

APPLICATION FORM

PROPOSED GATING ORDER FOR Smallman Road/Lunt Avenue , St Johns/Valley (15)

APPLICATION FROM Crewe & Nantwich Safer Communities Partnership CRIME & DISORDER REDUCTION PARTNERSHIP

1	LOCATION OF HIGHWAY <input type="checkbox"/> provide sufficient details and a suitable map (attach separately) to identify the start and end points of the highway, including, as appropriate, house numbers, street names, parish/district/sub-district, number if PROW	The alleyway is identified in this application and maps are provided for reference The alleyways on the block bounded by Smallman Road, Nantwich Road, Tynedale Avenue, Lunt Avenue and Ruskin Avenue. Gates 329, 330, 331, 332, 334, , 336 on the attached maps refer.
2	NATURE OF THE PROBLEMS <input type="checkbox"/> provide details of the type and location of all relevant crime and ASB NOTE – Police Incident Crime Numbers <u>must</u> be provided together with other relevant evidence <input type="checkbox"/> indicate how the following main criteria are met and how they are applicable to this application - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o1 premises adjoining or adjacent to the highway are affected by crime or ASB o2 the existence of the highway is facilitating the persistent commission of criminal offences or ASB o it is in all the circumstances expedient to make the Order for the purposes of reducing crime or anti-social behaviour 	<p>In order to evidence the need for the alley gates which have been identified as requiring gating orders an examination of levels of criminal damage to a dwelling, anti-social behaviour and the levels of burglary. Analysis to identify areas that would benefit from alleygating has shown that the areas of St Johns Ward and Part of Valley ward suffers from rear entry burglary rates, criminal damage and youth nuisance rates over twice the borough average.</p> <p>In the period 2006/2007 the area suffered from 578 Incidents of Anti-Social Behaviour, 81 Burglaries and 97 incidents of Criminal Damage & Arson.</p> <p>This application is for gating as part of the overall scheme to make this whole area safer by completing the gating that has already begun.</p> <p>Specific Crime Incidents related to this alleyway in 2006/7are: ASB Incidents: 1136, 821, 198, 46, 75, 415, 682, 940, 151, 991, 619, 963, 221, 398, 98, 987, 493, 703, 655, 905, 120, 924, 840, 559, 589, 921 Burglary: cc07285257, cc07365945, cc08041929, cc08048655, 707429839, Criminal Damage: cc07182235, 0707281803, 0707430901, cc07157783</p>
3	ALTERNATIVE METHODS OF REDUCING CRIME OR ASB <input type="checkbox"/> provide details of the alternative methods that have been tried or considered, or dismissed	Gating a passageway is not always an option, or even in some circumstances the best option. CNBC and C&N SCP have considered the options available for crime

<p>(give reasons). Indicate which have been tried and which have been considered or dismissed. Also indicate the actual or presumed levels of effectiveness of each method.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> indicate why stopping off or diverting the highway is not considered appropriate.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> indicate any previous contact/discussions with the County Council concerning possible stopping up.</p>	<p>and disorder reduction in each case and are only applying for a gating order as the most expedient manner of reducing the crime, disorder or anti social behaviour associated with the alley ways listed above and indicated on the plans provided.</p> <p>The alleyways are in an area where gating has been successfully carried out, and as such could compromise the effectiveness of the whole scheme if not included. The gating of these alleys will contribute to the improved safety and feelings of safety of the residents affected.</p> <p>The whole area of the ward was selected for possible gating on the basis of analysis of crime and disorder figures in the three years up to the end of 2004/2005. The ward was also identified in the Indices of Multiple Deprivation as the ward with the worst crime problem in Crewe.</p> <p>A survey to determine the appropriateness of gating these alleys has been carried out and alternate options considered. The alley ways have been assessed as suitable for gating, and was considered the most efficient, sustainable and cost effective intervention.</p> <p>Alternative methods tried - policing: this has proved over the years to be ineffective and is not a sustainable long term option as policing levels inevitable vary with time and other demands.</p> <p>Alternative Methods considered and dismissed - improved lighting. This is considered to be ineffective based on the experience of Stoke where increased lighting of alleys has been tried and the council there is now introducing gates as more effective. Lighting alleys increases problems where there is a lack of natural surveillance of the alleyway.</p> <p>Stopping off or diverting the 'highway' is not considered appropriate as the 'highways' are not through routes for vehicles, but provide access to the rear of properties</p> <p>County council highways have been consulted in the Crewe Alleygate Scheme and have advised that applications for gating orders would be required in all cases where highway status is indicated on the definitive map.</p>
--	---

4	<p>ACCESS TO DWELLINGS/PREMISES/FACILITIES</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> provide location details and addresses of all properties or facilities whose access would be <u>directly</u> affected by the restrictions</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> for each of these properties or facilities indicate its type and normal use. Also indicate whether the highway provides the primary or only access</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> provide location details and addresses of all buildings or facilities whose access is <u>indirectly</u> affected by the restrictions (i.e. always accessible, but takes longer to get there)</p>	<p>The primary access to no property will be affected.</p> <p>Properties affected are residential properties as follows:</p> <p>2-58 Tynedale Ave, 12-36 Smallman Road, 13-39 Lunt Avenue, 5-57 Ruskin Road, 223 to 227c Nantwich Road</p> <p>The gate at the rear of 10 Smallman Road will restrict access to a currently derelict property to the rear of 5 Carlisle Street. It should be noted that the owner of this property has previously applied for planning permission for conversion to two dwellings. This has been refused. Should permission be granted in the future any order would need to be rescinded.</p>
5	<p>ALTERNATIVE ROUTES</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> provide details, including location maps (attach separately), of alternative routes during the restricted periods</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> indicate the approximate increase in distance and foot or cycle journey times involved and comment on the potential negative aspects of the alternative routes (e.g. non-compliance with mobility standards, personal safety issues, lack of surfaced highway or lack of adequate crossing points, etc.)</p>	<p>In all cases below the longest and most likely journey has been used to calculate the difference in distance that would be added to a hypothetical journey without the alley gates being in place.</p> <p>The maximum alternative route between the two alley way entrances (gate position 333 and 334) on the public highway, that is Lunt Avenue turning right into Ruskin Road, then onto Nantwich Road and right again into Smallman Road is approximately 18m longer than that via the alleyway.</p>

6	<p>RESTRICTIONS</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> indicate the times and periods of the restrictions, providing reasons for the appropriateness thereof</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> provide details and addresses of the premises or facilities for which access is required at particular times or periods. Also indicate how the premises or facilities would be affected if the restrictions did not match these times or periods and how such effects would be mitigated</p>	<p>Restrictions would be in place twenty four hours a day 365 days a year.</p> <p>All properties with rear access via the alley way will be provided with access keys.</p> <p>Access is maintained by provision of master keys for utilities and emergency services, and arrangements have been made to inconvenience residents as little as possible over matters such as refuse collection.</p>
7	<p>MANAGEMENT OF THE RESTRICTIONS</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> suggest the particular bodies or organisations willing and capable of opening/closing the gates/barriers at the designated times/periods. NOTE – the body or organisation <u>must</u> have the capacity and resources available to fulfil these obligations on 100% of occasions and also must be able to provide full indemnities for employees and third parties (currently £5m)</p>	<p>Management of restrictions is not required</p>
8	<p>EFFECT ON THE COMMUNITY</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> indicate the positive and the negative effects on particular sections of the community (not just those adjoining or adjacent to the restricted highway). Include comments that indicate how the negative effects can be reduced to acceptable levels</p>	<p>Feelings of safety amongst residents of areas where alley gates have been installed has been shown to increase, and there is evidence of positive impacts on community feeling and health. Research by Professor Hirschfield and the University of Liverpool has shown the positive health benefits due to a reduction in stress and feelings of fear.</p> <p>Alley gate design is compliant with access requirements under the Disability Discrimination Act.</p>

9	<p>CONSULTATION</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> indicate which groups/individuals/bodies or organisations have been consulted, either formally or informally, and supply their comments</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> for negative comments from such consultations, indicate what modifications have been made to the proposals or indicate why any particular comments should not be taken into account and considered further</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> indicate which groups/individuals/bodies or organisations it was not possible to consult, but which it is considered should be given the opportunity to comment on the proposals</p>	<p>The Safer Communities Partnership carries out extensive consultation through its contractor, Alternatives (Lighthouse Project), Ltd. This is compliant with guidance and requirements under existing legislation, including the CROW Act, Highways Act and CNEA 2005.</p> <p>All properties affected by the scheme are consulted and any objections addressed to the satisfaction of residents.</p> <p>.</p>
10	<p>MANAGING DIVERSITY</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> provide comments on the direct or indirect effects of the proposals on the grounds of age, disability, gender, race, religion or belief, sexual orientation or social exclusion. (Notes to assist with this are provided in the Procedure Notes for Gating Orders)</p>	<p>Alley gating is intended to improve the quality life of all people in the effected area and promote social cohesion through an improvement in feelings of safety and community.</p> <p>Gate design is compliant with access requirements.</p>
11	<p>FUNDING</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> indicate the amount of funding available from other than the County Council's specific budget for Gating Orders</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> indicate whether this funding is available for either or both of the initial implementation and the annual ongoing management/maintenance costs</p>	<p>£432,000 has been allocated by the Borough Council to the Alleygate Project for initial implementation of all gating in St Johns and Valley Wards. This is based on estimates of £1,800 per gate plus the same again for future maintenance.</p> <p>Future maintenance will be managed by the borough council on behalf of county highways.</p>

12	OTHER INFORMATION/COMMENTS <p><input type="checkbox"/> indicate the source/origin of the initial request for consideration of a Gating Order</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> comment here on any other matter in support of this application</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> if the CDRP has made other applications, indicate the priority of this application compared to those others</p>	<p>he request for gating in this area originated with the Safer Communities Partnership on the grounds of extensive analysis of crime problems in Crewe and consideration of practicable long term solutions.</p> <p>The application for the gating of these alleyways is based on a thorough analysis of crime issues in this ward and across Crewe which indicated that a gating programme in appropriate areas would have an impact on crime in the area. This application is intended to allow the CDRP to gate the few remaining alleys in this area where ASB and crime can still occur.</p> <p>It is considered that a failure to gate these alleyways will compromise the objective of reducing crime and ASB across the ward, and will leave gaps in the scheme that could become a focus for ASB and crime in the area.</p>
<div style="text-align: right;">23/09/08</div> Completed on behalf of Crewe & Nantwich CDRP by David Burns print name Date		
Authorised on behalf of Crewe & Nantwich CDRP by David Burns (Safer Communities Manager) <div style="text-align: right;">23/09/08</div> <div style="text-align: right;">..... signed Date</div>		

FOR USE BY CHESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT ONLY					
Issue				Y/N	Remarks including next actions
	Status of the highway ●1 private ? no action by CCC ●2 adopted* ? action - Area Highway Manager ●3 unmetalled PROW* ? action – PROW Team Manager *see Procedures Section4.3				
2	Has the application been completed fully and correctly, and does it provide full justification for a Gating Order?				
3	Are all of the main criteria met? And have the relevant Members been consulted?				
4	Are there any conflicts with other CCC Policies, Standards or Plans (including diversity issues)?				
5	If the application from the CDRP was initially unacceptable/incomplete, has the CDRP been given the opportunity to modify/amend it for further consideration?				
Date of LJC		RECOMMENDATION			