

Cabinet

Date of Meeting: 05 November 2019

Report Title: Crewe Southern Link Road Bridge – Preferred Route

Portfolio Holder: Cllr Craig Browne - Deputy Leader

Senior Officer: Frank Jordan, Executive Director Place

1. Report Summary

- 1.1. The potential of High Speed Rail 2 (HS2) services coming to Crewe and creating a rail hub station provides a significant opportunity to deliver social, economic and environmental benefits to the town and the sub-region.
- 1.2. The Council has been developing a draft Crewe Hub Area Action Plan for the area around Crewe Station, which would provide a planning framework that supports the delivery of these opportunities.
- 1.3. A review of the future local transport needs of the area has also been undertaken. This supports the need to improve traffic flow through the delivery of a new crossing over the railway lines around the station. This would reduce congestion, improve air quality and improve the environment for cyclists and pedestrians around the immediate areas of the station. Therefore, it is proposed to create a new highway to be known as the Crewe Southern Link Road Bridge (the Bridge).
- 1.4. Notwithstanding the strategic relationship with HS2, the bridge and junction improvements would, in their own right, as an independent project, deliver significant transport and environmental benefits to Crewe.
- 1.5. Aligning the delivery of a new bridge crossing with the planned works for HS2 and the Crewe hub would minimise the period of disruption to local residents

and businesses and allow for programme cost efficiencies for the Bridge to be realised.

1.6. This report describes the work undertaken to assess the route choices for the Bridge, the outcomes of a recent public consultation on the subject and requests the adoption of a preferred route for incorporation in the final draft of the Crewe Area Action Plan.

1.7. HS2 is currently being independently reviewed. The review is being undertaken by Douglas Oakervee and is expected to report its findings and recommendations at the end of the 2019.

2. Recommendations

2.1. That Cabinet:

- 2.1.1. Note the findings of the Public Consultation Report;
- 2.1.2. Note the findings of the Preferred Route Assessment Report;
- 2.1.3. Note the legal implications of approving and announcing the preferred route in relation to triggering statutory blight and approves that any statutory blight notices be processed and considered accordingly by the Council, noting that this is limited to statutory blight only and not discretionary purchase/generalised blight/Part 1 claims;
- 2.1.4. Approve the route shown at Appendix A as the preferred route for the Southern Link Road Bridge;
- 2.1.5. Approve that the necessary steps are taken to protect the preferred route shown in Appendix A from future development including introducing the route into the submission version of the Area Action Plan;
- 2.1.6. Approve the development of the supporting package of local highway junction improvements, as set out in the Preferred Route Report (Appendix C) to complement the provision of the Bridge;
- 2.1.7. Approve the proposed cross section of the new highway as a 13.3m wide corridor as detailed in Appendix B and the form of bridge construction as either a Ladder Bridge or Multi-Girder construction;
- 2.1.8. Approve that the alignment of the preferred route is further developed to enable the submission of a planning application alongside the package of local highway improvements, reflecting where possible feedback received through consultation;

2.1.9. Authorise the Executive Director of Place to:

- 2.1.9.1. Work up and develop a Major Scheme Business Case for the Bridge and supporting measures in order to position the Scheme to compete for future Government funding opportunities.
- 2.1.9.2. Commence detailed discussions with affected landowners, local residents, businesses and recognised community groups to refine the design details (including access arrangements and traffic management measures on local roads) and that supplementary formal consultation be undertaken to inform planning submission material.
- 2.1.9.3. In consultation with the Director of Governance and Compliance, to enter into the required legal agreements with Network Rail to contribute to the design and development of the Scheme.
- 2.1.9.4. Enter into discussions with land owners about acquiring the necessary land and rights to deliver the scheme, including the advance relocation of affected businesses and to delegate the entering into any necessary supporting legal agreements to the Head of Estates.

3. Reasons for Recommendations

3.1. If approved this report would

- 3.1.1. Confirm a protected route for the Bridge from the public consultation exercise for incorporation into the final draft of the Crewe Area Action Plan;
- 3.1.2. Enable detailed design and the planning application process to commence for the Bridge and supporting junction improvements;
- 3.1.3. Give certainty on the width and form of construction of the Bridge to allow detailed design work to commence, acknowledging the constraints of extremely tight land boundaries;
- 3.1.4. Reduce uncertainty to Local Businesses and residents as to the location and impact of the route;
- 3.1.5. Enable the council to engage a dedicated project sponsor for the Bridge from Network Rail;

4. Other Options Considered

- 4.1. There could be an option of not continuing with the Bridge project. However, this would limit the potential for future development opportunities around the new Hub Station and therefore remove the opportunity to improve the environment in this part of Crewe.
- 4.2. The project could be 'Mothballed' awaiting the outcome of the Oakervee review. However, to do so would risk the ability of the Council to meet the programme for the delivery and dovetail with planned Network Rail works.
- 4.3. The Bridge crosses the railway in a location that is due to require extensive changes to both the signalling and railway infrastructure to accommodate HS2 services. Network Rail has accepted in principle that the location proposed is acceptable. There is limited scope to change the location of the bridge itself due to operational railway constraints.
- 4.4. Four connecting route options were developed and were subject to public consultation. The pros and cons of each route are described in the Preferred Route report, with the main difference being the impacts on different sets of businesses.
- 4.5. Prior to the development of the Bridge, different locations for a new bridge crossing were considered, including options to the North and South of the Bridge. The reasons these options were not developed further is set out in the Preferred Route Report.
- 4.6. A range of Bridge construction forms were initially proposed as possible in early feasibility studies. The full details of the relative costs of these bridge forms are contained in the Preferred Route Report.

5. Background

Public Consultation

- 5.1. The Public Consultation on the Bridge was open over a six-week period between 22 July 2019 and 3 September 2019.
- 5.2. The Public Consultation consisted of the following:

- 5.2.1. Two public exhibitions held at the Crewe Alexandra Conference Suite;
- 5.2.2. A consultation brochure and questionnaire distribution to 685 residential and business properties, directly affected by the scheme; based on geographical proximity to the scheme;
- 5.2.3. A consultation leaflet and cover letter sent out to residential and business properties within a wider geographical catchment of the scheme;
- 5.2.4. An email including brochure sent to stakeholders (local businesses, schools, vulnerable user groups) and statutory consultees (public bodies, local authorities, parish councils);
- 5.2.5. Consultation material and online questionnaire was made available on the Cheshire East Council website providing details about the scheme and the consultation; including a link to the Crewe Area Action Plan website;
- 5.2.6. Consultation leaflets and questionnaires were deposited at Crewe Lifestyle Centre, library, Town Hall and at Crewe Railway Station;
- 5.2.7. Meetings were held with Crewe Town Council, Local elected members, local landowners and businesses;
- 5.2.8. The consultation was supported by a Social Media campaign by the Council.

Consultation report

- 5.3. During the Public Consultation period, 148 online and paper questionnaires, 31 emails, 26 of which were direct responses to the consultation and 1 letter were received. The full analysis is contained in the Public Consultation Report at Appendix D.
- 5.4. The results illustrate that there is mixed public support for the Bridge with 86 respondents indicating that they support (strongly agree/tend to agree) the need for a bridge and 53 respondents indicating they are against (strongly disagree/tend to disagree). 9 respondents neither agreed nor disagreed with the question or did not know.
- 5.5. The majority of respondents (46) indicated they had 'No preference' on the West option, followed by 43 that preferred West 2. The most popular choice

for the east options was East 4 and 'No preference' both with 54 respondents.

5.6. The majority of respondents agreed with the Council's proposed junction improvements (75 – strongly agreed or tended to agree).

5.7. A number of key issues were identified throughout the Public Consultation. These were considered important by the public and are detailed in the Consultation Report. However, the principal issue raised by a number of respondents was concern about the bridge resulting in more traffic with associated environmental impacts using the local road network off Gresty Road. The main locations of concern were the residential side streets of Gresty Road including Manor Way.

5.8. As the project development continues it is critical that a package of traffic calming measures and controls for these areas is developed alongside the scheme to manage and control any additional traffic in the area.

Prominent Representations

5.9. Crewe Town Council

Crewe Town Council is supportive of the Bridge proposals stating, "The Town Council supports the provision of the Bridge to alleviate congestion on the Nantwich Road Bridge, and reduce pollution in that area. The Town Council's main priorities for the choice of route are that the impact on nearby residential and business properties be kept to the minimum possible." The Town Council did not express an opinion on a preferred route option

5.10. Network Rail

The Network Rail Response to the consultation stated support for any scheme that helps passengers gain access to Crewe station and have no objection to the scheme in principle. The response indicated that the design profile appears to show acceptable Overhead Line Electrification (OLE) clearance but will need further details to agree the bridge design. Network Rail did not express an opinion on a preferred route option.

5.11. HS2 Limited

The HS2 response to the consultation stated support for the principle behind the scheme and acknowledged both the wider benefits of investment in multiple transport modes and options being explored to address issues around the current limited local highway capacity as part of plans for the HS2 Crewe Hub.

5.12. Local Business Interests

As would be expected, detailed responses were received from the Businesses directly affected by the Scheme and these are contained in the Consultation Report. A summary of the issues raised in this feedback, including notes from meetings is set out below:

West Side (Gresty Road)

Business	Impacts and Concerns
Unipart Rail Holdings Ltd	CEC held meetings with Unipart on 17/05/2019 and 07/06/2019. Formal consultation response provided by Unipart indicating preference for West 1 or West 2. Least preferred option was West 4 due to alignment dissecting wider Unipart site, potentially requiring full relocation. Generally supportive of the overall scheme – but subject to mitigation measures to ensure the continuation of their existing business operations, for example a replacement warehouse constructed / compensated for off site (if necessary)
Crewe Alexandra Football Club	CEC held meeting with Crewe Alexandra on 14/06/2019. No formal consultation response received but indicated during meeting generally supportive of the overall scheme. No real preference given on western alignment options.
Mr Bayman (Landowner of small business site)	CEC met with Mr Bayman (landlord of plot containing several small businesses) at consultation event held on 08/08/2019. No formal consultation response received but indicated during discussions generally supportive of the overall scheme, subject to suitable compensation. No real preference given on western alignment options.

East Side (Weston Road)

Business	Impacts and Concerns
Royal Mail Group	CEC held meeting with Royal Mail Group Limited (RMG) on 25/06/2019. Formal representations were provided by Royal Mail Group Limited and its tenants MECX Group to CEC on 03/09/2019. Royal Mail Group strongly objected to all options but noted objection to East 1 and East 2 (which would require relocation of RMG) in the strongest possible way. If East 4 were adopted, we would need to consider how temporary car parking could be provided to allow the continuity of the business and impacts on their tenants.
Polemarch	CEC held meeting with Polemarch on 14/06/2019. Formal email correspondence was provided by Polemarch to CEC on 19/06/2019. Polemarch noted that all four options presented would likely impact on their land and buildings on Weston Way. No specific route preference was indicated in this correspondence.
Storage King	CEC held meeting with Storage King Limited on 20/08/2019. At this meeting Storage King expressed a lack of preference For East 1, this intersects their building, and East 2, which cuts across the front of their building and presents access issues.
Locomotive Storage (TOC) Limited	The response highlights their concerns as to how the proposed Southern Link Road overbridge crossing the northern end of their site will affect their businesses. They cannot contemplate any bridge abutment or similar structures being placed within their long leasehold site, stating that this would curtail their present and future railway operations particularly should the existing rail siding layout arrangements be compromised. Similarly, the construction works phase is of great concern to them.

- 5.13. As the Scheme develops, it will be necessary to engage closely with these businesses to ensure, if possible, that they are able to continue to operate. Consideration will be given to potential alteration to their premises, modifications to the scheme design, provision of alternative site or provision of direct financial compensation.

- 5.14. More work is also required to demonstrate to the Royal Mail that the preferred route can be constructed and delivered in a manner that does not unduly impact its (or its tenants) operations.
- 5.15. The comments from Locomotive Storage Limited are noted and continued dialogue with them on the exact location of any piers and form of bridge construction will be required.

Preferred Route Report

- 5.16. The report documents the methodology used to define the Preferred Route. It provides the reasoning and justification for the decisions made in establishing the Preferred Route, and explains the scoring and weighting system used to rank the options incorporating the feedback from the Public Consultation.
- 5.17. Based from the results of the assessment, Western Option 2 (West 2), and Eastern Option 4 (East 4) were selected. The preferred route acknowledges feedback from public consultation and moves the junction with Gresty Road slightly towards Nantwich Road. This will move the junction away from St. Clair Street and allow a longer right turn lane to be provided at the junction without impacting buildings of historic merit.

Further work and programme

- 5.18. In order to deliver a planning application for the scheme it is necessary to work up the preferred route and proposed junction improvements in more detail. Issues that will need to be considered include access arrangements, mitigation measures, drainage, environmental impacts and off-site traffic management on the side roads – which will form an essential part of the scheme. This will also allow the refinement of the scheme estimate.
- 5.19. Given the scale of the scheme, it is also necessary and good practice to undertake another round of formal public consultation prior to submission of the planning application.

5.20. Key activities and indicative dates include:

Activity	Indicative Dates (end date)
Preliminary Design	Complete approx April 2020
Environmental Surveys	Ongoing
Public Consultation on junction improvement details	Spring 2020
Environmental Statement	May 2020
Ground Investigation & reports	Complete approx January 2020
Pre planning Consultation	June 2020
Planning Application	September 2020
Land Assembly Complete	September 2022
Detailed Design and procurement (Assumes Design and Build contract)	September 2024
Advance Construction works commence	Spring 2025
Bridge and Junction improvements open	By Summer 2026 [dependent on exact Network Rail programme]

- 5.21. The Bridge programme aligns to Network Rail and HS2 Limited's current planned programmes for Crewe. This would allow the new bridge to benefit from programme and cost efficiencies and minimise the period of disruption to rail passengers, local residents and businesses. Without this opportunity, the scheme would likely need to bear significant costs of further railway possessions; which in all likelihood would render the scheme financially unviable. The programme will need to be adjusted as necessary to accommodate any changes in Network Rail's programmes
- 5.22. The submission of any future planning permission will take into account the views of a pre-planning application consultation. As with any scheme such as

this; it carries a risk that any planning application is called in by the Secretary of State.

6. Implications of the Recommendations

6.1 Legal Implications

6.1.1 One of the implications of the proposed protected route for a new highway is that it may give rise to claims arising from statutory blight pursuant to provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Statutory blight applies only to land which is proposed to be physically impacted by the alignment of a scheme to the extent that there will be actual land take. This regime should not be confused with generalised blight or with Part 1 Claims.

6.1.2 Statutory blight can be triggered in a number of ways if actions defined within Schedule 13 to the 1990 Act are engaged. The relevant paragraphs of that Schedule for CECs purposes are likely to be:

6.1.2.1 Paragraph 1A(2)(c) - where land is shown as being proposed or allocated for the purpose of a local authority in a deposited draft Development Plan Document. In this case the purpose being the proposed Bridge within the Area Action Plan;

6.1.2.2 Paragraph 13 – this is an alternative provision to paragraph 1A where land is indicated in a development plan (otherwise than by being dealt with in a manner mentioned in paragraph 1A) as land on which a highway is proposed to be constructed, or land to be included in a highway as proposed to be improved or altered;

6.1.2.3 Paragraph 15 - Land shown on plans approved by a resolution of a local highway authority as land comprised in the site of a highway as proposed to be constructed, improved or altered by that authority. In this case, the resolution of CEC to approve the preferred route;

6.1.3 The blight liability in relation to paragraphs 1A (2)(c) and 13 will become effective when the Area Action Plan is submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination. The current timescale for the submission of this is February 2020. However, the blight liability in relation to paragraph 15 will be triggered at the point in time that CEC makes public the announcement of the preferred route. The current timescale for this is November 2019.

- 6.1.4 The statutory blight procedure is in effect a 'reverse' compulsory purchase process order (CPO) in the sense that a person whose property is affected by statutory blight may, in certain circumstances, require the Council to purchase his property by the service of a statutory blight notice.
- 6.1.5 This right is conferred in recognition of the fact that property values may be adversely affected by, in this case, a proposed new highway.
- 6.1.6 If a property owner serves a statutory blight notice then the claimant must have a qualifying interest in the property. A qualifying interest is deemed to be the resident owner-occupier of a residential property (not relevant to SRLB) or, in the case of non-residential premises, have:

- an annual rateable value not exceeding £36,000; and
- be an owner-occupier

as assessed at the date of the service of a statutory blight notice. The requirements for an owner-occupier are that the claimant must have: owned (freehold or leasehold with more than 3 years remaining) the premises for at least six months before serving the statutory blight notice and have operated a business from there throughout this time; or, if the property is empty, the claimant must have operated a business from there for at least six months prior to it being empty, so long as it has not been empty for more than 12 months.

- 6.1.7 Statutory blight does not, as a general rule (save for rare exceptions) apply to those parties who are investment owners of land and is, instead, intended to benefit parties in actual occupation.
- 6.1.8 Claimants must show reasonable endeavours to sell their interest and demonstrate that as a consequence of blight they were unable to sell other than at a substantially lower price. There is no statutory definition of what is considered a "reasonable endeavour to sell" and this has to be determined in relation to each case on its own merits. It is, however, not sufficient to make no attempt to sell. The costs of any attempts to sell are not recoverable as compensation. There is also no definition of what constitutes "substantially lower" and, again, each case will need to be determined on its own merits.

- 6.1.9 If a blight notice is served, the Council will have the option to either accept the blight notice or serve a counter notice on one or more specified statutory grounds.
- 6.1.10 If the Council accepts the blight notice, then the effect of the acceptance is that a deemed Notice to Treat has occurred and the Council will then have 3 years to purchase the property. The Council will be compelled to purchase the relevant property on the same terms that would apply if the property were purchased pursuant to a CPO.
- 6.1.11 It should be noted that statutory blight applies to all land within a title and, as such, even if only a small part of land is impacted by the Bridge, statutory blight considers the diminution in value to the entirety of the land interest.
- 6.1.12 If the Council is served with a statutory blight notice, it is imperative that good systems of recording the date of receipt and ultimate processing of the notice are engaged. It is proposed that this process will be managed by the Council's retained solicitors.
- 6.1.13 Legislation provides that the Council only has 2 months from the date of service of the notice to either accept the notice or serve a counter notice. It should be noted that even if the statutory blight notice is not considered valid, the Council still has to respond to the notice, with one of the grounds of counter notice being that the statutory requirements have not been met. Failure to respond within 2 months results in a deemed Notice to Treat and requirement to purchase the land.
- 6.1.14 The grounds of counter notice are that:
- 6.1.14.1 the land is not blighted;
 - 6.1.14.2 the Council do not propose to acquire the land;
 - 6.1.14.3 the Council proposes to acquire only part of the land;
 - 6.1.14.4 the Council does not intend to acquire the land within the next 15 years;
 - 6.1.14.5 the claimant has no interest in the land;
 - 6.1.14.6 the claimant does not have a qualifying interest in the land; and/or
 - 6.1.14.7 legislative requirements (reasonable endeavours etc.) have not been fulfilled.
- 6.1.15 Upon serving a counter notice, the claimant has 1 month to either accept the counter notice or make a reference to the Upper Tribunal

(Lands Chamber). There are obviously significant cost implications related to any reference that could be made.

6.1.16 In terms of application to the Bridge, it is foreseen that the majority of land interests impacted by the preferred route will not qualify for a statutory blight claim on the basis of exceeding the rateable value threshold.

6.1.17 In due course, there may be claims pursuant to Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973 but these are only triggered at construction/use stage and will be considered later and/or as part of any Lands Cost Estimate.

6.1.18 The Council also has the discretion to consider acquiring land for the purpose of mitigating any adverse effects of the Bridge or acquiring land required in advance of requirements, under Section 246 and 248 of the Highways Act 1980. At this time, no assessment of the potential financial implications of this has been carried out and so the only form of blight being considered is statutory blight.

6.1.19 A public consultation has been undertaken. Case law has established four principles for consultation:

- (i) It must be undertaken at a time when proposals are still at a formative stage;
- (ii) It must include sufficient reasons to allow those consulted to give intelligent consideration and an intelligent response;
- (iii) Adequate time must be given for the consultation; and
- (iv) The product of consultation must be conscientiously taken into account when the ultimate decision is made.

Cabinet must therefore satisfy itself that the consultation has been conducted correctly and take the results of the consultation into account in reaching the decision requested by this report.

6.2 Finance Implications

6.2.1 The estimated scheme cost of the preferred route is c. £65M. This includes early assessments of business compensation costs and professional fees. This figure should be seen as an initial budget estimate at this stage. As the scheme develops further, this estimate will become more refined, for example after ground investigation works and Network Rail requirements are more fully understood. This amount

is not currently approved in the Council's capital programme or shown in the capital addendum. Cabinet approval of a detailed business case and refined cost estimate will be sought in due course.

- 6.2.2 The estimated amount required at this stage to take the project through to the planning application stage (expected summer 2020) is £0.750m and will be funded by the already approved Crewe HS2 Hub Station project in the Capital programme.

6.3 Policy Implications

- 6.3.1 An Area Action Plan is a Development Plan Document and consequently, once adopted, the Crewe Hub Area Action Plan will form a change in planning policy for the area over which it is defined and supersede the policy framework for the area in the existing Local Plan Strategy. The Bridge preferred route would be incorporated into the final draft Crewe Hub Area Action Plan.

Equality Implications

- 6.3.2 The Council has a duty under Section 149 of the Equalities Act to have due regard to the need to: eliminate discrimination; advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a "relevant protected characteristic" and persons who do not share it; foster good relations between persons who share a "relevant protected characteristic" and persons who do not share it.
- 6.3.3 There are no relevant considerations as part of the Bridge scheme. However, an Equality Impact Assessment is incorporated into the integrated Sustainability Appraisal of the Area Action Plan. This will consider how development proposals and planning policies will impact on different groups within the community.

Human Resources Implications

- 6.3.4 It shall be necessary to ensure that sufficient resource is allocated in Assets, Highways, Legal, Finance and Planning Services to support the delivery of the scheme. If additional temporary resources are required these will be met from the project budget.
- 6.3.5 It shall be necessary to ensure that sufficient resource is allocated in Highways, Assets, Legal, Finance and Planning Services to support the delivery of the scheme. If additional temporary and/or specialist resources are required, these will be met from the project budget.

Risk Management Implications

- 6.3.6 The Bridge delivery programme is aligned to Network Rail and HS2s programmes of works for Crewe to enable HS2 services at Crewe by 2027. Any slippage in either or both of these programmes could require the delivery programme for the bridge to move accordingly. At this point the project budget would then be subject to inflationary construction pressures.
- 6.3.7 At this time, the capital costs of this scheme remain unfunded and there can be no guarantee of success of a future funding bid to Government. However, given the strategic narrative of the scheme, helping to drive economic development on the back of the HS2 programme it is considered that there is a realistic prospect of success.
- 6.3.8 The project development costs necessary to deliver this scheme would be at risk if funding for the scheme were not available or the scheme does not achieve the necessary statutory permissions.
- 6.3.9 Traffic modelling to support the Business Case for a funding bid has been undertaken at a high level. This has been based on the proposed development quantum set out in the draft Area Action Plan. Early indications are that the scheme would be able to demonstrate a positive Benefit to Cost ratio, a key requirement for a successful funding bid to Government. However, work is now underway to refine the traffic model to fully comply with Department for Transport Standards, this may show that the benefits of the scheme are lower (or higher) than currently forecast. Much of the future year demand is also driven by the proposals in the Area Action Plan – and certainty on what is being delivered there would only flow after adoption of the Plan following a public inquiry.
- 6.3.10 There will be some instances where landowners / businesses believe that they cannot sell their properties because of the link road proposals, but are not directly affected by the proposal in terms of physical land take and thus not entitled to make a blight notice. In these circumstances, it may be possible for the Council, subject to review on a case by case basis to make open market acquisitions of property.
- 6.3.11 Statutory blight will be triggered at a stage where the capital funding for the scheme is not confirmed, and statutory blight notices may be

served on the Council. Failure to appropriately and expeditiously deal with any statutory blight notices served upon the Council may result in a deemed Notice to Treat and requirement to acquire land.

6.3.12 If property / land were to be acquired under a blight notice, the council would become the title holder. In this regard, should, for any reason the link road scheme not progress, the Council would be able to recoup its investment costs through the sale of the property / land. It is possible that the Critchell Down rules will apply and that the land would need to be offered back for sale to the original land owner first.

6.3.13 It will be possible to at least partly offset the holding costs of potential properties by seeking tenants.

6.3.14 The Government is currently undertaking an independent review of the HS2 programme. Any changes to the HS2 programme such as a delay or change in scope may affect the Bridge scheme and the programme for the Area Action Plan. The review is expected to conclude by the end of the year.

Rural Communities Implications

6.3.15 There are no direct implications for rural communities.

Implications for Children & Young People/Cared for Children

6.3.16 There are no direct implications for children and young people.

Public Health Implications

6.3.17 Nantwich Road is currently the site of an Air Quality Management Area, a result of Nitrogen emissions from traffic. The proposed package of transport measures, including the new Bridge are forecast to reduce traffic flows on Nantwich Road leading to an improvement in Air Quality. The exact impacts will fall to be determined as part of the Environmental Statement supporting the Planning Application for the scheme

6.3.18 The new bridge would provide new cycling and walking connections that are not currently available, as well as allowing, subject to further work the redesign of junctions and re-allocation of some existing road space to cycling and walking measures.

Climate Change Implications

6.3.19 An Environmental Statement will be produced as part of the Planning Application. This will define the impact of the scheme on traffic flows, delays and carbon emissions. At this early stage, the additional highway link and junction improvements are expected to reduce delays, with a consequential reduction in Carbon emissions and improvement in air quality.

6.3.20 The scheme includes a cycleway on one side of the new highway link and a footway on the other side.

7. Ward Members Affected

7.1. The project is within the Wards of Crewe South (Cllrs Flude and Hogben) and Crewe East (Cllrs Faddes, Brookfield and Bratherton)

7.2. Members have been briefed and consulted as part of the Consultation exercise.

8. Consultation & Engagement

8.1. A full consultation report is attached to this report at Appendix D , and described in section 5 of the report.

9. Access to Information

9.1. The following Appendices are attached to this report:

9.1.1. Preferred Route of the Southern Link Road Bridge (Appendix A)

9.1.2. Proposed Cross Section of Southern Link Road Bridge (Appendix B)

9.1.3. Preferred Route Report (Appendix C)

9.1.4. Public Consultation Report (Appendix D)

10. Contact Information

10.1. Any questions relating to this report should be directed to the following officer:

Name: Paul Griffiths
Job Title: Infrastructure Delivery Manager
Email: paul.griffiths@cheshireeast.gov.uk