the virtual workshops and evidence gathering and shared with each town council.
  - The baseline reports were supplemented with a 'Toolkit' report, building on research undertaken by the Institute of Place management (IPM).
- 1.7 In early August 2022 all CEC Ward Members connected to the nine towns were invited to be briefed at a meeting on their town TCVP with the Director of Growth & Enterprise and the Development and Regeneration Delivery Manager.
- 1.8 In mid-late August/start of September 2022, all nine town councils were invited to a meeting to update and share the draft TCVP for their town with the Development and Regeneration Delivery Manager and the Senior Regeneration Officer
- 1.9 Public consultation on the nine TCVP was launched on 27 September 2022 and ran for six week until 8 November. An example of one the summary reports shared on the website is provided in Appendix A. Feedback was gathered via questionnaires made available on the CEC website. An example of the questionnaire is provided in Appendix B. A full copy of each TCVP was also made available to those who wished to read the full document. A list of the organisations notified of the TCVP consultation is provided in Appendix C

#### Responses

1.10 Public Consultations ran from 27 September 2022 for 6 weeks. The following responses were received as part of the consultation.

| Town       | Online responses<br>updated | Written and email responses |
|------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Alsager    | 45                          | 3                           |
| Congleton  | 166                         | 12                          |
| Handforth  | 55                          | 2                           |
| Knutsford  | 79                          | 6                           |
| Middlewich | 192                         | 3                           |
| Nantwich   | 130                         | 6                           |
| Poynton    | 53                          | 6                           |
| Sandbach   | 94                          | 2                           |
| Wilmslow   | 111                         | 6                           |
| Total      | 925                         | 46                          |

1.11 All the comments that were received were reviewed by the consultants and consideration was given as to how the draft TCVPs needed to be amended to respond to the feedback.

- 1.12 For each Centre the following has been presented in the individual Centre Sections of this Report:
  - The number of responses to the online questionnaire received
  - The level of support for the priority areas received through the public consultation
  - A summary of key comments received in respect of the priority areas along with responses to these including, where relevant, how the final Report has been amended
  - A summary of other comments in respect of the TCVP, including additional comments from the Town Councils when provided, along with responses to these including where relevant how the final Report has been amended
  - A summary of the responses to the questions on the coverage, clarity and potential success of the TCVP
  - A summary of key characteristics of respondents to the survey.
- 1.13 This Report will be shared with key stakeholders so that they can review and take on board as relevant in working up specific projects or in their day to day activities.

#### Structure of Report

- 1.14 The remainder of the report is structured as follows:
  - Section 2 Feedback on Alsager
  - Section 3 Feedback on Congleton
  - Section 4 Feedback on Handforth
  - Section 5 Feedback on Knutsford
  - Section 6 Feedback on Middlewich
  - Section 7 Feedback on Nantwich
  - Section 8 Feedback on Poynton
  - Section 9 Feedback on Sandbach
  - Section 10 Feedback on Wilmslow
  - Section 11 Summary of overall messages.

## 2.0 Feedback from Alsager

2.1 45 responses were received in response to the online survey in respect of the Alsager Report. The level of support for the identified priority areas is identified in the charts below:



## Page 7



2.2 A summary of the specific comments received in respect of each of the proposed priorities for intervention in Alsager is provided below. The response includes how the Final Report has been edited to take into account the comments where appropriate or relevant:

| Priorities Intervention                    | Consultation Comments   | Response   |
|--|---|--|
| Enhancing Alsager's Public                 | Needing improvements to the pavements to address unevenness will create a   | Add at the end of How p76  |
| Realm                                      | coherent appearance. This was mentioned in numerous responses   | It is important to ensure that all public realm is well maintained including pavements and landscaping                 |
|  | 'Greening up' the public realm will help improve attractiveness and biodiversity  | Add at end of what on p76  |
|  | (particularly on the north side of Lawton Road)   | Greening the public realm will help improve attractiveness and biodiversity  |
|  | Improve quality of street furniture   | Important message is already included in the TCVP and the Alsager Public Realm<br>Feasibility Study                    |
|  | General upkeep and more/replacement of trees is needed  | Add at the end of How p76  |
|  |   | It is important to ensure that all public realm is well maintained including the condition of pavement and landscaping |
|  | Mixed views on shared pedestrian/roadways - but support for reducing traffic congestion   | Noted  |
|  | General support for improving area outside of the civic centre - although some believe has character as it is   | Noted  |
|  | Whilst separation of traffic and pedestrians through street furniture is beneficial in  | Noted - detailed design of projects will take this into account  |
|  | creating a convivial environment, people don't want to sit by the road - better area  |  |
|  | is the green space by the Council offices. Also don't clutter area  |  |
|  | Old signs outside shops and around the town need updating   | Agree - recommended on p80   |
|  | Make square in front of Asda more attractive  | Noted - in working up detailed designs this should be taken into account   |
|  | Businesses should use rear access for deliveries where possible   | Noted but outside of the remit of TCVP   |
|  | Open space Cedar Avenue is a good natural asset and offers a link to countryside  | Noted and should be taken into account in working up detailed proposals  |
| Improving Connections                      | Be explicit that this priority relates to supporting active travel  | Already covered on p80 of TCVP and specific priority (Action 3)  |
| between key destinations<br>and the Centre | Some believe the Town Centre is well laid out and already flows easily although some changes to traffic lights could further improve flows  | Noted  |
|  | Brookhouse Road is a priority corridor as provides open space links to countryside<br>and new residential   | Agree and is recognised in the Alsager Public Realm Feasibility Study  |
|  | Increase the number of formal crossings, zebras or pelicans - Crewe Road to<br>Milton Park and Sandbach Road South to health centre and area between The<br>Hodge to Ey up Duck - but make sure it doesn't result in congestion | Detail proposals will be guided by Alsager Public Realm Feasibility Study  |
|  | Footpath next to the train station platform extending to Edwards Way and beyond could provide walking and cycling access to train station and Health Centre   | Detail proposals will be guided by Alsager Public Realm Feasibility Study  |
|  | A small bus service that operates around the local area and stops at different areas, similar to Leighton bus links   | Bus routes as determined by bus operators based on demand rather than by CEC   |
|  | Some found the Town to already be quite well connected  | Noted  |
|  | Signage not considered as a priority by those who use the town regularly  | Noted  |

| Priorities Intervention     | Consultation Comments  | Response   |
|-----------------------------|--|--|
| Reduce Car Dominance -      | Needs to be aligned to improved public transport - bus and train in terms of           | Agree - public transport is determined by bus and train operators but CEC will       |
| better integrating all road | reliability, timings, cost - and recognition that people do need access to cars        | continue to lobby for improvements   |
| users                       | Be clear it's not about getting rid of cars completely but just reducing their use for | Add at the end of What on p84  |
|                             | short journeys as some car use is necessary  | Whilst seeking to reduce the dominance of cars in the Centre it is                   |
|                             |  | acknowledged that people do need to be able use their cars in some                   |
|                             |  | circumstances  |
|                             | Widening the footways should not be done if is negatively impact on traffic flows -    | Detail proposals will be guided by Alsager Public Realm Feasibility Study            |
|                             | some concerns that there isn't much scope to widen footways                            |  |
|                             | Prohibit parking/ deliveries in central 'pinch point' locations                        | Noted but outside of the remit of the TCVP   |
|                             | Maybe create an Alsager Car Share Community  | Add at the end How on p84  |
|                             |  | Consideration should also be given to establishing a Alsager Car Share               |
|                             |  | Community  |
|                             | Reduce HGV's to make it safer to cycle - encourage alternative routes that don't       | CEC Highways to note - outside the remit of the TCVP                                 |
|                             | go through the centre of Alsager   |  |
|                             | Introduction of cycle lanes and more cycle parking                                     | Message already included in TCVP - see Action 4                                      |
|                             | Design one way systems from key residential areas to schools, train station, Town      | Detailed design suggestions to be considered as part of potential future feasibility |
|                             | Centre   | work   |
|                             | Comments received both for and against the reduction to 20mph in the Centre            | Noted  |
|                             | Trusted town individuals e.g. town councillors to submit photos so fines can be        | Noted but outside the remit of the TCVP  |
|                             | issues and a deterrent created   |  |
|                             | One comment referred to a change of name for the priority so it doesn't consider       | Title revised  |
|                             | cars as a negative to 'Integrate all road users'                                       | Change all references to action to   |
|                             |  | Reduce Car Dominance - better integrating all road users                             |
|                             | Encourage parking further out of town to reduce car traffic in the centre e.g. land at | Detailed design suggestions to be considered as part of potential future feasibility |
|                             | junction of Well Lane/Cedar Avenue when not being used by local school                 | work   |
| Encouraging Walking and     | Some concern about groups of cyclists racing through the centres                       | Noted but outside the remit of the TCVP  |
| Cycling                     | Having a shared space for walking and vehicles feels too dangerous and                 | Good examples of how it can work in other areas - detailed worked would be           |
|                             | confusing - for it to work people need to feel safe                                    | needed to determine how it could work in Alsager                                     |
|                             | Need better quality and secure parking for bikes esp. at the station                   | P 86 bullet 4 add at the end e.g. the Station  |
|                             | Acknowledgement that this isn't a choice for everyone due to age, distance and         | Edit text and end of What p86 add  |
|                             | ability  | It should however be acknowledged that walking and cycling is not an                 |
|                             |  | option for everyone depending on age, distance of travel and ability                 |
|                             | Improve state of footways and address width issues (too narrow)                        | Message already included within the TCVP - see Action 4                              |
|                             | Need to extend the footprints of the proposals to include walking/cycling links to     | Message already included within the TCVP - see Action 4                              |
|                             | the new major residential development sites  |  |
|                             | Need to protect open spaces for walking from further development                       | Noted - but outside the remit of TCVP. Covered by Local Plan                         |
|                             | Better signage as lots is hidden   | Message already included within the TCVP - see Action 4                              |

| Priorities Intervention                    | Consultation Comments  | Response   |
|--|--|--|
|  | Signage to include QR codes with links to maps on phones to show routes and distances  | Message already included within the TCVP - see Action 5  |
|  | Sponsoring/encouraging a cycle shop for the town that could offer repairs and training   | Idea supported but will be delivered by the private sector   |
| Raise Alsager's Profile                    | Monument/landmark to represent Alsager and makes a statement when arriving e.g. could be on grounds at Civic Centre  | Detailed design suggestions to be considered as part of potential future feasibility work  |
|  | More interesting events e.g. antiques market   | Add e.g. antiques market to 2 <sup>nd</sup> bullet on p88  |
|  | Dedicated website for events and better co-ordination between businesses/<br>admins of website to promote - Alsager in Focus is good but only delivered to<br>residents. Alsager Facebook page | Message already included within the TCVP - see Action 5  |
|  | Local authority, both town and Cheshire East, to actively support (with grants, council works support etc) the charity groups who put on events which attract outsiders to the town            | Town Council and CEC already support/engage with local groups  |
|  | A signposted tourism base/local history centre   | Add new bullet at end of How p 88<br>Review the potential of promoting Alsager's history to encourage more<br>tourists to visit  |
|  | Increase police presence to ensure expanding night tie offer does not result in anti-social behaviour  | Noted - but outside the remit of the TCVP  |
|  | Don't spend lots of money on this as quite good social media already - could improve coordination of what is already being promoted by local businesses  | Noted  |
|  | Must make sure keep individual character of Alsager  | Add new sentence before penultimate sentence on p88 - just before This should<br>and its unique characteristics  |
| Mobilising Alsager's<br>Business Community | General view local businesses do support the town and try to make it attractive and many are already collaborating   | This is acknowledged on p90 of TCVP  |
| -  | Support more independents  | Add new sentence at the end of the para under What p90   |
|  |  | Many independents are passionate about the towns in which they are<br>located as they often have personal links to the town and respond to their<br>unique characteristics. Supporting independents to locate within Alsager |
|  |  | will broaden the centre's offer and enhance its vitality   |
|  | Incentives needed to attract businesses  | Noted but outside the remit of the TCVP  |
|  | CEC to engage with businesses to understand priorities   | CEC already engages with local businesses  |
|  | A BID "light" would be welcome, an established way to facilitate links and discussions would be beneficial   | Noted  |
|  | More diverse business offering as being overrun with cafes/restaurants   | Agree but type of businesses which choose to open in a particular location is outside the control of the Town Council and CEC  |
|  | Local loyalty card scheme has been introduced but didn't work as need everyone's support to be functional  | Noted but may be worth considering reintroducing   |
|  | Allow community groups to use large square by Asda   | To be considered in determining detailed action plan in response to the TCVP   |

| Priorities Intervention   | Consultation Comments   | Response   |
|---------------------------|---|--|
| Public Transport Strategy | Engagement needed with the public transport companies to find out the issues<br>and how CEC can help e.g. reliability | Ongoing engagement is already in place   |
|                           | Don't think buses should go through Milton Park as major safety concerns  | Any changes to bus routes will be made by operators following feasibility works                                    |
|                           | Bus options to out of town retail destinations are not great  | Noted - but bus routing is outside remit of TCVP and CEC   |
|                           | A small bus service that operates around the local area and stops at different  | Noted - CEC to consider potential.   |
|                           | areas, similar to Leighton bus links  |  |
|                           | Better options needed to Congleton and Sandbach   | Noted - but bus routing is outside remit of TCVP and CEC   |
|                           | Platform at train station needs to be lengthened  | Noted - but outside control of CEC   |
|                           | Alsager rail network need to be better connected to encourage locals to use the                                       | Noted - but outside control of CEC   |
|                           | train   |  |
|                           | Mixed views on more parking at the station  | Noted  |
|                           | A regular hop on, hop off shuttle service between Town Centre and train station                                       | Agree but bus routing is outside the control of CEC  |
|                           | may encourage use Digital signage/app use for timetable information   | Add new bullet to how p92  |
|                           |   | Improvement in real time timetable information potentially via apps and/or   |
|                           |   | digital signage  |
|                           | Exits not exists in 'What' paragraph - relating to public transport strategy priority                                 | P92 line 4 change exists to <b>exits</b>   |
|                           | Should this be improve "active travel" connections more specifically  |  |
| Other Comments            | Ensuring to keep the free parking in Alsager is a must for the town to survive  | Agree free parking encourages visitors to centres however pricing of car parking is determined by CEC Highways     |
|                           | Update the skatepark as currently it is not fit for purpose. This would encourage use and help reduce ASB             | Noted - detailed proposals for projects will be worked up locally by stakeholders                                  |
|                           | The market must remain in current location as close to parking for current stall                                      | Noted but outside the remit of the TCVP. Proposals for changes would be subject                                    |
|                           | holders although some have suggested the need for a bigger market   | to detailed feasibility and consultation   |
|                           | Bypass/Four way lights at Bank corner needed  | Noted - proposals for changes to highways will be undertaken by CEC Highways based on appropriate feasibility work |
|                           | Report should focus more on sustainability  | Sustainability is a central theme of the TCVP see p95  |
|                           | Make sure solutions are based on what Alsager needs not "copied" from other   | Agree - key message of all the TCVP any changes to the centres must relate to                                      |
|                           | places  | their unique characteristics   |
|                           | Need for social amenities such as surgery, schools etc  | Noted but outside of the remit of TCVP   |
|                           | Form a local energy company to raise funds for photovoltaics on school roofs  | Good idea - could be pursued as one of the projects in response to the TCVP  |
|                           | More electric charging points   | Key recommendation of the Alsager Public Realm Feasibility Study 0 see p20   |
|                           | Concerns about warehouses on Crewe Road   | Outside the remit of the TCVP  |
|                           | Rewilding project should be in the woods not in the town centre   | Exact location of any of the suggestions would be determined through future feasibility work                       |
|                           | Residents want to see investment not more surveys about what they would like every couple of years                    | Noted - TCVP is an action plan to support change in Alsager  |

| Priorities Intervention | Consultation Comments  | Response   |
|-------------------------|--|--|
|                         | There seem to be several inaccuracies and failures to have taken on board the        | The TCVP does not seek to be perspective in respect of any proposals rather it       |
|                         | public response to previous "consultations". Apparently there has even been a        | sets out suggestions based on discussions with stakeholders and from the public      |
|                         | suggestion that the weekly market should be moved from the Fairview car park         | consultations. Detailed projects will required further feasibility and consultation. |
|                         | onto the green space in front of the Town Council offices/Library. That appears to   |  |
|                         | be guaranteed to kill the market, making access for vehicles difficult or impossible |  |
|                         | for some of the traders, The land would soon become a mud bath, and creating a       |  |
|                         | hard standing would reduce the green attractiveness of the area                      |  |

Page 13

2.3 The following diagrams illustrate general feedback in terms of the TCVP:



## Page 14

#### 2.4 The table below summarises additional comments received in respect of the Alsager TCVP.

| Specific Revisions to Alsager TCVP                                 | Response to the Feedback  |
|--|---|
| The Vitality Plan is too long and unwieldy to read. You have to    | The TCVPs provide a range of information - baseline, policy       |
| plough through 70 pages of preamble before getting to the          | context, analysis of opportunities/constraints and actions plans. |
| actions. Most of the preamble should be consigned to an            | Whilst it is acknowledged that the TCVPs are quite large they     |
| appendix. Also, there is far too much jargon. You will lose,       | have been prepared to provide a consistent set of information for |
| confuse and annoy many people writing public documents like        | each of the centres. Readers are directed by the content page to  |
| this and consequently damage your credibility and ability to       | the section they may be most interested in reading. A glossary is |
| deliver. In future, please make more effort to make documents      | provided at the end of the TCVP to explain terms some             |
| easier to use. It will pay dividends!                              | individuals will not be familiar with                             |
| There seem to be several inaccuracies and failures to have         | The TCVP does not seek to be perspective in respect of any        |
| taken on board the public response to previous "consultations".    | proposals rather it sets out suggestions from discussions with    |
| Apparently there has even been a suggestion that the weekly        | stakeholders and from the public consultations. Detailed projects |
| market should be moved from the Fairview car park onto the         | will required further feasibility and consultation.               |
| green space in front of the Town Council offices/Library. That     |   |
| appears to be guaranteed to kill the market, making access for     |   |
| vehicles difficult or impossible for some of the traders, The land |   |
| would soon become a mud bath, and creating a hard standing         |   |
| would reduce the green attractiveness of the area                  |   |
| Page 40 - This was updated in 2021 an needs further updating.      | P40 Remove the yellow dots from the photos and edit the box       |
| Most of the buildings have new businesses e.g. the old solicitors  | Update 2022: Since the site visit in 2020 many of the units       |
| is now a cafe bar, the bake house is a cafe, Cartwright's is now   | that were vacant have now been occupied. For example a            |
| an opticians. Barclays bank is a restaurant /bar, with a huge      | former solicitors is now a cafe bar, the bake house is a cafe,    |
| front extension that is causing issues for drivers and             | Cartwright's is now an opticians and the former Barclays          |
| pedestrians.   | bank is a restaurant /bar   |
| Add reference to voluntary groups that are supporting on           | P64 add to last bullet in ( ) on under strengths Maintenance of   |
| maintenance of Milton Gardens                                      | Milton Gardens  |

| 2.5 T | The below provides a sum | nary of the characteristics of those v | who responded to the consultation. |
|-------|--------------------------|--|------------------------------------|
|-------|--------------------------|--|------------------------------------|

|                            | Individual  | 38  |
|----------------------------|---|-----|
| Individual/member of panel | Mobberley Parish Council                                  | 1   |
|                            | Local Business  | 1   |
|                            | Male  | 22  |
| Gender Identity            | Female  | 16  |
|                            | Prefer not to say   | 2   |
|                            | 16-24   | 0%  |
|                            | 25-34   | 15% |
|                            | 35-44   | 10% |
|                            | 45-54   | 23% |
| Age Group                  | 55-64   | 23% |
|                            | 65-74   | 13% |
|                            | 75-84   | 8%  |
|                            | 85 and over   | 0%  |
|                            | Prefer not to say   | 10% |
|                            | White British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/Irish | 88% |
|                            | Any other White background                                | 3%  |
|                            | Mixed: White and Black Caribbean/African/Asian            | 0%  |
| Ethnic Group               | Asian/Asian British                                       | 0%  |
|                            | Black African/Caribbean/Black British                     | 0%  |
|                            | Prefer not to say   | 10% |
|                            | Prefer to self-describe                                   | 0%  |

## 3.0 Feedback from Congleton

3.1 153 responses were received in respect of the Congleton Report. The level of support for the identified priority areas is identified in the charts below:



Page 16



3.2 A summary of the specific comments received in respect of each of the proposed priorities for intervention in Congleton is provided below. The response includes how the Final Report has been edited to take into account the comments where appropriate or relevant:

| Priorities<br>Intervention             | Consultation Comments  | Response   |
|--|--|--|
| Opportunities for<br>change around     | General agreement with suggestions under this action, but not considered by many to be a priority  | Noted - following review of all comments including those from Town Council this priority intervention has been removed   |
| Congleton Museum<br>and Police Station | Relatively remote area and under-utilised asset would require activity to drive footfall e.g. events, markets, café with outdoor seating, children's play area, popups | P76 How add:<br>is scope for it be better used as a communal area to host <b>outdoor</b> gathering and events<br><b>e.g. markets, pop up café, children's play</b>   |
|  | A number of concerns regarding impact of light and noise pollution and loss of parking on event days for surrounding residents particularly on Kinsey Street           | Noted - to be determined locally when working up more detailed proposals<br>P76 How 1 <sup>st</sup> para add - <b>However, care must be taken to ensure any adverse impacts</b><br>(light/noise etc.) on surrounding residential areas are mitigated, including those on<br>Kinsey Street.                                 |
|  | Needs to better lit, particularly at night to reduce risk of ASB   | P76 How 1 <sup>st</sup> bullet: Replace temporary lighting with <b>Appropriate lighting to create a</b> safer environment  |
|  | Buildings need to be aesthetically improved - police station and library detract from area   | P76 How Longer Tern add new 1 <sup>st</sup> bullet:<br>Consider improving the appearance of more dated buildings fronting this area such<br>as the police station and library  |
|  | Clean up area and ensure general maintenance e.g. mend pavements, mow grass  | P76 How add short term bullet:<br>Ensure this area is well maintained e.g. grass is mowed  |
|  | Fencing needs to be removed to open up grassed area  | Noted - suggested on P76 under How   |
|  | Not an area people congregate, therefore wildflower or other planting, more trees<br>or community allotment would be better to create a quiet space                    | P76 How add bullet - options for increased greening including trees, planting, wildflower meadows or community allotment   |
|  | Congleton Park is considered a more suitable events venue by some whilst others liked the idea of transferring ambience from the Park to a more central area of town   | Noted - to be considered as part of any more detailed proposals  |
|  | Events a good 'meanwhile' use until development can be delivered   | Noted - this action suggests this at P76 How   |
|  | Some suggestions of knocking down police station to extend development potential of the site and open it up to Mountbatten Way, but should not lose the library        | Noted - details of any future proposals will be worked up with stakeholders  |
|  | Better pedestrian signposted links through to Centre and Market Street,<br>Mountbatten Way and car parks with inviting on-foot access                                  | P76 at short terms bullet:<br>Create inviting signposted walking routes to from the town centre including Market Street,<br>Mountbatten Way and local car parks  |
|  | Longer term development in this area could suit a new market hall or good quality affordable housing   | Noted - to be determined locally when working up more detailed proposals<br>P76 last bullet: Site investigation to understand development potential and required site<br>remediation/ groundworks. <b>The site could suit a range of town centre developments</b><br><b>such as residential uses or a new market hall.</b> |

| Priorities<br>Intervention            | Consultation Comments  | Response   |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|
|                                       | Museum should be in a historic building instead, such as Bradshaw House or<br>Moody Hall. Need to better promote the museum  | Consider in TCVP in Action 5   |
| Repairing the severance and impact of | Majority against the reducing of road width/ number of lanes as would hinder traffic flow and cause more congestion, particularly at peak times on this major east-west route, pushing traffic onto residential streets and increasing pollution   | Noted, this will be worked up with stakeholders through detailed proposals Such proposals would only be brought forward after extensive traffic modelling and consultation.  |
| Mountbatten Way                       | Severance of Park and leisure centre from town centre recognised as an issue<br>Better pedestrian crossings to Congleton Park and leisure centre. Suggestions<br>include maybe remove current and add two more e.g. Road Hill, or introduce a foot<br>bridge or underpass                              | Agreed - this action seeks to address this issue P80-83         P80 How edit bullet or split into two points?         Traffic calming along Mountbatten Way to slow traffic speeds and allow for more opportunities to incorporate additional or enhanced pedestrian crossings.         Unfortunately it is unlikely that a footbridge or underpass would be affordable                      |
|                                       | Flower boxes by Congleton Bloom are appreciated and improve attractiveness but<br>one on corner of Mill Street obstructs pedestrian's view. Additional greening to create<br>a more tree lined boulevard or central carriageway could improve  | P90 how 4 <sup>th</sup> bullet add:<br>Introduce more soft landscape features to visually enhance the corridor as well as provide<br>opportunities for carbon and particulates management. Flower boxes are starting to do<br>this but greening could be extended to create a tree lined boulevard or central<br>carriageway subject to safety considerations.                               |
|                                       | Enough space for a cycle lane without removing lane<br>Need to address bus routes and how they link to Mountbatten Way   | Noted - to be determined locally when working up more detailed proposals<br>Agree - public transport is determined by bus and train operators but CEC will continue to<br>lobby for improvements   |
| Enhancing Walking<br>and Cycling      | Speed cameras and removal of on-street parking could ease flow           Ensure cycle routes are connected to all residential areas, schools and shopping areas outside of Town Centre as well as key town assets  | Noted - to be determined locally when working up more detailed proposals         P84 How 1st bullet add:         Explore design options to create a joined-up walking and cycling network through the         Town Centre, as identified by the LTDP. The network should integrate with         surrounding residential areas, schools and shopping areas.                                   |
|                                       | General accessibility enhancements required e.g. dropped kerbs, clear uncluttered routes and uneven surfaces   | Add at the end of How p84<br>It is important to ensure that all pathways are well maintained and safe for all users<br>including even pavements, dropped kerbs and landscaping   |
|                                       | Not considered by some to be a priority action<br>Difficulty in encouraging walking/cycling due to hilly/ steep roads in the town e.g.<br>Canal Street and Park Lane and ageing population   | Noted - no longer identified as a priority action following public consultation<br>P84 What 1 <sup>st</sup> para:also north to Macclesfield. Whilst there are recognised challenges<br>to walking and cycling in Congleton presented by its hilly topography (e.g. Canal<br>Street and Park Lane), there is potential to improve the walking and cycle network in<br>Congleton and encourage |
|                                       | Secure bike storage required           Electric bikes or scooters at the train station suggested           Safer cycling routes by separating bikes, pedestrians and cars into separate lanes/paths e.g. High Street, along River Dane and pedestrianised area of Bridge Street. Mentioned a few times | This message is picked up in the TCVP at P84 under What         Noted - to be determined locally when working up more detailed proposals         Noted - All modes of movement and potential conflicts between them to be considered         when working up more detailed proposals.         P84 How: Careful consideration should be given to balancing the requirements of each           |

| Priorities                         | Consultation Comments   | Response  |
|------------------------------------|---|---|
| Intervention                       | Consultation Comments   |   |
|                                    |   | conflicts between bikes, pedestrians and cars in some areas e.g. High Street, along   |
|                                    |   | River Dane and pedestrianised area of Bridge Street.  |
|                                    | Make Mountbatten Way a safer cycle route with designated cycle lanes to discourage use of town centre areas   | This message is considered within the TCVP at Action 1 and also picked up on P84  |
|                                    | Better routes from the train station to the Town Centre and West/Lower Heath and better links from the cycle lanes to Sandbach Road and Holmes Chapel Road  | Agreed and noted on P84 Action 3, as identified in the LCWIP  |
|                                    | Should not be at expense of impeding through traffic  | Noted - to be determined locally when working up more detailed proposals  |
|                                    | There is a CEC Cycling Champion   | Agreed and identified in Who on P.84 Action 3   |
|                                    | One way system on Market Square reversed to give cyclists a route into town from Mountbatten Way  | Noted - to be determined locally when working up more detailed proposals  |
|                                    | Cycle route on bypass leads to some roads with no pavements   | Noted - to be determined locally when working up more detailed proposals  |
|                                    | Provide a skate park/BMX track e.g. Kidsgrove   | Noted - detailed proposals for projects will be worked up locally by stakeholders   |
|                                    | River Dane cycle routes good idea. The river could be an attractive location but needs better maintenance and lighting  | Agreed and identified in How on P84   |
|                                    | Change Lawton Street to only cars for residents/ workers  | Noted - to be determined locally when working up more detailed proposals  |
|                                    | Needs to be in conjunction with improved public transport   | This message is considered within the TCVP at Action 10   |
|                                    | More signage of routes and maps with using Congleton as a starting point and leading to other assets/ towns. Similar to in the Peak District  | P84 add bullet: Ensure cycle and walking route are well signposted and identified on local maps   |
|                                    | Promoting surrounding walking routes  | Noted - to be determined locally when working up more detailed proposals  |
| Opportunities for<br>change around | Significant support for this action and the need for change in this area - suggestions that this should be a priority action.   | Noted - identified as a priority action through the public consultation as a result   |
| Market Hall                        | Needs comprehensive well thought out proposals  | Agreed - the How section on P86 sets this out   |
|                                    | Desperately needs to be made more attractive and better maintained as is currently<br>an eye sore. Could be a great welcoming asset/ gateway to the town  | Noted to address frontage P86 Action 4<br>P84 What:<br>The areas north of the existing Market Hall are in a key <b>gateway</b> location within the Town<br>Centre, with direct access and visibility from Bridge Street and Mountbatten Way |
|                                    | Incorporate with development of the whole Bridgestones area/ Mill Street  | No need to change document as p86 already refers to the opportunity to look at different sites in this area collectively  |
|                                    | Variety of different uses suggested such as health hub/ community hub/<br>entertainment facility/ sports facility for building and also outdoor uses for<br>theatre/film events including markets | P86 1 <sup>st</sup> bullet: Provide a mix of uses such as retail, leisure, residential and <b>community</b> based on <b>local need and</b> further demand assessment  |
|                                    | Suggestions of moving the market to the Town Centre for better visibility e.g. back on library car park   | Noted - to be determined locally when working up more detailed proposals  |
|                                    | Making the building more attractive to improve safety of the area   | Noted - to be determined locally when working up more detailed proposals  |
|                                    | More adequate lighting  | Noted - to be determined locally when working up more detailed proposals  |

| Priorities           | Consultation Commonto   | Response   |
|----------------------|---|--|
| Intervention         | Consultation Comments   |  |
|                      | Access from the north between Princess Street and Morrisons car park is unfriendly to pedestrians   | P86 3 <sup>rd</sup> bullet add: Improve links from shopping areas along Bridge Street through to Market Street and Mountbatten Way and onto the river and park, <b>and from the north via Princess Street</b>  |
|                      | Encouragement from the Council and local businesses to fill vacant premises e.g.<br>Rent free periods or other incentives   | This message is considered within the TCVP at Action 10 but rates are determined by landlords so outside the scope of CEC and this TCVP  |
|                      | Hall to be raised to same level as Morrisons  | Noted - to be determined locally when working up more detailed proposals   |
|                      | Better promotion of Market Hall as is not even on Google Maps   | This message is considered within the TCVP at Action 7   |
|                      | Address brick wall of Morrisons as is also an eye sore and does not enhance gateway to the town   | Noted to address frontage P86 Action 4   |
|                      | Too much retail. Consider residential to bolster footfall   | Noted as potential mixed-use option on P86 Action 4  |
|                      | Concern over anti-social behaviour in this area   | This TCVP seeks to improve vitality of the town centre and this action to transform the area around the Market Hall. In turn, increased footfall and natural surveillance, together with a well thought out holistic scheme should help to reduce the prospect of anti-social behaviour                  |
| Showcasing           | Some felt Congleton's heritage would have limited appeal or impact  | Noted  |
| Congleton's Heritage | Better promotion required   | P87 How para 3 add: More events focused on heritage should also be considered with scope to link to showcasing the Centre's other assets including the River. <b>Such events and initiatives should be well advertised.</b>  |
|                      | Old buildings of significance need to be restored and owners encouraged to improve building facades   | The aim of the TCVP is to increase the vitality of Congleton and to encourage footfall and spend in the Centre. This should in turn support owners to invest in their properties. In the case of heritage assets the TCVP could be used to support funding for bids to Historic England/Heritage Lottery |
|                      | 'Make Moody Marvellous' campaign to restore Listed Moody Hall which is falling into dereliction should be supported by CEC  | Noted – outside of TCVP remit as a privately owned asset. TCVP could be used to support funding for bids to Historic England/Heritage Lottery  |
|                      | To be noted that QR codes good for some but aren't applicable for everyone e.g. the elderly – consider free pamphlets and information boards at key sites e.g. Priestly Fields                          | P87 How 1 <sup>st</sup> para add to end - <b>Other options including characterful signage, information boards, maps and pamphlets should also be considered for those less digitally connected.</b>  |
|                      | Museum to be better connected to High Street or given new home in a historic building instead, such as Bradshaw House or Moody Hall. Need to better promote the museum                                  | P87 What add after heritage value. The town also benefits from the free Congleton Museum covering the local history of the area.   |
|                      | Provide walks to unseen areas of town e.g. ruins under/ behind Bridge Street,<br>Astbury Mere, Congleton Park, Cockshoots, The Bath House - could be incorporated<br>into a trail                       | P87 How 1 <sup>st</sup> para - Consideration should be given as to how to use these to encourage visitors to venture into other, and less well known, parts of the town such as the ruins behind Bridge Street, Astbury Mere, Congleton Park, Cockshoots and The Bath House.                             |
|                      | Free walks by the museum or local historians/volunteers to be run more frequently could be themed e.g. ghost walks. Trails should be accessible for all and also links to health and fitness objectives | This could also be linked to other themed trails e.g. ghost trail or pub trail led by local historians/volunteers or the Museum. Trails should be accessible to all and would support wider health objectives.   |

| Priorities                    | Consultation Comments   | Response   |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
| Intervention                  | Recently unveiled statue of Elizabeth Wolstenholme Elmy was positively received (made possible by donations from the public of £75k between 2018-2022)  | P87 What add:<br>A heritage trail is available providing details of a number of buildings of heritage value and<br>a statue of woman's suffragette Elizabeth Wolstenholme Elmy who lived in<br>Congleton has recently been unveiled  |
|                               | Heritage centre to build upon new Elizabeth statue which has led to<br>communications across the world with the Elizabeth's Group   | Noted - to be determined locally when working up more detailed proposals   |
|                               | History flags and large bears already work well   | Noted - to be considered when working up more detailed proposals   |
| Making more of<br>Congleton's | This section does not really identify which assets are referred to other than the area in front of the museum which is already picked up in Action 1  | Under 'where' - include Congleton paddling pool. Congleton Leisure Centre, Congleton Community Garden and Congleton Park, as well as other buildings, car parks and parks.   |
| Community Assets              | Area in front of Town Hall/ museum could be community gardens/allotments  | Considered within the TCVP at Action 1   |
|                               | Combine with priority re Museum (1)   | Action 1 is more a spatial priority but some overlap noted   |
|                               | Need to make sure all assets are maintained and attractive  | P88 How 2 <sup>nd</sup> para:<br>The Town Council is also active and may be willing to take a proactive role in managing<br>and maintaining some of these assets to ensure they remain attractive and maximise<br>their opportunity for use<br>Split to make a new para - How assets could be used in the short term |
|                               | Pavements, walkways and street furniture are assets that need to be properly maintained with appropriate materials and estate agents boards can detract from community assets   | Agreed - page 94 'Centre wide actions' addresses this.   |
|                               | Consideration of community assets should go beyond buildings and parks to include community groups as assets e.g. U3A, yoga etc   | P88 How add new para to end:<br>Consideration should also be given to engaging and collaborating with the wider<br>community assets across Congleton including local churches and community<br>based organisations e.g. U3A, sporting groups etc   |
|                               | Better promotion of assets. For example through a public/ private partnership to  | P88 How add new para:  |
|                               | ensure a good marketing budget and better marketing of assets   | Consideration should be given as to how best to promote each of the town's community assets to raise awareness and maximise their usage  |
|                               | Town Hall is underutilised and could be used for concerts/cinema/comedy nights  | P88 What: There are a number of public/community assets which sit within areas which have the potential to be brought <del>back</del> into more active use <b>including the Town Hall,</b><br>Library? and Congleton Park  |
|                               | Make more of Congleton Park - bandstand to be used for more events (circus, fairground, concerts) and sports and maybe market. Paddling Pool and Theatre to be felt as extension to the park. Congleton playing fields could also be used for sporting events | P88 How add new para:<br>Congleton Park is a significant community asset which together with the nearby<br>padding pool, theatre and playing fields, could be utilised more through a series of<br>events (e.g. circus, fairground, concerts), for example at the bandstand, or sports                               |
|                               | Better physical connections e.g. from park to Town Centre in terms of quality and accessibility   | which would also support health objectives.           Already included within the TCVP at Action 2 P80-83  |

| Priorities                        | Consultation Comments  | Response   |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| Intervention                      |  |  |
|                                   | Area should be extended so 'Town Centre' also includes Bridge Street and High Street areas   | The town centre is defined in the Local Plan and does include these areas  |
|                                   | Free parking associated with community assets mentioned frequently   | Noted - but beyond the remit of TCVP as pricing of car parking is determined by CEC Highways   |
|                                   | Lighting improvements to make connections between assets feel safer.<br>Better lighting to improve safety at the Park  | P88 How edit:<br>The use of (low energy) lighting to animate areas <b>and make key assets and connections</b><br><b>between assets safer</b> should be considered  |
|                                   | The War Memorial Hospital is a vital community asset   | The TCVP does not need to mention every community asset and therefore no need to specifically mention the War Memorial Hospital especially as it is outside the town centre.   |
|                                   | CEC to contribute to 'Make Moody Marvellous' campaign  | Considered in Action 5   |
|                                   | Café and toilet in the library   | Noted to be determined locally when working up more detailed proposals   |
| Raise the profile of<br>Congleton | Need to develop a USP as surrounded by a lot of market towns with similar assets, events and initiatives e.g. Ale Taster Trail was successful  | Noted - this action seeks to enhance the vitality of the town by maximising the opportunities presented by its USPs to raise the profile of Congleton  |
|                                   | Belper is a good example of a town that has raised its profile   | Picked up in Action 8 P90  |
|                                   | Any effort to raise the profile needs to be backed up with improvements to the Town Centre   | Noted - the TCVPs seek to enhance the vitality of the town centre as a whole   |
|                                   | Consistent modern signage  | P89 How edit: Improved <b>consistent and modern</b> signage (physical and virtual via app/<br>QR code) to stop people just passing through   |
|                                   | Website needs to be better designed and accessible to both residents and tourists.<br>Should be kept up to date. Some key attractions are missing on website e.g. canal.<br>Website should have a 'What's On' section - including in local pubs and venues | P89 How add at the end of 1st paragraph:<br>local walks, cycle routes, key assets such as the canal etc which would be useful to<br>both tourists and local residents. It must be ensured that the website is kept up to<br>date and could include a "What's on" section covering local venues, pubs and<br>events to support this |
|                                   | Advertise the town more in press and social media e.g. Facebook  | P89 how. Add new bullet:<br>Promotion of Congleton via positive PR and good news stories in the press and<br>dedicated social media channels   |
|                                   | Beartown leaflet through local doors is main way residents know of upcoming events so should continue  | P89 how. Add new bullet:<br>Continuation of the popular Beartown leaflet through local doors to inform local<br>residents of upcoming events   |
|                                   | Link to attractions further afield e.g. Jodrell Bank, Little Moreton Hall  | P89 3 <sup>rd</sup> para:for example other centres with heritage assets such as Sandbach and Nantwich, CEC website, and visitor attractions further afield such as Jodrell Bank and Little Moreton Hall  |
|                                   | Some prefer to keep Congleton a 'hidden gem'   | Noted  |
|                                   | Poor perception from Mountbatten Way and improved signage along Mountbatten<br>Way to attract people into the town as well as on iconic footbridge and to Astbury<br>Mere  | This is considered in more detail under Action 2   |

| Priorities                       | Consultation Comments   | Response   |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| Intervention                     |   |  |
|                                  | Could link with house developers to include details of what Congleton has to offer  | Noted - to be considered in working up any future detailed proposals   |
|                                  | within new home 'welcome packs' including services, voluntary groups etc  |  |
|                                  | Better public transport connections for accessibility   | This is considered in more detail under Action 10  |
|                                  | Reintroduce the Carnival as a central community venture   | Noted - to be considered in working up any future detailed proposals   |
|                                  | The market needs to be in a higher profile location   | The TCVP promotes a review of the market place locality and any proposals for the market can be considered as part of that. No need for any change to document |
|                                  | More evening and leisure attractions to attract people at night-time. Need attractions with broader appeal e.g. evening economy | Considered within action 9 of the TCVP   |
| Mobilising Business<br>Community | Reduced business rates for start-up businesses  | Noted - but business rates are determined centrally and beyond the control of CEC or the scope of the TCVP   |
|                                  | Repurposing of vacant units   | This is considered in more detail under Action 9   |
|                                  | Define 'businesses' as all key employers and not just 'shops' or 'retail businesses'  | Agreed - this is picked up on P90 under what of this action  |
|                                  | Use example of Elizabeth Status as businesses did pro-bono work for the   | Noted - P90 How edit:  |
|                                  | installation  | If actions can be identified around issues/opportunities that relate to their core function,   |
|                                  |   | businesses may be able to provide support towards the Town's aspirations in the form   |
|                                  |   | of sponsorship, materials, technical support or volunteers. This is already starting   |
|                                  |   | to take place in Congleton with local businesses recently providing services for the   |
|                                  |   | installation of the new Elizabeth Wolstenholme Elmy statue   |
|                                  | Organise events solely for advertising local businesses/ independent retailers  | P90 How 2 <sup>nd</sup> para - Businesses networking could also identify "themes" where businesses   |
|                                  |   | can drive opportunities forward for example retailer and F&B hosting a fashion show or   |
|                                  |   | beauty event that promotes and showcases local businesses  |
|                                  | Businesses to pull together for events such as Halloween/Easter just like they  | P90 How 2 <sup>nd</sup> para add to end: Local businesses in Congleton already pull together for   |
|                                  | already do for Christmas/ Congleton Pride/Jazz and Blues Festival   | the Christmas, Congleton Pride and Jazz and Blues Festival, but could also get   |
|                                  |   | more involved in other events such as Halloween or Easter  |
|                                  | Important to retain local established businesses  | P90 What add: Engaging with these businesses and encouraging them to collaborate   |
|                                  |   | more effectively will both support the economic growth of the area and help to ensure  |
|                                  |   | that businesses are retained and flourish in Congleton   |
|                                  | Up-to-date business directory on the town website   | P90 Add 3 <sup>rd</sup> para to How: The provision of an up to date business directory on  |
|                                  |   | Congleton's website could support greater collaboration and networking between   |
|                                  |   | businesses whilst also raising their profile locally   |
|                                  | Encourage major employers e.g. AstraZeneca to visit or stay here  | P90 Add new point to How: Engagement with major employers in the locality and  |
|                                  |   | surrounding area to promote Congleton as a great place for staff to live or visitors   |
|                                  |   | to stay  |
|                                  | Better communication with Council through sponsorship and advertising   | Noted - to be considered in working up any future detailed proposals   |
|                                  | Transport is key such as free shuttle bus from train station  | Noted - covered in Action 10   |
|                                  | Integrate and connect periphery businesses and employees to the town centre via better walking routes                           | Noted - covered in Action 3  |

| Priorities<br>Intervention | Consultation Comments  | Response  |
|----------------------------|--|---|
| Tackling void              | Attract businesses to start up and fill empty voids in Congleton   | This is the purpose of this action  |
| properties                 | Many supported this action as a priority   | Identified as a new priority action following on from public consultations as a result  |
|                            | Reduced business rates to attract businesses. Mentioned a few times  | Noted but outside of the remit of TCVP as business rates are set nationally and private landlords set rental levels   |
|                            | Help with rents which may mean a lower Council tax to be paid to attract businesses  | Noted but outside of the remit of TCVP as business rates are set nationally and private landlords set rental levels   |
|                            | Encourage more people to live in town centre premises - consider change of use to residential or above shops e.g. consideration of retail on Mill Street and Lawton Street | Message already included within the TCVP - see P91 add to How para 2:<br>Residential is also another option to be considered for smaller units on the edges of the<br>town or above shops <b>e.g. Mill Street and Lawton Street</b>   |
|                            | Burwash, Sussex a good example of retail turned to residential with plaques<br>stating which shops once stood here, and can be included as part of heritage trail          | P91 2 <sup>nd</sup> para add: Residential is also another option to be considered for smaller units on<br>the edges of the town or above shops. <b>This has been successfully achieved in</b><br><b>Burwash, Sussex where plaques identify which shops previously occupied the</b><br><b>homes</b>  |
|                            | Vinyl window displays or local group displays to promote town rather than blank windows  | Message already included within the TCVP within this action at P91. Add to How 4th para:<br>Other short term solutions which <b>brighten</b> up vacant shop-fronts include <b>vinyl window</b><br><b>displays or</b> "wrappers" promoting the town and its businesses or <b>using vacant shop-</b><br><b>windows to showcase products of existing businesses or online stores</b> |
|                            | Some view wrappers as a good meantime use, others as a waste of time/money   | Noted   |
|                            | Council must pursue owners to either renovate or sell  | Noted - but CEC do not have powers to enforce unless the building is dangerous or sufficiently bad to invoke S215 maintenance notices   |
|                            | Improve appearance of voids  | This action considers a number of options to tackle voids and improve their appearance  |
|                            | Temporary pop-up shops or other initiatives e.g. promotion of Town Centre assets,<br>local art, local school exhibitions   | Message already included within the TCVP within this action at P91<br>Meanwhile uses (until <b>longer term occupation</b> can happen) and pop up stores or<br>activities can support footfall and allow potential occupiers to test the local area <b>or</b><br><b>support the local community e.g. local art or school exhibitions</b>   |
|                            | Don't fill with more of the same e.g. charity shops, take-aways, hairdressers  | Noted - but the type of occupier will be determined by the market/private sector and is therefore beyond the remit of the TCVPs   |
|                            | Focus attention on Mill Street, Cross Street and West Street   | P91 What - The attractiveness of parts of Congleton is undermined by vacancies and the closure of a number of large stores, <b>particularly around Mill Street, Cross Street and West Street within the town centre</b>   |
|                            | Change to entertainment/leisure facilities to improve night-time economy   | P91 How add to 1 <sup>st</sup> para: Instead of focusing on new retail occupiers it is worth trying to target leisure operators, <b>including those to improve the evening economy</b>  |
|                            | Congleton needs marketing widely   | Covered within the TCVP in Action 7   |
|                            | 'Make Moody Marvellous' campaign   | Picked up within TCVP in Heritage action  |
|                            | A theme to attract small businesses  | Noted - to be considered in working up any future detailed proposals  |
|                            | Public services e.g. doctors to accompany growing resident numbers   | Noted - to be considered in working up any future detailed proposals  |

| Priorities<br>Intervention    | Consultation Comments  | Response   |
|-------------------------------|--|--|
| Enhancing Public<br>Transport | More frequent and reliable bus and train services with reasonable fares to nearby<br>towns such as Wilmslow and Alderley Park and further afield e.g. Crewe, Stoke,<br>Macclesfield and Manchester, particularly in evenings and on Sunday | Noted - it must be acknowledged that public transport it outside the control of CEC but<br>they should use the feedback from the TCVPs to lobby for improvements as part of wider<br>engagement with providers as identified in this action on P92<br>P92 Who - Add <b>Network Rail</b>              |
|                               | Train station is out of town and up a steep hill making links to town centre challenging. A shuttle service that coincides with train times would be welcomed, particularly at peak community times, but unlikely to be viable             | This action notes the importance of improving connections between the rail station and town centre within How on P92   |
|                               | Bus service should coincide with train times mentioned frequently, but also local school/college starting and finishing times  | Noted - to be considered in working up any future detailed proposals   |
|                               | Vital for young people for socialising and accessing employment and enticing people here to live and commute   | Noted and agreed   |
|                               | Integrate digital route planning technology e.g. live timings and touch-in touch-out system for ease of use. Website for bus timings to be improved/digital times at bus stops   | P92 How add new bullet:<br>Consider the opportunity to introduce digital route planning technology e.g. live bus<br>and train timings and touch-in touch-out system for ease of use  |
|                               | Bus service to reach new residential developments  | P92 How edit: Look to strengthen bus services around Congleton<br>to locations including the Congleton Rail Station and <b>surrounding residential and</b><br><b>employment</b> areas such as West Heath, Buglawton and Mossley  |
|                               | Consider park and ride   | Park and Ride schemes only work in large towns with very high levels of congestion which deter use of private cars   |
|                               | Introduce electric vehicle infrastructure, scooters and e-bikes  | Noted - to be considered in working up any future detailed proposals   |
|                               | Make Beartown bus routes free for everyone   | Noted - to be considered in working up any future detailed proposals   |
|                               | Evaluate the current routes for accessibility which travel down narrow streets and make pedestrians feel unwelcome   | Noted - to be considered in working up any future detailed proposals   |
|                               | Move public transport hubs to cardinal points outside the Town Centre within walking distance  | Noted - to be considered in working up any future detailed proposals   |
|                               | Maps at station to show routes into town and its assets and services   | Considered within TCVP at Action 3   |
|                               | Improve cleanliness and safety of public transport to make it more appealing. In particular, improve attractiveness of station   | Noted - it must be acknowledged that public transport it outside the control of CEC but they should use the feedback from the TCVPs to lobby for improvements as part of wider engagement with providers as identified in this action on P92   |
| Other Comments                | There is a lot of cynicism regarding the delivery of change in Congleton   | The aim of the TCVP is to increase the vitality of Congleton, encourage footfall and spend<br>in the Centre and delivery positive change. However, it is recognised that there is no<br>budget to support the actions and local cynicism is therefore understood                                     |
|                               | Infrastructure needed to accommodate new residents e.g. doctors, dentists, schools. Mentioned a few times  | Noted but outside the remit of the TCVP. Proposals for new development are considered<br>by CEC through the Local Plan process and in determining individual planning<br>applications and infrastructure requirements associated with new development determined<br>as part of planning applications |

| Priorities<br>Intervention | Consultation Comments  | Response   |
|----------------------------|--|--|
|                            | Funding will be needed to support these actions  | The TCVP makes clear at P6 that there is not a pot of money available to support the delivery of the Vitality Plan. Rather the Vitality Plan has been prepared as a resource to support accessing funding                              |
|                            | Provision of public toilets. Mentioned a few times   | Noted - to be considered in working up any future detailed proposals   |
|                            | Recycling Centre/ Tip needed. Mentioned a few times  | Noted - to be considered in working up any future detailed proposals   |
|                            | Chapel Brook nursing home/former Council building in West Heath to be                              | This is not a CEC building   |
|                            | repurposed for multi-use, particularly to accommodate new services e.g. doctors                    | The importance of addressing town centres vacancies is covered in the TCVP so no need to reference this particular building  |
|                            | Addressing the attractiveness of Morrisons building as is gateway to town                          | This is a private business premises. The TCVP already includes an action to mobilise the business community to engage with them to better support economic growth in the area and add value. No need to specifically mention Morrisons |
|                            | Remove abandoned boat from riverside - mentioned a few times                                       | Noted - to be considered in working up any future detailed proposals   |
|                            | Need to improve accessibility for disabled/ prams in resurfacing pavements and ramps into shops    | Noted - picked up throughout the TCVP  |
|                            | Community volunteers to be used for quick wins   | Noted - picked up through community assets action  |
|                            | More clarification on average retail visit times, how was it over 3 hours, what were people doing? | This comment refers to footfall data collected in the benchmarking section of the TCVP.<br>This is included as an example demonstrating the Council review footfall data and dwell<br>time monthly                                     |

Page 27

3.3 The following diagrams illustrate general feedback in terms of the TCVP:



3.4 The following table summarises additional comments received in respect of the Congleton TCVP.

| Specific Revisions to Congleton TCVP   | Response to the Feedback  |
|--|---|
| It's full of exposing the learning curve of the consultants, it's out of date, given the current situation and it doesn't appear | Noted - all local stakeholders have been given the opportunity to feed into the     |
| to listen to local business leaders. It's the usual CEC waffle, full of preconceptions. Congleton's problems are obvious to      | TCVPs and this report of consultation demonstrates how those views have been        |
| many of the folk that live here and many of them stem from the stranglehold that CEC has. A more devolved solution is            | taken on board. The final version of the TCVP should better reflect this. The       |
| needed for all the towns in this study. Less reliance on CEC and more control of assets, planning and funding. The               | TCVPs were not intended to investigate the options for devolution, rather what      |
| Opportunities and Threats sections, such as they are, fail to address the fundamentals. Overall? 5 out of 10. Poor work          | actions could be undertaken under current conditions to support the future vitality |
| for presumably a fat fee. Sorry for an opportunity missed.   | of each town.   |
| You've broken down item 1 into short and long term actions - why not do the same with the other sections? There must             | Detailed projects will required further feasibility and consultation including      |
| be small steps possible in the short term?   | consideration of phasing and actions in the short, medium and long term.            |
| I feel that the plan is very superficial and despite having a long introduction in Our Place it doesn't give a feel of being     | This consultation process seeks to ensure that each local community has an          |
| generated for our community. It comes across as being a cut and paste report with minimal local interaction.                     | opportunity to inform and shape the TCVPs. This report of consultation              |
|  | demonstrates how the responses from those consultations have been taken on          |
|  | board and the reports updated to reflect the comments made.                         |
| I gave up on reading the plan halfway through, as it was very annoying to have to keep moving the bottom slider to see           | Taken on board  |
| all the information, the colour scheme was awful, and it was full of grammatical errors and typos, as is this survey. You        |   |
| really need a decent proof reader, as it leaves a bad impression.  |   |
| I was very surprised to see Glebe Farm described as a visitor attraction, because Glebe Farm is a mess which has                 | Subjective opinion in terms of quality of Glebe Farm. Still considered to attract   |
| destroyed the integrity of Astbury.  | visitors to the area  |
| The text boxes in this consultation also seem to have a word limit that is not mentioned which means that detailed               | Noted for future consultations  |
| examples could not be given.   |   |
| Firstly, the plan itself needs more work on the presentation - some maps were missing keys and along with tables were            | Plan and keys made larger where possible  |
| presented in such fonts that made it difficult to read. I question how those with eyesight issues would manage.                  |   |
| Several areas of this plan seem to focus upon "lets make the area look pretty" rather than addressing underlying and             | Taken on board - the consultation process has helped to identify those ideas that   |
| practical issues that would bring people into the area and look at the infrastructure needed by those who already live           | will not work in practice.  |
| here. Whilst that's all very well if you miss out the infrastructure, and practical issues it doesn't matter how pretty          |   |
| somewhere looks.   |   |
| There's often also steps missing to check assumptions made from several ideas that will influence the success of what            | Taken on board - the consultation process has helped to identify those ideas that   |
| looks good theoretically to what works practically.  | will not work in practice.  |
| There's no mention for example about public toilets that are clean and well maintained. There's a lot of focus upon              | Noted. The TCVPs are primarily focused on enhancing the town centre areas, but      |
| walking and cycling around the town centre but not on access for those with mobility issues in that area or for those living     | recognising the importance of the surrounding communities to support this aim.      |
| in Congleton but not in the town centre. Want people to walk more - improve the existing pavements by simply                     | Toilets, mobility and surface quality have all been responded to within the updated |
| resurfacing them so that its easier for push chairs etc to get to the town centre.   | TCVP following comments made during the public consultation.                        |

|                            | Individual  | 145 |
|----------------------------|---|-----|
| Individual/member of panel | Group, organisation or club                               | 2   |
|                            | Local Business  | 3   |
|                            | Male  | 74  |
| Gender Identity            | Female  | 73  |
|                            | Prefer not to say   | 2   |
|                            | 16-24   | 3%  |
|                            | 25-34   | 7%  |
|                            | 35-44   | 16% |
|                            | 45-54   | 24% |
| Age Group                  | 55-64   | 18% |
|                            | 65-74   | 20% |
|                            | 75-84   | 5%  |
|                            | 85 and over   | 0%  |
|                            | Prefer not to say   | 5%  |
|                            | White British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/Irish | 91% |
|                            | Any other White background                                | 2%  |
|                            | Mixed: White and Black Caribbean/African/Asian            | 1%  |
| Ethnic Group               | Asian/Asian British                                       | 1%  |
|                            | Black African/Caribbean/Black British                     | 0%  |
|                            | Prefer not to say   | 4%  |
|                            | Prefer to self-describe                                   | 1%  |

3.5 The below provides a summary of the characteristics of those who responded to the consultation:

## 4.0 Feedback from Handforth

4.1 55 responses were received in respect of the Handforth Report. The level of support for the identified priority areas is identified in the charts below:



Page 31



4.2 A summary of the specific comments received in respect of each of the proposed priorities for intervention in Handforth is provided below. The response includes how the Final Report has been edited to take into account the comments where appropriate or relevant:

| Priorities Intervention | Consultation Comments  | Response  |
|-------------------------|--|---|
| Deliver strong walking  | There has been a particular emphasis on safety with recommendations such as increased            | Agree - safety will be a critical element of detailed design of new or                          |
| and cycling connections | CCTV, wider pavements and better accessibility for disabled people                               | improved routes.  |
|                         |  | Add <b>safe</b> after well designed on p76 under What 2 <sup>nd</sup> word 2 <sup>nd</sup> para |
|                         | Multiple comments stating the walking and cycling routes are adequate                            | Whilst this is acknowledged as part of the climate crisis it is essential that                  |
|                         |  | people are encouraged to walk or cycle more rather than getting into their                      |
|                         |  | cars for short journeys   |
|                         | This section appears to concentrate solely on the links to the Garden Village - important        | The section does not just focus on the Garden Village. However it does                          |
|                         | though these links are the links between other parts of the village are equally important- e.g.  | recognise that designing strong walking and cycling routes which                                |
|                         | safe cycle routes along Wilmslow Rd from Wilmslow to the parish boundary at the Waggon           | encourages new residents to walk into the centre rather than use their car                      |
|                         | and Horses. Should include improvements to the underpass (lighting etc) or the connecting        | will be really important for the future of Handforth.   |
|                         | roads beyond the railway line (cycle paths )   |   |
|                         | Pavement widths are not wide enough - cars park on the pathways creating a problem               | Noted this will be taken into account in the detailed design of any new or                      |
|                         | for people with prams/wheelchairs forcing them to go on the road around them.                    | improved routes   |
|                         | Concerned that making Hall Road a thoroughfare will be detrimental to the surrounding            | Noted this would need to be considered in working up specific schemes                           |
|                         | neighbourhood. The increased traffic and commuter thoroughfare will also be                      |   |
|                         | detrimental to the oldest historical site in Handforth - Handforth Hall                          |   |
|                         | People emphasise the benefit of adding new cycle routes but stress the lack of cycle parking     | Agree - need for appropriate cycle parking is already specified on p76                          |
|                         | and the effect this may have   |   |
|                         | Wilmslow Road is a key stress point for many residents with cyclists complaining of cars         | Noted   |
|                         | passing to close and therefore welcoming the idea of cycle lanes                                 |   |
|                         | Use of surplus public realm land to create ghost right turn lanes into some of the side streets  | Noted this would need to be considered in working up specific schemes                           |
|                         | including in particular the turns into the Paddock and beside Spar                               |   |
|                         | Prefer if an alternative route for the traffic to and from the proposed village garden was found | The optimum solution will be determined as part of the planning                                 |
|                         | such as building another bridge or underpass to overcome the train line - to get direct access   | applications however the cost of a bridge spanning the railway line will be                     |
|                         | to Handforth centre  | very expensive and is unlikely to be able to be delivered                                       |
|                         | Need better signage/raise awareness of existing and proposed routes                              | Agree - is already specified on p76   |
|                         | Improve cycle parking at the station – add canopies on cycle parking                             | Noted - Town Council/CEC to lobby the train operator  |
| Enhancing street        | Create a barrier with trees and planting to provide safety from the road, providing              | P80 under what bullet 1 add at the end  |
| environment along       | attractive places to sit whilst screened from the road too. Reduce traffic noise by              | More planting (including wild flowers) will not only improve the                                |
| Wilmslow Road           | reducing speed through the village - numerous comments on supporting greening                    | appearance of the road but will also reduce pollution and increase                              |
|                         | including recognising how it can reduce pollution. Wildflower planting should be                 | biodiversity  |
|                         | considered to attract bees and other wildlife. Plant in non-linear layouts e.g. on lazy S with   |   |
|                         | cherry trees   |   |
|                         | Remove unnecessary clutter on the pavements and encourage the shops to have a                    | Add at the end of How p80 as new para   |
|                         | uniform frontage - discourage garish colours. Shutters could be painted and signs                |   |

| Priorities Intervention                           | Consultation Comments  | Response   |
|---|--|--|
|   | improved. Encourage artwork in vacant shops. Failure to modernise and improve commerce is going to lead to Handforth's ultimate demise   | In parallel to improvements to the public realm, local businesses<br>should be encouraged to invest in their premises. Working together<br>to agree a more consistent palette or material or brand for the Centre  |
|   | Need to really look at the existing & future locations of these planters because some of them really impede visibility when exiting certain roads.   | Agree - detailed work will be required to determine best location of planters to maximise benefits and minimise any potential negative impacts.  |
|   | Plans show three crossings 2 pedestrian crossings at each set of lights within a small proximity of each other and another one within a small distance from the church. A further two crossings are just off shot. Implementation of a further crossing is absurd considering the amount that are currently there  | Further work will be required to determine detailed schemes.<br>Change 2 <sup>nd</sup> bullet under what on p80<br><b>Review current crossing arrangement to enhance the ability to cross</b><br><b>the road without creating inappropriate congestion</b> |
|   | Parked cars pose a hazard to pedestrians Extend stations "platform for art" along Wilmslow Road  | Agree - detailed work will be required to determine best location of plantersto maximise benefits and minimise any potential negative impacts.Add to 4 <sup>th</sup> bullet on p80 under How   |
| Making More of The<br>Paddock and Meriton<br>Park | More attractive planting (lots of support) and outdoor seating and art/installations<br>The Paddock it the town square and should be the hub of what's going on e.g. market  | and extend stations "platform for art"<br>Agree - many of the ideas already included in Action 3<br>Add under how bullet 1 p84 and accommodate art installations before<br>etc   |
|   | There are some fabulous restaurants but no night time vibe for civilised drinks and get togethers, be lovely to have a Mediterranean feel in the paddock in the evenings. Lovely lighting and patio heaters for winter, places to stop and get coffee/wine late evening and maybe a glass of wine before or after having a meal out.                                     | Add new bullet after 4 <sup>th</sup> under how on p84<br>Add lighting and heaters to extend hours of operation   |
|   | The Pavilion in Meriton Road Park must be returned to the Community. It was bestowed<br>onto the Community and the Community is being denied rightful use of it as it has been<br>leased out to a hobby group. Conscientious work must be done with Friends of Meriton<br>Road Park to secure the return of the Pavilion to the Community where it rightfully<br>belongs | Noted but outside the remit of the TCVP  |
|   | Improve linkages between Park and Paddock – lots of support. Multiple people have stated Meriton Park needs more paths as majority is muddy and therefore puts people off going  | Key recommendation Action 3  |
|   | More shelter for dog walkers in the park e.g. café would be good and seats for walkers<br>Already is residential above the shops   | To be considered in working up detailed proposals for the Park<br>Remove <b>potentially for residential use?</b> From the last bullet on p84 under<br>How  |
|   | Encourage young people to play in the park not the Paddock – under 4s play area<br>Offer more things in the park e.g. gym, boules. Park needs more paths. If get kids along<br>their parents come and spend money  | This is already something that is being looked into as part of the masterplan for the park   |
|   | Include more information and local info for walkers<br>Could we have something similar to Altrincham or Mackie mayors market in the<br>paddock?  | Detailed provided in Action 4<br>This will be down to individual businesses determining that this would work<br>in Handforth. The TCVP seeks to create a more vibrant centre which would<br>increase the potential of this                                 |
|   | Get the locals involved first and others will follow. Use word of mouth to promote   | Agree - see Action 4   |

| Priorities Intervention | Consultation Comments  | Response  |
|-------------------------|--|---|
| Raise Handforth' s      | Local information about events or dates of interest to be more generally published.  | Agree - see Action 4  |
| Profile                 | No one outside of Handforth knows what is here and the good links to other areas   |   |
|                         | More community events - various suggestions  | And to 2 <sup>nd</sup> bullet point in second block of bullets on p86 under how (events |
|                         |  | programme)  |
|                         |  | expand existing programme to offer a range of events including                          |
|                         |  | community events  |
|                         | Some concerns about negative publicity that occurred due to Town Council meeting   | Noted - promoting positive messages about Handforth will mean people will               |
|                         | going viral  | soon forget about this incident   |
|                         | A few have mentioned that information around events which are currently on going need to   | Agree - see Action 4 for suggestions  |
|                         | be better publicised, so people are actually aware   |   |
|                         | Businesses could get together to have occasional late night shopping, in conjunction   | Agree - already included in Action 5  |
|                         | with restaurants, advertise a night maybe once a month or once a fortnight where there   |   |
|                         | are little boutique shops open, offers on in restaurants, somewhere to get just a drink.   |   |
|                         | Perhaps there could be short term, very minimum token rent pop up "boutiques" for  |   |
|                         | local artists/crafts people/clothes/retro  |   |
|                         | Have to have the right type of businesses in the village to be able to do that. Currently  | This will be down to individual businesses determining that this would work             |
|                         | the majority of units are occupied by takeaways. Some concern that some businesses   | in Handforth. Town Council and CEC to work together to undertake                        |
|                         | do not care about their environment - bins on show over filled in alleyways, smashed   | enforcement against inappropriate behaviour   |
|                         | glass, poor hygiene ratings  |   |
| Mobilising Business     | Promote local businesses that bring something to the community. Cafes and dog places   | Noted - but which businesses decide to take space in available units is                 |
| Community               | are needed. Home wares, gifts etc not takeaways, barbers and vape shops  | outside the control of the Town Council and CEC Good idea                               |
|                         | By working together and supporting local businesses we can provide a facility for work<br>experience and apprenticeships and encourage younger people to want to work in the | P85 at end of how add a new para  |
|                         | locality as an alternative to working in Stockport and Manchester. This will help to   | Local businesses could also collaborate to offer work experience and                    |
|                         | reduce carbon emissions if people have the opportunity to work closer to home and  | apprenticeships to encourage local people to work locally rather than                   |
|                         | local people will take greater pride in their environment and locality.  | believing they need to work elsewhere   |
|                         | By working together greater job opportunities can be created for people who live here  |   |
|                         | All assets should be utilised to their maximum potential to get the most value out of  | Agree   |
|                         | them for local community - including religious buildings   |   |
|                         | The Town Council cannot afford to take on the Youth Centre and should not be placing   | Noted - for Town Council to determine   |
|                         | that burden on the ratepayers of Handforth. They should have been helping getting the  |   |
|                         | Pavilion back into Community hands instead.  |   |
| Making more of          | Definitely make more use of the Youth Centre although again reliant on local volunteers  | Work ongoing on investment in Meriton Park and its facilities                           |
| Community Assets        | for the events/user groups   |   |
|                         | Strongly oppose the conversion of the Pavilion into a youth hub - this currently   |   |
|                         | accommodates the model railway group which would have to leave Handforth if  |   |
|                         | dispossessed Local residents strongly support the retention of the model railway group   |   |
|                         | despite what the friends of Meriton Park may say   |   |

| Priorities Intervention      | Consultation Comments  | Response   |
|------------------------------|--|--|
|                              | The youth centre is the place for youth activities especially if renovated and reenergised   |  |
|                              | No formal sports facilities in Handforth so re-establishing the MUGA at the Youth centre<br>and/or a football pitch at Stanley Green Park would be good (Stanley Green Park<br>needs signposting/advertising as a community facility beyond use by Spath Lane<br>residents   | Noted - suggestions in the TCVP will be prioritised further and specific projects worked up in more details by partners including CEC and Town Council   |
| Public Transport<br>Strategy | Improving public transport is critical to reducing car dependency. Whilst this includes active travel, buses and trains are critical to link it all together.  | Agree - this is why Action 7 was included  |
|                              | Handforth should get a Metrolink tram station at Handforth Dean and by Lakeland.<br>Handforth is in the commuter belt of Greater Manchester and improving public transport<br>links is a necessity for business and trade within the local area  | Agree this would deliver a step change in public transport. Would require significant investment from Central Government. CEC and other northern authorities are lobbying for investment in the northern transport systems   |
|                              | Handforth appears to be cut off with minimal public transport. Commuter access to<br>Manchester City Centre and the Airport is in serious need of investment. Bus services<br>appear to treat Handforth as a rural village yet the increase in housing in the area needs<br>to be supported by significant increase in public transport.   | Note - see above   |
|                              | The lifts to the station platforms are long overdue. Handforth is not disabled friendly at all - various comments  | CEC to continue to engage with train operators to lobby for improvements   |
|                              | A lack of late-night services is preventing commuters from living in Handforth   | CEC to lobby train operators   |
|                              | Improve station - by friends of ?  | Town Council to investigate whether sufficient support   |
|                              | Drop off points at the station is needed   | CEC and Town Council to continue to engage with train operators to lobby for improvements  |
|                              | More off street parking on Spath Lane Estate and speed bumps   | Noted - suggestions in the TCVP will be prioritised further and specific projects worked up in more details by partners including CEC and Town Council   |
| Other Comments               | Increased use of apps such as Car share to decrease number of cars   | Agree 0 could be looked at as a project emerging from TCVP   |
|                              | Concern about more homes being built on the greenbelt  | Noted but outside the remit of the TCVP. CEC responsible for determining housing allocations in response of need   |
|                              | Hope the public will be invited to hear the actual plans on this proposal as the information I have read so far is very limited on information and implementation. Many need to be correctly informed rather than told by the town council that we need a cycle lane, there ought to be a full detailed plan delivered to each household to comment on rather than being informed via town | The TCVP seeks to provide a consistent report across the 9 centres to help<br>individual centres to be able to engage with stakeholders to work up<br>detailed projects and seek funding.<br>Recommendations for future communication and engagement are set out<br>on p93 |
|                              | How does the council intend to work with health commissioners to ensure that health facilities within the locality match demand from the new housing developments in the coming years?   | CEC to advise on work on supporting the sustainable delivery of new homes  |
|                              | Future plans must consider all people Handforth is not just for the well off   | Agree  |

Please note that all comments received have been dealt with in the above Table

Page 36

4.3 The following diagrams illustrate general feedback in terms of the TCVP:


| 4.4 | The below provides a summary of the characteristics of those who responded to the consultation: |
|-----|---|
|-----|---|

|                            | Individual  | 46  |
|----------------------------|---|-----|
| Individual/member of panel | Council employee/professional                             | 2   |
|                            | Other   | 2   |
|                            | Male  | 22  |
| Gender Identity            | Female  | 25  |
|                            | Prefer not to say   | 2   |
|                            | 16-24   | 2%  |
|                            | 25-34   | 10% |
|                            | 35-44   | 34% |
|                            | 45-54   | 22% |
| Age Group                  | 55-64   | 14% |
|                            | 65-74   | 12% |
|                            | 75-84   | 4%  |
|                            | 85 and over   | 0%  |
|                            | Prefer not to say   | 2%  |
|                            | White British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/Irish | 88% |
|                            | Any other White background                                | 2%  |
|                            | Mixed: White and Black Caribbean/African/Asian            | 0%  |
| Ethnic Group               | Asian/Asian British                                       | 2%  |
|                            | Black African/Caribbean/Black British                     | 0%  |
|                            | Prefer not to say   | 2%  |
|                            | Prefer to self-describe                                   | 2%  |

## 5.0 Feedback from Knutsford

5.1 79 responses were received in respect of the Knutsford Report. The level of support for the identified priority areas is identified in the charts below:



Page 39



5.2 A summary of the specific comments received in respect of each of the proposed priorities for intervention in Knutsford is provided below. The response includes how the Final Report has been edited to take into account the comments where appropriate or relevant:

| Priorities Intervention | Consultation Comments   | Response  |
|-------------------------|---|---|
| Reduce Car Dominance    | Like the plans for spill-out from shops but need to be careful not to create an obstacle  | Action 1 acknowledges the need to consider prams and those with mobility  |
| of Cars Along King      | course for those with prams, mobility aids or on cycles   | impairments   |
| Street                  | The pavement needs widening or it needs to be a shared space with limited access to   | Principles identified in Action 1 - details of potential scheme to be worked up   |
|                         | vehicles. Pedestrians need to take priority.  | with key stakeholders   |
|                         | Cars turning right from Minshull St to take a short cut should also be restricted by  |   |
|                         | widening the corner pavement to limit width across King Street before this junction   |   |
|                         | Simply reducing the number of parking spaces isn't enough.  | Agree - the TCVP seeks to tackle a range of factors to support the vitality of<br>Knutsford   |
|                         | There should be no vehicles on King St - not even loading. Loading can take place from  | Previous feasibility work has been undertaken into different options and this   |
|                         | the side streets, the drivers can use hand carts and trolleys   | should be built upon to determine a workable scheme and to access funding   |
|                         | Lots of comments on ensuring any proposals take into account people with disabilities -<br>current disabled parking spaces don't provide flat walking access for the infirm | Principle acknowledged in Action 1  |
|                         | Some for and against pedestrianisation of King Street - maybe experiment with only pedestrians on one day a month - would be safer for children                             | Details of potential scheme to be worked up with key stakeholders. Need to consider safety is identified in Action 1  |
|                         | Change of use of King Street during lockdown shows the art of change and how quickly people can adapt   | Agree - as noted on Action 1  |
|                         | Only parking for disabled on King Street or necessary loading/unloading   | Details of potential scheme to be worked up with key stakeholders   |
|                         | Allow bus drop-off outside Lost & Found   | Noted but bus services/stops are outside the remit of the TCVP  |
|                         | Business community appears to be biggest blocker towards less cars in Town Centre -<br>long advocated by residents  | Building upon the previous work undertaken by the Town Council and the TCVP will hopefully support the identification of a scheme which works better for the majority of stakeholders |
|                         | Don't want to create unwelcome traffic/ increase in other areas   | Agree - proposals would look to ensure  |
|                         | Mix of comments on reducing speed limit   | Details of potential scheme to be worked up with key stakeholders   |
|                         | Removing parking will most likely reduce people visiting the town. What other parking   | The TCVP seeks to support the vitality of Knutsford it does not seek to reduce  |
|                         | priorities are there. There needs to be accessible and free street parking for local people   | visitors rather to make it an even more attractive centre   |
|                         | Access for town centre residents 2-way of King street at North end near Tatton park   | Details of potential scheme to be worked up with key stakeholders   |
|                         | will allow residents access for Drury lane and of town and houses behind bottom St. The   |   |
|                         | other end of King street can still use King street and Church walk  |   |
|                         | Implement 'From Top to Bottom Street' town centre masterplan for access rather than rat   | TCVP supports many of the principles of the masterplan. This TCVP focuses   |
|                         | run use of the two principal streets.   | on what are considered to be the priorities for supporting town centre vitality.  |
|                         |   | From Top to Bottom Street includes several detailed proposals which could be  |
|                         |   | complementary to this plan. Those which are considered highest priority for   |
|                         |   | supporting town centre vitality have been incorporated. Other proposals may   |
|                         |   | also be supportive and complementary and not including all ideas does not   |
|                         |   | mean they are considered to conflict with this TCVP.  |

| <b>Priorities Intervention</b> | Consultation Comments   | Response   |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
|                                | Better coach parking if tourism/visitor offer is to be extended                             | Page 85 - Add note at end of HOW to say. Explore options for improving visitor       |
|                                |   | coach parking  |
|                                | Stop all parking except for disabled parking along King St - various                        | Details of potential scheme to be worked up with key stakeholders taking into        |
|                                |   | account different factors and the impact in users                                    |
|                                | Traffic makes it unpleasant and difficult to appreciate buildings so could reduce parking   | Agree - see Action 1   |
|                                | outside attractions   |  |
|                                | Make the top end two-way, so people can legally cycle south there                           | Details of potential scheme to be worked up with key stakeholders                    |
|                                | Local businesses rely on people being able to park outside their shop and pop in. Worry     | Building upon the previous work undertaken by the Town Council and the               |
|                                | that reducing car use will turn the street into an area where ASB is more able to take hold | TCVP will hopefully support the identification of a scheme which works better        |
|                                | if there is not a constant flow of cars through the centre                                  | for the majority of stakeholders   |
|                                | Heaters should not be included due to climate crisis  | P74 under how 4 <sup>th</sup> para edit last sentence of 4 <sup>th</sup> para to say |
|                                |   | Consideration should be given to create space attractive outside space linked        |
|                                |   | to cafes, bars and restaurants   |
|                                | Support as long as there is adequate affordable parking                                     | Noted - any proposals would need to consider the impact on different factors         |
|                                |   | and on users   |
|                                | Agree with changing it to stop the parking and allow restaurant outside and more green      | Details of potential scheme to be worked up with key stakeholders                    |
|                                | spaces, but need to make the main road by the police station a full dual carriageway all    |  |
|                                | along to ensure traffic can keep moving   |  |
|                                | 10.00 to 16.00 pedestrian only in King St except for disabled. Service vehicles outside     | Details of potential scheme to be worked up with key stakeholders                    |
|                                | these hours   |  |
|                                | Widening pavements and allowing spill out areas would be a good thing. It would reduce      | Noted  |
|                                | the "rat run" that King Street has become   |  |
|                                | Consider a free period in car parks to encourage people to use those rather than on         | Noted - CEC parking charges are set by CEC but must take into account a              |
|                                | street/illegal parking. Outside Rohan shop (Princess Street) is good example of this        | wide range of issues alongside supporting town centre vitality                       |
| Connecting green               | Green assets routes should also be connected to other community spaces such as sports       | What p78 add at the end of the paragraph   |
| assets                         | & leisure centres and cinemas and school. The Neighbourhood plan and cycling                | Improved green routes should also be connected to other community                    |
|                                | infrastructure plan all signed off by Town Council identifies crossing and route            | spaces such as sports and leisure centres and cinemas and school                     |
|                                | improvements  |  |
|                                | More support and resources needed for 'Friends of the Heath'                                | Agree - supporting local groups is identified in Action 2                            |
|                                | Pedestrianisation of Malt Street to improve safety connections between King Street to       | Details of potential scheme to be worked up with key stakeholders                    |
|                                | Moorside  |  |
|                                | Access needed from King Street to Princess Street Car Park                                  | Access retained on plan. Details of potential scheme to be worked up with key        |
|                                |   | stakeholders   |
|                                | This is vital for sustainability  | Agree - sustainability is a key theme which runs through most of the identified      |
|                                |   | actions - see p90  |
|                                | Additional access to Tatton Park along Mobberley Road, particularly around Parkgate         | Access retained on plan. Details of potential scheme to be worked up with key        |
|                                | would create a green route into town  | stakeholders   |

| Priorities Intervention | Consultation Comments   | Response  |
|-------------------------|---|---|
|                         | Reduce speed limit to 20mph along Tabley Rd and enforce no HGV and stop buses using                                 | Details of any schemes to be worked up with key stakeholders including CEC                |
|                         | the road as a short cut. Tabley Rd is presently dangerous due to traffic speed and size                             | Highways  |
|                         | There is also a missed opportunity to connect The Moor with Drury Lane (and hence Wall                              | Access retained on plan. Details of potential scheme to be worked up with key             |
|                         | Wood and Tatton Park) with a new promenade or some such, which would be a further                                   | stakeholders  |
|                         | tourist 'green' attraction. The area is an unsightly unadopted road at present                                      |   |
|                         | Text suggests that an improvement of signage for cyclists and by improving the pavement                             | The TCVP identifies a range of actions supported by suggestions which seek to             |
|                         | on Princess Street will lead to Knutsford being a safer place to cycle - this is not the case                       | support the experience of cyclists as well as other users                                 |
|                         | Many of these green assets are used by residents to cross the town away from busy                                   | Agree   |
|                         | roads. Also encouraging slower traffic speeds (20mph for example) would help  |   |
|                         | encourage more people to walk and cycle, and enjoy our green spaces more  |   |
|                         | Cyclists do travel fast and could cause accidents   | Noted but outside of the control of the TCVP  |
|                         | It is not difficult to get from The Moor to The Heath and Tatton Park: this is not London!                          | Noted but it is considered that the experience could be improved for the good of the Town |
|                         | Sending public money on art works not required  | Whether money should be spent on art will be determined local by key stakeholders         |
|                         | Like the idea of following footsteps printed on the route. Different colours for different                          | P82 how bullet point 3 add  |
|                         | routes and suitable signage to go with them   | Different colours for different routes works well to aid navigation                       |
|                         | Signage, particularly from the station would be brilliant, new visitors to the town have no                         | Identified in by Action 3   |
|                         | idea which way to walk. Clear consistent signage throughout town to green spaces would                              |   |
|                         | be good. Not sure about art installations but picnic tables great idea  |   |
|                         | Cycling infrastructure needs huge focus and attention. Roads are so dangerous (no cycle                             | Action 3 recognises the need to improve cycling infrastructure                            |
|                         | lanes, speeds needs to be reduced to 20MPH. Not attractive at all for kids to cycle and                             |   |
|                         | too busy. Cars parking on pavements all the time. No wonder kids don't cycle to school or through Knutsford anymore |   |
|                         | This initiative is most helpful for visitors as opposed to residents  | The initiative seeks to encourage all users - residents or visitors to explore the        |
|                         |   | town more in a sustainable way  |
|                         | Need better lighting from the moor up to Mobberley Road. Many people walk the dog                                   | The need to consider improved lighting is identified in Action 2                          |
|                         | wood route but it's not welcoming as poor lighting  |   |
|                         | Needs more programmed use of the moor (with better land drains); subsidised   | Details of any potential scheme would need to be worked up with key                       |
|                         | inexpensive electric shuttle bus at weekends running from Knutsford town into Tatton and                            | stakeholders. No specific change to document as it already flags the need for             |
|                         | back;   | enhanced public transport connections proposals for bus services would be                 |
|                         |   | taken forward aligned to the CEC Bus Service Improvement Plan rather than                 |
|                         |   | specifically in this document   |
|                         | Tatton Park are not co-operative and closes Mondays during winter months. National                                  | Action 2 identifies the need for further engagement with National Trust and               |
|                         | Trust shop in the gatehouse would draw footfall and add profits. Unused green space                                 | Tatton Park to stimulate visitors and spend in the Town Centre and Tatton Park            |
|                         | behind Nat West Bank on King St   |   |
|                         | People aren't daft - they know where Knutsford's green assets are, or can find them with                            | Local residents may but visitors and new residents will encouraged to explore             |
|                         | existing signs which are adequate   | more of the Centre through good signage   |

| Priorities Intervention | Consultation Comments  | Response  |
|-------------------------|--|---|
|                         | The walk link between the 4 Moor & Tatten Gate (off Mallard Close) is treacherous. It is   | P78 how p 78 bullet 2 add at the end  |
|                         | unkempt, boggy & unusable during winter months. This needs to be substantially   | prioritise the worst connections initially particularly those that are  |
|                         | improved to qualify as "connecting green assets!"  | unusable in the winter months   |
|                         | Create several pedestrian/cycle priority crossings on Moorside where the existing paths  | Details of potential scheme to be worked up with key stakeholders   |
|                         | across the Moor reach the road. Extend these up to King Street - flat surfaces to allow  |   |
|                         | buggies to ride easily. This would allow the main paths to flow up to King Street carpark  |   |
|                         | more safely (Malt Street needs work to clear the cars that get parked all day on unowned   |   |
|                         | section)   |   |
|                         | Make Mere Road car free and safe   | Noted - CEC parking charges are set by CEC but must take into account a wide range of issues alongside supporting town centre vitality                                    |
| Prioritising more       | B5085 is a good option for cycle lanes   | Noted. Details of potential scheme to be worked up with key stakeholders  |
| walking and cycling     | Connection to Tatton Park and The Moor should be strengthened at Middle Walk. The path from Middle Walk up to Woodlands Crescent should be upgraded, and a Sparrow Crossing provided.      | Noted. Details of potential scheme to be worked up with key stakeholders  |
|                         | Better connections between Tatton Park and The Moor for walking and cycling (Refer to  | Add at end of what 2 <sup>nd</sup> para p82   |
|                         | the cycling infrastructure strategy already signed off by Knutsford Town Council)  | Knutsford Town Council has recently signed off a cycling infrastructure<br>strategy   |
|                         | Need cycle space and pedestrian space separate with safe connections to schools, shops, businesses and residences  | Details of potential scheme to be worked up with key stakeholders   |
|                         | Cycle hire partnership between Tatton Park, Town Council and Network Rail  | Northern Rail trialled a bike hire scheme at Knutsford with 10 bicycles available<br>but there were never more than 2 hired at any time, so the scheme was<br>withdrawn   |
|                         | We have an older population who needs transport to get them into town  | The TCVP seeks to try to deliver a better balance for all users   |
|                         | Consider narrowing Canute Place. And Princess Street should also be pedestrianised.  | Details of potential scheme to be worked up with key stakeholders   |
|                         | Walking routes need improving but it is important to not simply put up shared space signs<br>and expect walkers and cyclists to share  | TCVP recognises the importance of considering improvements for all users.<br>Future proposals will need to consider the optimum way to support cyclists and pedestrians   |
|                         | The problem is how unpleasant and dangerous it is to approach Knutsford town centre from virtually any direction on a bike. Unless the plan can address that I don't see anything changing | TCVP seeks to enhance movement across the town for all users - looking at movement of cars, parking and improving routes for cyclists and walking                         |
|                         | The biggest priority however is to improve the behaviour of the cyclists themselves, who think they own the road and the pavement  | Noted but outside the control of the TCVP   |
|                         | Until the volumes of vehicles passing through the town can be reduced cycling cannot be made safer   | Agree that is why there are actions proposed for reducing the dominance of cars and better management of car parks as well as proposals to prioritise walking and cycling |
|                         | Should be a cycle path from new housing such as Redrow into Knutsford  | Noted - active travel is established as a key principle in all planning policy. It will be considered in reviewing any development proposal                               |

| Priorities Intervention                      | Consultation Comments  | Response   |
|--|--|--|
|  | Please ensure pedestrians have more priority in Knutsford  | TCVP seeks to enhance movement across the town for all users and identifies proposals to enhance the pedestrian experience in key locations across the town in particular on King Street |
|  | Cycle parking needs to be well spread, not just one hub. It should be designed so that it's easy for people to cycle into town for errands Vs driving putting hazards on while parked on the double yellows at Rohan shop. Clear cycle and pedestrian prioritisation is needed at the top of Adams Hill  | Principles support in Action 3   |
| Mobilising Knutsford's<br>Business Community | Better communication to businesses on town plans   | Action 4 and 6 seek to raise awareness and support better communication between businesses and other stakeholder to support investment in Knutsford                                      |
|  | Creation of a BID needed as no forum for businesses - shame the town council failed to get support for this - there is no forum for businesses in Knutsford  | Recommendation of the TCVP - see Action 4  |
|  | Knutsford's Business Community is already sufficiently mobilised. Despite the current economic situation, Knutsford businesses are wide-ranging in nature, successful if they are viable, and contribute as necessary to "giving back" to the town - encourage businesses to join current ones who are already involved with the community and local charities | Noted there are some good examples of businesses supporting the Centre<br>however there is scope to enhance this aligned to businesses commitments to<br>social value                    |
|  | Knutsford business community needs to mobilise itself and not keep looking to Council for ideas and resources  | TCVP seeks to support the business community to collaborate more and<br>support Knutsford to thrive  |
|  | Need to consider how Parkgate can be maximised without impacting on more large vehicles through Knutsford town centre  | Noted - CEC Highways responsible for monitoring traffic movement   |
|  | When people see local businesses helping, they are more likely to use them and shop. I am always trying to support local businesses and love going to Knutsford regularly.   | Agree - TCVP seeks to encourage residents and businesses to support their local centre   |
|  | We have a good proportion of businesses who are already very involved with the community and do an excellent job supporting various local charities etc. Just keep encouraging others to join them   | Agree - TCVP seeks to build upon current good work   |
|  | Some concern over focus of Knutsford Town Council only focus on town centre retailers.<br>And CEC only interested in residents not businesses and their employees (some who<br>come in from out of town)   | TCVP seeks to balance needs of all groups and recommend change which will support the Centre to Thrive for all users   |
|  | Outlying business parks often employ people from outside Knutsford or are businesses offering services/products less directly relevant to local people as such Knutsford town centre may not be their top priority for their workforce or customers  | Noted but by enhancing Knutsford employees are move likely to visit the centre<br>and ultimately may decide it's a great place to live as well as work                                   |
| Showcasing                                   | Use of QR codes good so buildings don't need to be kept open for people to learn about   | Agree - see Action 5   |
| Knutsford's Heritage and Tourism Assets      | Improved access to Tatton Park from Town Centre, Parkgate and along Mobberley Road, potentially through shuttle bus  | Key recommendation of the TCVP - see Action 8  |
|  | Remember any significant increase in visitors by car or coach will cause congestion on the road infrastructure   | Noted but if well managed they will also support the vitality of the Town Centre   |
|  | More collaboration with the different heritage groups in the area - it's not just Tatton Park<br>- utilise the cinema and other buildings more for local exhibitions   | Importance of working with local groups and volunteers is noted in Action 5 (who)  |

| Priorities Intervention        | Consultation Comments   | Response  |
|--------------------------------|---|---|
|                                |   | Add at the end of 3 <sup>rd</sup> para under how  |
|                                |   | Make more of other assets in the centre such as the cinema to host local exhibitions  |
|                                | Tourists are important for the survival of many of our businesses. Visitors are often walking around lost and looking for where to head to. Appointing town centre champions is a great idea especially on our busy days (Artisan market days, may day etc)   | Agree - various recommendations in the TCVP seek to grow the visitor economy in Knutsford   |
|                                | Heritage and Tourism is too blinkered a starting point and too backwards looking and<br>history focussed. Needs added tiers of arts & culture including engagement and<br>participation. Suggestion is that 60 King Street with set up of a Building Preservation<br>Trust could become the community cultural hub for Knutsford and its shop window literally<br>– (music festival, library festival, live performances, crafts events, dances, weddings)  | Noted - as part of working up detailed proposals consideration should be given<br>to the proposals for 60 King Street Shared paper on proposals with Town<br>Council. TCVP supports showcasing heritage assets such as 60 King St<br>already                                    |
|                                | Start a Parkrun in Tatton park near the Knutsford entrance so people then go into Knutsford   | <ul> <li>Add p86 how last set of bullet points</li> <li>Start a Parkrun in Tatton Park near the Knutsford entrance to raise the profile of both destinations</li> </ul>   |
|                                | Don't devalue heritage with poor quality modern buildings – make more of connections to<br>Elizabeth Gaskell and the unique architecture of Richard Harding Watt. Both are under-<br>valued and under exploited currently in terms of promoting the town as a visitor magnet. It<br>is particularly so in relation to the overseas visitor market. The Heritage Centre which<br>could act as a Heritage and Tourism centre is hidden from view, difficult to locate and too<br>small for what it could offer in terms of exhibition and services. Potential of marketing<br>links between Tatton Park and Heritage Centre, currently unproductive from Tatton, need<br>radical overhaul. Knutsford town fails to benefit fully from the 800K visitors pa. | Heritage including the Heritage Centre is recognised an important asset of the Town and by Action 5 is recommended  |
|                                | Better planning and advertising of a vibrant events schedule with more events at the Moor   | Agree - see Action 6  |
|                                | Need to have an easier process for closing streets for events e.g. rising bollards<br>Continue to drive the F&B Summer Evenings. Got to make it a great destination, currently<br>such a lack of outdoor seating in summer e.g. seating on Regent St referenced   | Agree - COVID has demonstrated that temporary options can work         Add to p86 3 <sup>rd</sup> para How after Chester         Consideration should be given to the introduction of more seating at key         locations in the town to encourage people to dwell for longer |
|                                | Knutsford already has a good reputation among visitors, what lets it down is access, congested streets with parked cars, and generally an unpleasant atmosphere for people to walk around and see what is on offer  | TCVP seek to support these challenges to be overcome  |
| Raising Knutsford's<br>Profile | While keen to see the profile raised, I am concerned that there are other improvements (e.g. King Street, pedestrian priority) that should happen first so that the intention of this action (to increase footfall) is drawing visitors to improved facilities  | Noted - Action 6 is not a priority action   |
|                                | Love the QR codes idea. Will get kids involved as everyone now has these phones.<br>Particularly the younger ones coming up and the ones we want to settle and encourage  | Agree   |
|                                | Some concerned that current infrastructure can't handle more visitors   | TCVP seeks to ensure that the town works better for all users   |

| Priorities Intervention | Consultation Comments   | Response  |
|-------------------------|---|---|
|                         | Single starting source of information through one website excellent idea - could also         | Agree - links to other websites is included in Action 6                             |
|                         | include a section to link to the plethora of Knutsford Facebook pages (Knutsford matters,     |   |
|                         | virtual high street, buy and sell pages etc) – but others of view it wouldn't work            |   |
| Better Management of    | Mix of messages about enough and not enough parking in the town centre                        | Further feasibility work will be required to ensure a better balance of car parking |
| Car Parking             |   | across the centre to meet the needs of shoppers who want to pop into one or         |
|                         |   | two shops and those who are visiting or working for longer periods of time          |
|                         | Reintroduction of former circular bus service or like High Leigh/ Rivington bus. Many         | Noted but delivery of bus services are determined by commercial operators           |
|                         | responses for this  |   |
|                         | Bus services to new housing   | Noted but delivery of bus services are determined by commercial operators           |
|                         | Reduced parking costs at train station  | Noted - CEC parking charges are set by CEC but must take into account a wide        |
|                         |   | range of issues alongside supporting town centre vitality or private operators      |
|                         | Too many large vehicles parking on double yellow lines after 6pm, especially in very          | Noted - but parking enforcement is outside the remit of the TCVP                    |
|                         | narrow road way outside   |   |
|                         | New waiting facility at train station   | Noted but outside the control of the TCVP   |
|                         | Park and ride from train station into Town Centre   | Park and ride is unlikely to be viable in a small centre such as Knutsford          |
|                         | Car parking strategy to understand where they are coming from and why not using public        | Further feasibility work will be required to ensure a better balance of car parking |
|                         | transport   | across the centre and how to encourage more visitors to use walk, cycle or use      |
|                         |   | public transport  |
|                         | Coach parking for visitors  | Noted Coach parking needs to be considered as part of a centre wide parking         |
|                         |   | strategy  |
|                         | Parking is terrible in Knutsford. Making the car parks free for half an hour would also help  | Action 7 supports the introduction of a car parking strategy that provides a        |
|                         | if this was well monitored.   | better balance of car parking across Knutsford                                      |
|                         | The only on-street car parking that should be available in the shopping centre should be      | Action 7 supports the introduction of a car parking strategy that provides a        |
|                         | for disabled people. Everyone else should be parking further away and walking, or             | better balance of car parking across Knutsford                                      |
|                         | walking/cycling along the new protected infrastructure you need to build                      |   |
|                         | Since Aldi was built, traffic flow through Knutsford has been poor. This needs to be          | Noted - CEC Highways to consider as part of ongoing monitoring of traffic           |
|                         | looked at and some new arrangement worked out outside their premises. Perhaps a               | movement across the Borough   |
|                         | roundabout  |   |
|                         | 30 minutes is ridiculous. If what you need to do takes up to or less than 30 mins you         | Further feasibility work will be required to ensure a better balance of car parking |
|                         | move on anyway. An hour isn't long enough to dine, or browse, so that's already ideal for     | across the centre to meet the needs of shoppers who want to pop into one or         |
|                         | rapid turnover. Disabled spaces seem too few more should be added                             | two shops and those who are visiting or working for longer periods of time          |
|                         | The main carpark behind King Street is completely in the wrong place. A radical move          | Noted - King Street car parking is an important car park for users and local        |
|                         | would be to turn this land into a more useful community space (and maybe selling off          | businesses and is likely to be more important aligned if proposals for King         |
|                         | some land for controlled development to generate funds) and focus on parking options on       | Street are delivered  |
|                         | the edge of town - so Tatton St as a multistorey is a fantastic initiative.                   |   |
| Public Transport        | Improved pedestrian access to train station   | Agree - see Action 3  |
| Strategy                | Quality of train service needs improving but recognition that this is likely out of Council's | It is but CEC are working with other local authorities to lobby for investment in   |
|                         | control. Request to reference need for improved train services                                | rail services and infrastructure across the Borough. Add to page As a small         |

| Priorities Intervention | Consultation Comments  | Response  |
|-------------------------|--|---|
|                         |  | town Knutsford struggles to support a fully integrated and high frequency public      |
|                         |  | transport network. However the railway station is a major asset. There is scope       |
|                         |  | to improve its connections to the Town Centre and overall accessibility and           |
|                         |  | lobby for improved services   |
|                         | You need to address public transport first or you will simply shut down the town. Our only     | TCVP seeks to support improved access across all modes of transport                   |
|                         | access to Knutsford after about 4pm is by car or taxi or drive to a train station and then     |   |
|                         | the volume of cancellations mean we aren't using it  |   |
|                         | Agree with the plan to reduce on-street parking but do not agree with a multistorey car        | Action 4 recommends a targeted car parking strategy for the Centre                    |
|                         | park   |   |
|                         | Better quality and more waiting shelters at bus stops  | Noted but bus services/stops are outside the remit of the TCVP                        |
|                         | Improvements to public transport, bus and rail, along with better infrastructure for walking   | Agree as set out within specific actions with the TCVP                                |
|                         | and cycling should be used to encourage more people to leave the car at home, or park          |   |
|                         | away from the immediate town centre. Leave central parking for those with mobility             |   |
|                         | issues who have no other option than to drive  |   |
|                         | Range of views on appropriate length of stay for on street parking ranging from objection      | Proposals taken forward would need to be subjected to normal public                   |
|                         | to reducing time to support for reducing time to increase churn                                | consultation  |
|                         | Implementation of co-ordination of the town centre's traffic signals (using ImFlow),           | Noted - CEC Highways to consider as part of ongoing monitoring of traffic             |
|                         | Knutsford already having been agreed by Cheshire East Council's Highways Team as a             | movement  |
|                         | priority in the Borough, second only to Crewe, but requiring budgetary provision. ImFlow       |   |
|                         | reduces traffic congestion typically by up to 25% and the system is installed in many UK       |   |
|                         | towns and cities; a multi-storey car park as suggested, to the highest architectural           |   |
|                         | standard as befitting the existing nature of place of Knutsford and its existing architectural |   |
|                         | quality (listed buildings and Conservation Areas)  |   |
|                         | a shuttle bus would be fantastic. The community rail partnership with rail operators could     | How p88 add new bullet  |
|                         | also support funding for this. See Rivington bus for example                                   | Investigate the potential of improving local provision through local                  |
|                         |  | community transport schemes such as Rivington example                                 |
|                         | Improving the facilities is all well and good but improved and more frequent services are      | CEC is working with other local authorities to lobby for investment in rail           |
|                         | needed at Knutsford station. The campaign for the link the Crewe should be better              | services and infrastructure across the Borough  |
|                         | publicised   |   |
|                         | In addition, shuttle facilities to stations at Chelford/Wilmslow/Macclesfield/Manchester       | Noted but delivery of bus services are determined by commercial operators             |
|                         | Airport would greatly improve connectivity in the region                                       |   |
|                         | Sort out the buses! It's already challenging for residents from Over Ward and those with       | Noted but delivery of bus services are determined by commercial operators             |
|                         | our a car to access the town centre  |   |
|                         | The Customer Information System at Knutsford station needs improving. It is vastly             | Noted but outside the remit of the TCVP   |
|                         | inferior to the system installed at stations like Hale, Alderley Edge and Congleton. There     |   |
|                         | is only one single sided display on each platform and these displays only have two lines       |   |
|                         | Success depends on the one thing beyond CEC's control: the quality of the service              | It is but CEC is working with other local authorities to lobby for investment in rail |
|                         | offered by Northern Rail. Poor service and timetables will stop people using public            | services and infrastructure across the Borough  |

| Priorities Intervention | Consultation Comments  | Response  |
|-------------------------|--|---|
|                         | transport to come here in the first place regardless of how good the offer is once they get    |   |
|                         | here   |   |
|                         | Adam's Hill junction is a nightmare for both pedestrians and drivers, this needs sorting out   | Noted but changes to junctions required traffic modelling. CEC Highways to        |
|                         |  | note concern  |
|                         | Disagree connectivity to Manchester is good. The public transport strategy should be           | TCVP seeks to encourage drivers to consider alternative modes of transport        |
|                         | looking at moving people out of cars, not just linking the station to the town                 | where appropriate   |
|                         | We need more regular buses, especially to Macclesfield hospital                                | Noted but delivery of bus services are determined by commercial operators         |
|                         | The twice hourly trains we've been promised. Bus services that don't run. EV car               | CEC is working with other local authorities to lobby for investment in rail       |
|                         | charging. Start with the basics  | services and infrastructure across the Borough                                    |
|                         | Multiple for and against a MSCP  | As noted feasibility work is being undertaken to assess it benefits, vitality and |
|                         |  | impacts   |
|                         | Canute place needs a facelift. The three roundabouts (Northwich road, Canute place and         | Details of potential schemes to be worked up with key stakeholders                |
|                         | Mobberley road) should welcome people into Knutsford. May Pole and dancers on one,             |   |
|                         | keep the deer for the Canute one, penny farthing in the other                                  |   |
|                         | Reintroduction of lamppost mounted LED speed cameras   | CEC highways to consider  |
| Other Comments          | Need public toilets  | Noted but outside the remit of the TCVP. Scope to encourage local cafes and       |
|                         |  | bars to allow non customers to use their facilities                               |
|                         | Needs electric charging points for cars - minority point                                       | Add under how p87   |
|                         |  | Aligned to wider proposals to respond to the climate crisis consider scope for    |
|                         |  | introducing more electric charging points across the centre                       |
|                         | There should be consideration of the benefits of utilising empty 'above shop' space for        | Agree – the supporting Toolkit to the TCVP sets out best practice as to how       |
|                         | affordable housing to bring more people to live in the centre of Knutsford                     | landlords can seek to bring underutilised spaces back into use                    |
|                         | But you need to make the town look better. Get rid of the weeds on the streets, empty the      | Agree – all towns need to focus on getting the basics working well and then can   |
|                         | bins, pick up the litter, clean the signs. Fix potholes  | build upon these. The recommendations set out on in the Centre Wide actions       |
|                         |  | (p89-91) seek to support partners to work together to achieve this                |
|                         | Nothing has been said about improving seating and spaces and filthy bin storage                | The need for improved seating would be looked at in working up detailed           |
|                         | eyesores   | schemes. Waste is outside the remit of the TCVP but by bringing partners          |
|                         |  | together it is hoped that concerns such as ingoing waste management and           |
|                         |  | general public realm maintenance will be improved                                 |
|                         | There is no mention whatsoever to health and wellbeing development/improvements                | P82 add new sentence at the end of para 1 under What                              |
|                         |  | This will also support wider objectives to improve the health and                 |
|                         |  | wellbeing of the community  |
|                         | All this is great - but until you help us make the town look better and safer then all will be | Agree – all towns need to focus on getting the basics working well and then can   |
|                         | in vain. It must be the most neglected town in the Borough with the least investment by        | build upon these. The recommendations set out on centre wide actions seek to      |
|                         | CEC  | support partners to work together to achieve this                                 |

| Priorities Intervention | Consultation Comments  | Response   |
|-------------------------|--|--|
|                         | The TCVP is a good idea but needs strong leadership to implement the proposed actions  | Agree the TCVP seeks to support enhanced collaboration between the Town<br>Council, CEC and other stakeholders working to a common vision and town<br>wider objectives   |
|                         | A properly costed budget with available funding  | There is currently no funding pot to deliver the proposals in the TCVP. Rather<br>is has been prepared to support partners to be better able to bid for funding<br>through a variety of funding sources - supported by a strong evidence base. |
|                         | Numerous comments on lots of consultation but limited action   | The TCVP aims to support partners to prioritise action and to seek funding, as appropriate to support delivery on the ground   |
|                         | Street lighting is a massive problem in Knutsford, especially in the Longridge and Shaw Heath area.  | Noted - improvements to lighting is identified in a number of action in particular Action 2  |
|                         | Art & culture and creative engagement strategies   | P85 What last line after tourism and ,arts and culture   |
|                         | Pavements in town uneven so many falls of older generation and Knutsford has big percentage of older residents   | The issue of maintenance of public realm has been raised in all centres and the need to support improved maintenance is acknowledged on p90 of the TCVP  |
|                         | Concerns that the infrastructure such as schools, health care and dentistry cannot accommodate further growth in residents. Appropriate for visitors to attract them to areas but resources are already stretched with little funding to support the infrastructure we already have in Knutsford | Noted but outside of the remit of the TCVP - infrastructure requirements associated with new development is determined as part of planning applications  |
|                         | With over 2000 new homes in the pipeline for Knutsford - need to address infrastructure issues first, as a priority  | Noted but outside the remit of the TCVP - infrastructure requirements<br>associated with new development is determined as part of planning<br>applications   |

Page 50

5.3 The following diagrams illustrate general feedback in terms of the TCVP:



5.4 The following table summarises additional comments received in respect of the Knutsford TCVP.

| Specific Revisions to Knutsford TCVP  | Response to the Feedback  |
|---|---|
| It can be stated in the preamble that ensuring Knutsford Town Centre remains a thriving independent destination for visitors and residents alike is a key strategic aim of Knutsford Town Council emerging in its new strategic plan, likewise a second aim is to promote active travel/public transport and reduce the need for use of cars. The Town Council submitted its From Top to Bottom Street report in 2020. Whilst it is referenced in this document, it is considered that it needs to be referenced more greatly and encourage the implementation of these measures which received public support. | Add new para to p69<br>These actions align with the Town Council's objective of ensuring Knutsford<br>Town Centre remains a thriving independent destination for visitors and<br>residents alike and the need to promote active travel/public transport and<br>reduce the need for use of cars<br>Drawn out more in new text under Action 1 |
| Page 12 - delete "marketing manager" replace with "Town Centre Manager"   | Edited  |
| Page 12 - in list of events add "music festival" to the list  | Edited  |
| Page 26 - The scale at which the plan looks at deprivation is too high. There is a pocket of local deprivation which is within the 30% most deprived neighbourhoods (dark blue). This should not be overlooked and missed by stating Knutsford as a whole is within the 20% lease deprived areas as it is a significant issue.  | Add at the end of 1 <sup>st</sup> para<br>However is should be recognised that there is a pocket of local deprivation<br>which is within the 30% most deprived neighbourhoods (dark blue)   |
| Page 34 - should Knutsford Heritage Centre and the Brook Street Heritage Site be listed under attractions?<br>Page 48 - this misses the privately operated public car parks on Green Street and Northwich Road (behind Oka)   | Add Knutsford Heritage Centre and the Brook Street Heritage Site under attractions<br>Under table add<br>In addition there are privately operated car parks on Green Street and<br>Northwich Road   |
| Page 49 - there is a pedestrian footway on Church Hill  | P49 remove para 1 under active travel line 4 remove with no pedestrian footway  |
| Page 50 - move the first two paras (which includes half a sentence form p49 to p49)   | Format p49/50   |
| Page 60 - Delete "currently there is only one active 2022" this relates to a development outside Knutsford and is incorrect. It is correct to state "There are currently two major residential developments taking place to the North West and North East of Knutsford comprising 190 and 236 homes respectively. A further site for 60 houses in the North West of Knutsford has outline planning permission whilst applications for outline consent for two further developments, 250 at the North West of Knutsford and 225 houses to the East of Knutsford, have been submitted".                           | Edited  |
| Page 62 - delete "marketing" from Town Centre Manager.  | Edited  |
| The document rightly highlights that Knutsford has a railway station, but does not refer to the need for improved services. Knutsford Station is one of the busiest stations on the Mid Cheshire Line and a second hourly service in each direction is desperately needed. The Town further suffers from a poor service provider with trains frequently cancelled/delayed.  | Add new bullet under p 88<br>CEC to continue to lobby with other local authorities for improvements to the<br>rail service across in the North.   |
| Page 69 - delete the s from King Street   | Edited  |
| Page 70 - second column refers to Handforth and lists three nor two priorities.   | Text revised due to outcome of public consultation  |
| The From Top to Bottom Street report proposes to reduce the dominance of cars across the town centre, not solely from King Street. Princess Street, Canute Place and Minshull Street must not be overlooked and should be included within the priority.   | P74 under what<br>This action supports the findings of The From Top to Bottom Street report.<br>The report proposes to reduce the dominance of cars across the town centre,<br>not solely from King Street. Whilst the TCVP identifies recommends that the  |

| Specific Revisions to Knutsford TCVP  | Response to the Feedback   |
|---|--|
|   | initial focus should be on Kings Street but reconsiders the need to consider<br>other areas such as Princess Street, Canute Place and Minshull Street<br>The under where add (priority) after first bullet   |
| Page 78 - Under "Who" add: Friends of the Heath, Friends of the Moor as well as Tatton Estates (this being the owner of the Heath) and CEC/ANSA (as owners of the Moor).<br>Under "How" add the creation of a cycle path from the Moor to the Dog Wood entrance to Tatton Park. This would create a cycle/pedestrian loop and is an ambition in the Knutsford Cycle Plan.   | Wider town including Princes Street, Canute Place and Minshull Street           Edited   |
| Page 82 - under "How" Add reference to implementation of measures identified in the Knutsford Cycle Infrastructure<br>Plan to promote cycling across the whole town to enable residents to be able to cycle to the town centre.   | Edited   |
| Page 84 - the first paragraph under "How" is incredibly specific in an otherwise quite broad plan.<br>Under "Who" why is Groundwork with a "?" they are either a who or they are not.<br>It is important to note under this section that the Town Council employs a Town Centre Manager to lead on business<br>engagement and communication and through this we already undertake a number of initiatives such as our Taste<br>Knutsford food tours, operating a local gift voucher scheme and some targeted events to promote local business.            | Edit who<br>External support to engage with businesses - Wilmslow have worked with<br>Groundwork   |
| Page 85 - under How, second line typo - assets not assess, and second para - King not Kings.<br>Add reference to the Brook Street Heritage Site and grave of Mrs Gaskell.<br>Add "Tatton Park" to Who.<br>More express comment should be made on the importance of the role of Tatton Park and opportunity for them to direct<br>visitors into Knutsford; the current phrasing of "tap into" suggests the onus is on Knutsford when, as a publicly run<br>asset, Tatton Park should play an active role in looking to see how they can support Knutsford. | Edit typos<br>Considerable potential existing for Tatton Park to encourage more of its<br>visitors to go on to visit Knutsford Town Centre. Improvements to their<br>physical connections would support this |
| Page 86 - under How, para 2, ditto - refer to how Tatton Park can support Knutsford, not just how Knutsford can tap into Tatton Park.<br>Note that Knutsford has an active volunteer body - the Knutsford Hosts - which could be used to develop a town ambassadors scheme, add to the Who  | Edited<br>Add at the end of paragraph 2 Tatton Park should work with CEC and the Town<br>Council to support this<br>Add Knutsford Hosts to who   |
| Page 87 and 88 - add reference to the need to create coach parking at Knutsford Bus Station to promote and enable coach visits to the town. This is under discussion with CEC   | Edited   |
| Page 88 - add Mid Cheshire Community Rail Partnership to the Who         Page 92 - presume NTC should be KTC?         Page 94 - again King not Kings. Perform a find check to see if there are more instances of this   | Edited<br>Edited<br>Edited and do search for others  |
| Page 95 - change Town Clerk to Town Council         Re: Public transport strategy - I was horrified that on the connectivity page it was glibly stated that there was good rail connectivity to Manchester. This is not the case. The public transport strategy should be looking at moving people out  | Edited P10 line 2 remove with excellent connectivity   |
| of cars, not just linking the station to the town<br>I couldn't easily see the timeline. I see initiative No. 5,6,& 7 are ongoing and would be good to see what has been<br>achieved to date. For No.1 Reducing the Dominance of Cars Along Kings Street - I would be really keen to see some<br>urgency on this one. Seeing how we changed the use of King St during lock down shows the art of the possible and<br>how quickly folk can adapt to changes.   | P84 Change action 1 to white   |

|                            | Individual  | 46  |
|----------------------------|---|-----|
| Individual/member of panel | Council employee/professional                             | 2   |
|                            | Other   | 2   |
|                            | Male  | 22  |
| Gender Identity            | Female  | 25  |
|                            | Prefer not to say   | 2   |
|                            | 16-24   | 2%  |
|                            | 25-34   | 10% |
|                            | 35-44   | 34% |
|                            | 45-54   | 22% |
| Age Group                  | 55-64   | 14% |
|                            | 65-74   | 12% |
|                            | 75-84   | 4%  |
|                            | 85 and over   | 0%  |
|                            | Prefer not to say   | 2%  |
|                            | White British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/Irish | 88% |
|                            | Any other White background                                | 2%  |
|                            | Mixed: White and Black Caribbean/African/Asian            | 0%  |
| Ethnic Group               | Asian/Asian British                                       | 2%  |
|                            | Black African/Caribbean/Black British                     | 0%  |
|                            | Prefer not to say   | 2%  |
|                            | Prefer to self-describe                                   | 2%  |

5.5 The below provides a summary of the characteristics of those who responded to the consultation.

## 6.0 Feedback from Middlewich

6.1 192 responses were received in respect of the Middlewich Report. The level of support for the identified priority areas is identified in the charts below:



Page 55



6.2 A summary of the specific comments received in respect of each of the proposed priorities for intervention in Middlewich is provided below. The response includes how the Final Report has been edited to take into account the comments where appropriate or relevant:

| Priorities              | Consultation Comments  | Response  |
|-------------------------|--|---|
| Intervention            |  |   |
| Town Wharf              | Should be a priority as an under-utilised asset  | Noted - identified as a priority intervention through the public consultation   |
| Development<br>Brief    | Positive feedback about the need for development, particularly to stop vandalism and because site is currently an eyesore at a key gateway to the town | Agreed - P74 What add - The area around Tower Wharf is an underutilised but important <b>and</b><br><b>prominent gateway</b> asset linking the town centre to the attractive waterways that surround<br>Middlewich.   |
|                         | Should be a focal point that raises perceptions, encourages tourism and increases footfall   | P74 What add: The future potential of this area should be harnessed to encourage visitors, <b>increase footfall</b> and extend dwell time in Middlewich whilst aiding legibility and enhancing perceptions at this key gateway location.  |
|                         | Important to create accessible and safe links between the Town Centre and the canal through this area  | Agreed - this action references this P74 How 1 <sup>st</sup> bullet   |
|                         | Largest suggestion for café/restaurant/bars to attract canal users   | Noted - this action suggests this P74 How   |
|                         | Suggestions of uses including museum, info centre, workshops, shops for  | P74 How bullets add:  |
|                         | canal, event and exhibition space, leisure facilities, public space  | <ul> <li>Refurbishment of the existing wharf buildings on the site, which are of local heritage value<br/>and could provide space for a café/bar/restaurant with artisan workshops or<br/>museum/exhibition space above, bringing activity and art led culture to the canal side.</li> </ul>  |
|                         | Suggestion of turning into residential unpopular   | Noted - residential development not suggested within this action  |
|                         | Acknowledgement of difficulty due to building being in private ownership so many suggesting CPO needed.  | P74 How 3 <sup>rd</sup> para add: The document will also be used to inform discussions and decision making through the planning process, thus providing an element of control over the future of the site. It's preparation would consider the actions required to implement development and could  |
|                         |  | include options for intervention by CEC and other partners.   |
|                         | Concern development brief may restrict development   | P74 para 3 responds to this. The aim of the Development Brief is not to restrict development but ensure that development is appropriate and maximises the benefits to the town centre in the long term. It seeks to strike a balance between landowner and stakeholder aspirations.   |
|                         | Concern use of specialist advisors adds extra cost to development  | P74 para 4 add: The appointment of specialist advisors who understand the land and property market together with the planning and development process, and are adept at engaging with multiple stakeholders can support this process, helping to deliver a better value development that maximises benefits to the town in the medium to long term. |
|                         | Development should be in keeping with heritage of area and ensure preservation of buildings  | Preservation of buildings noted on P74 2 <sup>nd</sup> bullet<br>P74 What add: The future potential of this area should be harnessed <b>and its heritage preserved</b><br>to encourage visitors   |
|                         | Lack of parking may be an issue to address   | Noted - parking would be considered when working up detailed proposals  |
|                         | Could set up a community land trust to engage residents and support change<br>in the area  | Noted - to be determined locally when working up more detailed proposals  |
| Reduce Car<br>Dominance | General support for this action and resulting benefits this would bring including reduced pollution, enhanced health and wellbeing                     | Update text on P78 under What:  |

| Priorities                   | Consultation Comments  | Response   |
|------------------------------|--|--|
| Intervention                 |  |  |
|                              |  | Reducing the dominance of cars will create a safer and healthier environment, encouraging  |
|                              |  | visitors to be able to dwell, and enhance the experience of and arrival into the centre, creating a                                    |
|                              |  | safer and more pleasant place to shop and relax.   |
|                              | Lots of responses re bypass. For and against if this will reduce car dominance   | Noted  |
|                              | in the Town Centre but majority state it is needed to ease traffic congestion  |  |
|                              | Difficult to deliver due to poor public transport. Need more varied bus service  | Agree - public transport is determined by bus and train operators but CEC will continue to lobby for improvements                      |
|                              | Many responded that train station is much needed to support the delivery of this intervention  | Message already included in TCVP – see Action 9  |
|                              | Reduce and enforce speed limits via cameras or calming measures e.g.,<br>humps and crossings on residential roads and at pinch points including St<br>Michael's Way and Holmes Chapel Road to improve safety | CEC Highways to note - outside the remit of the TCVP   |
|                              | Enforce weight limits and/or remove HGVs through the town, particularly Lewin Land and Brooks Lane   | CEC Highways to note - outside the remit of the TCVP   |
|                              | Reconsider traffic light sequencing to ease traffic flows  | CEC Highways to note - outside the remit of the TCVP   |
|                              | Improvement of the Bullring  | Noted – picked up through short and medium term actions on P74 and in more detail on P80   |
|                              | More and safer pedestrian crossings, particularly Town Bridge and Lewin  | P74 5 <sup>th</sup> bullet Add: More <b>safe</b> crossings could be added in to assist connections into the town from                  |
|                              | Street   | key assets such as the canal and river network <b>via Lewin Street</b> and new development at Brooks Lane and Midpoint 18.             |
|                              |  | P74 6 <sup>th</sup> bullet add: Town Bridge junction - Aim to provide safer and better facilities for pedestrians,                     |
|                              |  | including safer crossing facility, re-prioritising the capacity released by the Eastern Bypass   |
|                              | More responses for than against pedestrianizing Wheelock Street, including suggestion of weekend closures to traffic to allow more café spill out space  | Noted - to be considered when working up more detailed proposals.<br>P78 1 <sup>st</sup> bullet:                                       |
|                              | suggestion of weekend closures to traine to allow more care spin out space   | These spaces could provide temporary activities such as seating areas, outdoor   |
|                              |  | dining areas or cycle parking to create activity and reduce the dominance of cars. The local   |
|                              |  | community could be consulted on effectiveness of installations to see if a more permanent solution                                     |
|                              |  | would be popular, especially along Wheelock Street, where there have been previous reservations  |
|                              |  | around reducing the number of on-street parking bays. Weekend closures to traffic in this  |
|                              |  | location could also be a good way to test the effectiveness of these measures.   |
|                              | Trees along bus lane for attractiveness and to combat traffic pollution  | P78 How add new bullet to end: Consider tree planting along major routes to screen roads,  |
|                              |  | buffer noise and combat traffic pollution but taking care not to endanger safety in terms of   |
|                              |  | visibility   |
| Connecting<br>Green and Blue | Make more of USP of having 3 canals in the town  | Noted - This action seeks to enhance the vitality of the town by maximising the opportunities presented by these green and blue assets |
| Assets                       | More seating and picnic benches needed along the canal. Many responses for this  | P82 How add to bullet:   |

| Priorities<br>Intervention | Consultation Comments  | Response   |
|----------------------------|--|--|
|                            |  | Enhance existing green areas along the canal corridor to create more destination open spaces with places to dwell through new seating and picnic benches, play spaces, urban gyms and enhanced planting  |
|                            | General path maintenance, particularly along the canal, including removing overgrown trees and hedges, widening where possible, consideration of uneven surfaces and filling in potholes, ensure well lit and providing bins | P82 How add new third bullet:<br>Ensure paths are safe, well lit and maintained including removing overgrown trees and<br>hedges, ensuring even surfaces, widening where possible and providing bins   |
|                            | More signage needed directing both pedestrians and canal boaters to the<br>Town Centre and extended connections to Sandbach/Winsford   | P82 How new bullet to end: <b>Provide better co-ordinated directional signage between the</b><br>canal, town centre and other key locations and surrounding assets to ensure locals and<br>visitors can easily navigate between destinations. This could extend beyond the<br>Middlewich to other canal connected towns including Sandbach and Winsford. |
|                            | Better relations with the Canal and River Trust would help   | P82 How add new bullet to end: Engage with the Canal and River Trust to support implementation of enhancements along the canal.  |
|                            | Make more of Croxton Park  | P82 How add to bullet:<br>Enhance existing green areas along the canal corridor <b>such as Croxton Park</b> to create more<br>destination open spaces with new seating, play spaces, urban gyms and enhanced planting.   |
|                            | Work with businesses to improve look of buildings along the canal  | The aim of the TCVP is to increase the vitality of Middlewich and to encourage footfall and spend<br>in the Centre. This should in turn support owners to invest in their properties   |
|                            | Consider segregation from pedestrian paths as safety concerns  | Noted - All modes of movement and potential conflicts between them to be considered when working up more detailed proposals  |
|                            | Appropriate policing to reduce anti-social behaviour   | Noted - but outside the remit of the TCVP  |
| Brooks Lane<br>Masterplan  | Responses for and against masterplan with many feeling no more housing required, or that housing quantum should be smaller and affordable  | Noted but outside the remit of the TCVP. Proposals for new development are considered by CEC through the Local Plan process and in determining individual planning applications and infrastructure requirements associated with new development determined as part of planning applications  |
|                            | Need to provide adequate social infrastructure such as doctors, dentists, schools, leisure facilities including swimming pool alongside the development. Many responses on this  | Noted but outside the remit of the TCVP. Proposals for new development are considered by CEC through the Local Plan process and in determining individual planning applications and infrastructure requirements associated with new development determined as part of planning applications  |
|                            | Concern regarding road infrastructure as there would be an increase in cars, so a new bypass is needed   | Noted - CEC Highways to consider as part of ongoing responsibility for town centre movement  |
|                            | Brooks Lane Bridge to become 2-way   | Noted - CEC Highways to consider as part of ongoing responsibility for town centre movement and capacity of the bridge itself  |
|                            | Train station is a must to reduce use of cars and relieve congestion e.g., Lewis Street. Many responses for this   | Message already included in TCVP - see Action 9  |
|                            | Safer walking/ cycling connections are good ideas and needed to connect to the Town Centre, and wider areas including Midpoint 18  | Noted - walking and cycling connections considered within TCVP at Actions 2 and 3  |

| Priorities   | Consultation Comments   | Response  |
|--------------|---|---|
| Intervention |   |   |
|              | Need to improve Town Centre offering which would lead to more footfall in the     | The aim of the TCVP is to increase the vitality of Middlewich and to encourage footfall and spend     |
|              | Brooks Lane area  | in the Centre   |
|              | Marina is needed, particularly to generate growth and drive footfall              | The aim of the TCVP is to increase the vitality of Middlewich and to encourage footfall and spend     |
|              |   | in the Centre. The marina forms part of the SPD identified within this action at P84                  |
|              | Concern regarding proximity of housing to waste recycling plant and industrial    | Noted - but outside the remit of TCVP. More detailed design considerations will be considered         |
|              | uses  | through the planning process aligned to the Local Plan and SPD for the Brooks Lane area               |
| Showcasing   | Need to address appearance of historic/ listed buildings and encourage            | The aim of the TCVP is to increase the vitality of Sandbach and to encourage footfall and spend in    |
| Middlewich's | owners to maintain, particularly within Conservation Area                         | the Centre. This should in turn support owners to invest in their properties. In the case of heritage |
| Heritage     |   | assets the TCVP could be used to support funding for bids to Historic England/Heritage Lottery        |
|              | Create a well sign-posted heritage trail  | Page 85 How para 2 add: Creation of a heritage trail and better signage could also help direct        |
|              |   | visitors to these assets.   |
|              | More heritage themed events needed such as the old historical festival/           | Page 85 How para 5 add: More events focused around heritage such as the Folk&Boat Festival            |
|              | Folk&Boat festival but require good financial management                          | should also be considered with scope to link to showcasing the towns other assets.                    |
|              | More characterful signage and information boards, maybe using QR codes, to        | Page 85 How para 2: Other actions proposed should enhance the setting of the                          |
|              | attract users of the canals into town so brine pump, Harbutts Field etc           | Town's heritage assets and encourage people to dwell more around those at the Bull Ring,              |
|              |   | Wheelock Street, Harbutts Field and the canal and appreciate them. Better and more                    |
|              |   | characterful signage and information boards could also help direct visitors to these assets and       |
|              |   | inform them of their significance.  |
|              | Promote heritage links with other towns e.g., Winsford/ Northwich                 | P85 How 5th para: You have already suggested working with other local towns such as                   |
|              |   | Winsford and Northwich around a series of heritage linked events such as floating markets based       |
|              |   | upon your linked waterways.   |
|              | Encourage occupation of vacant and under-utilised heritage buildings and          | P85 How add new 3 <sup>rd</sup> para:   |
|              | assets e.g. Harbutts Field and cinema days/nights in Victoria Hall                | Encourage greater utilisation of heritage buildings and assets e.g. Harbutts Field and                |
|              |   | Victoria hall for events e.g. cinema days/evenings, exhibitions etc.                                  |
|              | Better advertising of local events and initiatives                                | P85 How para 5 add: More events focused around heritage should also be considered with scope          |
|              |   | to link to showcasing the towns other assets. Such events and initiatives should be well              |
|              |   | advertised  |
|              | Priority pricing for Middlewich residents to attractions e.g. as has been done in | Noted - beyond the scope of the TCVP but to be considered when working up more detailed               |
|              | Bath  | proposals   |
|              | Reinstate Town Crier  | Noted - to be considered when working up more detailed proposals                                      |
| Mobilising   | Northwich a good example of cleaner streets, outdoor seating, more footfall       | P86 How para 1 add to end:  |
| Business     | and a better business community   | thus supporting footfall and spend. Northwich is a good local example of how a                        |
| Community    |   | collaborative business community is supporting a more attractive town centre.                         |
|              | Engage with landlords to update premises and maintain attractive shop fronts      | Agree - the overall TCVP seeks to increase vitality in Middlewich which should support landlords to   |
|              |   | be more willing and able to invest in their properties  |
|              | Empty shops used as 'pop-up' shops or for themed window displays or to            | Agreed - picked up within this action in How on P86 add to para 5:                                    |
|              | display local art work e.g. display school children did for the church            |   |

| Priorities     | Consultation Comments  | Response   |
|----------------|--|--|
| Intervention   |  |  |
|                |  | In Middlewich, there could be benefits to engaging with the landlords of vacant retail units to          |
|                |  | discuss opportunities of 'meantime' uses or attractive window displays/hoardings. Other ways to          |
|                |  | engage local retailers and businesses could be through bringing their involvement into events and        |
|                |  | initiatives such as extended opening hours for key events or themed window display competitions          |
|                |  | such as local school children did for Church display or window treasure trails                           |
|                | Get local businesses to donate to or match fund initiatives that support town centre improvements, local events or charities | Noted - to be considered when working up more detailed proposals   |
|                | Creation of a website to showcase businesses   | Message already included in TCVP - see Action 7  |
|                | Business rate reduction  | Noted - beyond the scope of TCVP or CEC. Business Rates are set nationally                               |
|                | Need to evolve the diversity of businesses and facilities e.g. supermarket,  | Agreed - but type of businesses which choose to open in a particular location is outside the control     |
|                | evening economy and F&B, a market  | of the Town Council and CEC  |
|                | Encourage local retailers to hold more experience events   | Agreed - included in this action of the TCVP P86   |
|                | Local reward cards/ loyalty scheme   | Agreed - included in this action of the TCVP P87   |
|                | Better communication between businesses  | Agreed - included in this action of the TCVP P86   |
|                | Schools to be invited into local businesses to see how they work and what they   | P86 How para 2 add to end:   |
|                | produce  | One such scheme to involve local communities could be to invite local schools to visit                   |
|                |  | businesses, see what they do and support local employment opportunities in the future                    |
|                | Bring back previous events e.g. business carnival where everyone had a float/  | P86 How para 4 add:  |
|                | treasure trail where an item was placed in every shop window   | Business networking could also identify "themes" where businesses can drive opportunities                |
|                |  | forward for example retailer and F&B hosting a fashion show or beauty event. This should not just        |
|                |  | be focused on retailers but should also target businesses in the surrounding employment areas.           |
|                |  | An example of this was the former business carnival where organisations had a float. It                  |
|                |  | could also generate opportunities for B2B referrals.   |
| Raisings the   | Improvements to website, to be made more interactive and kept up to date   | P88 How 2 <sup>nd</sup> para:  |
| Town's Profile |  | As a first step a revamped or new website for Middlewich, that is kept up to date, should provide        |
|                |  | a single point for information that is relevant to existing and new residents;                           |
|                | Extend reach online and social media e.g. Facebook to better promote   | P88 how. Add new bullet:   |
|                | Middlewich   | Promotion of Middlewich via dedicated social media channels e.g. Facebook                                |
|                | Utilise the free monthly 'Go Local' magazine to promote the town and events  | P89 add to bullet:   |
|                |  | Promotion through positive PR, good news stories and the free monthly 'Go Local' magazine                |
|                | Collaborate with surrounding towns for events with suggestion of libraries to  | P89 add to bullet:   |
|                | connect each town  | Engage with other similar market towns and see if there is scope to showcase each                        |
|                |  | other's assets <b>and/or events</b> to broaden the appeal of the town to attract new visitors e.g. Leek, |
|                |  | Buxton etc.  |
|                | A 'What's On' display at the library   | P89 add to bullet:   |
|                |  | Wider promotion of the Town's established programme of popular events – a wider                          |

| Priorities       | Consultation Comments  | Response  |
|------------------|--|---|
| Intervention     |  |   |
|                  |  | promotion of your "what's on" in Middlewich page. A "What's On" display in the library could          |
|                  |  | also promote events for those less digitally connected  |
|                  | Events such as Folk&Boat festival to be brought back and artisan Sunday<br>market          | Message already included in TCVP – see Action 5   |
|                  | More funding and joined up thinking between voluntary groups and local businesses          | Noted – to be considered when working up more detailed proposals                                      |
|                  | Better signage of history, buildings, canal, more in-keeping with the heritage of the town | Message already included in TCVP – see Action 5   |
| Improve          | Quality of roads and pavements needs improving, making more even and                       | P90 add third bullet to How:  |
| connections      | widening where possible to make safer, particularly for wheelchair users and               | Ensure roads, foot and cycle paths are safe and well maintained including smooth surfaces             |
| between key      | those with prams. Areas mentioned include from Cow Estate and Holmes                       | and widening where possible, in particular around Cow Lane Estate and Holmes Chapel                   |
| destinations and | Chapel Road, Lock and Kings Lock   | Road, Lock and Kings Lock   |
| the centre       | More footpaths connecting residential estates  | Agreed – included in this action of the TCVP P90  |
|                  | Safer designated cycling lanes and routes, particularly with connections to                | P90 How add to bullets:   |
|                  | Sandbach and Holmes Chapel e.g. Nantwich on the A530                                       | - Explore feasibility of a Middlewich to Holmes Chapel and Sandbach cycle route.                      |
|                  |  | - Support the introduction of high-quality <b>designated</b> safe cycling routes throughout the town, |
|                  |  | as identified by the Local Transport Development Plan (LTDP).   |
|                  | More public transport including a train station  | Message already included in TCVP – see Action 9   |
|                  | A more reliable and affordable bus service   | Noted - public transport is determined by bus and operators but CEC will continue to lobby for        |
|                  |  | improvements  |
|                  | Improved crossings around the Town Centre  | Message already included in TCVP – see Action 2   |
|                  | Better signage   | Agreed – included in this action of the TCVP P90  |
|                  | Schools to encourage walking/ car share schemes  | P90 add How bullet to end:  |
|                  |  | Consideration could also be given to establishing a Middlewich Car Share Community                    |
| Deliver a New    | Majority of responses stated a new train station as a high priority                        | Noted – and identified as a priority action through public consultation                               |
| Train Station    | Would decrease road usage by commuters and therefore congestion, car                       | Message already included in TCVP – see Action 2   |
|                  | dominance and pollution  |   |
|                  | Will bring in visitors to the town and drive footfall for events                           | P91 What add:   |
|                  |  | This both limits growth and regeneration in Middlewich, and the opportunities for both footfall       |
|                  |  | through visitors to the town and for residents  |
|                  | Will reduce isolation for no-drivers and attract young professionals and help              | P91 What add:   |
|                  | young people have independence and visit education facilities, local cinemas,              | This both limits growth and regeneration in Middlewich, and the opportunities that residents who      |
|                  | leisure attractions etc  | do not drive (including young people) have access to elsewhere including employment,                  |
|                  |  | education and leisure attractions.  |
|                  | Must ensure the line goes to useful destinations e.g., Liverpool, Manchester,              | P91 How add: This would connect locally to Crewe, Sandbach and Northwich, with wider                  |
|                  | Crewe  | connections to Manchester and Liverpool beyond via changes at Crewe                                   |
|                  | Would require adequate car parking provision   | Noted – to be considered as part of any detailed proposals  |

| Priorities<br>Intervention | Consultation Comments   | Response   |
|----------------------------|---|--|
|                            | Would need integrated bus service   | Agree – public transport is determined by bus and train operators but CEC will lobby for integration   |
| Other Comments             | Development of the 'Jack's' site  | The development of the Jacks will be undertaken by the private sector. The TCVP seeks to raise the vitality of Middlewich to support the private sector to invest.   |
|                            | Accessible public toilets in the Town Centre  | Noted – to be considered through more detailed proposals   |
|                            | There is a lot of cynicism regarding the delivery of change in Middlewich                                       | The aim of the TCVP is to increase the vitality of Middlewich, encourage footfall and spend in the Centre and delivery positive change. However, it is recognised that there is no budget to support the actions and local cynicism is therefore understood. |
|                            | Sutton Lane developed into a functioning leisure centre, with lots of mention over the 'promised' swimming pool | Noted - but outside of the remit of TCVP   |
| Please note that all       | comments received for Middlewich have been covered in the above Table   |  |



6.3 The following diagrams illustrate general feedback in terms of the TCVP:



## Page 64

|                            | Individual  | 168 |
|----------------------------|---|-----|
|                            |   |     |
| Individual/member of panel | Local business  | 2   |
|                            | Council employee/professional                             | 1   |
|                            | Other   | 4   |
|                            | Male  | 57  |
| Gender Identity            | Female  | 111 |
|                            | Prefer not to say   | 6   |
|                            | 16-24   | 0%  |
|                            | 25-34   | 9%  |
|                            | 35-44   | 22% |
|                            | 45-54   | 23% |
| Age Group                  | 55-64   | 25% |
|                            | 65-74   | 13% |
|                            | 75-84   | 5%  |
|                            | 85 and over   | 0%  |
|                            | Prefer not to say   | 4%  |
|                            | White British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/Irish | 92% |
|                            | Any other White background                                | 1%  |
|                            | Mixed: White and Black Caribbean/African/Asian            | 0%  |
| Ethnic Group               | Asian/Asian British                                       | 1%  |
|                            | Black African/Caribbean/Black British                     | 0%  |
|                            | Prefer not to say   | 6%  |
|                            | Prefer to self-describe                                   | 1%  |

6.4 The below provides a summary of the characteristics of those who responded to the consultation:

## 7.0 Feedback from Nantwich

7.1 130 responses were received in respect of the Nantwich Report. The level of support for the identified priority areas is identified in the charts below:



Page 66



7.2 A summary of the specific comments received in respect of each of the proposed priorities for intervention in Nantwich is provided below. The response includes how the Final Report has been edited to take into account the comments where appropriate or relevant:

| Priorities Intervention       | Consultation Comments  | Response  |
|-------------------------------|--|---|
| Connecting Green              | Tidy up green spaces and area along the River and lakeside mentioned by  | P72 add new bullet to How:  |
| Assets                        | many with ideas including weeding, planting trees, wild flowers, better<br>pathways and surfacing, removing graffiti, bin provision and emptying,<br>controlling anti-social behaviour | Ensure green routes are safe and well maintained including removing overgrown trees<br>and hedges, ensuring even surfaces, removing graffiti, adequate bin provision and<br>lighting  |
|                               | Improvements needed to connect Nantwich Town Centre to Reaseheath,<br>the waterways and the Greenway   | P72 How 1st bullet – separate out the two sentences and update 1 <sup>st</sup> :<br>Creating a co-ordinated network of improved walking and cycling links that sustainably connect<br>planned new development and the Town Centre with the riverside <b>and other green assets</b>  |
|                               | Make better use of vital green spaces including at Barony Park, Queens<br>Drive and the walled garden - enhance, protect and help Nantwich Walled<br>Garden Society obtain ownership   | P72 How 1 <sup>st</sup> bullet – separate out the two sentences and update 2 <sup>nd</sup> :<br>Lots of community interest in the potential to enhance the landscape attractiveness/ wildlife value<br>of Brookfield Park and other vital green spaces such as Barony Park, Queens Drive and<br>Nantwich Walled Garden.<br>P73 Where Add :<br>Brookfield Park, Barony Park and Nantwich Walled Garden |
|                               | Better signage towards pathways and green assets   | P72 How add to bullet:<br>Improved entrance points, signage, crossing points and lighting to encourage more trips into the<br>riverside, pathways and green assets  |
|                               | Create places to dwell along the river e.g. picnic areas, children's play areas  | P72 How add to bullet:<br>Creating a variety of landscape types to help diversify the offer of the corridor park ranging from<br>urban food grow spaces, wildflowers, adventure play spaces, dwell spaces with benches and<br>picnic areas, quiet spaces  |
|                               | Encourage biodiversity   | Already stated in TCVP at P72   |
|                               | Green spaces are well used locally and don't need to be linked   | Noted   |
|                               | Will require multi-party engagement – Council, C&RT, Prince Albert<br>Angling Society etc.   | P73 Who add:<br>Local community/ voluntary groups e.g. local angling societies and Nantwich Walled Garden<br>Society  |
|                               | Local Green Gap is designated in the Acton, Edleston and Henhull Parish<br>Plan and should be identified in the TCVP   | Noted – to be considered as part of more detailed proposals   |
| Enhancing the Swine<br>Market | The majority of people agree that Swine Market needs an update since it is a centrepiece and key entrance into the town  | Agreed – this action seeks to address this and is identified as a priority intervention through the public consultation   |
|                               | Improve the mix of shops in this area which currently includes a lot of fast food, hairdressers and charity shops  | Noted – beyond the scope of the TCVP and the type of businesses which choose to open in a particular location is outside the control of the Town Council and CEC  |
|                               | Shopkeepers should be coveted to ensure shopfronts and signage are attractive  | Agree – picked up in TCVP at P76.<br>The overall TCVP seeks to increase vitality in Nantwich which should support landlords to be<br>more willing and able to invest in their properties  |

| Priorities Intervention | Consultation Comments  | Response  |
|-------------------------|--|---|
|                         | Some questioned the shutter art programme as not many shops have               | Noted – to be considered as part of more detailed proposals   |
|                         | shutters   |   |
|                         | New public realm now highlights poorer surrounding areas including dated       | Noted – picked up within TCVP at P76  |
|                         | 1960/70s buildings which need a facelift                                       |   |
|                         | Redevelop the area and start again mentioned a few times                       | Noted – picked up in TCVP at P76 through potential redevelopment and to be considered as part       |
|                         |  | of more detailed proposals  |
|                         | Consider pedestrianisation of this area or reduced traffic including via       | Noted – pedestrianisation to be considered as part of more detailed proposals                       |
|                         | removal of the island was mentioned numerous times although some felt          | P76 How last para edit: improved pedestrian crossings, increased                                    |
|                         | this would reduce footfall   | pedestrian space, potentially through the removal of the island, and a                              |
|                         | Make use of empty buildings  | Message already included within the TCVP within this action at P76 and specifically within Action 8 |
|                         | Creating more of a café culture with outdoor seating suggested by a few        | Noted – to be considered as part of more detailed proposals   |
|                         | but others felt this would not work with volume of traffic                     |   |
|                         | Concerns over safety in this area in the evenings                              | Noted – to be considered as part of more detailed proposals   |
| Arrivals and Journeys   | The station should be considered as a key gateway and a visual welcome         | Agreed – update P80 Action 1 under What:  |
|                         | for people arriving by train. Station environs, entrance and bridge in a poor  | Nantwich Station is also a key primary gateway into the town for those arriving by train.           |
|                         | state of repair  | P81 Where – add the station to the primary gateways   |
|                         |  | Noted – but the station is beyond the remit of the TCVP as Network Rail control                     |
|                         | Station is underutilised as infrequent train services and limited destinations | Noted - it must be acknowledged that public transport it outside the control of CEC but they        |
|                         |  | should use the feedback from the TCVPs to lobby for improvements as part of wider                   |
|                         |  | engagement with providers   |
|                         | Support and progress proposals for walking and cycling in the Local            | Already stated in the TCVP  |
|                         | Transport Delivery Plan and Neighbourhood Plan                                 |   |
|                         | There are too many cars on the road  | The TCVP seeks to reduce car dominance at P80   |
|                         | Enhance the greenery, particularly from the bus station                        | P80 How edit: improving the visual quality of pedestrian links from main arrival points including   |
|                         |  | the train and bus stations and main car parks car parklets', business spill out space,              |
|                         |  | additional greening and planters with seating, improved materials and lighting.                     |
|                         | Welsh Row is a vibrant area but cut off from the town                          | P80 How edit bullet: Welsh Row is of major local historic and civic importance, as well as being a  |
|                         |  | vibrant hub for local businesses. However, the area currently feels cut off from the town and       |
|                         |  | the quality of the street should be improved, with the intention of creating clearer connections    |
|                         |  | and a better balance between the needs of vehicles and pedestrians.                                 |
|                         | Pilroy St and Hospital St must be made more pedestrian friendly.               | P80 How: Pillory St and Hospital St are both narrow streets where the highway dominates and         |
|                         | Suggestions include raised surfaces to prioritise pedestrians,                 | the footways are often in poor condition. They are in need of upgrades to the public realm to       |
|                         | pedestrianisation, wider pavements but noted service vehicles still require    | better support businesses, accessibility and create a safer pedestrian environment.                 |
|                         | access   | Consideration should also be given to the options for giving pedestrians priority over              |
|                         |  | cars in this area, including wider pavements  |

| Priorities Intervention | Consultation Comments   | Response   |
|-------------------------|---|--|
|                         | General foot and cycle path maintenance including removing overgrown      | P80 add new para after pedestrian links in How:  |
|                         | trees and hedges, widening where possible, consideration of uneven        | Ensure foot and cycle paths are safe and well maintained including removing overgrown                    |
|                         | surfaces and filling in potholes, ensure well lit                         | trees and hedges, ensuring even surfaces and are well lit  |
|                         | Some questioned the value of sculptures                                   | Noted  |
|                         | More parking needed mentioned numerous times                              | The message is considered within Action 9 of the TCVP  |
|                         | Improved signage to car parks and key destinations required               | Agreed – this is picked up within the TCVP at P80  |
|                         | Introduce 20mph speed limit across the town centre                        | Noted – CEC Highways control road safety. To be considered as part of more detailed proposals            |
|                         | Support for enhancement of gateways - suggestion to include footpath      | P80 add text to bullets under 'Where' as follows:  |
|                         | from Snow Hill Car Park to Beam St, routes from Civic Centre car park and | Primary Gateways – Waterlode, Welsh Row, Beam Street / Coronation Gardens, Water                         |
|                         | bus station arrival point   | Lode / Pillory Street and bus station  |
|                         |   | Pedestrian Links - Civic Hall Car Park, Monks Lane, Hospital Street, Pillory Street., Mill Street,       |
|                         |   | Wall Lane, Oat Market, Snow Hill Car Park link to Beam St and Welsh Row                                  |
|                         | Improving the journey across Waterlode is important .                     | Agreed- Waterlode is identified as a primary gateway on p81 and as an important link to green            |
|                         |   | spaces on the page on page 74.   |
| Showcasing              | Tourist information centre should be open on Saturdays and utilised more  | P84 How last para:   |
| Nantwich's Heritage     | with a proper reception and visitor centre built for incoming tourists    | The tourist information office would benefit from being more prominent/higher profile with               |
| and Tourist Assets      |   | extended opening hours to encourage greater utilisation. More could also be made of the                  |
|                         |   | Hack Green Secret Nuclear Bunker located south of Nantwich.  |
|                         | Not just heritage assets – leisure and tourism                            | P85 where: Across Nantwich Town Centre with wider links to nearby relevant heritage, leisure             |
|                         |   | and tourism assets of interest   |
|                         | Need and events and marketing manager                                     | Noted - to be considered as part of more detailed proposals  |
|                         | Need a programme of events including building on existing ones            | P84 How 3 <sup>rd</sup> para: As well as heritage events, there is also an opportunity for more targeted |
|                         |   | thematic events e.g. cultural and food, building upon those that are already established such            |
|                         |   | as the Jazz and Blues, Words and Music Festivals. These can be used to help position the                 |
|                         |   | town and assist promotion and profiling.   |
|                         | Posters on notice boards as well as QR codes to appeal to both older and  | Message already included within the TCVP – see P84   |
|                         | younger generations   |  |
|                         | Concerns over how busy the town gets during events                        | Noted - to be considered as part of more detailed proposals  |
|                         | Historical frontages such as Tudor buildings should conform to compulsory | Noted - but CEC do not have powers to enforce  |
|                         | standards and be well maintained  |  |
|                         | Make more of the brine pool   | Mentioned in What at P84   |
|                         | Infrastructure improvements to accommodate increases in population/       | Noted but outside the remit of the TCVP. Proposals for new development are considered by                 |
|                         | tourist numbers   | CEC through the Local Plan process and in determining individual planning applications and               |
|                         |   | infrastructure requirements associated with new development determined as part of planning               |
|                         |   | applications   |
| Further Embracing       | More diversity in the business types is needed                            | Agree but type of businesses which choose to open in a particular location is outside the control        |
| Nantwich's Business     |   | of the Town Council and CEC. The TCVP seeks to enhance vitality within the town centre which             |
| Community               |   | in turn will help to attract a greater variety of businesses.  |

| Priorities Intervention            | Consultation Comments   | Response   |
|------------------------------------|---|--|
|                                    | Create more incentives to start new businesses  | Noted but outside the remit of the TCVP  |
|                                    | Support existing independent businesses was a frequent response   | This action seeks to achieve this  |
|                                    | Link with a wider pool of younger people, not just Reaseheath e.g. 6th form   | P86 How 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph: after Reaseheath college and other local colleges and schools   |
|                                    | colleges, junior markets  | Then add new sentence: Other initiatives to engage young people and encourage  |
|                                    |   | entrepreneurialism could be a junior market which is proving successful in Stockport.  |
|                                    | Introduction of loyalty scheme  | Message already included within the TCVP within this action. See P86   |
|                                    | Encourage businesses to volunteer   | P86 How 5 <sup>th</sup> para add: Many businesses, particularly larger ones, are being encouraged to   |
|                                    |   | support their local communities for example through involvement with voluntary or  |
|                                    |   | community groups.  |
|                                    | Using social media to promote and highlight local businesses  | Noted and add into Action 6, additional bullet point in How section:   |
|                                    |   | More use of social media to promote and highlight local businesses   |
|                                    | More overnight accommodation for tourists   | Noted but beyond the scope of TCVP - the private sector will develop new hotels if they  |
|                                    |   | assesses there to be demand for them   |
| Raising Nantwich's                 | Website for both tourists use and resident's information  | P87 How add at the end of 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph after cycle routes etc which would be useful to  |
| Profile                            |   | both tourists and local residents.   |
|                                    | Involve local community in any branding exercise – Crewe did not and is   | P87 How add:   |
|                                    | poorer as a result  | Consideration could be given, as has just been done in Wilmslow, to working with a local   |
|                                    |   | marketing company to develop a brand linked to the town's website and other media channels -   |
|                                    |   | https://wilmslowswaybetter.co.uk/ - the local community should be engaged to assist with   |
|                                    |   | this process to engender civic pride.  |
|                                    | Introduction of Town Ambassadors  | Message already included within this action of the TCVP at P87   |
|                                    | Need to get Nantwich featured in Cheshire Life and other high profile   | P87 How add new 1 <sup>st</sup> bullet:  |
|                                    | publications  | Promotion of Nantwich through positive PR and good news stories e.g. feature in Cheshire Life  |
|                                    | More publicity is required around events e.g. food festival   | P87 How 4 <sup>th</sup> bullet: Enhanced programme of events and raise   |
|                                    |   | awareness of businesses. Such events and initiatives should be well advertised via a   |
|                                    |   | variety of methods.  |
|                                    | Other towns are promoted on rail lines e.g. Mid-Cheshire line ran by  | P87 How add bullet:  |
|                                    | Northern advertise Altrincham and Chester   | Consider collaboration with local rail operator Transport for Wales to promote Nantwich  |
|                                    |   | and other Cheshire towns on the local line.  |
|                                    | House builders to provide 'welcome to Nantwich' booklets containing local information                                 | Noted - to be considered in working up any future detailed proposals   |
|                                    | Need USP's to attract tourists e.g. original birthplace of Shakespeare  | Noted – This action seeks to enhance the vitality of the town by maximising the opportunities presented by its USPs to raise the profile of Nantwich |
| Making More of<br>Community Assets | A large number of comments regarding the need for public toilets.<br>Proposed Snow Hill location considered suitable. | Noted – message picked up in TCVP within this action on P88  |

| Priorities Intervention | Consultation Comments   | Response   |
|-------------------------|---|--|
|                         | Extension of the underutilised and tired looking Civic Hall considered be a   | Noted  |
|                         | great improvement by most but some questioned benefit. Replacement            |  |
|                         | rather than extension was also suggested.                                     |  |
|                         | More parking required to support an extension of the Civic Hall, particularly | Noted - to be considered in working up any future detailed proposals                                       |
|                         | if extend onto existing car park. Many responses to this.                     | Parking strategy is includes within the TCVP at Action 9   |
|                         | Uses within these assets should be focused on the local community -           | Noted – P88 What 2 <sup>nd</sup> para add: Consideration should be given as to how                         |
|                         | families and elderly rather than private enterprise                           | Nantwich's assets could be further utilised to attract footfall into the Centre and serve the              |
|                         |   | needs of the local community including families, young people and the elderly.                             |
|                         | An expansion of the Civic Hall could include an enlargement of the Library    | Noted - to be considered in working up any future detailed proposals                                       |
|                         | Increasing the income of community assets to support the wider town is        | Noted  |
|                         | desirable   |  |
|                         | Civic Hall needs larger fire doors to allow increased capacity of events      | Noted - to be considered in working up any future detailed proposals                                       |
|                         | Consideration of community assets should go broader than CEC and Town         | P88 How add new para to end:   |
|                         | Council – consider churches and community based organisations and             | Consideration should also be given to engaging and collaborating with the wider                            |
|                         | assets  | community assets across Nantwich including local churches and community based                              |
|                         |   | organisations.   |
| Tackling Void           | Murals/ vinyl wrappers on empty shops to improve look e.g. of places of       | Message already included within the TCVP within this action at P89. Add to How 4 <sup>th</sup> para: Other |
| Properties              | interest in town, iconic buildings. Local schools could be involved           | short term solutions which brighten up vacant shop-fronts include vinyl "wrappers" promoting the           |
|                         |   | town and its businesses e.g. places of interest or iconic buildings or using vacant shop-                  |
|                         |   | windows to showcase products of existing businesses or online stores. Local schools could be               |
|                         |   | encouraged to create window displays.  |
|                         | Co-working, pop up or community space in empty shops as temporary use         | Message already included within the TCVP – see P89   |
|                         |   | Meanwhile uses (until development can happen) such as pop up stores, activities or                         |
|                         |   | community use can support footfall and allow potential occupiers to test the local area.                   |
|                         | Landlords/owners of vacant properties to stay on top of upkeep                | Noted - but CEC do not have powers to enforce unless the building is dangerous or sufficiently             |
|                         |   | bad to invoke S215 maintenance notices   |
|                         | Long standing voids to be converted into residential                          | Message already included within the TCVP – see P89 add to How para 3:                                      |
|                         |   | Residential is also another option to be considered, particularly for longer standing voids and            |
|                         |   | for smaller units on the edges of the town or above shops.   |
|                         | Reduce business rates and rents to encourage businesses                       | Noted but outside of the remit of TCVP as business rates are set nationally and private landlords          |
|                         |   | set rental levels.   |
| Car Parking Strategy    | Many would like to see more free or reduced cost parking generally or at      | Noted – but beyond the remit of TCVP as pricing of car parking is determined by CEC Highways               |
|                         | certain times of day, Sundays or for first 30 minutes                         |  |
|                         | Some strong views around insufficient parking being available                 | Noted – amend bullet on p90 to make position clearer   |
|                         | Lack of parking provision perceived to be putting shoppers and visitors off.  | "Consider recommendations made by CEC Parking Strategy." To become   |
|                         | Situation considered to have worsened given volume of new housing             | Revisit parking strategy for Nantwich town centre taking into account the                                  |
|                         | surrounding town.   | recommendations of this TCVP and views received in consultation  |

| <b>Priorities Intervention</b> | Consultation Comments   | Response   |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
|                                |   | P90 How add new bullet: Ensure car parking locations are well signposted throughout the            |
|                                |   | town centre  |
|                                | Some have stated there is enough parking and would like to see it reduced     | Noted - to be considered in working up any future more detailed proposals around parking           |
|                                |   | requirements   |
|                                | Increase in disabled parking provision e.g. make Church Lane Car Park         | Noted - to be considered in working up any future more detailed proposals around parking           |
|                                | exclusive for Blue Badge holders to compensate for the loss of on-street      | requirements   |
|                                | spaces  |  |
|                                | Introduce more electric charging points                                       | P90 How add bullet to end:   |
|                                |   | Consider introduction of more electric charging points linked to car parking within the            |
|                                |   | town centre  |
|                                | Improve ease of parking e.g. card payment machines                            | Noted - to be considered in working up any future more detailed proposals around parking           |
|                                |   | requirements   |
|                                | Introduce resident only parking in some areas                                 | Noted - to be considered in working up any future more detailed proposals around parking           |
|                                |   | requirements   |
|                                | Reduce car parking time to 15-30 minutes, whilst others suggested a           | Consideration of parking time limitations already included within this action of the TCVP at P90.  |
|                                | minimum of an hour was required to support town centre activities             | More detailed requirements would be worked up through the recommended car parking strategy.        |
|                                | Introduce a park and ride facility or MSCP for more parking provision         | Noted - to be considered in working up any future more detailed proposals around parking           |
|                                |   | requirements through a car parking strategy  |
|                                | More car parking provision at train station                                   | P90 What first para add:   |
|                                |   | Better balancing short-stay high turnover parking (which supports retail/leisure) with longer-stay |
|                                |   | worker parking such as at the train station will be important.                                     |
|                                | Suggestion for additional provision includes using the cleared Gas Works      | Noted - to be considered in working up any future more detailed proposals around parking           |
|                                | site for parking in the interim, the Love Lane Car Park through               | Requirement for pick up locations to be included in within How text?                               |
|                                | reconfiguration of spaces, the train station, Snow Hill and Barony Park       |  |
|                                | On street parking make it difficult for pedestrians and spoil the look of the | P90 What 2 <sup>nd</sup> para:   |
|                                | area  | Considerations should be given to limiting on street parking to loading or very short stay (30     |
|                                |   | min). The reduction of on street parking will enhance the look of Nantwich and improve             |
|                                |   | safety for pedestrians.  |
|                                | Need to better enforce parking restrictions                                   | P90 How add new bullet: Ensure parking restrictions and conditions are enforced across             |
|                                |   | the town centre  |
|                                | Need to consider parking strategy during larger events                        | Noted - to be considered in working up any future more detailed proposals around parking           |
|                                |   | requirements through a car parking strategy  |
| Other Comments                 | Infrastructure improvements to support increase in population – health,       | Noted but outside the remit of the TCVP. Proposals for new development are considered by           |
|                                | education etc   | CEC through the Local Plan process and in determining individual planning applications and         |
|                                |   | infrastructure requirements associated with new development determined as part of planning         |
|                                |   | applications   |
| Priorities Intervention | Consultation Comments   | Response  |
|-------------------------|---|---|
|                         | Many detailed constructive suggestions made by Nantwich Civic Society with regard to all priority actions | Value is likely to be added to any proposals by inclusion of Civic Society rep in any discussions<br>on specific proposals taken forward especially any impact on the character of the Centre and<br>setting of heritage assets   |
|                         | There is a need to manage expectations around funding   | The TCVP makes clear at P6 that there is not a pot of money available to support the delivery of the Vitality Plan. Rather the Vitality Plan has been prepared as a resource to support accessing funding.  |
|                         | There is a lot of cynicism regarding the delivery of change in Nantwich                                   | The aim of the TCVP is to increase the vitality of Nantwich, encourage footfall and spend in the Centre and delivery positive change. However, it is recognised that there is no budget to support the actions and local cynicism is therefore understood.                        |
|                         | Nantwich Town Council would like to invite CEC officers to a tour of the town                             | A tour of the town with CEC officers and Nantwich Town Council is welcomed and now being arranged   |
|                         | Not enough to address walking, cycling and public transport   | The need to enhance walking and cycling is picked up int the TCVP under Actions 1, 3 and 9.<br>Public transport operators control bus and train services and are therefore beyond the scope of<br>the TCVP although CEC will continue to lobby for public transport improvements. |
|                         | The TCVP is short of a vision   | The vision and objectives for Nantwich are set out within the Neighbourhood Plan and included within the TCVP at P9   |
|                         | Very long document with a lot of jargon and poor grammar  | The TCVP is deliberately detailed to provide a robust assessment of the needs and opportunities of the town. A glossary is provided at the end of the report which will be proof read before issuing.   |
|                         | Need a coherent place making strategy and cultural engagement plan  | Noted – to be considered through more detailed proposals  |
|                         | No mention of disabled access or inclusivity. Nothing to tackle loneliness<br>or mental health            | The TCVPs aim to be inclusive for all however mental health is beyond the remit of the TCVPs  |
|                         | Nothing on climate change or sustainability   | Sustainability is a central theme of the TCVP see p93   |

Page 74

7.3 The following diagrams illustrate general feedback in terms of the TCVP:



7.4 The following table summarises additional comments received in respect of the Nantwich TCVP.

| Specific Revisions to Nantwich TCVP  | Response to the Feedback   |
|--|--|
| On a practical note, we found the format difficult to read through.  | Final Report will be available to view as an electronic and print version  |
| We would have been able to read a paper document more effectively. The wide format on a screen is hard to scroll                         |  |
| through, up and down, without losing your place.   |  |
| Also, the use of coloured texts on coloured backgrounds has, to be candid, reduced our ability to really understand                      |  |
| everything in it.  |  |
| Update: After over five years of lobbying CEC, we have seen Beam Street and Swine Market have resurfaced                                 | Noted  |
| pathways over the late summer 2022. This could not be mentioned in the Study, as the surfacing has taken place                           |  |
| since you prepared it.   |  |
| "The Old Biot" - a constantly running brine spring, feeding the outdoor Brine Pool across Waterlode. (The study calls                    | Replace Lido with Pool throughout document - P73 and P76   |
| it a Lido - perhaps an aspiration but not the current reality. It is a rare feature that is not exploited enough by the pool operators.) |  |
| Since this report's publication, events have caught up with us. Barclays Bank has closed and adjoining it on Church                      | P36 Remove the dots from the photos and edit the box   |
| Yard Side, Bratts, the only department ladies clothing store left, will close next month. Some other vacancies have                      | Update 2022: Since the site visit in 2020 some of the units that were vacant have  |
| arisen too with several not reused for months.   | now been occupied, for example the former Laura Ashley store. Likewise, some   |
|  | other units have become vacant such as the Barclays Bank and Bratts on   |
|  | Church Yard Side.  |
| Page 10, para 2 - Nantwich Town Centre is based on the Market Square (which is not mentioned)  | P10 para 2 - Nantwich Town Centre is focused around Market Square, Beam Street,  |
|  | High Street, Hospital Street, Pillory Street   |
|  | and Welsh Row.   |
| Page 10, para 4 - The population maybe diverse in age structure but it is not in ethnicity - this should be clarified (c/f               | P10 para 5 - The housing mix reflects the relatively economically diverse local  |
| Page 21)   | population which includes a high proportion of residents aged over 65 years, some of   |
|  | whom are struggling financially, and highly skilled economically active affluent groups  |
|  | surrounding the urban core.  |
| Page 10, para 5- Fails to mention the business park near Sainsbury's and the planned commercial development in                           | P10 para 6 - Due to its close proximity to Crewe and accessibility to the M6, Nantwich   |
| Kingsbourne  | is predominantly a commuter town with no significant industrial estate or business park  |
|  | employment cluster within its urban area, with the exception of a relatively small   |
|  | employment park off Middlewich Road to the north of the town and proposals for<br>additional commercial development at Kingsbourne |
| Page 12 - The River Weaver does not flow through Nantwich Town centre - this is misleading and inconsistent with                         | P12 para 2 - Brookfield Park and Barony Park provide attractive and well used open   |
|  | spaces close to the Town Centre and the River Weaver flows to the west at Nantwich   |
|  | Riverside  |
| Page 13 - Dorfold Hall mislocated it is west of Nantwich not south   | P13 - update map   |
| Page 14 Map includes Morrisons, but not Grade 1 listed St. Mary's Church which is a key visual component of the                          | P14 - add St Mary's Church to map  |
| town centre???   |  |
| Page 14 Annotation in Box - River Weaver is adjacent, but separated from the town centre by the ring road                                | P14 - existing text sufficient   |
| Page 14 Map should indicate Local Green Gap from the made Acton, Edleston and Henhull Neighbourhood Plan.                                | P14 - add Park and Garden to Dorford Hall label  |
| The greenspace to the west of the Shropshire Union canal does not make sense. The Dorfold Hall Registered Park                           | P14 - consider adding green gap  |
| and Garden should be indicated and annotated.  | Is theatre a significant enough asset to include on this plan?   |

| Specific Revisions to Nantwich TCVP  | Response to the Feedback   |
|--|--|
| Why is the Nantwich Players Theatre not shown?   |  |
| Page 17 The Local Green Gap between Nantwich and Acton from the made Acton, Edleston and Henhull Neighbourhood Plan should be identified                                 | This plan shows allocations from the Cheshire East Local Plan rather than Neighbourhood Plan   |
| Reference should be made to the permissions associated with Kingsbourne and the stage of delivery - not just reference to the Local Plan allocations                     | Kingsbourne is identified as LPS 46 on the plan on P17 and again at P58<br>P17 - add to text - LPS 46 'Kingsley Fields', <b>known as Kingsbourne</b> , located north<br>west of the Town Centre can accommodate 1,100 homes and ancillary uses.<br><b>Development is currently underway</b>  |
| Page 18 - Future direction first bullet point does not make sense. Nantwich in Bloom should be capitalised   | P18 edit - Continue to support Nantwich in <u>B</u> loom and procures planting and other services from Cheshire East Council   |
| Page 26 River Weaver is adjacent, but separated from the town centre by Waterlode  | P26 - The River Weaver network lies adjacent to Town Centre <b>but separated by</b><br>Waterlode   |
| Page 26 Map - should this locate the health centre? What about M+S as Aldi and Morrisons get a mention?  | P26 - could add health centre. If M&S is of similar scale to other supermarkets could also add   |
| Page 28 Visit should have extended longer - footfall drops off significantly after about 3.30 - the centre can seem dead at 4pm  | Noted for future reference   |
| Page 31 There is a very clear, historically important gateway to the west, the Thomas Telford Aqueduct - this should be included.  | P31 add bullet: The Thomas Telford Aqueduct provides a historically important gateway from the west  |
| This gateway analysis does not reflect reality and the illustrations in many cases are looking out of town not into the town centre.                                     | P31 photos - OPEN to consider changing   |
| Page 33 - Brine Pool not Brine Bath  | P33 - replace Bath with Pool   |
| Page 39 - Photo 4 is Market Square   | P39 photo 4 - replace text - Strong sense of centre <b>at Market Square including</b><br>Nantwich War <u>M</u> emorial   |
| Page 43 - Comments about public realm need updating based on recent investment in new footpath surfacing   | Text added to acknowledge  |
| Page 45 - White text on red is difficult to read   | Plan edited  |
| Page 47 - Comments about public realm need updating based on recent investment in new footpath surfacing   | Text edited  |
| Page 48, para 3 - Hospital Street AQMA Zone is not south of the town centre, although the western part of Hospital Street is   | P48 edit - Hospital Street close to the town centre.   |
| Page 49 para 6 - The A51 realignment around the Green is no longer a proposal it is under construction. It does not link to the town centre, it links into Kingsbourne   | P49 para 6<br>A series of improvements are planned for the A51 route, including junction and<br>drainage enhancements, to tackle congestion and address pedestrian and cyclist<br>severance. Furthermore, an amended alignment of the A51 around The Green <b>is now</b><br><b>under construction</b> to include a new link from the A51 north of Nantwich <b>at</b><br><b>Kingsbourne</b> into the Town Centre. |
| Page 57 - Fails to mention the business park near Sainsbury's and the planned commercial development in Kingsbourne  | P57 - There is no significant industrial estate or business park, with the exception of a relatively small employment park off Middlewich Road to the north of the town and proposals for additional commercial development at Kingsbourne, but  |
| Page 60 - Strengths - Events should read Jan to October - to include the October Words and Music Festival which has been running for 15 years and brings people to town. | P60 strengths - Strong calendar of events throughout the year  |

| Specific Revisions to Nantwich TCVP  | Response to the Feedback   |
|--|--|
| The theatre is not mentioned.  | including <b>the Words and Music Festival</b> , <b>Jazz and Blues Festival and a</b> number of <b>triathlons (2/3 a year)</b> which brings in visitors<br>P60 strengths - Attractions include the River Weaver and Brine Pool (one of the only two outdoor brine pools in the country and for which investment has recently been secured), proximity to canal network, <b>a theatre</b> and a museum - there is scope to make more of these assets |
| Page 60 - Weakness -Comments about Nantwich Riverside margin maintenance seem out of context in terms of other strategic points - of more significance is the random planting that has been implemented in the Riverside and other areas, with no ongoing maintenance.<br>Gateway analysis not sound so weaknesses identified not justified.   | Text reworded  |
| Page 60 Opps - Add music festivals to calendar of events - there are already three per year (Blues/ Roots and Words and Music)<br>Laura Ashley Unit is occupied.<br>What does opportunity to avoid over-reliance on surface parking mean - a multi-storey?<br>Did the consultants have access to the 2007 Nantwich Snow Hill Study? If not they should have.<br>Does the improve public realm comments need amending?<br>Riverside development on old gas works site should be mentioned.  | Events - Added to 'strengths' with other events<br>P61 - remove Laura Ashley bullet<br>Add bullet to Opportunities - Opportunity for riverside development at the old Gas<br>Works site  |
| Page 60 Threats - St. Anne's Lane car park already closed and development site remediated. Could question why this is taking so long - a threat is that it will remain undeveloped for years What new development on Snow Hill? This is not mentioned anywhere elsewhere??   | P60 threats - Redevelopment (hotel and retail) of St Anne's Lane Site/car park <b>is proposed and has resulted</b> in the loss of 80-100 spaces (due for completion 2022).   |
| Page 66 Disagree that Nantwich feels like a village  | Reference to village removed   |
| Page 68/ 69 - Text too small to read on 'local amenities' on plan<br>Brine Pool not Lido<br>Disagree in principle with the gateway locations and suggestions - there is a strong gateway to the west (Aqueduct)<br>which has not been mentioned - there is no need for a random gateway somewhere along Welsh Row. To the north<br>the Thomas Fairfax Bridge (not mentioned anywhere creates a gateway from where you see the tower of St. Mary's,<br>the other two are road junctions - what sort of 'gateway' is proposed. 12 gateways???<br>Disagree with expenditure on this - would be much preferable to be used improving more of the town centre public<br>realm etc.<br>There is already a Nantwich Riverside Plan - it does not need intensification in terms of development in the<br>Riverside.          | Plan enlarged<br>P68/9 - Replace Lido with Pool<br>Language in key updated to be more specific to town centre arrivals. Noted<br>significance of landmarks in comments but understanding is that these are on the<br>periphery of the town settlement and beyond the focus of the study.   |
| Page 70 N_PR1 - This proposal does not appear to have come from any analysis earlier in the study?? Welsh Row public realm is better quality (certainly in terms of materials) than much of Nantwich and was subject to an upgrading scheme in the last 20 years. Whilst there are areas where services have not been reinstated which could be repaired better any suggestion that this needs prettification and additional variety in materials is unfounded. Underwhelming is a pejorative and subjective term based on no analysis - it is an understated and robust public realm scheme fitting for the heritage area it passes by. The Park Lane Poynton scheme if this is what is proposed for Welsh Row looks to be of poorer quality materials than that currently on Welsh Row and lacks a cohesive simple | This text is taken from the LTDP and relates to a specific proposal within that document<br>Whilst the footways are of a good quality and would not require replacement, we feel that the carriageway and lining of Welsh Row is visually intrusive and in poor condition in some areas. It prioritises linear vehicular movement and makes little attempt to support pedestrian movement between frontages. Poynton precedent is used to          |

| Specific Revisions to Nantwich TCVP   | Response to the Feedback   |
|---|--|
| approach, as would befit the character of Welsh Row which needs simplicity in the public realm to act as a serene | convey approach to the above changes, not as a temple or specification of materials. |
| background to the variety of the architecture.  | CEC Highways have reviewed all TCVPs for suitability.                                |
| Has Cheshire East Highways Department been consulted on addition of wide range of materials?                      |  |
| It is hoped that the consultants are aware of the first iteration of the Welsh Row public realm which included    | Dorford Hall reference is on P14.  |
| chicanes which were subsequently removed following a negative reaction from the public.                           |  |
| It is unclear why Dorfold Hall is mentioned - the plan as shown goes nowhere near Dorfold Hall - not even to the  |  |
| Aqueduct.   |  |
| Page 74 As above too many gateways in unjustified locations   | Key texted changed   |

|                            | Individual  | 114 |
|----------------------------|---|-----|
| Individual/member of panel | Group, organisation or club                               | 1   |
|                            | Elected CE Ward Councillor or Town/Parish Councillor      | 1   |
|                            | Other   | 3   |
|                            | Male  | 61  |
| Gender Identity            | Female  | 54  |
|                            | Prefer not to say   | 3   |
|                            | 16-24   | 0%  |
|                            | 25-34   | 7%  |
|                            | 35-44   | 9%  |
|                            | 45-54   | 18% |
| Age Group                  | 55-64   | 22% |
|                            | 65-74   | 26% |
|                            | 75-84   | 13% |
|                            | 85 and over   | 1%  |
|                            | Prefer not to say   | 4%  |
|                            | White British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/Irish | 91% |
|                            | Any other White background                                | 3%  |
|                            | Mixed: White and Black Caribbean/African/Asian            | 1%  |
| Ethnic Group               | Asian/Asian British                                       | 1%  |
|                            | Black African/Caribbean/Black British                     | 1%  |
|                            | Prefer not to say   | 4%  |
|                            | Prefer to self-describe                                   | 0%  |

7.5 The below provides a summary of the characteristics of those who responded to the consultation:

### 8.0 Feedback from Poynton

8.1 53 responses were received in respect of the Poynton Report. The level of support for the identified priority areas is identified in the charts below:



Page 81



8.2 A summary of the specific comments received in respect of each of the proposed priorities for intervention in Poynton is provided below. The response includes how the Final Report has been edited to take into account the comments where appropriate or relevant:

| <b>Priorities Intervention</b> | Consultation Comments   | Response   |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| Making more of                 | The first half of the document tries to ignore the proposals to build houses on the       | The ability to protect green space from development is outside the remit of the TCVP.        |
| Poynton's                      | current sports club grounds, and then the second part of the document appears to          | However in light of proposals for development of the Sports Centre now being                 |
| Community Assets               | use the current location of the sports club as part of the vision for connected green     | embedded into the SADPD and significant concerns raised by Town Council and                  |
|                                | space and a reduction in car use. Our precious few green spaces are vital, please         | individuals about issues with parking it is proposed that this priority is removed and       |
|                                | protect them and stop overdevelopment   | elements of it are incorporated into Connecting Green Assets and Expanding Events            |
|                                |   | Actions instead  |
|                                | The only community assets in the Centre are the Civic Hall, library and a small           | Acknowledged - There may still be some limited scope to support town centre vitality         |
|                                | section of the car park. As such the ability to change this area is limited               | through events in the car park with the agreement of the leaseholder for example in the      |
|                                |   | evenings when the supermarket is close, or by holding modest scaled events in and            |
|                                |   | around the Library, but it is appreciated that this is limited so the priority given to this |
|                                |   | has been removed from the TCVP see proposed changes above                                    |
|                                | Create a children's/ youth centre as nearest one is unable to be reached via public       | Noted – Creation of a new centre is outside of the remit of the TCVP however                 |
|                                | transport so excludes some parents - Reintroduce youth club as former was very            | proposals for events will support more for young people                                      |
|                                | popular and kept kids off of streets. Need more for young people to do                    | Add and more day time events for the elderly and less mobile residents as well               |
|                                |   | as events for young people to last bullet under How on p86                                   |
|                                | Include Community Centre on Park Lane   | Add to plan on p73   |
|                                | Public realm improvements in front of library to create an environment with better        | Bullet 1 on p78 can be tweaked and incorporated into Action 5 (Events) Enhancing             |
|                                | natural surveillance  | the public realm around the Library  |
|                                |   | with consistent paving, seating, and planting  |
|                                |   | which would allow for small scale event space.   |
|                                | Add more seating to encourage people to dwell   | Page 82 (current) Incorporate additional sentence in Action 2 - walking and cycling to       |
|                                |   | say More seating to add resting points and places to dwell                                   |
|                                | There is a need to have more long time car parking on the site. If we are to encourage    | Noted - outside the remit of the TCVP and some car parks are in private ownership so         |
|                                | people to spend longer in the town then the restriction of 2 hours in the short stay      | outside of CEC's control. However CEC Highways to consider where scope to revise             |
|                                | area needs to be removed. If people are attending events need more longer stay            |  |
|                                | parking options to encourage users to stay in the centre longer.                          |  |
|                                | Don't reduce the number of parking spaces (particularly disabled spaces). This only       | The TCVP does not recommend a reduction in the number of car parking spaces but              |
|                                | leads to out of town shopping therefore reducing footfall in Poynton. Parking is          | rather to consider for specific events whether some car parking could be utilised.           |
|                                | becoming difficult in the main car park. Any additional activity needs to address this    | Clearly consideration would need to be made to ensuring sufficient car parking overall       |
|                                | increasing problem If the aim is to attract more people into the centre of Poynton, it is | to accommodate visitors  |
|                                | essential that parking provision is expanded.   |  |

| <b>Priorities Intervention</b>                                 | Consultation Comments  | Response  |
|--|--|---|
|  | More patrols on Park Lane by PCSOs to prevent cars and vans from parking on pavements and blocking entrances. Especially from 8am to 11am. Fixed penalties to be given out for a period to send a message  | Noted - outside the remit of the TCVP but CEC Highways to consider  |
|  | Town Council has repeatedly requested information on assets but not received an<br>update on progress towards the preparation of the list have been asking CEC to see<br>list of community assets to understand potential  | Noted - It is not clear where specifically requests have been sent. However key assets in/close to the town centre owned by CEC include the Library and Poynton Park (750m walk from the Library). The term 'Community Assets was not intended to purely refer to CEC owned assets but also to encompass such things as Poynton Sports Club which whilst in private ownership is still a community facility. In light of the draft SADPD allocation of the Poynton Sports Club site and acknowledged limited scope of community assets in the centre, as set out above priority intervention 1 to be removed.   |
| Connecting Green<br>Assets/ Encouraging<br>Walking and Cycling | Support improvements of cycle lanes/ paths. Particularly along Chester Road, London<br>Road and connection from A555 to Hazel Grove/ oil terminal junction and towards<br>Bramhall Park, to Poynton Pool and paths between Hazel Grove and Poynton could<br>connect to the Manchester bee network cycleway   | P80 of the TVCP does identify most of these but list will be revised slightly<br>Bullet 1 change to London Road North and South<br>Add new bullet to Poynton Pool   |
|  | The main green space (which is largely ignored in the plan) is Poynton Park. Request for play area at Poynton Park   | P80 of the TCVP acknowledges the importance of Poynton Park and the need to<br>improve links to it and other green spaces. There may be potential for children's play<br>space in any redevelopment proposals for Poynton Sports Club. Page 80 already<br>refers to the redevelopment of the sports club site - strengthen to flag potential benefits<br>of incorporating a play area accessible from the town centre.<br>Page 80 How final bullet amended to read <b>If redevelopment proposals come</b><br>forward for Poynton Sports Club ensure strong direct walking and cycling links<br>with town centre services such as the Library, explore potential for children's<br>play to serve both new homes and the town centre plus ensure strong walking<br>and cycling links to any re-provided sports facilities |
|  | Chester Road pedestrian pavements are hard to use and feel unsafe to walk on. The pavement from the station towards Woodford is overgrown.<br>Paving improvements are needed and long term regular maintenance of trees and foliage on the pavements. In some cases, it might be that private owners need to be persuaded to keep their shrubs and trees from blocking the pavements.  | Add new bullet to p80<br>Improve maintenance of pavements, drains and vegetation to support more<br>walking and cycling   |
|  | The route between roundels and Poynton Pool is woefully inadequate with a very narrow footway and pedestrians are required to pass other people on the carriageway. Narrowing the carriageway to create a wider footway/cycleway would help lower vehicle speeds and improve conditions for non-car users.   | Insert <b>Poynton Pool</b> to list under bullet 5 under How on p80<br>'London Road North linking to Poynton Park and Pool. '  |
|  | Improvements to public realm in the shared space are urgently required - the lack of maintenance has meant a significant deterioration which impacts on pedestrians and cyclists. The Town's infrastructure also needs attention for example surface water flooding after heavy rea in a number of areas of the won due to poor and ineffective drainage. Concern was also noted for proposal to improve the flood resilience of | Add new bullet to p80<br>Improve maintenance of pavements, drains and vegetation to support more<br>walking and cycling   |

| Priorities Intervention | Consultation Comments  | Response   |
|-------------------------|--|--|
|                         | Poynton Pool which could lead to the loss of trees - important historical and            |  |
|                         | ecological landscape should be protected for future generations                          |  |
|                         | Repairs to existing road and pathways need to be addressed first; missing and loose      | Add new bullet to p80  |
|                         | granite sets and poor patch replacements using sunken tarmac.                            | Improve maintenance of pavements, drains and vegetation to support more              |
|                         | Opportunities for enhancing planting using perennial pollinators and wildlife friendly   | walking and cycling  |
|                         | areas even in small pockets.   |  |
|                         | Walking should definitely be encouraged as this would potentially free up parking        | Add new bullet to p80  |
|                         | spaces for people travelling from further afield. However, the current state of the      | Improve maintenance of pavements, drains and vegetation to support more              |
|                         | pavements and gutters would need to be improved considerably. There are numerous         | walking and cycling  |
|                         | places where hedges and trees have been allowed to over grow and encroach on to          |  |
|                         | pavements meaning that it is impossible to walk. The blocked gutters around the          |  |
|                         | roundabouts need to be sorted. Consideration should also be given to exhaust fumes       |  |
|                         | when there is a traffic jam coming into Poynton. Cyclists currently ride on the          |  |
|                         | pavement, this is also a hazard for walkers and a resolution is required if walking and  |  |
|                         | cycling are to be encouraged.  |  |
|                         | Chester Road and London Road North and South are havens for speeding vehicles            | Noted - but outside the remit of the TCVP. CEC Highways to note                      |
|                         | Speeding occurs from the double roundabout in all three directions in the case of        |  |
|                         | Chester Road all the way to Woodford.  |  |
|                         | Imminent completion of the Poynton relief road in early 2023 presents an ideal           | Add new text to page 74  |
|                         | opportunity to prioritise active travel via the introduction of a multi-modal pathway on |  |
|                         | London Road North. The aim of the Relief Road is to reduce through traffic in            | The impact of the Poynton Relief Road should be assessed to determine how            |
|                         | Poynton. However, merely opening the new road won't be enough in itself - traffic        | active travel can be prioritised going forward.                                      |
|                         | calming measures will also be needed to stop people using London Road as it will         |  |
|                         | remain the most direct route from Stockport to Macclesfield. Suggestion that a multi     |  |
|                         | modal pathway be put in between Fiveways in Hazelgrove and Poynton. This would           |  |
|                         | connect to the Manchester bee network cycleway at Fiveways and would encourage           |  |
|                         | people to cycle instead of driving on London Road North. It is a wide road and so        |  |
|                         | there is plenty of room for a pathway in addition to the existing pavement.              | P80 Add new bullet   |
|                         | There appears to be no provision for wheelchair users. Certainly review on-street        |  |
|                         | parking and ban completely parking on pavements as this is dangerous for wheelchair      | All future proposals must ensure they are accessible for everyone                    |
|                         | users, parents with prams and people with sight problems. The disabled are routinely     |  |
|                         | ignored when things are planned.   |  |
|                         | The existing Sport Club is an important green link from the town centre to Poynton       | The proposed scheme for the Sport Club site must ensure pedestrian and cycling links |
|                         | Pool an excellent but underused asset.   | between the proposed homes and the centre are optimised. This is already referenced  |
|                         |  | on page 80   |
|                         |  | The importance of links to Poynton Pool are identified under Action 1                |
|                         |  | Add Poynton Pool as new bullet point under Where on p80                              |

| Priorities Intervention | Consultation Comments   | Response  |
|-------------------------|---|---|
|                         | Make sure pathways are available to all green assets                                  | Fully support and endorsed by Action 1  |
|                         | Signage for bikes to travel in cycle paths/ lanes and not on pavements                | Existing recommendation on p80  |
|                         | Ban parking on pavements, particularly on Park Lane                                   | Noted - but outside the remit of the TCVP   |
|                         | Concerns raising about cutting down on the use of cars - but can't do if public       | Noted - CEC Highways is committed to supporting more sustainable modes of   |
|                         | transport is not adequate   | movement  |
|                         | The pavement is sufficient for the railway commuters. We do not need separate         | Noted but many other comments support need for improvements   |
|                         | cycling lanes for the odd cyclist to ride along at the expense of road users. Chester |   |
|                         | Road is narrow enough already and does not need stupid cycle lanes as at Fiveways,    |   |
|                         | Hazel Grove. No one has any problem getting around. Leave well enough alone and       |   |
|                         | think of the motorist for once.   |   |
|                         | Some have never heard of 'Poynton Round' so need to better explain                    | Noted recommend that as part of enhanced marketing Poynton Round is promoted more                                     |
|                         | Poynton Town Council management of Poynton Park and other open spaces is<br>supported | Noted   |
| Raising Poynton's       | Websites are currently confusing and not updated very often                           | Noted - supported by Action 4   |
| Profile                 | Town Council's website needs to be more dynamic – looks tired                         | Noted - supported by Action 4   |
|                         | A single website as a source of information would definitely be a step forward        | Noted - supported by Action 4   |
|                         | Poynton already has a high profile as a desirable place to live and bring up families | Accepted but scope to support local businesses if local and visitors can be encouraged                                |
|                         | with good rail and road links to areas  | to spend time   |
|                         | Very good idea - need a person with vision and an excellent communicator              | Noted   |
|                         | Town Council is already working on a Welcome to Poynton leaflet with information for  | Add sentence at the end of 2 <sup>nd</sup> para under How on p85  |
|                         | new residents   | Town Council is preparing a Welcome to Poynton leaflet with information for   |
|                         |   | new residents and has set up a Business Directory and is currently looking at how to work with businesses in the Town |
|                         | Giving the town and identifiable "brand" can be helpful in instilling pride in the    | Noted - in working up detail proposals these ideas should be taken into account                                       |
|                         | community and in helping to sell the community to sell itself to the outside world.   |   |
|                         | Nearby examples are Ashbourne - Gateway to the Peak and Chapel en le Frith - The      |   |
|                         | Capital of the Peak. Poynton with its superb adjacent countryside and already very    |   |
|                         | popular with families and excellent accessibility already has a number of possible    |   |
|                         | branding opportunities.   |   |
|                         | Provide more accommodation choices for visiting groups                                | Noted but the private sector will develop new hotels if they assesses there to be demand for them                     |
|                         | Town Council has set up a business directory and is currently looking at how to work  | This is acknowledged under Action 3 but add sentence at the end of 2 <sup>nd</sup> para under                         |
|                         | with businesses in the Town   | How on p85  |
|                         |   | Town Council is preparing a Welcome to Poynton leaflet with information for   |
|                         |   | new residents and has set up a Business Directory and is currently looking at   |
|                         |   | how to work with businesses in the Town   |
|                         | Town Council is already good at this and good business networking as well             | Agree - this is acknowledged in Action 3  |

| Priorities Intervention | Consultation Comments  | Response   |
|-------------------------|--|--|
| Mobilising Poynton's    | Should have a single platform for all networks / local charity groups/ activities/ council | Add under How after para " businesses networking on p84 add                            |
| Community               | information etc  | Consider creating a single platform for all networks/local charity                     |
|                         |  | groups/activities/council information etc and offer support and advice for             |
|                         |  | volunteers looking to set up events/ workshops/ classes                                |
|                         | Need to offer support and advice for volunteers looking to set up events/ workshops/       | See above for suggested edit to text   |
|                         | classes  |  |
|                         | Reduce business rates rental levels on properties for local businesses                     | Noted outside remit of the TCVP. Central Government set rates                          |
|                         | Businesses will only engage in funding of initiatives only if they see personal gain       | Accepted in some cases but there are lots of examples where they can support their     |
|                         |  | local communities whilst also helping their own businesses                             |
|                         | Encourage people to utilise local amenities e.g. clubs and outdoor activities              | Action 4 will support this making more people aware of what is on offer in Poynton     |
| Expanding Events        | There's already a lot going on   | Agree but scope to make more people more aware   |
| Programme               | Make sure all events link to Town Centre e.g. Poynton Show and Fireworks                   | Key objective of Action 5  |
|                         | More events e.g. Foodie Fair night markets, more food markets, dog friendly events         | Key objective of Action 5  |
|                         | and introduction of 'incredible edible'  |  |
|                         | Make more use of Poynton Park  | Add  |
|                         |  | including Poynton Park to bullet point under Where p86                                 |
|                         | Poynton Arts Festival will take place in Summer 2023                                       | P86 bullet point 1 replace with The majority of pre Covid events have been re-         |
|                         |  | established in 2022 of there are plans to bring them back in 2023. All events as       |
|                         |  | promoted on the Town Council website. Preparation is underway for the                  |
|                         |  | Poynton Arts Festival which will take place in summer 2023.                            |
|                         | 'Expanding the Events Programme' includes omits mentioning the civic bonfire               | Add Civic Bonfire to list of events under what line 2 on p86                           |
|                         | Poynton Show has been running for 150 years and the Civic Bonfire 50 years.                |  |
|                         | More day time events for the elderly and less mobile residents                             | Add and more day time events for the elderly and less mobile residents as well         |
|                         |  | as events for young people to last bullet under How on p86                             |
|                         | Conduct a drive for volunteers for events  | Add  |
|                         |  | Conduct a drive for volunteers for events as new bullet point on p86 under How         |
|                         | Big barrier for events is capacity of current car-parks and of the town for anymore/       | Noted and needs to be managed on an event by event basis to ensure that any            |
|                         | bigger events . Concern about attraction of more cars for people outside the area -        | proposals to enhance the vitality of the centre are not impacting negatively on local  |
|                         | Parking and traffic is a nightmare already!  | residents  |
|                         | Must be done in conjunction with improving public transport, particularly a better bus     | Noted - it must be acknowledge that public transport it outside the control of CEC but |
|                         | service to be ablet to get homes after 6pm   | they should use the feedback from the TCVPs to lobby for improvements as part of       |
|                         |  | wider engagement with providers  |
|                         | Image used of vacant shops isn't Poynton   | P40 replace with image of Poynton  |
| Tackling Void           | Encourage short term uses e.g. exhibition spaces, use by community groups, artwork         | Include text in new Action 2   |
| Properties              |  | Town Council and CEC to work with owners of vacant units to encourage them             |
|                         |  | to use vacant shops/windows to display exhibitions/art work or for use by              |
|                         |  | community groups to engage with community  |

| Priorities Intervention | Consultation Comments  | Response  |
|-------------------------|--|---|
|                         | There are a small number of voids in Poynton. Generally, occupancy is good.                                  | Add text into Action 2  |
|                         | However, some properties have been empty long term despite approaches being                                  | There are a small number of voids in Poynton. Generally, occupancy is good.                   |
|                         | made to the property holders by other businesses. The Town Council would like to                             | However, some properties have been empty long term despite approaches being                   |
|                         | see Cheshire East undertake action to bring empty properties back into use,                                  | made to the property holders by other businesses. Further approaches should                   |
|                         | especially where it is known that demand exists. The Town already has a vibrant F&B                          | be made where resources allow with the Town Council and CEC collaborating to                  |
|                         | offering.  | try and establish the route cause, with consideration being given to all potential            |
|                         |  | options to tackle vacancies   |
|                         | Change of uses for children's/ elderly activities, workshop space, residential instead                       | Fully support but letting of individual units is controlled by owners of the building not the |
|                         | of on green belt   | Town Council or CEC   |
|                         | Concerns noted about some of owners of existing businesses not investing in their                            | Noted but CEC have limited powers to control the activities of individual businesses          |
|                         | properties or willing to let them out or sell them to others to bring new occupiers into the Centre          |   |
|                         | Make landlords maintain vacant shop fronts   | Good idea but CEC do not have powers to enforce unless the building is dangerous or           |
|                         |  | sufficiently bad to invoke S215 maintenance notices   |
|                         | Introduce incentives to be in Poynton for businesses   | Given limited public sector budget unlikely to be scope to offer financial incentives to      |
|                         |  | businesses in Poynton although CEC does offer a wide range of support to local                |
|                         |  | businesses across the Borough   |
|                         | CEC undertake action to bring empty properties back into use especially where it is known that demand exists | Noted but CEC have limited powers to control the activities of individual businesses          |
|                         | Encourage eco-themed businesses e.g. refill stores   | Supported but letting of individual units is by owners of the building not the Town           |
|                         |  | Council or CEC  |
|                         | Reduce rates and rental value on properties  | Noted outside remit of the TCVP. Central Government set rates. Private landlords set          |
|                         |  | rents   |
|                         | Free/ lower parking rates for employees/ volunteers  | Noted - but outside the remit of the TCVP for individual business or organisation to          |
|                         |  | negotiate with car park operators. CEC parking charges are set by CEC but must take           |
|                         |  | into account a wide range of issues alongside supporting town centre vitality.                |
| Other Comments          | More infrastructure/ services to accompany further development   | Noted but outside of the remit of the TCVP - infrastructure requirements associated           |
|                         |  | with new development determined as part of planning applications                              |
|                         | Flooding is a major concern for residents, need to ensure streets are swept clean of                         | Add new bullet to p80   |
|                         | leaves and debris to avoid blocking drains and causing flooding.   | Improve maintenance of pavements, drains and vegetation to support more                       |
|                         |  | walking and cycling   |
|                         | Impose weight limit on HGV's to avoid travelling through Centre when bypass is<br>opened                     | Noted - outside of the remit of the TCVP. CEC Highways to note                                |
|                         | Climate change friendly amenities e.g. electric charging points, protecting wildlife                         | The importance of sustainability is recognised in the Centre Wide Action (see p88). It        |
|                         | habitats   | must be considered in working up any proposals for the Centre                                 |
|                         | Restrict loading times outside businesses to help traffic flow   | Noted - outside the remit of the TCVP. CEC to note  |
|                         | Help to improve litter problem with more bins, signage, better education                                     | Noted - Town Council to consider if potential for further attention                           |

| Priorities Intervention | Consultation Comments  | Response  |
|-------------------------|--|---|
|                         | Overdevelopment is mentioned in plans but needs more consideration as is major issue   | Noted - outside of the remit of the TCVP. CEC to note   |
|                         | Lots of messages about ensuring centre is accessible to everyone   | P80 Add new bullet<br>All future proposals must ensure they are accessible for everyone   |
|                         | Concern that the TCVP is not underpinned by the Poynton Neighbourhood Plan but others acknowledge it is  | See pages 15-17   |
|                         | A great deal of work still remains to flesh out the plans and make them a reality.   | Agree the aim of the TCVPs is to provide a consistent baseline of the issues and opportunities in each of the centres and to provide a guide to a wider range of stakeholders to work up details plans for the centres. The TCVP will be an important document in supporting bids for accessing future investment See Phasing Section of the TCVP |
|                         | Council should be ensuring that more affordable homes are built within the town, including share ownership, rent to buy and rental. Council should be identifying sites within and close to the town centre for sheltered housing and extra care housing both private and affordable. Given the apparent indifference of the private sector to provide such facilities, the initiative will probably have to be taken by the Council and appropriate Housing Associations. | Noted – outside of the remit of the TCVP but will be considered by CEC as part of their Housing Strategy  |
|                         | Need to improve public transport - in public transportation for Poynton. Links to<br>Manchester are not good. There is no shuttle bus to link to the Park and Ride at<br>Hazel Grove and the bus service is irregular and non-existent on a Sunday. The bus<br>journey to Macclesfield is circuitous and there is no bus service to Wilmslow.  | Noted - it must be acknowledged that public transport it outside the control of CEC but they should use the feedback from the TCVPs to lobby for improvements as part of wider engagement with providers  |

8.3 The following diagrams illustrate general feedback in terms of the TCVP:



8.4 The following table summarises additional comments received in respect of the Poynton TCVP.

| Specific Revisions to Poynton TCVP   | Response to the Feedback   |
|--|--|
| General - given the nature of this Vitality Plan and its reliance on the individuals, businesses, community groups and other       | The process of preparing the TCVPs has involved a variety of engagement -      |
| bodies to ensure its success, there should be a more open approach to communications and consultation than has so far              | see p7   |
| been the case.   | Recommendations for future communication and engagement are set out on         |
| We would suggest that a Communications and Consultation Plan be prepared for the next steps of the Vitality Study which            | p91  |
| sets out timescale for involvement and when and who will be involved.  |  |
| P19 of the document as it is extremely misleading in that the labelling of the map disguises the fact the sports club is marked    | Noted edit text PYT1 80 homes on site of Sports Centre                         |
| for development ('PYT 1: 80 homes just north of the town centre', in contrast the Vernon infant school site is accurately          |  |
| referred to as such) and has completely missed labelling the green belt development on the periphery of Poynton as a new           |  |
| site, this will most likely have impacted other respondents understanding of what is being proposed.                               |  |
| On page 21 the comment next to it says 'Designate and protect the green spaces within and around the town which would be           | This is an extract of the Neighbourhood Plan. The draft allocation for new     |
| protected from development' What exactly does 'new sports facilities sensitive to green belt location' mean in relation to this    | development referred to above is emerging through the Borough wide Local       |
| comment? How can building sports facilities be sensitive to a green belt location - it is either green belt or it isn't.           | Plan process   |
| Page 78 detailing making more of community assets (PRIORITY) clearly shows how important the sports club is in its current         | The proposal is outside of the remit of the TCVP. It is part of the Local Plan |
| location and page 79 says it can be used for community events, there is no reasonable detail whatsoever detailing what the         | but will require further consultation before it will be allocated              |
| alternatives are if it is destroyed with housing. Page 42 is misleading especially seeing how close into the centre of the town it |  |
| is and its connection to the civic hall area, it seems to be clearly marked as public green space - you need to check the key      |  |
| carefully so see 'Potential development site for housing'. Also note this area is also covered on 2 sides by belts of mature       |  |
| woodland which will be at severe risk of degradation with building and harm the environment and denude another key part of         |  |
| the character and green-ness of the centre.  |  |
| On page 46 the 'positives' in open space include 'No immediate town centre open space, however Brecon Park, Deva Park              | Proposals for the Sports Centre are emerging from the Local Plan and will be   |
| and Poynton Park provided closest recreational green space' - these are already stated as being on the periphery therefore         | reviewed as part of this process rather than the TCVP                          |
| how can they be regarded as a positive for the centre?, there is immediate town centre open space - it is the current location     |  |
| of the sport club. Also seeing the weaknesses described on page 47: 'Lack of central open space within the immediate centre'       |  |
| and 'Green spaces such as Poynton Park and Deva Park are on the periphery of the town centre, with connections to and from         |  |
| them not clear and of varying quality' If this is the case why is it regarded as a good idea to build on the sports club location, |  |
| Poynton park is classed as periphery here, why would the proposed green belt location for the sport club be classed as a good      |  |
| move as this is even further away.   |  |

|                            | Individual  | 42  |
|----------------------------|---|-----|
|                            | Local business  | 1   |
| Individual/member of panel | Council employee/professional                             | 1   |
|                            | Other   | 1   |
|                            | Male  | 23  |
| Gender Identity            | Female  | 18  |
|                            | Prefer not to say   | 3   |
|                            | 16-24   | 0%  |
|                            | 25-34   | 2%  |
|                            | 35-44   | 16% |
|                            | 45-54   | 14% |
| Age Group                  | 55-64   | 27% |
|                            | 65-74   | 23% |
|                            | 75-84   | 11% |
|                            | 85 and over   | 0%  |
|                            | Prefer not to say   | 7%  |
|                            | White British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/Irish | 91% |
|                            | Any other White background                                | 2%  |
|                            | Mixed: White and Black Caribbean/African/Asian            | 0%  |
| Ethnic Group               | Asian/Asian British                                       | 0%  |
|                            | Black African/Caribbean/Black British                     | 0%  |
|                            | Prefer not to say   | 7%  |
|                            | Prefer to self-describe                                   | 0%  |

8.5 The below provides a summary of the characteristics of those who responded to the consultation:

#### 9.0 Feedback from Sandbach

9.1 94 responses were received in respect of the Sandbach Report. The level of support for the identified priority areas is identified in the charts below:





9.2 A summary of the specific comments received in respect of each of the proposed priorities for intervention in Sandbach is provided below. The response includes how the Final Report has been edited to take into account the comments where appropriate or relevant:

| Priorities Intervention  | Consultation Comments  | Response   |
|--------------------------|--|--|
| Opportunity for physical | This is a key gateway location   | P74 1 <sup>st</sup> para:  |
| change round the Market  |  | However, the area around the Market Hall and Town Hall is surrounded by roads which          |
| Hall                     |  | detract from their profile and key gateway location, creating a less pleasant environment    |
|                          |  | than their setting deserves.   |
|                          | General agreement that there is a need to make more of the Market Hall     | Noted - this action responds to this   |
|                          | Expand outdoor areas for bars and restaurants to create vibrant            | P74 bullet 1:  |
|                          | atmosphere   | Claim more space (from roads and highways) in front of and behind the Town Hall/ Market      |
|                          |  | Hall building, to increase dwell time and create a more vibrant atmosphere - with pop-up     |
|                          |  | seating areas, lighting installations, art installations, moveable planting                  |
|                          | Don't reduce road space, car parking or hinder traffic around Market Hall. | Noted - should be taken into account when working up more detailed proposals                 |
|                          | Poynton cited by some as a bad example of this                             |  |
|                          | Altrincham and Crewe Market Hall cited by some as good examples for        | P74 add bullet:  |
|                          | new food halls having positive impact                                      | Consider potential for pop up food events in Market Hall on none-market days e.g. Altrincham |
|                          |  | and Crewe Food Halls   |
|                          | Stall holders report space too small and rents high                        | Noted - Beyond the scope of TCVP   |
|                          | Need up upgrade the Market Hall internally                                 | Noted - Beyond the scope of TCVP - CEC to consider requirement as part of ongoing            |
|                          |  | management of the Market Hall  |
|                          | Consider ongoing maintenance cost of planters                              | Noted - Beyond the scope of TCVP   |
|                          | Hold weekly market on The Cobbles  | Message already included in TCVP - see Action 4  |
|                          | Open up Market Hall for weekend events                                     | Noted - this action responds to this under How   |
|                          | Must not raise expectations unrealistically                                | Agreed Add at end of What It must be recognised that significant physical change             |
|                          |  | would be very costly and whilst this may be a longer term aspiration, more modest            |
|                          |  | interventions may be more realistic in the current economic climate.                         |
|                          | Promote the town / town hall activities with emerging technology etc but   | Agreed- add text to final bullet on p74 - Use Town Hall frontage in 'smarter' ways - e.g.    |
|                          | this needs to be balanced with conservation / environmental impact and to  | 'Good Ideas Shop' to provide space for online business advertising:                          |
|                          | make sure we retain look and feel of the historic building.                | https://www.facebook.com/business/m/good-ideas-shop?content_                                 |
|                          |  | id=8dxdnW5laCGdmVb, but always ensuring the heritage character of the area is                |
|                          |  | protected "  |
| Deliver a movement plan/ | Improving congestion and reducing car dominance would help pedestrian      | Update text on P78 under What:   |
| reduce car dominance     | safety and health  | Reducing the dominance of cars in the heart of the town centre to encourage visitors to be   |
|                          |  | able to dwell, creating a safer and healthier environment. Re-prioritising pedestrians and   |
|                          |  | reducing the space for cars provides town centre visitors with a more pleasant place         |
|                          |  | to shop, relax and to browse more comfortably  |

| Priorities Intervention | Consultation Comments  | Response   |
|-------------------------|--|--|
|                         | Focus on Hightown and High Street with suggestions including shared access or pedestrian priority areas, creating a traffic free area, and reversing the one way system on High Street   | Noted - should be taken into account when working up more detailed proposals   |
|                         | Don't make traffic movement through the town difficult as will discourage visitors   | Enhancing movement to support the overall vitality of Sandbach is a key principle of the TCVP through this action.   |
|                         | Reduce large vehicles through the town centre and peak time traffic - rush hour, school run  | CEC Highways to note - outside the remit of the TCVP   |
|                         | Bring in traffic calming measures and/or 20mph zone to reduce speeding and HGV usage   | CEC Highways to note - outside the remit of the TCVP   |
|                         | Sandbach adversely impacted by problems on M6  | Noted - CEC Highways responsible for monitoring and responding to highways issues  |
|                         | Eastern bypass required from J17 to the Middlewich Eastern Bypass  | Noted - CEC Highways to consider as part of ongoing responsibility for town centre movement  |
|                         | Improve traffic flows around edge of town e.g. Sandbach bypass, A534<br>Old Mill Road to M6, A533, Aldi junction and the Mill, through widening<br>roundabouts to dual entry/exit, ensuring traffic light sequencing works   | Noted - CEC Highways to consider as part of ongoing responsibility for town centre movement  |
|                         | Disabled / general access to both platforms at the station must be a priority for the town and should form part of the final TCVP  | Agreed- insert extra bullet under How under Action 3<br>Disabled access to platforms at Sandbach Station   |
|                         | Comment on bringing back a 2-way system to ease traffic flow   | Noted - CEC Highways to consider as part of ongoing responsibility for town centre movement  |
|                         | Make walking and cycling apriority including the introduction of cycle parking   | Message already included in TCVP - see Action 3  |
|                         | The Town Hall has seen formidable refurbishment by Sandbach Town<br>Council and provides a show piece asset at the centre of the town<br>retaining a thriving market and a town hall which regularly hosts weddings,<br>parties, christenings and community events and is the pride of the town<br>centre. | Noted and agreed - Emphasise under Action 1 by amending text as follows: Sandbach<br>benefits from a number of interesting heritage buildings and attractive public spaces reflecting<br>its market town status and creating a unique identify for the town. <b>The Town Hall in</b><br><b>particular has benefitted from significant refurbishment by Sandbach Town Council</b><br><b>and is a thriving hall hosting many events</b> . However, the area around the Market Hall and<br>Town Hall is surrounded by roads which detract from their profile and create a less pleasant<br>environment that the setting they deserve. |
|                         | Ensure suitable free parking in right location and including blue badge<br>spaces to encourage people to use the town. Enforce limited time parking<br>in central area.  | Agree - free parking encourages visitors to centres however pricing of car parking and time enforcement is determined by CEC Highways  |
|                         | Better public transport required to support this action including a shuttlebus between the town centre and railway station matching with train arrivals and more regular bus services to more destinations including Sunday services together with better communication of public transport time tables.   | Agree - public transport is determined by bus and train operators but CEC will continue to lobby for improvements  |

| Priorities Intervention          | Consultation Comments   | Response   |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
|                                  | Concern that excessive development has led to increased traffic and that<br>further housing development around Waitrose roundabout will generate<br>further issues.   | Noted but outside the remit of the TCVP. Proposals for new development are considered by CEC through the Local Plan process and in determining individual planning applications and infrastructure requirements associated with new development determined as part of planning applications.                     |
|                                  | Review Town Transport Plan  | The Local Transport Delivery Plan (LTDP) is reviewed on P52-53 of the TCVP with relevant interventions to Sandbach built upon within the Movement action plan of P72 of the document. CEC Highways are responsible for assessing and implementing transport proposals.   |
|                                  | Review access & movement to the Town Centre - suggestion to include cycle counts  | Noted, this could be part of a review  |
|                                  | Expansion of setts on High Street would not assist cycling - tarmac may be better for cycling lanes   | Noted that there needs to be consideration given to all users in any detailed schemes developed  |
|                                  | Note that schemes to 'reduce congestion' can make conditions even worse for cyclists and pedestrians  | p78 be amend<br>Old Mill Road - explore design options to address congestion and improve access into<br>Sandbach town centre <b>whilst ensuring conditions for cyclists and pedestrians are also</b><br><b>enhanced</b>  |
|                                  | A key active travel connection is to connect people living in the eastern half of Sandbach to the railway station.  | Agreed - Action 3 references this  |
| Encourage Walking and<br>Cycling | More safe cycle/walking routes mentioned in following locations: A533 to station; Hind Heath Road; Sydney end of Crewe; Middlewich Road   | Noted - details to be worked up alongside LTDP and TCVP  |
|                                  | Walking and cycling routes on major road and should not disrupt traffic-<br>learn from mistakes made on Old Middlewich Road   | Noted - CEC Highways to consider as part of ongoing responsibility for town centre<br>movement   |
|                                  | There has been a particular emphasis on need for secure cycle parking, particularly around central retail areas of Welles Street, Green Street and Bold Street. View that cycle parking should be spatially dispersed rather than a single hub. | P80 How. Edit bullet 3:<br>Consider the location of cycle <b>hubs parking</b> linked to improve <u>d</u> green links and introduce<br>secure, safe cycle parking <b>in central retail areas such as Welles Street, Green Street and</b><br><b>Bold Street</b>  |
|                                  | Adequate crossings provided currently therefore limited need for<br>additional or improved crossing points. Possible exceptions include<br>between B&M and Waitrose, Bradwall Road, Heath Road Co-op  | P80 How. Edit bullet 2:<br>Deliver enhanced pedestrian/cycle crossing facilities at key junctions and pedestrian routes<br>including the Crewe Road/Highton Road roundabout, and the High Street/ The Hill junction,<br>Park Lane, between B&M and Waitrose, at Bradwell Road and near the Heath Road Co-<br>op. |
|                                  | General foot and cycle path maintenance including removing overgrown trees and hedges, widening where possible, consideration of uneven surfaces and filling in potholes, ensure well lit   | P80 add bullet to How:<br>Ensure foot and cycle paths are safe and well maintained including removing<br>overgrown trees and hedges, ensuring even surfaces and are well lit   |
|                                  | Raise awareness, provide information and improve access to existing provision for walking and cycling e.g. St Mary's Dell, Dingle Wood and the Woodland Corridor  | P80 How 4 <sup>th</sup> bullet add:<br><b>Raise awareness and</b> improve pedestrian/cycle connections to <b>existing provision for</b><br><b>walking and cycling including</b> Sandbach Park, <b>St Mary's Dell, Dingle Wood and the</b><br><b>Woodland Corridor</b>  |

| Priorities Intervention | Consultation Comments  | Response  |
|-------------------------|--|---|
|                         | Recognise walking and cycling sometimes conflict e.g. in pedestrianised            | Noted - all modes of movement and potential conflicts between them to be considered when                |
|                         | areas  | working up more detailed proposals.   |
|                         | Enforce double yellow lines and dangerous parking on main routes and               | Noted - parking enforcement beyond remit of TCVP  |
|                         | conflict with cycle lane e.g. parking near St Mary's Church                        |   |
|                         | Need to recognise not all can walk/cycle and therefore need to retain              | Add at the end of What on p80:  |
|                         | some parking   | Whilst seeking to encourage walking and cycling it is acknowledged that not all people                  |
|                         |  | are able to do so and therefore car use will continue to be required in some                            |
|                         |  | circumstances   |
|                         | Ensure new developments provide adequate provision. Some cycling                   | Noted - but outside the remit of TCVP. Covered by Local Plan  |
|                         | lanes provided by new housing do not connect with cycle lanes into town            |   |
|                         | Engage with volunteer groups such as Sandbach Footpath Group and                   | P80 How. Last bullet edit:  |
|                         | Woodland Wildlife Group to promote natural assets in the town                      | Consider linkages with local cycling clubs, walking groups and relevant volunteer                       |
|                         |  | organisations e.g. Sandbach Footpath Group to encourage walking and cycling                             |
|                         |  | P80 Who add:  |
|                         |  | Local cycling and walking organisations   |
|                         | A 'history walk' around the town connecting places of interest                     | Message already included in TCVP - see Action 4   |
|                         | Consider pedestrianisation or pedestrian priority zones around High Street         | Message already included in TCVP - see Action 2   |
|                         | 20mph speed limit zone within central town centre, but not surrounding major roads | Message already included in TCVP - see Action 2   |
| Showcase Heritage and   | Promote and take pride in local heritage offer - The Town Council already          | Agreed – add extra words on page *2 (Action 4) to reflect this  |
| Tourism Assets          | supports the promotion of the town's heritage by enhancing the setting of          | The Town Council and other groups already promote the town's heritage,                                  |
|                         | heritage assets via the work of its rangers, floral displays etc                   | including through a series of events, and by enhancing the setting of heritage assets                   |
|                         |  | through the work of its rangers, floral displays etc. There is scope to expand upon these               |
|                         |  | assets,   |
|                         | Introduce a Conservation Area to protect heritage assets                           | Noted - CEC to consider through local planning process and oversight to protect appropriate             |
|                         |  | heritage assets.  |
|                         | Consider more history and heritage themed events and trails e.g. May Day           | P82 How last para:  |
|                         | Market   | More events focused around heritage, such as a May Day Market, should also be                           |
|                         |  | considered with scope to link to showcasing the towns other assets.                                     |
|                         | QR codes idea received mixed views but integrated information via                  | Noted re. QR codes  |
|                         | contemporary information stands and plaques suggested e.g. Chester                 | P82 How 1 <sup>st</sup> para: The use of QR codes, <b>apps and interactive information points</b> means |
|                         |  | more insight can be offered   |
|                         | Make better utilisation of Sandbach Park and The Cobbles for events - lots         | P82 how para 4:   |
|                         | of people suggested outdoor seating for bars and restaurants on The                | Better utilisation of Sandbach Park for events and The Cobbles for events, markets                      |
|                         | Cobbles or markets   | and outdoor seating for bars and restaurants focused around heritage should also be                     |
|                         |  | considered with scope to link to showcasing the towns other assets                                      |
|                         | Involve historic local businesses e.g. Faders/ERF/Bentley in relevant              | P82 How. Move last sentence of first bullet to end and create new bullet:                               |
|                         | events e.g. Transport Festival and Faders Brass Band                               |   |

| Priorities Intervention          | Consultation Comments  | Response  |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
|                                  |  | There could be scope to engage with local businesses in local relevant events e.g. Bentley for a Transport Festival or Faders Brass Band. Local businesses may also be willing to provide expertise to support the Town to develop a local app or QR codes.   |
|                                  | Encourage owners to maintain heritage assets   | The aim of the TCVP is to increase the vitality of Sandbach and to encourage footfall and spend in the Centre. This should in turn support owners to invest in their properties. In the case of heritage assets the TCVP could be used to support funding for bids to Historic England/Heritage Lottery                               |
|                                  | Improve park facilities with things such as model railway, crazy golf, café improved toilet facilities                                 | Noted - details would be worked up in proposals to support improvements in local parks  |
|                                  | Provide a Sandbach Museum showcasing history and heritage  | Noted - project to be considered by local stakeholders  |
|                                  | More town centre accommodation required – hotel and motorhome options  | The development of hotels will be undertaken by the private sector. The TCVP seeks to raise the vitality of Sandbach to support the private sector to invest.   |
|                                  | Betting shop building detracts from the Square and obscures view of Church   | Noted - outside the remit of the TCVP individual landlords determine  |
|                                  | Mobility issues created by uneven surface of The Cobbles   | Noted - proposals to improve specific areas of Sandbach will be determined as part of detailed projects   |
| Raise the Profile of<br>Sandbach | Sandbach has a reasonable profile proportionate to its offering and already well-supported   | P84 How add as an intro para:<br>Whilst Sandbach already has a well-supported and reasonable profile proportionate to<br>its size and offering, a number of actions could be considered to further raise the<br>profile of the town:  |
|                                  | Better website that is kept up to date and promotes the many assets, facilities and community groups. Include link on Council website. | Agreed - picked up through 'how' for this action<br>P84 How last para:<br>including <b>its assets and facilities together with</b> profiles of local businesses (and<br>individuals to make it more personal), local walks, cycle routes etc. Links to relevant websites<br><b>including community groups</b> could also be provided. |
|                                  | Extend reach online and social media to better promote Sandbach including Town Council   | P85 how. Add new bullet:<br>Promotion of Sandbach via dedicated social media channels   |
|                                  | Producing an events calendar   | Agreed - already picked up through 'how' for this action  |
|                                  | Appoint a non-political Community Major to promote Sandbach  | Message already included in TCVP - "establish Town Ambassadors"   |
|                                  | Use Sandbach Services and banners on the M6 to promote town  | Action 5 supports raising the profile of Sandbach. Suggests are noted and will be reviewed in working up detailed proposals   |
|                                  | Consider how to promote the town to those not online or tech savvy   | Agreed - already picked up through 'how' for this action  |
|                                  | Use library as an information hub  | P85 how. Add new bullet:<br>Provide information on things to do in Sandbach within the Library  |
|                                  | Involve community, volunteer and sporting groups   | P85 how. Add new bullet:<br>Engage with established community, volunteer and sporting groups to promote things<br>to do and special interests   |
|                                  | Promote heritage assets including through tourist information boards   | Message already included in TCVP - see Action 3   |

| Priorities Intervention  | Consultation Comments  | Response  |
|--------------------------|--|---|
|                          | Free Wi-Fi in the town centre  | The is beyond the remit of the TCVP but key stakeholders are working with operators to        |
|                          |  | improve digital connectivity across Cheshire  |
|                          | Signage/ way finding for visitors is non-existent at the moment                            | Noted - already picked up through 'how' for this action                                       |
|                          | Tighter on anti-social behaviour will lead to more visitors                                | Noted - but outside the remit of the TCVP   |
| Mobilising the Business  | Greater collaboration and engagement between businesses e.g.                               | Acknowledged in "what" on P86 of TCVP   |
| Community                | reinstated Traders and Retailer Group or Chamber of Commerce                               | P86 How add new para after 3 <sup>rd</sup> para :   |
|                          |  | This action could be supported through the establishment or reinstatement of                  |
|                          |  | business groups such as Traders and Retailer Group, Sandbach Partnership or                   |
|                          |  | Chamber of Commerce. In the interim, the Town Council is keen to work with the                |
|                          |  | business community to build linkages and develop this action.                                 |
|                          | Challenging without financial incentives   | Page 86 How 1 <sup>st</sup> para add:   |
|                          |  | Whilst it is recognised that it is challenging without financial incentives, local            |
|                          |  | stakeholders and businesses should be encouraged to collaborate can                           |
|                          |  | generate new opportunities to share customers, cross sell etc.                                |
|                          | Support local independent businesses   | Agreed - picked up within this action   |
|                          | Encourage town centre businesses to improve their curb appeal e.g.                         | Agree - the overall TCVP seeks to increase vitality in Sandbach which should support          |
|                          | shopfronts, litter, cleaning etc   | landlords to be more willing and able to invest in their properties                           |
|                          | Remove rents for market stalls as a promotional offer for 24 months and                    | The ability to determine rents for the market stalls and other operational changes is outside |
|                          | advertise  | the remint of the TCVP  |
|                          | Businesses are engaged and consulted around initiatives and local plans                    | P86 What add:   |
|                          |  | Engaging and consulting with these local stakeholders and businesses                          |
|                          | Approach the banks to move into smaller premises and retain services e.g. Banking Hub      | Noted - Beyond the scope of TCVP  |
|                          | Encourage outdoor seating for bars and restaurants on the cobbles. Many responses for this | Message already included in TCVP - see Action 4   |
| Improving Connections    | Improved access between town centre and station very important                             | Message already included in TCVP - see Action 3   |
| between key destinations | including wider pavements and integrated bus service                                       |   |
| and the Centre           | Join up pedestrian and cycle destinations  | Message already included in TCVP - see Action 3   |
|                          | Limited agreement with greening Scotch Common due to loss of parking                       | P87 How 2nd bullet:   |
|                          |  | Greening of Scotch Common - to provide a clear walking route but retaining car parking        |
|                          |  | provision   |
|                          | Improve signposting including with distances and destinations to car parks                 | Agreed - picked up within this action   |
|                          |  | P87 How 3 <sup>rd</sup> bullet:   |
|                          |  | Provide better co-ordinated directional signage, with distances where appropriate,            |
|                          |  | between town centre locations and surrounding assets to ensure locals and visitors            |
|                          |  | understand direction and time between key destinations.                                       |
|                          | Maps of the town, pointing to all the cut throughs, green spaces and                       | P87 How 3 <sup>rd</sup> bullet:   |
|                          | footpaths needed   |   |

| <b>Priorities Intervention</b> | Consultation Comments   | Response  |
|--------------------------------|---|---|
|                                |   | Provide better co-ordinated directional signage and maps, with distances where                |
|                                |   | appropriate, between town centre locations and surrounding assets to ensure locals and        |
|                                |   | visitors understand direction and time between key destinations.                              |
|                                | Connect Albion Lock Estate to town centre via safe pedestrian route   | Connection to surrounding residential areas picked up on P87 under What                       |
|                                | Utilise surrounding natural habitats to improve links                 | Message already included in TCVP - see Action 3   |
|                                | Provide a safe walking and cycling route between Elworth and Sandbach | Already picked up on P87 under What   |
| Other Comments                 | Some members wish to change the order of priorities                   | Feedback on the priority based on the results of the public consultation is identified in the |
|                                |   | final report. Which projects can be taken forward will be determined by availability of       |
|                                |   | resources.  |
|                                | Numerous concerns regarding scale of new housing development and      | Noted but outside the remit of the TCVP. Proposals for new development are considered by      |
|                                | lack of infrastructure to support                                     | CEC through the Local Plan process and in determining individual planning applications and    |
|                                |   | infrastructure requirements associated with new development determined as part of planning    |
|                                |   | applications  |

Page 101

9.3 The following diagrams illustrate general feedback in terms of the TCVP:



9.4 The table below summarises additional comments received in respect of the Sandbach TCVP.

| Specific Revisions to Sandbach TCVP   | Response to the Feedback  |
|---|---|
| I wonder whether Park Lane above should refer to Middlewich Road? The map on page 53 does not show this.  | Park Lane changed to Flat Lane  |
| Page 52 however shows two schemes that the Park Lane option might relate to:  |   |
| 'S5m - 'Improve cycling links from Elworth via Park Lane'. Description: 'Improve cycling links from Elworth via                                   |   |
| Abbeyfields development/Park Lane towards Waitrose area.  |   |
| Scheme S_AT5 is mentioned on page 72 and has the description 'Aim to reduce severance and provide safer and                                       | Noted but this text is extracted by CEC documents. CEC Highways to note                         |
| better crossing facilities for pedestrians and cyclists at Old Mill Road/High St/The Hill junction' however, it                                   |   |
| achieves the opposite.  |   |
| Relevant Town Council Current Projects / Initiatives / Contributions  | P82 What 1 <sup>st</sup> para add: The Town Council and other groups already promote the town's |
| In addition to its ownership and promotion of key town assets the Town Council also contributes to Town Centre                                    | heritage, including through a series of major annual events such as the Transport               |
| vitality in the form of provision of, for example, additional ranger services, substantial floral displays throughout                             | Festival,   |
| the town and funding for various major annual events e.g. Transport Festival.   |   |
| The Town Council also currently has a number of initiatives, at different stages of progress, which are relevant                                  | P84 How second para: As a first step a revamped or A new website for Sandbach has               |
| and should be taken into account as part of the achievement and delivery of the emerging TCVP priorities as                                       | been approved by the Town Council and planned for launch in 2023. It will provide               |
| follows:  | an improved single point for information that is relevant to existing and new residents;        |
| <ul> <li>A new website with improved public information and access (approved and planned for implementation<br/>January to March 2023)</li> </ul> | local businesses; community groups; and visitors. It should <b>also</b> provide information on: |
| <ul> <li>Small common car park refurbishment (approved and planned for implementation Spring 2023)</li> </ul>                                     | P87 What add: Improvements to the links which connect these assets to the town centre           |
| <ul> <li>Improved and enhanced parks (working group subject - 2023)</li> </ul>  | are already being identified by the Town Council's Access Working Group and will                |
| <ul> <li>Skate Park (working group subject 2023, subject to agreement of joint funding package and location)</li> </ul>                           | require working jointly with CEC to seek funding to deliver. Improved connections               |
| <ul> <li>Indoor and Outdoor Market development (ongoing)</li> </ul>   | across Sandbach will encourage more sustainable movements as well as encouraging                |
| <ul> <li>Feasibility of public toilet refurbishment and commitment to Changing Places facilities subject to CEC</li> </ul>                        | more trips back into the town centre.   |
| assistance for securing grant aid and affordability   |   |
| <ul> <li>Access improvements across the Town Centre identified by the Town Council's Access working group and</li> </ul>                          |   |
| requiring joint working and funding with CEC to deliver   |   |
| 3. Encourage walking and cycling - PRIORITY   | The priority actions have been identified through the public consultation exercise and          |
| The Town Council has recently joined the Community Rail Partnership and is working towards match funded   | include the following:  |
| community projects to enhance walking cycle links to the station as well as other initiatives.  | - Deliver a movement plan/reduce car dominance  |
|   | <ul> <li>Mobilising the business community</li> </ul>   |
|   | - Improve connections between key destinations and the centre                                   |
|   | P80 What, Add: Support cycle and walking routes from the town centre to the Train               |
|   | Station in Elworth. The Town Council and Community Rail Partnership are already                 |
|   | working towards match funded community projects to support this aspiration.                     |
|   | P80 Who, Add: Community Rail Partnership  |
| 6. Mobilising the business community  | P86 How add new para after 3 <sup>rd</sup> para :   |
| The Town Council is keen to work with its business community and will endeavour to develop these themes. The                                      | This action could be supported through the establishment or reinstatement of                    |
| Town currently does not have an active Chamber of Commerce and the Sandbach Partnership has recently  | business groups such as Traders and Retailer Group, Sandbach Partnership or                     |

| Specific Revisions to Sandbach TCVP   | Response to the Feedback  |
|---|---|
| ceased to operate and is reviewing its membership. This reduces capacity in the town to deliver such aspirations  | Chamber of Commerce. In the interim, the Town Council is keen to work with the  |
| but we will work with the community to re build these links in whatever way works best for the town.              | business community to build linkages and develop this action.                   |
| Finally, many of these priorities require the Town Council and Cheshire East Council to work closely and to allow | The TCVP recognises the importance of this and sets out a series of recommended |
| access to expertise and advice within the Borough for e.g. external funding bids for changing places / play area  | centre wide actions to support delivery at pages 90-93.                         |
| grants, infrastructure improvements to pavements, funding available for improvement to cobbles and other          |   |
| spaces, improved signage across the wards etc. to make things happen. It would be enormously helpful if these     |   |
| links could be emphasised and identified within the final TCVP as part of the action plan.                        |   |

9.5 The below provides a summary of the characteristics of those who responded to the consultation:

|                            | Individual  | 80  |
|----------------------------|---|-----|
| Individual/member of panel | Group, Organisation or club                               | 2   |
|                            | Other   | 3   |
| Gender Identity            | Male  | 41  |
|                            | Female  | 38  |
|                            | Prefer not to say   | 4   |
|                            | Self-describe   | 1   |
|                            | 16-24   | 1%  |
|                            | 25-34   | 10% |
|                            | 35-44   | 10% |
|                            | 45-54   | 31% |
| Age Group                  | 55-64   | 13% |
|                            | 65-74   | 18% |
|                            | 75-84   | 10% |
|                            | 85 and over   | 0%  |
|                            | Prefer not to say   | 8%  |
|                            | White British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/Irish | 86% |
|                            | Any other White background                                | 0%  |
|                            | Mixed: White and Black Caribbean/African/Asian            | 0%  |
| Ethnic Group               | Asian/Asian British                                       | 2%  |
|                            | Black African/Caribbean/Black British                     | 0%  |
|                            | Prefer not to say   | 8%  |
|                            | Prefer to self-describe                                   | 4%  |

### 10.0 Feedback from Wilmslow

10.1 111 responses were received in respect of the Wilmslow Report. The level of support for the identified priority areas is identified in the charts below:



Page 106



10.2 A summary of the specific comments received in respect of each of the proposed priorities for intervention in Wilmslow is provided below. The response includes how the Final Report has been edited to take into account the comments where appropriate or relevant:

| Priorities Intervention                            | Consultation Comments   | Response  |
|--|---|---|
| Strengthening Wilmslow's<br>green spaces and links | Need a "necklace" of green walkways around the town. We need "green routes" to be signed around town, either with no traffic (wider pavements and segregated bike lanes) or 20mph limits. Need to be able to safely access all the schools and all the key parts of the town (station, library, leisure centre, post office etc) safely   | Agree - details provided in Action 1  |
|  | Green spaces already strong<br>Greater pedestrianisation of key routes into and around the town centre would help<br>achieve this. The town centre is dominated by cars which is off putting for pedestrians<br>and doesn't make the best of Wilmslow's green assets. Comments were also made for<br>the need to promote the important "green spaces" provided by the Carrs, the Memorial<br>Gardens, and St Bartholomew Church. It was suggested that signage and information<br>be provided both in the Town Centre and at the Carrs Park to inform residents and<br>visitors of these routes. Include links to Wilmslow Park and between Bollin Valley West<br>(Carrs) and Bollin Valley East i.e. Pelican crossing with signage to BV East and West | Noted but scope to improve<br>Agree - initial ideas identified in Action 1. Detailed proposals should consider<br>suggestions made as part of the consultation alongside ongoing work of the<br>Wilmslow Neighbourhood Plan Implementation Group  |
|  | There is no specific reference to ongoing pocket park design in this section (although it is referenced in action 2) (Green Lane / Alderley Road junction) but generally in line with WNPIG vision<br>Need to improve safety for pedestrians trying to cross Hawthorn Street to Little Lindow, as Hawthorn Street is used heavily by traffic trying to bypass the town centre   | Add new sentence at the end of p76<br>Wilmslow Neighbourhood Plan Implementation Group is working up<br>proposals for improvements to pocket parks<br>Noted – suggestion to be considered as proposals are worked up for the<br>Centre by the Wilmslow Neighbourhood Plan Implementation Group and other<br>stakeholders  |
|  | Highlighting a walking tour could be very beneficial - Wilmslow Walks - promote hard copies and on line   | Add new bullet point under How<br>Align to Action 6 create a series of Wilmslow Walks to highlight local<br>walks and links to existing walks in the wider area   |
|  | Walking must also include cycling, so that any routes built are not only suitable for people cycling, but for mobility scooters, hand cycles, wheelchairs, etc. Need to support plans for the redevelopment of Jim Evison playing fields.   | Agree creating a better balance for all users of the town is an explicit aim of the TCVP and supported by a number of the actions<br>Suggestion to be considered as proposals are worked up for the Centre by the   |
|  | Making routes joined up and pleasant will support healthy activity. A safe and waymarked route - there is no pedestrian crossing across Manchester Road near the Memorial Garden, and currently no pathway under the viaduct following the river bank.  | Wilmslow Neighbourhood Plan Implementation Group and other stakeholders<br>This is to be determined by detailed proposals<br>Agree - aim of Action1<br>Add at the end of What <b>and support healthier lifestyles</b><br>Noted - suggestion to be considered as proposals are worked up for the Centre<br>by the Wilmslow Neighbourhood Plan Implementation Group and other |
|  | Bedells Lane/Hawthorn Lane in particular feels dangerous and unpleasant to walk along but is a key route. More needs to be done to help people feel motivated and safe  | by the Wilmslow Neighbourhood Plan Implementation Group and other<br>stakeholders<br>Agree creating a better balance for all users of the town is an explicit aim of the<br>TCVP and supported by a number of the actions Plan updated to reflect areas<br>where enhanced pedestrian experience is needed   |

| Priorities Intervention   | Consultation Comments  | Response  |
|---------------------------|--|---|
|                           | to walk instead of drive and to slow cars down on rat run routes around the town                                 |   |
|                           | centre.  |   |
|                           | Lindow common could be open to the public  | It is already open to the public  |
|                           | Believe scope to improve pedestrian connectivity to the enhanced Little Lindow public                            | Noted - details to be determined by future proposals. Plan highlights routes to |
|                           | space from the Town Centre and have been looking at potential Highway  | be improved between Little Lindow and town centre.                              |
|                           | improvements at this junction  |   |
|                           | The trees in Wilmslow are a fantastic asset and should be considered for enhanced                                | Noted - CEC review the need for Tree Preservation Orders                        |
|                           | TPO coverage to protect them for future generations.   |   |
|                           | Must be aligned to better maintenance of green space, drainage and signage                                       | Already recognised in the TCVP - see p94  |
|                           | Concern sewage and pollution in the Bollin   | Noted but outside the remit of TCVP   |
|                           | Make sure good links into green spaces outside of the Town in rest of Cheshire and                               | Add at end of where on p75 including ensuring links to walks in the rest of     |
|                           | South Manchester   | Cheshire and South Manchester   |
|                           | Identifying the Romany Garden / Romany Walk and its restoration which has been                                   | Noted - Labels added to plan  |
|                           | accepted in principle potentially an area to recognise "Legends of Wilmslow" in                                  |   |
|                           | addition to Romany   |   |
|                           | Potential for new tree planting should be included   | P74 edit Existing public realm, spill out space, urban grow spaces and          |
|                           |  | additional tree planting and soft landscaping could combine to create a series  |
| <b>•</b> "                |  | of links which better connect Wilmslow with its existing green space assets     |
| Creating more             | Numerous comments have said there is a need for all weather pavements and that                                   | All TCVPs include a recognition for the need to improved maintenance of         |
| opportunities to dwell in | pavements are broken and hazardous - need to be better maintained and also suitable<br>for wheelchairs and prams | pavements and greenspace see p 94   |
| the centre                | Strong support for improvements to Tesco block which is widely seen as an eyesore                                | Key recommendation of TCVP - see Actions 2 and 3. Potential schemes are         |
|                           | and attracts anti-social behaviour   | being worked up by Wilmslow Neighbourhood Plan Implementation Group             |
|                           | Do more with area around HSBC/ Bank square should be utilised every day through                                  | Key recommendation of TCVP - see Actions 2 and 3                                |
|                           | markets etc would benefit from more planting   | Ney recommendation of rowr - see Actions 2 and 5                                |
|                           | Support to make more of Gove Street for outside dining . The gate at the top of Grove                            | Key recommendation of TCVP - see Actions 2 and 3                                |
|                           | Street needs to remain closed and vehicles should not be allowed access unless in an                             | Specific details to be worked up as part of detailed proposals                  |
|                           | emergency outside of the permitted hours. The cars that continually park at the bottom                           |   |
|                           | of Grove street (Bank Square end) need to be stopped. Pedestrian area needs                                      |   |
|                           | repaving   |   |
|                           | Continuing the theme of artwork, benches & tables along the verge to Alderley road is                            | Identified in Action 2  |
|                           | a good idea  |   |
|                           | Safe crossing point near top of Parkway or Broadway  | Noted - to be considered in working up specific proposals                       |
|                           | Artworks could be situated along QR code walk  | Agree - identified in Action 4  |
|                           |  | To be considered in working up specific proposals                               |
|                           | More maps to show different routes which can be taken  | Agree - identified in Action 4  |
|                           | Lack of flood lightning of the viaduct   | Noted - to be considered in working up specific proposals                       |
| Priorities Intervention      | Consultation Comments  | Response  |  |  |  |  |
|------------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|--|
|                              | Anti-social behaviour is increasing and therefore more things for the youth to do is important   | Agree - various actions make recommendations to increase activities for young people  |  |  |  |  |
|                              | Many people have stated the use of outdoor heaters is wrong for cost and should not be used due to energy crisis   | Remove bullet 5 from How  |  |  |  |  |
|                              | Need more notice boards and need to be regularly updated   | Agree - identified in Action 6  |  |  |  |  |
|                              | More picnic areas area needed closer to leisure facility   | Agree - identified in Action 2  |  |  |  |  |
|                              | Need to encourage private landlords to bring vacant units back into use – moving from retail to residential / leisure / office.  | Agree the overall TCVP seek to increase vitality in Wilmslow which should<br>support landlords to be able to attract occupiers/support repurposing of units                                       |  |  |  |  |
| Improving the Town's<br>Core | Mixed up Grove Street and Green Lane. Actual Green Lane is shown one way but which direction   | Plan amended  |  |  |  |  |
|                              | Wilmslow library provides a great service and should be more integrated into the core<br>of the town. If the idea is to add picnic tables and pop-up coffee shops this could be a<br>great building to centre this on - use the library as the civic heart of the town<br>Needs improved links to main centre - Pedestrianising the southern access towards the<br>library from Sainsburys would help to link the library more to the centre - Revitalization<br>of the Library site would be considerably aided if the same were done for the<br>"Romanys Garden"/potentially an area to recognise "Legends of Wilmslow" in addition<br>to Romany. Consideration should be given to providing information boards for the<br>latter. | Agree - identified in Action 2 and 3  |  |  |  |  |
|                              | Various comments on better range of shops especially fresh food  | The ability to attract occupiers into the town is related to its vitality. TCVP seeks to increase vitality in Wilmslow which should support landlords to be able to attract better/more occupiers |  |  |  |  |
|                              | Many people talk about the Tesco block as being one of the main eyesores of the whole centre current issues with anti-social behaviour - Area in front of Tesco can be improved through benches, artwork and planting  | Key recommendation of TCVP – see Actions 2 and 3<br>Specific details to be worked up as part of detailed proposals  |  |  |  |  |
|                              | A food hall/market would make a good addition to the town – old sports bar building could be revamped into an indoor market supporting a shift from retail to more leisure Build upon outside eating experience that thrived during Covid – deter people from heading into Manchester or Altrincham  | The ability to attract occupiers into the town is related to its vitality. TCVP seeks to enhance vitality in Wilmslow which should support landlords to be able to attract better/more occupiers  |  |  |  |  |
|                              | Focus on Wilmslow's historic buildings and bring them into the mix.  | Historic assets are recognised in the TCVP baseline. How they can be made more should be considered in working up specific proposals  |  |  |  |  |
|                              | Wilmslow needs a core place to visit but needs to shift from retail to leisure and hospitality   | Agree - see Action 3  |  |  |  |  |
|                              | Semi covered areas could encourage more footfall   | Agree - to be considered in working up specific proposals   |  |  |  |  |
|                              | Introduce more green walls and roofs with better appearance  | Noted - to be considered in working up specific proposals   |  |  |  |  |
| Creating stronger            | Consideration should also be given to enhancing around Tesco's with a further green  | Agree - see Action 3  |  |  |  |  |
| gateways into the Centre     | project at the junction of Alderley Road and Parkway (Costa and BP Garage).  | Details to be worked up as part of specific proposals   |  |  |  |  |

| Priorities Intervention           | Consultation Comments  | Response  |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|
|                                   | Together, these two developments (i.e. Tesco block) would enhance footfall in the area and strengthen the "Green Gateway   |   |
|                                   | Route between the Station and the Town Centre needs to be enhanced - including signage, lighting, quality paving, planting as well as pathway under the viaduct following the riverbank  | Agree - see Action 1 and 4  |
|                                   | Better information on how to reach green spaces is needed  | Agree - see Action 1  |
|                                   | Strengthen links with National Trust/ Quarry Bank  | Add new bullet how p87<br>Establish stronger links with tourist attractions in the local area including<br>Quarry Bank Mill   |
|                                   | Convert service roads into parklet spaces  | Exact location of parklets to be determined locally but principle is supporting - see Action 1  |
|                                   | Key gateway into Wilmslow is the avenue of stately copper beech trees overhanging<br>Manchester Road as you approach from Handforth. Maintain this, and other, tree-lined<br>avenues should be a high priority. Needed to support sustainability and biodiversity  | Add Manchester Road to where on p 75<br>Agree sustainability and biodiversity should be key factor of the TCVP.,<br>however focus of this action is around improving the frontage and use of space<br>at the Manchester road roundabout     |
|                                   | Closer link to Rex cinema would encourage more visitors  | Agree - the Rex is recognised under a number of actions as a key assets which should be harnessed   |
|                                   | Entry from M56 along Altrincham Road and Water Lane is devoid of any significant welcoming signage or planters   | Action 1 and 4 supports improves at key gateways and along key routes.<br>Details to be worked up as part of specific proposals   |
| Expanding the Events<br>Programme | More markets/Pop-up stalls supported. Artisan market should be moved back to a<br>Sunday. Peoples shopping habits have changed and the Artisan market on a Sunday<br>would free up space for people who genuinely want and do come to town on a<br>Saturday to. If held on a Sunday like Knutsford and Macclesfield and Warrington it<br>would allow for the town to benefit from 7 day a week activity  | Will be determined by market operators and stallholders but the TVCP should support improvement to the vitality of Wilmslow   |
|                                   | There is a strong volunteer ethic in the town which could be tapped into without much<br>support from CEC. Recognise the groups that put on events - Wilmslow's Festival of<br>Nature organised by Transition Wilmslow, and Transition Wilmslow's regular events<br>including Repair Cafes, its Community Market Gardens and Walks and Talks; ;<br>Wilmslow Guild for Lifelong Learning, the Art Trail (sometimes Art Under One Roof), In<br>Bloom, Love the Lane, The Carrs, Wilmslow Civic Trust. Other groups include Cycle<br>Wilmslow | What p 86 Add after events second line<br>many of which are organised by Voluntary Groups then add Festival of<br>Nature including the Car Free Street Day after the Artisan Market<br>add Voluntary Groups including under Actions 5 and 6 |
|                                   | The two festivals of nature was seen as a great event included a Car Free Street Day in Alderley Road and, Some also keen to see car show. Make more use of carnival fields and more arts and sports centres   | See edit above<br>How p86 add new bullet<br>Hold events across a variety of locations including Leisure Centre,<br>Carnival Park and other open spaces  |
|                                   | Don't just do events for kids/families should do for others in society   | P86 what Under what 6 <sup>th</sup> line after <b>expanded to attract a wider mix of</b><br><b>attendees</b> And follow on with and promoted  |

| Priorities Intervention    | Consultation Comments   | Response  |
|----------------------------|---|---|
|                            | Some concern that uses car parks for events will add to existing issues with car parking  | The potential of using some of the existing car parks for events would need to<br>be determined for specific events and ensure that sufficient car parking was  |
|                            | The recent car free day on 25th September and the Jubilee events demonstrated that people really want more events. Feedback from all events have been positive  | available for associated visitors<br>Noted and consideration should be given to holding the initiative again  |
|                            | A few people have stated the events are good and that there is enough   | Noted but there is still scope to make these even better attracting a wider range of visitors   |
|                            | Idea of linking most entertainment/leisure facilities to benefit mutually from increased footfall   | Agree - supported in Actions 5 and 6  |
| Raise the Centre's Profile | Appearance of shops needs improving   | TCVP seeks to improve the vitality of Wilmslow which should support landlords<br>to see the benefits of investing in their assets to attract high quality occupiers<br>P84 add at the end of first para under what <b>This in turn should support</b><br><b>landlords to invest more in their properties</b>  |
|                            | Generally supportive of the concept of Town Centre Ambassadors. Improvement is needed in the distribution of the Wilmslow Town Council News. Consider a closer link to the Rex Cinema - a "Local News" feature produced for the cinema (e.g. via the Guild AV Group | Supported Actions 5 and 6   |
|                            | Already have two Wilmslow.co.uk and Wilmslow hub could they not be working with<br>Cheshire east rather than another website  | Action 6 does recognised some of the good initiatives already taking place and encourage a single integrated platform – see below   |
|                            | Need a distinctive product for all the partners to pursue.<br>F&B is important but Wilmslow's offering is little different to other towns. How can we attract differentiators that partners can promote   | Agree - something that key groups will be able to work together to determine  |
|                            | Para under what on p87 is confusing   | Edit what p87 as follows<br>Change . at end of line 6 to , change Offering to offering. Replace last<br>sentence to read. Ideally this should become the go to single<br>website/platform for the time Town which provides links to other partners<br>websites to showcase what the town offers in terms of shops, amenities,<br>events, education and opportunities to get involved. |
|                            | Transition Wilmslow is currently working with the Wilmslow Neighbourhood Plan Group<br>to establish a "Countryside Access Guide to Wilmslow and its Environs". This will<br>complement the existing cycle guide.  | Add<br>New bullet to how p87<br>Transition Wilmslow is currently working with the Wilmslow<br>Neighbourhood Plan Group to establish a "Countryside Access Guide to<br>Wilmslow and its Environs". This will complement the existing cycle<br>guide  |
|                            | Look at how successful the bees were in Manchester, or the frogs in Stockport - both done through an app and encourage people to visit the town, and dwell longer, thus connecting all of your suggested themes together - this is really important                 | Noted - to be considered in working up specific proposals   |
|                            | Wilmslow Way Better has been a good and visible campaign  | Agree and the TCVP identifies the benefits of building upon this  |

| Priorities Intervention            | Consultation Comments   | Response  |
|------------------------------------|---|---|
| Mobilising Business                | Needs better engagement from the community  | Agree - will be supported by Action 6   |
| Community                          | Need to lower business rates  | Agree - but business rates are determined by Central Government   |
| Community                          | The BID has already been voted in and due to start in November 2022   | <ul> <li>P18 remove is para under Business Engagement edit existing text to</li> <li>Wilmslow Town Council has appointed and then follow on with existing text and then add at the end of the current paragraph A Business</li> <li>Improvement District (BID) was established in November 2022</li> <li>P 86 change second bullet point to BID and local businesses</li> <li>P87 change third bullet point to BID and local businesses</li> <li>P88 what remove second and third sentences and replace A Business</li> <li>Improvement District has just been established. And then and BID and to</li> <li>4<sup>th</sup> bullet under who</li> <li>P97 remove existing third sentence and replace with The BID has been voted in and started in November 2022</li> <li>P98 middle column remove from Engagement to BID would on line 5 and follow</li> </ul> |
|                                    |   | on with <b>The recently established BID will generate spend which will be</b><br>follow on with spent on locally agreed priori  |
|                                    | Perhaps a "Wilmslow card" (like the "Urmston card") so locals can sign up for a free  | To be determined by local businesses - something the BID could look into  |
|                                    | card that then gives them certain special offers in local shops.  |   |
|                                    | The REX cinema is a great addition to the town, long may it stay, but linking it with other entertainment facilities will only encourage more people and therefore make   | Agree - it is acknowledged in various actions as a key asset which should be harnessed  |
|                                    | Wilmslow a much more bustling place. Need to create atmosphere  |   |
| Making more of<br>Community Assets | The leisure centre classes and activities are poorly advertised.  | P87 how change bullet 5<br>Better promote existing ongoing activities in the centre (e.g. leisure<br>centre classes), events then follow on with existing text  |
|                                    | Needs community 'hub' a neutral place for people to get together that supports local independents. Something like Festival Hall in Alderley, the Storyhouse in Chester or Altrincham Market.  | Noted - some good work is currently occurring between local independents.<br>Could be considered by Wilmslow Hub Group  |
|                                    | Library / Romany area to be enhanced. Don't forget Chapel Lane area - not town centre but good to have small shop alternatives.<br>Need to support plans for the redevelopment of Jim Evison playing fields.  | Noted - to be considered by Wilmslow Hub Group/local stakeholders   |
| Better management of movement      | Switch the emphasis from car parking to traffic management. Need real push to get locals to walk/cycle. The priority has to be on of Alderley Road /Water Lane although accident stats suggest other areas as well, they appear to require less intervention.   | Agree - numerous actions in the TCVP seek to support this   |
|                                    | The main problem with Wilmslow is parking - cars cramming themselves in any available place, which often causes the neighbours to be disgruntled and detract from the local frontages. Select a couple of town centre parking areas, and make it free for Wilmslow shoppers!! To detract from the workers taking these free spaces, make them | Supported in Action 9<br>Revise bullet point 1 under How to say<br>Undertake review of car parking in the town centre to ensure there is<br>sufficient supply of parking in appropriate location for key users - very   |
|                                    | free only from 11am for a period of three hours.  | short stay shoppers to pop in, medium stay for longer visitors and longer   |

| Priorities Intervention | Consultation Comments  | Response   |
|-------------------------|--|--|
|                         |  | stay for workers. Consideration also needs to be given to the residential parking in the vicinity of the centre  |
|                         | The town centre is dominated by cars and speeding is a real problem. Pedestrians are<br>not given priority. On street parking is a real issue for residents near the town centre<br>and local amenities especially around the Carrs Park. The problem with anti-social<br>parking along Cliff Road persists and is in urgent need of a viable long term solution | Agree - numerous actions in the TCVP seek to support this  |
|                         | Sorting parking is key - Not enough short stay parking. Too many cars parking on roads in the town centre. Make reasonably priced parking for office/retail workers. Make it possible for people to park for free for 20 minutes using a ticket to enable a quick trip to the bank/ shop as they do in AE car park. Also needs better signage. Comments on costs | Supported in Action 9<br>Revise bullet point 1 under How to say<br>Undertake review of car parking in the town centre to ensure there is<br>sufficient supply of parking in appropriate location for key users - very<br>short stay shoppers to pop in, medium stay for longer visitors and longer<br>stay for workers. Consideration also needs to be given to the residential<br>parking in the vicinity of the centre |
|                         | Some support for the stalled triple decker car park at Broadway Meadow – should be free at weekends and a small charge during the week, people will come and shop here and stay in the town centre drink coffee and cake don't forget its free at Handforth dean to park your car  | Noted - following feasibility work by CEC the proposals for additional parking at<br>Broadway Meadow is currently on hold due to lower demand but will be<br>reviewed again if circumstances change  |
|                         | Not pedestrian or cycling friendly - 20mph speed limits everywhere please and<br>narrower carriageways. Bedells Lane and Hawthorn Street a particular concern and<br>could see greater traffic of town centre altered. Need to avoid speeding and rat-running  | Agree - numerous actions in the TCVP seek to support this  |
|                         | Train services need to be increased to bring more people in  | Recognised - CEC to continue to lobby train operators to ensure services meet local needs  |
|                         | Much better balance needed between the needs of pedestrians (including children and the elderly), cyclists and car/lorry users. At the moment car/lorry users are highly privileged - yet research indicates a better balance improves town centre vitality  | Agree - numerous actions in the TCVP seek to support this  |
|                         | E scooters have been welcomed by most people   | Noted  |
|                         | The creation of South Poynton Bypass has potential to relieve Wilmslow of traffic heading between the airport and Macclesfield. New signage is needed to encourage that. Stop directing airport traffic through the town centre  | Noted - CEC to consider as part of wider management of local road network  |
|                         | Traffic from motorway should be sent along A555 and then either A34 to North or East Wilmslow, A523 for Macclesfield or Bramhall   | Noted - CEC to consider as part of wider management of local road network  |
|                         | Park and ride scheme has been suggested  | Park and Ride scheme only work in large town with very high levels of congestion. TVCP does support the need to review the current parking strategy - see Action 9   |
|                         | Stop parking along shop fronts   | There is a need for parking to be provided to allow shoppers to nip into individual shops - however the need to ensure a range of parking options is supported by the TCVP   |
|                         | More traffic diverted via the A34/ A555  | Noted - CEC to consider as part of wider management of local road network  |

| Priorities Intervention | Consultation Comments   | Response  |
|-------------------------|---|---|
|                         | Reduce speed limit to 20 mph through the town centre  | Noted - to be considered in working up specific proposals   |
|                         | P73 – Movement Action Plan map - W_H1 Improve cycle safety at key junctions – can this also reference pedestrian safety and user convenience.   | Add<br>'Improve pedestrian and cycle safety at key junctions'<br>'Explore and implement quick wins for improving safety for those on foot or cycle<br>across the town, including enhanced/new crossings and advanced stop lines on<br>major junctions.' |
|                         | <ul> <li>Clarification of AT2 on Movement Action Plan requested<br/>(Full query below:</li> <li>There appears to be a conflict here with the description which states 'introduce a cycle<br/>route on Alderley Rd (N) towards Handforth' Alderley Rd (N) ends at Swan St traffic<br/>lights and becomes Manchester Rd.</li> <li>Does this refer to a cycle 'link' on Alderley Rd from say Barclays traffic lights to Swan<br/>St traffic lights for right turn to Station? Or perhaps more likely on Manchester Rd over<br/>the Bollin link roundabout and up to the existing (soon to be enhanced?) cycles lanes<br/>at Hilltop? Or even both of those i.e. Barclays to Hilltop?</li> <li>The main challenges here we believe are a) Bollin Link roundabout b) narrowness of<br/>Manchester Rd and c) necking at Bollin bridge.</li> <li>The proposed LCWIP scheme to Handforth that we aware of, avoids all this by using<br/>Swan St, Church St. Chancel Lane, Cliff Rd (hopefully one way vehicular) and Styal Rd<br/>to Hilltop.)</li> </ul> | Plan has been edited  |
| Embracing cycling       | Kerb protected cycle ways would help incentivise more cyclists  | Noted - to be considered in working up specific proposals   |
|                         | Better, more secure cycle parking is needed - not easy to use   | Noted - to be considered in working up specific proposals   |
|                         | Hireable bikes at the station   | Noted - to be considered in working up specific proposals   |
|                         | The "introduction of high quality safe cycle routes "would be greatly enhanced by the creation of 20MPH limits on Green Links routes. Like further consideration to be given to the safety of students travelling to Wilmslow High School   | Noted - to be considered in working up specific proposals   |
|                         | Quite a few concerns raised about cyclist not driving safely, concerned about not being insured or giving consideration to other users  | Noted - to be considered in working up specific proposals   |
| Other Comments          | Stop people parking on pavements  | Noted - but outside the remit of TCVP   |
|                         | Issues with Litter - need more bins especially if encouraging people to picnic/sit in the Centre  | Noted - needs to be considered when working up detailed proposals   |
|                         | Better public transport might bring more people here - buses almost non-existent , train services now much reduced. In Greater Manchester public transport mostly free to national concession card holders - in Cheshire East everyone pays for poor services. Why can't CEC do a deal with the Greater Manchester Authorities to create a new GM/CEC travel area   | Recognised - CEC to continue to work with other local authorities in the north to lobby government for further investment in public transport network   |
|                         | Planning officers need to take more notice of Neighbourhood Plan  | CEC officers to note  |

| <b>Priorities Intervention</b> | Consultation Comments  | Response   |
|--------------------------------|--|--|
|                                | Lot of plan seems outdated on focuses on coming out of lockdown  | The TCVP has been prepared over a 2 year period. The baseline was<br>undertaken in 2020 and actions are identified to support centres to respond to<br>long term impacts on Town Centres and the impact of COVID           |
|                                | At 100 pages it is way too long to expect your average resident to read it thoroughly<br>and then understand what is meant. Also as mentioned in the plan as there is no<br>funding available then how can any of the proposals be taken seriously   | TCVP provides an evidence to support funding bids and resource for a wide range of partners to be able to draw on sections of the TCVP as required to support their activities in the Centre                               |
|                                | Please implement the proposals. A consultation was issued months ago to make the Manchester road / cliff road area more cycle & pedestrian friendly and nothing has been done!   | TCVP seeks to identify a series of potential interventions and an evidence base<br>to support funding bids. The next step is for local stakeholders to determine an<br>action plan to support delivery of their priorities |
|                                | Although the vision is clear, the how we get there and how it is funded is not clear.<br>Some costings and an overview plan would have been useful. The public will be<br>dismissive and have less faith in local government if we sell a vision that never comes<br>to fruition because of funding. | TCVP seeks to identify a series of potential interventions and an evidence base<br>to support funding bids. The next step is for local stakeholders to determine an<br>action plan to support delivery of their priorities |
|                                | More focus on sustainability and biodiversity - e.g. energy resilience and insulation  | Sustainability is a key theme of all actions and underpins the TCVP - see p95  |
|                                | Numerous mentions of lack of public toilets - should reopen the public toilet near Twinney's Bridge  | Noted but outside the remit of the TCVP  |

Page 116

10.3 The following diagrams illustrate general feedback in terms of the TCVP:



10.4 The table below summarises additional comments received in respect of the Wilmslow TCVP.

| Specific Revisions to Wilmslow TCVP   | Response to the Feedback  |
|---|---|
| SWAT - The SWAT analysis is out of date with particular reference to the creation of a Wilmslow Town Centre           | See suggested updates below   |
| Business Improvement District since the document was initially formatted.   |   |
| The highlighted weaknesses relating to 'No effective Business Group' and a' Lack of online presence and               | P62   |
| Branding' no longer applies with the creation of the BID and the 'Wilmslow's Way Better' brand. These                 | Add 'Wilmslow's Way Better' brand to strengths and remove last two bullet points - No effective |
| aspects are now strengths and should also be recognised with amendments made to the opportunities to                  | Business Group' and a' Lack of online presence and Branding'                                    |
| reflect.  |   |
| Spatial Access Plan (Page 70) - Please include reference to Romany Gardens link (adjacent Library) and                | Text label added to plan  |
| proposed landscape masterplan   |   |
| Parking management - Reference to traffic management on service roads and trial pop-up uses (the wording              | Noted but this text is extracted by CEC documents. CEC Highways to note                         |
| needs to be consistent as the headlines suggest the use of Alderley Road (Main Road) for pop up uses when             |   |
| in fact we believe that this relates entirely to the Alderley Road (service road). WNPIG proposing further            |   |
| highway studies with a view to improving car park access / egress off Alderley Road                                   |   |
| Highway - reference only to cycle safety at key junctions and needs to also reference pedestrian safety and           | Noted but this text is extracted by CEC documents. CEC Highways to note                         |
| user convenience  |   |
| Active travel - see detailed comments below - Active Travel AT 1-4, these proposals are welcomed, additional          | Noted but this text is extracted by CEC documents. CEC Highways to note                         |
| to and complementary with the published LCWIP schemes. AT2 needs further clarification                                |   |
| AT2 - Cycle link on Alderley Rd (N) to Wilmslow TC.   | Noted but this text is extracted by CEC documents. CEC Highways to note                         |
| We believe that greater clarity is required to aid understanding of the proposals.                                    |   |
| There appears to be a conflict here with the description which states 'introduce a cycle route on Alderley Rd         |   |
| (N) towards Handforth'. Alderley Rd (N) ends at Swan St traffic lights and becomes Manchester Rd.                     |   |
| Does this refer to a cycle 'link' on Alderley Rd from say Barclays traffic lights to Swan St traffic lights for right |   |
| turn to Station? Or perhaps more likely on Manchester Rd over the Bollin link roundabout and up to the                |   |
| existing (soon to be enhanced?) cycles lanes at Hilltop? Or even both of those i.e. Barclays to Hilltop?              |   |
| The main challenges here we believe are a) Bollin Link roundabout b) narrowness of Manchester Rd and c)               |   |
| necking at Bollin bridge.   |   |
| The proposed LCWIP scheme to Handforth that we aware of, avoids all this by using Swan St, Church St.                 |   |
| Chancel Lane, Cliff Rd (hopefully one way vehicular) and Styal Rd to Hilltop.   |   |
| The document also should include reference to Romany Gardens link and proposed landscape masterplan                   | Noted and referenced on plan  |
| Note Wilmslow population figure incorrect on page 14 (it appears that the figure used is 10 times larger than         | Figure on p14 needs to be changed to 24,497   |
| is actually the case)   |   |
| 7. Ecology Para 7.6 - add "Applicants should also refer to references in local Neighbourhood plans (e.g.              | Add to end of section 4 See the Neighbourhood plan for further details e.g. NE5 Biodiversity    |
| Wilmslow Neighbourhood Plan Policies NE5 Biodiversity Conservation)   | Conservation  |

## Page 118

|                            | Individual  | 93 |
|----------------------------|---|----|
|                            | Local Business  | 2  |
| Individual/member of panel | Group, Organisation or club                               | 3  |
|                            | CE Ward Councillor, Town/Parish Councillor                | 2  |
|                            | Male  | 40 |
| Gender Identity            | Female  | 53 |
|                            | Prefer not to say   | 3  |
|                            | 16-24   | 1  |
|                            | 25-34   | 2  |
|                            | 35-44   | 21 |
|                            | 45-54   | 24 |
| Age Group                  | 55-64   | 23 |
|                            | 65-74   | 14 |
|                            | 75-84   | 11 |
|                            | 85 and over   | 0  |
|                            | Prefer not to say   | 3  |
|                            | White British/English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/Irish | 86 |
|                            | Any other White background                                | 3  |
|                            | Mixed: White and Black Caribbean/African/Asian            | 3  |
| Ethnic Group               | Asian/Asian British                                       | 2  |
|                            | Black African/Caribbean/Black British                     | 0  |
|                            | Prefer not to say   | 4  |
|                            | Prefer to self-describe                                   | 1  |

10.5 The below provides a summary of the characteristics of those who responded to the consultation:

## 11.0 Overall Feedback

11.1 The following table sets on the level of support (agree or strongly agree) in respect of the TCVPs

| General Feedback   | Alsager | Congleton | Handforth | Knutsford | Middlewich | Nantwich | Poynton | Sandbach | Wilmslow |
|--------------------|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|----------|---------|----------|----------|
| Covers appropriate | 56      | 78        | 85        | 74        | 83         | 83       | 63      | 71       | 82       |
| focus              | 50      | 70        | 00        | 74        | 05         | 00       | 05      | 71       | 02       |
| Is clear           | 51      | 73        | 78        | 68        | 76         | 72       | 67      | 63       | 72       |
| Will be successful | 30      | 39        | 50        | 35        | 39         | 41       | 36      | 30       | 40       |

- With the exception of Alsager, over 60% of respondents thought that the TCVP provided appropriate focus - for 6 centres it was over 70%
- With the exception of Alsager, over 60% of respondents thought that the TCVP was clear for 5 centres if was over 70%
- Respondents were less confident that it would be successful most confident was Handforth with 50%, the rest were between 30% and 41%

#### **Key Priorities**

- 11.2 The following table summarises common priorities (identified as very or fairly important) across the centres.
- 11.3 Considering the identified priorities across all 9 centres, a number of consistent areas emerged where respondent supported intervention. These include:
  - Mobilising the business community to get more involved in improving the centres over 65% in all centres
  - Raising the profile of the centres over 65% in all centres
  - Enhancing public realm identified as a priority intervention in all areas (except Knutsford) and in 7 centres over 60% of respondents considered this to be very or fairly important
  - Improving connections was identified as a priority intervention in 7 centres and for all (except Congleton) over 65% of respondents identified this as very or fairly important
  - Encouraging walking and cycling was identified as a priority intervention in 7 centres and for all (except Congleton and Wilmslow) over 65% of respondents identified this as very or fairly important

| Priorities                      | Alsager | Congleton       | Handforth              | Knutsford       | Middlewich      | Nantwich               | Poynton          | Sandbach         | Wilmslow                |
|---------------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| Enhance public realm            | 78      | 73 <sup>1</sup> | 96 <sup>3</sup>        | -               | 66 <sup>6</sup> | <b>87</b> <sup>7</sup> | -                | 64 <sup>11</sup> | 86 <sup>12</sup>        |
| Improve connections             | 66      | 58 <sup>2</sup> | -                      | 71 <sup>5</sup> | 81              | 84 <sup>9</sup>        | -                | 80               | <b>87</b> <sup>13</sup> |
| Reduce car dominance            | 60      | -               | <b>92</b> <sup>4</sup> | 89              | 83              | 94 <sup>9</sup>        | -                | 65               | 86                      |
| Encourage walking and cycling   | 69      | 57              | 70                     | 80              | -               | -                      | 74               | 70               | 56                      |
| Raise areas profile             | 77      | 76              | 78                     | 66              | 84              | 77                     | 65               | 82               | 76                      |
| Mobilise business community     | 67      | 82              | 79                     | 79              | 80              | 81                     | 75 <sup>10</sup> | 81               | 81                      |
| Importance of public transport  | 89      | 83              | 87                     | 86              | 89              | -                      | -                | -                | -                       |
| Improve heritage and/or tourism | -       | 74              | -                      | 90              | 76              | 88                     | -                | 82               | -                       |
| Make more of community assets   | -       | 86              | 97                     | -               | -               | 83                     | 70               | -                | 85                      |
| Tackle void properties          | -       | 94              | -                      | -               | -               | 83                     | 84               | -                | -                       |
| Improving gateways              | -       | -               | -                      | -               | -               | 79                     | -                | -                | 52                      |

Notes:

1. Related to two specific schemes around Museum (73%) and around Market Hall (57%)

2. Related to repairing severance across Mountbatten Way

3. Related to improving The Paddock and Meriton Park

4. Related to enhancing street environment on Wilmslow Road

- 5. Related specifically to green assets
- 6. Related specifically to Brooks Lane
- 7. Related specifically to Swine Market
- 8. Related specifically Riverside
- 9. Related to need to improved parking strategy
- 10. Related specifically to community rather than business community
- 11. Related specifically to Market Hall
- 12. Related specifically to encouraging dwell time in the Centre (86%) and improving vitality (97%)
- 13. Related specifically to green spaces

## **Top Three Priorities**

#### 11.4 The top three priorities in each centre identified as very important were as follows:

| Town       | Top Three Priorities (very important)   |
|------------|---|
| Alsager    | 1. Improving public transport (60%)   |
|            | 2. Improving public realm (49%)   |
|            | 3. Encouraging walking and cycling (39%)  |
| Congleton  | 1. Tackling voids (82%)   |
|            | 2. Improvements around the Market Hall (57%)  |
|            | 3. Enhancing public transport (57%)   |
| Handforth  | 1. Making more of The Paddock and Meriton Park (78%)  |
|            | 2. Improving public transports (73%)  |
|            | 3. Enhancing the environment along Wilmslow Road (65%)  |
| Knutsford  | 1. Improving public transport (67%)   |
|            | 2. Better managing of car movement (61%)  |
|            | 3. = Prioritising cycling and walking (47%) and Making more of heritage and tourism assets (47%)                |
| Middlewich | 1. New train station (76%)  |
|            | 2. Delivery of Town Wharf (64%)   |
|            | 3. = Reducing the dominance of cars and raising the town's profile (60%)  |
| Nantwich   | 1. Improved car parking strategy (79%)  |
|            | 2. Enhancing the Swine Market area (56%)  |
|            | <ol> <li>Connecting green assets and making more of the riverside and tackling void properties (52%)</li> </ol> |
| Poynton    | 1. Connecting green assets and encouraging walking and cycling (57%)  |
|            | 2. Tackling voids (47%)   |
|            | 3. Making more of community assets (45%)  |
| Sandbach   | 1. Improving connections between key destinations (51%)   |
|            | 2. Reducing car dominance (49%)   |
|            | 3. Mobilising the business community (47%)  |
| Wilmslow   | 1. Improving the town's core (78%)  |
|            | 2. Better management of movement (67%)  |
|            | 3. Strengthening green spaces and links (64%)   |

## Who responded?

| Characteristics of<br>Responders (%) | Alsager | Congleton | Handforth | Knutsford | Middlewich | Nantwich | Poynton | Sandbach | Wilmslow |
|--------------------------------------|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|----------|---------|----------|----------|
| >25                                  | 0       | 3         | 2         | 0         | 0          | 0        | 0       | 1        | 1        |
| 25-64                                | 71      | 65        | 80        | 71        | 79         | 56       | 59      | 64       | 70       |
| 65+                                  | 21      | 25        | 16        | 23        | 18         | 40       | 34      | 28       | 25       |
| White British                        | 88      | 91        | 88        | 88        | 92         | 91       | 91      | 86       | 86       |

Appendix A - Example Summary CE TCVP Report used in the public consultation



Alsager Town Centre Vitality Plan Consultation Draft

OFFICIAL

# Page 124

## **Alsager Town Centre Vitality Plan - Consultation 2022**

#### Change in our town centres

Town centres across the UK are facing unprecedented challenges. Changes in how we shop, in particular the growth in internet shopping, has significantly decreased footfall in town centres resulting in numerous store closures, leaving many centres struggling. These are trends that have only been exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic.

This draft plan is about establishing an agreed set of priorities, and is not a commitment of finance to delivery the proposals - funding would need to be sought once plans are agreed. Any actions would be taken forward as and when opportunities arise and resources allow.

#### Applying for funding to improve town centres

Cheshire East Council (CEC) is committed to supporting the vitality and viability of all town centres within the borough. When opportunities to apply for funding for town centre improvements arise, such as from central government, it is beneficial to have clear town centre plans already in place to support bids for funding.

We can also identify initiatives to support the vitality and viability of local centres which do not require significant funding, but which could be taken forward by local volunteers and/or businesses.

#### Creating Town Centre Vitality Plans to support funding bids

With this in mind, Cheshire East Council has commissioned an expert team to produce bespoke Town Centre Vitality Plans (TCVP) for each of the borough's nine Key Service Centres (KSC) as listed..



The 9 Key Service Centres which form part of this study

OFFICIAL

## Aims and objectives

The aim is that the Town Centre Vitality Plans will provide a clear sense of direction for each Service Centre. They will also identify initiatives to support each Service Centre, as well as reflect the unique opportunities, specific challenges and local groups/stakeholders of each.

They:

- Are bespoke in nature, based on the individual circumstances of each town
- Are cross functional and seek to recommend a practical, realistic set of priority actions for supporting the vitality and viability of each town centre
- Are informed and tested by relevant policy and strategy, local stakeholder views, relevant research, commercial markets and spatial considerations



We would now like your feedback on the Alsager Town Centre Vitality Plan

OFFICIAL

TCVP Suggested priority areas for intervention as and when resources allow and opportunities arise

This is about establishing an agreed set of priorities it is NOT committing to a delivery solution or finance



## 1. Enhance Alsager's public realm- PRIORITY

### What

Alsager is a vibrant town but it has a tired public realm that is detracting from the offer and in some cases, presenting issues to mobility where surface quality is poor. Partners have already prepared a Public Realm Strategy focused on the crossroad junction at the heart of the town centre. The delivery of an enhanced public realm could bring numerous benefits in terms of raising the town's profile and perceptions, encouraging walking, increasing dwell time and showcasing what Alsager has to offer.

#### How

Commissioned by the Neighbourhood Planning Committee, the Alsager Public Realm Feasibility Study was carried out in 2019 and suggests proposals for improvements to the public realm, which are endorsed under this action.

Public realm enhancement should:

- Prioritise works around the crossroads, up to the Crewe Road entrance to Milton Park
- Address poor quality highway and footway surfaces to ensure pavements and crossings are suitable for those with limited mobility or disabilities.
- Create a street environment that welcomes and values pedestrians- not one that feels hostile.
- Look at re-wilding pocket spaces as part of the works
- Review proposed public realm scheme principles to pick out quick delivery wins e.g. de-cluttering
- Progress the vision for Alsager's public realm to next stages of design (RIBA2/3), including identification of quick wins and an estimation of costs





## 2. Improve connections between key destinations and the centre- PRIORITY

#### What

The town has several community assets located on the edge of its centre that are currently disconnected. Improvements to the linkages will encourage more sustainable movements through better connections with the train station and the promotion of walking and cycling via easier, more attractive routes. It will also encourage more trips into the town centre. Improvements can create improved links between the station, open spaces, planned residential development, existing residential areas, community infrastructure and wider outdoor recreational routes back into the town centre.

OFFICIAL

#### How

- Establishing a series of gateway points along important connector routes across the town to help with wayfinding and sense of arrival.
- Create an 'Activity and Accessibility' map for the town to showcase the wider connectivity to outdoor assets for pedestrians and cyclists
- Footway widening where possible to create improved walking provision and accessible access.
- Wayfinding signage between town centre locations and surrounding assets to ensure people understand direction and time between destinations.
- Improve crossings adjacent to key assets to enhance pedestrian accessibility
- Promote trails and linked activities across wider outdoor recreational destinations to encourage families to undertake cycle trips and outdoor activities
- Quick wins could include improving signage to key destinations and creating temporary spaces, such as parklets, to encourage activity along key arrival routes



## 3. Reduce car dominance - PRIORITY

### What

Reducing the dominance of cars on Crewe Road and at the heart of the town centre to encourage visitors to be able to dwell, creating a safer and more pleasant place to shop and relax. This priority is closely linked to priority 1.

#### How

The highway is currently too engineered and urban, with too much space for cars. Techniques to reduce car dominance and soften the street environment that could be considered include:

- Removal of street clutter (e.g. remove guardrail), improve pedestrian crossings, new good quality street furniture, tree planting and green infrastructure.
- Incremental change may work well unless major funding source can be found to deliver transformational change.
- A 20mph speed limit through the town centre could be considered to improve safety.
- Narrowing of splayed junctions
- Initiatives do not need to be expensive e.g, in Macclesfield CEC covered the £1,000 cost for licenses to enable outdoor eating and drinking and local businesses paid for furniture/planters.
- Ideas can be tested as temporary measures to demonstrate how they won't impact negatively on businesses.



## 4. Encouraging walking and cycling

### What

Opportunities for cycling are limited primarily to on-road, and therefore not suitable for most people. Therefore there is a need for improved cycling routes across Alsager. The Local Transport Delivery Plan (LTDP) identifies the B5077 and Sandbach Road South as priorities for improved cycling facilities. The town centre is within a walkable distance for much of the wider community, but the quality of walking journeys is key to propensity. A detailed audit of key walking routes should be undertaken to identify improvements to local streets to support more journeys being made on foot.

### How/where

- Create a network of streets that better support active travel across the wider residential catchment. This could include wider footways, improve crossing facilities and interventions to reduce traffic levels on important walking and cycling streets.
- The Alsager Partnership has created walking and cycling maps of the town. These need updating and used to make more people aware of the routes, through wayfinding, signposting, social media for example.
- Links to local cycling clubs
- Introduce safe, secure cycle parking in the town centre and at key transport/services/shopping destinations.





enhancements which could range from improved pavement materials and crossings to temporary seating areas and parklets

## 2

connections between key destinations



Action 3:

Action 4: Encouraging walking and cycling

#### OFFICIAL

## 5. Raise Alsager's profile

#### What

Create a platform from which to promote Alsager's great assets and numerous events to ensure that residents, visitors and local businesses are aware of what is on offer in the centre. This should support the centre to be recognised as the heart of the community.

#### How

Town Council and The Alsager Partnership have websites, however, many centres now have their own websites to showcase what their centres have to offer.

- A revamped or new website for Alsager should provide a single point for information for existing and new residents; local businesses; community groups; and visitors. It should provide information on:
  - The existing offer in terms of shops, bars, restaurant etc ٠
  - **Events** programme
  - How local businesses can get together to identify collaboration opportunities
  - How to get involved in local groups
  - What's on offer in the local and surrounding area including tourism attractions
- Consideration given to developing a brand
- Link with other partners' websites (e.g. CEC and other market centres).
- Alsager has a page on the Visit Chester and Cheshire website that promotes • the town -to update with additional content to showcase the town

| VISIT    | My Planner | 0       | 6 |   | 0 | 0 |
|----------|------------|---------|---|---|---|---|
| CHESTER& | ,          |         | v | - | • | 9 |
|          |            | alsager |   |   | ( | Q |
| CHESHIRE |            |         |   |   |   |   |

at's On Things To Do Accommodation Food & Drink Shopping Cheshire Inspiration Explore

| Accommodation Search Results for "alsager"                                      |           |  |  |  |  |
|---|-----------|--|--|--|--|
| Manor House Hotel   | Alsager   |  |  |  |  |
| Event Search Results for " <b>alsager</b> "                                     |           |  |  |  |  |
| → See more  |           |  |  |  |  |
| Alsager RoundTable Charity bonfire (this event has already taken place)         | Alsager   |  |  |  |  |
| Alsager Music Festival (this event has already taken place)                     | Alsager   |  |  |  |  |
| Alsager Christmas Market & Light Switch On (this event has already taken place) | Alsager   |  |  |  |  |
| Alsager Community Choir Concert (this event has already taken place)            | Cheshire  |  |  |  |  |
| South Cheshire Real Ale Trail (this event has already taken place)              | Congleton |  |  |  |  |
| Attraction Search Results for "alsager"   |           |  |  |  |  |
|   |           |  |  |  |  |





## 6. Mobilising the business community

### What

Alsager already has a strong network of local community groups who support the town and its amenities including a team of volunteers who lead on Alsager's successful events programme. It is recommended that this energy is harnessed and extended to the business community (those in the centre and in employment locations around its edges such as Radway Green). Engaging with these local stakeholders and businesses and encouraging them to collaborate more effectively will support the economic growth of the area. In addition, many businesses are considering how they can add value to their local communities.

**OFFICIAL** 

#### How

Encouraging local stakeholders and businesses to collaborate can generate new opportunities to share customers, cross sell etc. Special events could be organised by a group of businesses.

Wilmslow Town Council are supporting local business engagement and testing the appetite to establish a Business Improvement District (BID). However, a lighter approach could be pursued in Alsager by supporting local businesses to network and to see how they could get involved in supporting the actions identified. If actions can be identified around their issues and opportunities, businesses may be able to provide the following to support the Town's aspirations:

- Sponsorship
- Materials
- Technical support ٠
- Volunteers ٠
- Promotion

Business networking could also identify "themes" where businesses can drive opportunities forward. Not just be focused on retailers but also businesses on local business parks. It could also generate opportunities for B2B referrals. Other ways to engage local retailers and businesses could be through bringing them into events and initiatives such as extended opening hours for key events or window display competitions.

Businesses could also come together to established loyalty schemes to support shoppers to stay local.

# Page ယ္သ

## 7. Public transport strategy

### What

As a small town Alsager struggles to support a fully integrated and high frequency public transport network. However the railway station in particular is a major asset. Before Covid disruption to travel habits, Alsager Station saw annual rises in entries and exists over the past four years for rail usage, with 3.5% increase between 2017-2018 and 2018-2019. There is scope to improve its connections to the Town Centre and overall accessibility. The CEC Bus Service Improvement Plan seeks to build on previous collaborative working between CEC, bus operators, public transport user groups and rail stakeholders.

## How

The public transport offer of Alsager could be strengthened in several ways:

- Support double tracking of rail connection to Crewe Hub
- Ensure Alsager is equipped to reap the full benefits of HS2 at Crewe
- Explore design options for improved connections between the town centre and railway station
- Provide ticket machines at Alsager railway station.
- Explore options to increase parking provision at Alsager railway station





## **Key Messages for Public Consultation**

- Manage expectations
- This is about establishing an agreed set of priorities it is NOT committing finance to delivery
- Actions would be taken forward as an when opportunities arise and resources allow
- Why do we need them?
  - To establish the things which will make the biggest difference so we don't waste efforts focusing on things which have no impact
  - Without an agreed strategy we undermine our ability to bid for funding when opportunities arise

## **Key Questions for Public Consultation**

- How strongly do you agree or disagree with each priority for action?
- Is there anything we should consider to improve the priorities for action identified?
- Are there any priorities for action which have been omitted and which you would like to be considered?

Page 136

Appendix B - Example Questionnaire



## Alsager Town Centre Vitality Plan -Consultation 2022

## Change in our town centres

Town centres across the UK are facing unprecedented challenges. Changes in how we shop, in particular the growth in internet shopping, has increased competition for town centre businesses and many multiple retailers and service providers have closed town centre outlets. These are trends that have only been exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic.

## Applying for funding to improve town centres

Cheshire East Council (CEC) is committed to supporting the vitality and viability of all town centres within the borough. When opportunities to apply for funding for town centre improvements arise, such as from central government, it is beneficial to have clear town centre plans already in place to support bids for funding.

## **Creating Town Centre Vitality Plans**

With future funding opportunities in mind, Cheshire East Council has commissioned an expert team to produce bespoke Town Centre Vitality Plans (TCVP) for each of the borough's nine Key Service Centres (KSC).

These draft plans are about establishing an agreed set of priorities and are not a commitment to finance the delivery of proposals - funding would need to be sought once plans are agreed as and when opportunities for funding arise and resources allow. Having an agreed set of priority projects is however generally an important step in being able to bid for funding. It is also important to ensure that any resources which can be identified are used on actions that will have the greatest impact and that all parties with an interest in supporting town centres can work towards a common set of ambitions.

## Aims and objectives

The aim is that the Town Centre Vitality Plans will provide a clear sense of direction for each Service Centre. They will also identify initiatives to support each Service Centre, as well as reflect the unique opportunities, specific challenges and local groups/stakeholders of each.

They will be:

• Bespoke in nature, based on the individual circumstances of each town

- Cross functional and seek to recommend a practical, realistic set of priority actions for supporting the vitality and viability of each town centre
- Informed and tested by relevant policy and strategy, local stakeholder views, relevant research, commercial markets and spatial considerations

# Consultation on the Alsager Town Centre Vitality Plan

We would now like your feedback on the Alsager Town Centre Vitality Plan.

You can submit your comments either by:

- Completing this short survey and return it to us using the freepost envelope to Freepost Plus RSJJ-YTHC-CHZK, Research and Consultation, Cheshire East Council, Westfields, Middlewich Road, Sandbach, CW11 1HZ
- Emailing macclesfieldregenerationteam@cheshireeast.gov.uk
- Writing to Research and Consultation, Cheshire East Council, Westfields, Middlewich Road, Sandbach, CW11 1HZ

#### Please give your feedback by **Tuesday 8 November 2022**.

Once the consultation is complete, results will be analysed and used to finalise the Town Centre Vitality Plans, before they are considered for approval by local Town and Parish Councils, and Cheshire East Council.

If you have any queries about the consultation, or if you would like to receive this questionnaire in an alternative format or submit your response in a different way, please contact the Research and Consultation team at Cheshire East Council.

## Your confidentiality is assured

Any personal information you supply will remain strictly confidential and will be used in line with the Data Protection Act 2018. To find out more about how we use your information see our Privacy Policy enclosed in this survey pack.

## **Alsager Priority Areas for Intervention**

The Alsager Town Centre Vitality Plan sets out the Priority Areas for Intervention in Alsager, and the Potential Actions that will be taken to achieve these.

The remainder of this survey lists each of the suggested areas for focused intervention and asks how they might be improved.

## Please note the numbers do not denote any priority order but are for ease of reference.

## 1. Enhance Alsager's Public Realm

## What

Alsager is a vibrant town but it has a tired public realm that is detracting from the offer and in some cases, presenting issues to mobility where surface quality is poor. Partners have already prepared a Public Realm Strategy focused on the crossroad junction at the heart of the town centre. The delivery of an enhanced public realm could bring numerous benefits in terms of raising the town's profile and perceptions, encouraging walking, increasing dwell time and showcasing what Alsager has to offer.

### How

Commissioned by the Neighbourhood Planning Committee, the Alsager Public Realm Feasibility Study was carried out in 2019 and suggests proposals for improvements to the public realm, which are endorsed under this action.

Public realm enhancement should:

- Prioritise works around the crossroads, up to the Crewe Road entrance to Milton Park
- Address poor quality highway and footway surfaces to ensure pavements and crossings are suitable for those with limited mobility or disabilities.
- Create a street environment that welcomes and values pedestrians- not one that feels hostile.
- Look at re-wilding pocket spaces as part of the works
- Review proposed public realm scheme principles to pick out quick delivery wins e.g. de-cluttering
- Progress the vision for Alsager's public realm to next stages of design (RIBA2/3), including identification of quick wins and an estimation of costs

How important do you think enhancing Alsager's public realm is for the vitality of Alsager? Please circle one answer only

- Very important
- Fairly important
- Not very important
- Not at all important
- Not sure / Don't know

Do you have any comments to make about the Priority Area for Intervention - Enhance Alsager's public realm? *Please write in below* 

# 2. Improve connections between key destinations and the centre

## What

The town has several community assets located on the edge of its centre that are currently disconnected. Improvements to the linkages will encourage more sustainable movements through better connections with the train station and the promotion of walking and cycling via easier, more attractive routes.

It will also encourage more trips into the town centre. Improvements can create improved links between the station, open spaces, planned residential development, existing residential areas, community infrastructure and wider outdoor recreational routes back into the town centre.

### How

- Establishing a series of gateway points along important connector routes across the town to help with wayfinding and sense of arrival.
- Create an 'Activity and Accessibility' map for the town to showcase the wider connectivity to outdoor assets for pedestrians and cyclists
- Footway widening where possible to create improved walking provision and accessible access.
- Wayfinding signage between town centre locations and surrounding assets to ensure people understand direction and time between destinations.
- Improve crossings adjacent to key assets to enhance pedestrian accessibility
- Promote trails and linked activities across wider outdoor recreational destinations to encourage families to undertake cycle trips and outdoor activities
- Quick wins could include improving signage to key destinations and creating temporary spaces, such as parklets, to encourage activity along key arrival routes

How important do you think improving connections between key destinations and the centre is for the vitality of Alsager? *Please circle* one answer only

- Very important
- Fairly important
- Not very important
- Not at all important
- Not sure / Don't know

Do you have any comments to make about the Priority Area for Intervention - Improve connections between key destinations and the centre? *Please write in below* 

## 3. Reduce car dominance

## What

Reducing the dominance of cars on Crewe Road and at the heart of the town centre to encourage visitors to be able to dwell, creating a safer and more pleasant place to shop and relax. This priority is closely linked to priority 1.

## How

The highway is currently too engineered and urban, with too much space for cars. Techniques to reduce car dominance and soften the street environment that could be considered include:

- Removal of street clutter (e.g. remove guardrail), improve pedestrian crossings, new good quality street furniture, tree planting and green infrastructure.
- Incremental change may work well unless major funding source can be found to deliver transformational change.
- A 20mph speed limit through the town centre could be considered to improve safety.
- Narrowing of splayed junctions
- Initiatives do not need to be expensive e.g, in Macclesfield CEC covered the £1,000 cost for licenses to enable outdoor eating and drinking and local businesses paid for furniture/planters.
- Ideas can be tested as temporary measures to demonstrate how they won't impact negatively on businesses.

How important do you think reducing car dominance is for the vitality of Alsager? Please circle one answer only

- Very important
- Fairly important
- Not very important
- Not at all important
- Not sure / Don't know

Do you have any comments to make about the Priority Area for Intervention - Reduce car dominance? *Please write in below* 

## 4. Encouraging walking and cycling

## What

Opportunities for cycling are limited primarily to on-road, and therefore not suitable for most people. Therefore there is a need for improved cycling routes across Alsager. The Local Transport Delivery Plan (LTDP) identifies the B5077 and Sandbach Road South as priorities for improved cycling facilities.

The town centre is within a walkable distance for much of the wider community, but the quality of walking journeys is key to propensity. A detailed audit of key walking routes should be undertaken to identify improvements to local streets to support more journeys being made on foot.

### How

- Create a network of streets that better support active travel across the wider residential catchment. This could include wider footways, improve crossing facilities and interventions to reduce traffic levels on important walking and cycling streets.
- The Alsager Partnership has created walking and cycling maps of the town. These need updating and used to make more people aware of the routes, through wayfinding, signposting, social media for example.
- Links to local cycling clubs
- Introduce safe, secure cycle parking in the town centre and at key transport/services/shopping destinations.

How important do you think encouraging walking and cycling is for the vitality of Alsager? *Please circle one answer only* 

- Very important
- Fairly important
- Not very important
- Not at all important
- Not sure / Don't know

Do you have any comments to make about the Priority Area for Intervention - Encouraging walking and cycling? *Please write in below* 

## 5. Raise Alsager's profile

## What

Create a platform from which to promote Alsager's great assets and numerous events to ensure that residents, visitors and local businesses are aware of what is on offer in the centre. This should support the centre to be recognised as the heart of the community.

### How

Town Council and The Alsager Partnership have websites, however, many centres now have their own websites to showcase what their centres have to offer.

A revamped or new website for Alsager should provide a single point for information for existing and new residents; local businesses; community groups; and visitors. It should provide information on:

- The existing offer in terms of shops, bars, restaurant etc
  - Events programme
  - How local businesses can get together to identify collaboration opportunities
  - How to get involved in local groups
  - $\circ\,$  What's on offer in the local and surrounding area including tourism attractions
- Consideration given to developing a brand
- Link with other partners' websites (e.g. CEC and other market centres).
- Alsager has a page on the Visit Chester and Cheshire website that promotes the town to update with additional content to showcase the town

How important do you think raising Alsager's profile is for the vitality of Alsager? *Please circle one answer only* 

- Very important
- Fairly important
- Not very important
- Not at all important
- Not sure / Don't know

Do you have any comments to make about the Priority Area for Intervention - Raise Alsager's profile? *Please write in below* 

## 6. Mobilising the business community

## What

Alsager already has a strong network of local community groups who support the town and its amenities including a team of volunteers who lead on Alsager's successful events programme. It is recommended that this energy is harnessed and extended to the business community (those in the centre and in employment locations around its edges such as Radway Green). Engaging with these local stakeholders and businesses and encouraging them to collaborate more effectively will support the economic growth of the area. In addition, many businesses are considering how they can add value to their local communities.

### How

Encouraging local stakeholders and businesses to collaborate can generate new opportunities to share customers, cross sell etc. Special events could be organised by a group of businesses.

Wilmslow Town Council are supporting local business engagement and testing the appetite to establish a Business Improvement District (BID). However, a lighter approach could be pursued in Alsager by supporting local businesses to network and to see how they could get involved in supporting the actions identified. If actions can be identified around their issues and opportunities, businesses may be able to provide the following to support the Town's aspirations:

- Sponsorship
- Materials
- Technical support
- Volunteers
- Promotion

Business networking could also identify "themes" where businesses can drive opportunities forward. Not just be focused on retailers but also businesses on local business parks. It could also generate opportunities for B2B referrals.

Other ways to engage local retailers and businesses could be through bringing them into events and initiatives such as extended opening hours for key events or window display competitions.

Businesses could also come together to established loyalty schemes to support shoppers to stay local.

## How important do you think mobilising the business community is for the vitality of Alsager? *Please circle one answer only*

- Very important
- Fairly important
- Not very important
- Not at all important
- Not sure / Don't know

Do you have any comments to make about the Priority Area for Intervention - Mobilising the business community? *Please write in below* 

## 7. Public transport strategy

## What

As a small town Alsager struggles to support a fully integrated and high frequency public transport network. However the railway station in particular is a major asset. Before Covid disruption to travel habits, Alsager Station saw annual rises in entries and exists over the past four years for rail usage, with 3.5% increase between 2017-2018 and 2018-2019. There is scope to improve its connections to the Town Centre and overall accessibility. The CEC Bus Service Improvement Plan seeks to build on previous collaborative working between CEC, bus operators, public transport user groups and rail stakeholders.

## How

The public transport offer of Alsager could be strengthened in several ways:

- Support double tracking of rail connection to Crewe Hub
- Ensure Alsager is equipped to reap the full benefits of HS2 at Crewe
- Explore design options for improved connections between the town centre and railway station
- Provide ticket machines at Alsager railway station.
- Explore options to increase parking provision at Alsager railway station

How important do you think public transport strategy is for the vitality of Alsager? Please circle one answer only

- Very important
- Fairly important
- Not very important
- Not at all important
- Not sure / Don't know

Do you have any comments to make about the Priority Area for Intervention - Public transport strategy? *Please write in below* 

## Page 148

# Final comments on the Alsager Town Centre Vitality Plan

How strongly do you agree or disagree that the Alsager Town Centre Vitality Plan covers appropriate areas of focus? *Please circle one answer only* 

- Strongly agree
- Tend to agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Tend to disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know / Not sure

How strongly do you agree or disagree that the Alsager Town Centre Vitality Plan is clear? *Please circle one answer only* 

- Strongly agree
- Tend to agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Tend to disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know / Not sure

## How strongly do you agree or disagree that the Alsager Town Centre Vitality Plan will be successful? *Please circle one answer only*

- Strongly agree
- Tend to agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Tend to disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know / Not sure

If you feel anything is missing from the plan, or have any other comments, please explain these below:

## About you

It would help us to check that we are providing services fairly if you could answer the questions below. Information you give will be used to see if there are any differences in views for different groups of people. You do not need to answer any of the following questions if you do not wish to.

Which of the following best describes how you are you responding to this survey? *Please circle one answer only* 

- On behalf of a group, organisation or club
- On behalf of a local business
- As an individual (e.g. local resident)
- As an elected Cheshire East Ward Councillor, or Town/Parish Councillor
- As a council employee / A professional
- Other (please specify):

If you are responding on behalf of a group, organisation, club, Ward or Parish / Town Council area please state the name and postcode in the box below (you do not need to complete the rest of the 'About you' section). *Please write in below* 

Name of group, organisation, club, Ward or Parish / Town Council:

Postcode:

What is your gender identity? Please circle one answer only

- Male
- Female
- Prefer not to say
- Prefer to self describe (please write in the box below):

## What age group do you belong to? Please circle one answer only

- 16-24
- 25-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- 55-64
- 65-74
- 75-84
- 85 and over
- Prefer not to say

## What is your ethnic origin? Please circle one answer only

- White British / English / Welsh / Scottish / Northern Irish / Irish
- Any other White background
- Mixed: White and Black Caribbean / African / Asian

Page 150

- Asian / Asian British
- Black African / Caribbean / Black British
- Prefer not to say
- Prefer to self describe (please write in the box below):

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? This includes problems related to old age. *Please circle one answer only* 

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to say

Thank you for completing this survey. Please return it to us using the freepost envelope to Freepost Plus RSJJ-YTHC-CHZK, Research and Consultation, Cheshire East Council, Westfields, Middlewich Road, Sandbach, CW11 1HZ. Appendix C - List of Organisations Notified about the TCVP Consultations

## List of all Organisation notified of the TCVP Consultation

| Activity in Retirement                  | Acton, Edleston and Henhull<br>Parish Council | Adlington Parish Council                 |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| AGE UK                                  | Alderley Edge Parish Council                  | Alpraham Parish Council                  |  |  |
| Alsager Town Council                    | ANSA  | Arclid Parish Council                    |  |  |
| Arriva                                  | Ashley Parish Council                         | Aston by Budsworth Parish                |  |  |
| Anva                                    | Ashiey Fahan Oodheir                          | Council                                  |  |  |
| Astra Zeneca                            | Audlem Parish Council                         | Barthomley Parish Council                |  |  |
| Betchton Parish Council                 | Bickerton and Egerton Parish                  | Body Positive                            |  |  |
|   | Council                                       |  |  |  |
| Bollington Town Council                 | Bosley Parish Council                         | Bradwall Parish Council                  |  |  |
| Brereton Parish Council                 | British Deaf Association                      | Bruntwood                                |  |  |
| Buerton Parish Council                  | Bulkeley and Ridley Parish<br>Council         | Bunbury Parish Council                   |  |  |
| Calveley Parish Council                 | CEC Adult Social Care                         | CEC Assets                               |  |  |
| CEC CCTV                                | CEC Communities and                           | CEC Conservation                         |  |  |
|   | Partnerships                                  |  |  |  |
| CEC Cultural Economy                    | CEC Development Management                    | CEC Engine of the North                  |  |  |
| CEC Environmental Protection            | CEC Facilities Management                     | CEC Highways                             |  |  |
| CEC Housing Options                     | Macc Pride                                    | Utopia Crewe (Youth Support              |  |  |
| 5 1                                     |   | Service)                                 |  |  |
| Utopia Macclesfield (Youth              | CEC Learning Disabilities                     | CEC Property Services                    |  |  |
| Support Service)                        | Partnership Board                             |  |  |  |
| CEC Spatial Planning                    | CEC Strategic Infrastructure                  | CEC Transport Policy                     |  |  |
| Chelford Parish Council                 | Cheshire and Warrington LEP                   | Cheshire Constabulary                    |  |  |
| Cheshire Cycling Campaign               | Cheshire East Eye Society                     | Cheshire East Rail Users Group           |  |  |
| Cheshire Fire Authority                 | Cheshire Local Access Forum                   | Cholmondeley & Chorley Parish<br>Council |  |  |
| Chorley Parish Council                  | Church Commissioners of England               | Church Lawton Parish Council             |  |  |
| Church Minshull Parish Council          | Churches Conservation Trust                   | All Cheshire East Councillors            |  |  |
| Congleton Town Council                  | Cranage Parish Council                        | Crewe Green Parish Council               |  |  |
| Crewe Town Council                      | CVS   | Disley Parish Council                    |  |  |
| Dodcott-cum-Wilkesley Parish<br>Council | Doddington & District Parish<br>Council       | East Cheshire NHS                        |  |  |
| Eaton Parish Council                    | Electricity North West                        | English Heritage                         |  |  |
| Environment Agency                      | Federation of small businesses                | Gawsworth PC                             |  |  |
| GMPTE                                   | Great Warford Parish Council                  | Groundwork Cheshir                       |  |  |
| Handforth Parish Council                | Hankelow Parish Council                       | Haslington Parish Council                |  |  |
| Hassall Parish Council                  | Hatherton & Walgherton Parish<br>Council      | Henbury Parish Council                   |  |  |
| High Legh Parish Council                | Higher Hurdsfield PC                          | Holmes Chapel Parish Council             |  |  |
| Homes and Communities                   | HOPE  | Hough & Chorlton Parish Council          |  |  |
| Agency                                  |   |  |  |  |
| House Builders Federation               | Just Drop In Youth Information<br>and Advice  | Kettleshulme Parish Council              |  |  |
| Knutsford Town Council                  | Ladies Circle                                 | LGBT Support Service                     |  |  |

| Little Warford Parish Council      | Lower Peover Parish Council      | Lower Withington PC               |  |  |  |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Macclesfield Disability            | Macclesfield Town Council        | Marbury & District Parish Council |  |  |  |
| Information Bureau                 |                                  |                                   |  |  |  |
| Marketing Cheshire                 | Marton Parish Council            | Mere Parish Council               |  |  |  |
| Middlewich Town Council            | Millington Parish Council        | MIND                              |  |  |  |
| Minshull Vernon & District         | Mobberley Parish Council         | Moston Parish Council             |  |  |  |
| Parish Council                     |                                  |                                   |  |  |  |
| Mottram St Andrew Parish           | All five Members of Parliament   | Nantwich Town Council             |  |  |  |
| Council                            |                                  |                                   |  |  |  |
| Nether Alderley Parish Council     | Network Rail                     | Newbold Astbury-cum-Moreton       |  |  |  |
|                                    |                                  | Parish Council                    |  |  |  |
| Newhall Parish Council             | North Rode Parish Council        | NUPAS                             |  |  |  |
| NW Ambulance Service               | Odd Rode Parish Council          | Ollerton with Marshall Parish     |  |  |  |
|                                    |                                  | Council                           |  |  |  |
| Over Alderley Parish Council       | Peaks and Plains Housing         | Peaks and Plains Housing trust    |  |  |  |
|                                    | Association                      |                                   |  |  |  |
| Peover Superior Parish             | Pickmere Parish Counci           | Plumley with Toft & Bexton Parish |  |  |  |
|                                    |                                  |                                   |  |  |  |
| Pott Shrigley Parish Council       | Poynton Town Council             | Prestbury Parish Council          |  |  |  |
| Rainow Parish Council              | Rope Parish Council              | Rostherne Parish Council          |  |  |  |
| Salvation Army                     | Sandbach Town Council            | Shavington-cum-Gresty Parish      |  |  |  |
| Qiddin aton Donich Ocurail         |                                  | Council                           |  |  |  |
| Siddington Parish Council          | Skills and Growth Company        | Smallwood Parish Council          |  |  |  |
| Snelson Parish Council             | Spurstow Parish Council          | Stoke and Hurleston Parish        |  |  |  |
| Stud Dariah Council                | Sustrana                         | Council<br>Sutton Parish Council  |  |  |  |
| Styal Parish Council               | Sustrans                         |                                   |  |  |  |
| Swettenham Parish Council          | Tabley Parish Council            | The Thread                        |  |  |  |
| Twemlow Parish Council             | U3A<br>Warmingham Dariah Caunail |                                   |  |  |  |
| Wardle Parish Council              | Warmingham Parish Council        | WEAVE Board                       |  |  |  |
| Weston & Basford Parish<br>Council | Willaston Parish Council         | Wilmslow Town Council             |  |  |  |
| Wistaston Parish Council           | Worleston & District Parish      | Wrenbury-cum-Frith Parish         |  |  |  |
|                                    | Council                          | Council                           |  |  |  |
| Alternative Solutions Support      | Bipolar UK                       | Campaign Against Living           |  |  |  |
| Service                            |                                  | Miserably (CALM)                  |  |  |  |
| Carers Trust (Cheshire and         | Carers UK                        | Changing Lives Together           |  |  |  |
| Warrington)                        |                                  |                                   |  |  |  |
| Chapter Aspire                     | Cheshire Agricultural            | Cheshire East Carers Hub          |  |  |  |
|                                    | Chaplaincy                       |                                   |  |  |  |
| Cheshire Wildlife Trust            | CWP - 24/7 All age crisis mental | CWP - Central Cheshire Wellbeing  |  |  |  |
|                                    | health help line                 | Hub                               |  |  |  |
| CWP - Community Mental             | CWP - East Cheshire & Vale       | CWP - Home Treatment Team         |  |  |  |
| Health Teams                       | Royal Early Intervention Team    |                                   |  |  |  |
| CWP - Single Point of Access       | Disability Health                | Every Mind Matters                |  |  |  |
| Headway                            | Making Space                     | SANE                              |  |  |  |

This page is intentionally left blank