

# REPORT FOR DECISION



**MEETING:** CABINET

**DATE:** 2 MARCH 2016

**SUBJECT:** PRESTWICH: HIGH STREET REGENERATION SCHEME

**REPORT FROM:** COUNCILLOR CONNOLLY (LEADER OF THE COUNCIL AND CABINET MEMBER FOR REGENERATION) AND COUNCILLOR ISHERWOOD (CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT)

**CONTACT OFFICERS:** STEVE HOPLEY (REGENERATION AND ESTATES MANAGER, PROPERTY & ASSET MANAGEMENT)

---

**TYPE OF DECISION:** KEY DECISION

**FREEDOM OF INFORMATION/STATUS:**

---

**SUMMARY:** The report considers proposals to undertake a high street regeneration scheme in Prestwich in line with the Prestwich Regeneration Strategy.

Two proposals were drawn-up and submitted for widespread public consultation.

The report outlines both the consultation process and the consultation feedback and goes onto make specific recommendations which take into account the consultation results.

**OPTIONS & RECOMMENDED OPTION**

**Option 1**

Members are recommended to:

- (a) Instruct officers to undertake detailed designs and obtain tenders in respect of delivering Proposal One subject to the following amendments and within the approved budget:
  - i) Clifton Road to remain open in both directions. The situation will be monitored for a period of 12 calendar months from completion of the scheme as to its effect on traffic flows, congestion and safety.

- ii) The on street (adopted) parking bays to be reduced in length and additional street trees to be included to improve the aesthetic appearance. Parking bays to be subject to restrictions of 60 minutes with no return with 1 hour.
  - iii) Officers to work with Transport for Greater Manchester to ensure traffic light sequencing is maximised to reduce congestion.
- (b) Delegate authority to the Chief Executive and the interim Executive Director of Resources and Regulation, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to consider all tenders received and to approve the awarding of the contract to undertake the approved scheme within the approved budget.
- (c) Instruct officers to seek opportunities to secure additional match funding and sponsorship specifically in respect to street furniture, signage and planting

**Option 2**

Not approve the recommendations of this report.

**Cabinet is recommended to approve Option 1 with the amendments outlined above.**

**IMPLICATIONS:**

**Corporate Aims/Policy Framework:**

Do the proposals accord with Policy Framework? Yes.

**Statement by s151 Officer:**

A funding package for this scheme has been assembled using approved Council Budgets, and by securing external funding.

Before final commitment the Council will undertake robust cost estimates and tenders to ensure that the scheme can be delivered within budget.

Wider risk mitigation measures are outlined at section 8 of the report

**Statement by Executive Director of Resources:**

This is a key scheme for the regeneration of Prestwich High Street and the surrounding areas.

The aims of the scheme are to:

***“Create a lively high street, attractive to***

***both national and independent operators with a much improved environment”***

**Equality/Diversity implications:**

In considering the proposals and the results of the consultation process, Members must have due regard to the Council’s equality duties (under the Equality Act 2010), must ensure that the consultation process was fair and thorough and that they have an opportunity to consider responses.

**Considered by Monitoring Officer:**

If a proposal is approved for implementation, further advice should be sought from the Council Solicitor to ascertain:

- That Procurement Rules have been complied with in respect of the appointment of any works contractors.
- That all of the works comprised in the proposal are covered by general and specific powers under the Highways Act 1980 and that appropriate procedures for advertisement, consultation with utility providers and others and for the making of orders are followed.
- Whether any particular access rights need to be secured over private land in order to carry out the works to the highway and any potential difficulties in securing such rights.
- Whether there is any potential for claims to be made for loss of use/depreciation of value of neighbouring land under section 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973 due to the carrying out of public works.

**Are there any legal implications?**

**Wards Affected:**

Prestwich

**Scrutiny Interest:**

Overview & Scrutiny

---

**TRACKING/PROCESS**

**Chief Executive: Mike Owen**

Chief Executive/ Strategic Leadership Team	Cabinet Member/Chair	Ward Members	Partners
Scrutiny Committee	Cabinet	Committee	Council
	2 March 2016		

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 As Members will be aware in 2009 the Council undertook a major consultation exercise with the people of Prestwich to look at developing a strategy for the long term vitality of Prestwich town centre.
- 1.2 The Strategy included a number of recommendations in both what should be done and how that could be delivered.
- 1.3 One of the key recommendations was the need to deliver improvements to the high street in Prestwich which was deemed as providing an unattractive environment especially for pedestrians.
- 1.4 The high street is dominated by the A56 (Bury New Road) with areas of narrow and uneven pavements and street clutter. The 2009 Prestwich Strategy had intended that the high street improvement could be funded through excess profits generated by a major redevelopment of the Longfield Centre with the development and profit being based on attracting a major new supermarket.
- 1.5 However since the original strategy was produced the economic climate has changed dramatically and despite significant efforts by both the owners of the Longfield Centre and Bury Council it was not possible to attract a supermarket to the site. As such alternate funding options have needed to be considered to deliver the much needed improvement.
- 1.6 By 2013 it was clear that the likelihood of the Longfield Centre redevelopment being able to generate the excess profits was no longer a possibility.
- 1.7 This report sets out the process by which scheme options were developed, it outlines the consultation process, summarises the responses and recommends a preferred scheme for Members' approval. In order to protect the integrity of the tender process financial details are set out in the report contained within the exempt section of the agenda.

## **2.0 CURRENT PROPOSALS**

- 2.1 Officers from the Council were commissioned to undertake updated surveys and produce initial designs based on the approved Prestwich Strategy. A Regeneration Group and Design Group were established which included local Councillors, Council officers and a range of local business owners and residents.
- 2.2 The aim of the High Street Improvement Scheme, reflecting the results of the 2009 consultation, is to:

***“Create a lively high street, attractive to both national and independent operators with a much improved environment”***

This includes:

- Improve the town centre environment for all
- Improve pedestrian movement and accessibility
- Support local businesses
- Attract additional public and private investment
- Reduce the impact of traffic while maintaining traffic flow

2.3 As the design options were being developed it became clear that trying to undertake the improvements on a phased basis would cause considerable disruption and would cost significantly more to deliver than a single phase scheme.

### 3.0 SCHEME DESIGNS

3.1 The design group, supported by Bury Council, continued to work up a range of potential options for the high street improvement from which two proposals were selected and put forward for public consultation.

3.2 Appendix 1 shows the two proposals in plan format.

#### 3.3 Proposal 1

3.3.1 This comprises: single lane traffic in both directions on the A56, with wider pavements, permanent parking bays, new bus lay-bys, bus stop relocation, dedicated cycle lanes and improved public realm.

- **Wider pavements** - on both sides of the road (east and west) to improve pedestrian access and encourage shoppers to browse.
- **Bus stop relocation** – the stop outside 491 Bury New Road (Ellie Magpie) will be combined with the bus stop at 463 Bury New Road (NatWest). Moving the bus stop away from the junction of Fairfax Road will improve traffic flow.
- **Bus lay-bys** – to improve traffic flow and make it easier for passengers to get on and off buses.
- **Pavements extended at key crossing points** – making it easier and safer for pedestrians to cross the road.
- **Improved environment** - trees, new street furniture, better lighting, upgraded paving and seating will redefine pedestrian areas and improve the on-street environment.
- **On-street parking bays** - vehicles will be able to park for up to one hour at any time of day (no return within one hour) in permanent parking bays. Parking in the carriageway will not be allowed, to reduce congestion and improve customer access.
- **Single lane running** - sections of the A56 currently have two lanes of traffic running in both directions. When vehicles park on the inside lane it blocks traffic, causes lane-swapping and adds to congestion. Single lane traffic which is clear of parked vehicles (from junction of Bury New Road/St Mary's Close (Prestwich Church Institute) to the junction of Fairfax Road/Chester Street) will keep traffic moving and ease congestion.
- **Dedicated cycle lanes** – to improve facilities for cyclists in both directions. Cycle lanes will run southbound (towards Manchester) from Fairfax Road to St Marys Close, and northbound (towards M60) from Church Lane to Chester Street.

- **One way system along Clifton Road** – to streamline traffic flows along Clifton Road/Bury New Road while retaining vehicle access for residents. Access onto Bury New Road will be via Chester Street. With one way traffic, the double yellow lines along one side of Clifton Road could be removed to create additional parking. Short stay parking places would also be put in place with limited waiting of up to one hour (no return within one hour).
- **Closure of Warwick Street junction** – to reduce hold-ups on Bury New Road by stopping traffic turning onto Warwick Street. It also allows for the construction of a new bus lay-by (outside NatWest).

### 3.4 Proposal 2

3.4.1 Proposal 2 is similar to proposal 1 however in order to allow space for a northbound (towards M60) peak time combined bus and cycle lane the ability to widen the pavements is significantly reduced.

- **Bus lay-bys** – on the southbound carriage way (towards Manchester) only.
- **Wider pavements and improved pedestrian environment** – pavements on the west side of the high street are only slightly wider than existing widths to allow for a dedicated bus/cycle lane.
- **Permanent parking bays** – on the southbound carriageway only (towards Manchester) with limited waiting of one hour (no return within one hour). Parking bays on both sides of the road is not an option because of the shared northbound bus/cycle lane.
- **Shared northbound bus/cycle lane (towards M60)** – to operate 7-10am and 4-7pm in the **northbound carriageway only**. The shared lane would run from Chapel Street to Clifton Road. When the bus/cycle lane is not in operation, on-street parking with the potential of affecting traffic flow will be allowed with limited waiting of one hour (no return within one hour). There would be short sections of dedicated cycle lane before and after the shared bus/cycle lane. A cycle lane would also run between the Red Lion and St Mary's Close on the southbound carriageway.

3.5 In considering the two proposals considerable thought was put into the potential effect of the regeneration on the traffic flows on the A56 as it passes through Prestwich centre

3.6 The A56 is a very busy road for both local residents and commuters and whilst the high street improvement is not predicated on improving traffic flows increasing traffic congestion within the town centre would not be an acceptable outcome.

3.7 Given the distances between the existing buildings on the high street in order to achieve the wider aims, it is not physically feasible to have two lanes of traffic running in both directions and there are no circumstances under which this could be a viable option.

3.8 The Council has therefore been working closely with Transport for Greater Manchester who have undertaken modelling of the options to predict the

effects of the proposals on traffic not only through the town centre but in terms of the wider local network.

- 3.9 Appendix 2 of the report includes the projections for peak rush hour flows through Prestwich Town Centre both in respect to the existing position and for each of the proposals.

#### **4.0 CONSULTATION PROCESS**

- 4.1 Appendix 3 of the report includes for additional information in respect to the consultation process. Outlined below is a brief overview.
- 4.2 The consultation was promoted via the press, on social media, and launched through a presentation at the Prestwich Township Forum Meeting and with a press release in the local press (12 November), and ran until 30 December 2015.
- 4.3 The consultation process gave people the opportunity to view the proposals on line [www.bury.gov.uk/prestwichhighst](http://www.bury.gov.uk/prestwichhighst) or in person at Prestwich Library. Exhibition stands raising awareness of the consultation were also displayed in high footfall areas in M&S and Tesco through the consultation period
- 4.4 The consultation process included the production of a range of information (available to view both on line and in person) including permanent displays, drop-in sessions and a number of meetings/ presentations.
- 4.5 It is proposed that following Cabinet, information on the approved scheme together with regular updates are provided to stakeholders and other interested parties, via the Prestwich Township Forum and also on the Bury Council website.
- 4.6 Published information will include the overview and summaries of the feedback received as part of the consultation together with reasons why changes have been made to the proposed scheme as a result of the consultation feedback.

#### **5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

- 5.1 As part of the consultation process the Council produced a questionnaire requesting a response on 10 questions and providing the ability to provide comments and feedback.
- 5.2 The Council received 594 fully completed questionnaires together with 504 comments
- 5.3 The questions related specifically to:
- Public realm
  - Crossing points
  - Wider pavements
  - Parking bays
  - Shared bus lane/cycle lanes
  - Dedicated cycle lanes
  - Bus laybys
  - Bus stop relocations
  - Closure of Warwick Street
  - Making Clifton Road one way

- 5.4 Appendix 4 contains additional detail in respect to the questions and the responses received.
- 5.5 In forming the recommendations in this report the Council has considered all of the comments received. Appendix 4 outlines this in greater detail however outlined below in Table 1 is a brief synopsis of the responses to the 10 questions and the recommended Council response.

<b>Question</b>	<b>Overview of consultation responses</b>	<b>Council's response</b>
1.Public Realm	Proposed improvements to the public realm was welcomed by the majority of respondents.	Detailed design will look improving the quality of public realm specifically through improving pavement quality, de-cluttering and inclusion of street trees.
2.Crossing points	Proposed improvements to the existing crossings was generally felt to be important or very important in order to improve pedestrian safety and reduce traffic hold ups.	The Council will review the location of the crossing points and ensure they are at key locations. The Council will look at the traffic light sequencing in order to minimise disruption whilst ensuring safety.
3.Wider pavements	Both pavement widths and quality were felt to be an issue at certain locations along the High Street	The Council will look in detail at those areas where the pavements require widening and those which are already adequate.  Detailed designs will take into account the needs of a wide range of users including those with disabilities and mobility needs as well as those with young children.  The Council will undertake a road safety audit which includes an independent review of the designs from both a user and safety impact.
4.Parking bays	The response as to the need for parking bays was mixed. In general the parking bays shown on the proposals were felt to be too large.	The Council will look to reduce both the total number and the length of the parking bays whilst maintaining access to businesses. This will enable more street trees to improve the visual appearance. Parking will be subject to restrictions (60 minutes maximum parking with no return within 60 minutes)
5.Shared bus / Cycle lanes	This option only relates to proposal 2 and was not well supported.	Proposal 2 will not be taken forward for recommendation
6.Dedicated Cycle lanes	The need to dedicated cycle lanes was not practically well	In order to support the Council's climate change plan it is proposed that the dedicated cycle lanes within



	supported. A lot of the responses related to the detailed design especially around concerns over the proximity of the parking bays adjacent to the cycle lane i.e cyclists would be within the door zone of parked cars.	proposal 1 are retained. The Council will look to address the concerns of respondents including the cycling lobby groups as part of the detailed design.
7. Bus lay-by's	The creation of bus lay-bys as part of the scheme was supported however there were Very few specific comments received	The Council will work up the detailed designs for the laybys
8. Bus Stop Relocation	The proposal to move the bus stop away from the Fairfax Road junction was welcomed. There were some concerns that the proposed location would obstruct traffic as it turned left into Clifton road	The bus stop positioning will be looked at in detail as part of the detailed design. It is thought that moving the bus stop slightly south would assist with traffic turning into Clifton Road.

Table 1: Summary of feedback and responses

- 5.6 The final two questions i.e those relating to the proposals to close Warwick Street and make Clifton Road one way are interrelated and produced the largest response and a local residents group was set up (One Way, No Way).
- 5.7 As a response an additional meeting was held with local residents and those businesses that would be affected most.
- 5.8 As a result of the meeting and representations made as part of the consultation process it is proposed that:
- The closure of Warwick street (to traffic) at the junction with the High street is retained
  - The proposals that would have seen Clifton Road altered to 'one-way only' are not implemented.
  - Detailed design in respect to the precise location of the bus lay-by (in order to reduce potential conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians using and crossing Clifton Road) is included.
- 5.9 In addition to the responses and feedback relating to the 10 questions the Council also received feedback in respect to a wide range of other issues.
- Environmental and Road safety issues
  - Concerns in respect to single lane running. A large proportion of respondents expressed concerns that as a result of single lane running congestion would increase significantly
  - Traffic delays during the works construction period
  - Existing traffic and parking issues, public transport and the Longfield Centre.

5.10 Further details in terms of the consultation feedback and the Council's proposed response is included in Appendix 4 and the projected peak hour traffic travel times as existing and for the proposals are contained in appendix 2)

## **6.0 OPTIONS**

### 6.1 Option Summary

6.1.1 Outlined below are the main options that are available to the Council.

### 6.2. Do nothing

6.2.1 The baseline option is to do nothing.

6.2.2 The do nothing option would not address the current issues of:

- i) Narrow pavements and poor pedestrian and shopping environment.
- ii) Traffic congestion and unsafe driving practices resulting from the discontinuous two lane system (for example the uncontrolled manoeuvres of cars who are looking to park/ return to the traffic and turn into side streets.

6.2.3 Given the results of the recent consultation, the approved masterplan and the Council's own aspirations to deliver sustainable improvements to Prestwich town centre, this option is not felt to be acceptable.

### 6.3 Undertake Proposal 2

6.3.1 The feedback from the consultation was that there was little support for proposal 2 as it did not deliver, to the same extent as option 1, the regeneration benefits and a significant number of the responders (78% did not feel that the proposal of including a shared bus and cycle lane were of importance),

### 6.4 Undertake proposal 1 (without amendments)

6.4.1 Whilst proposal one is the preferred option a number of valid concerns were raised as part of the consultation and as such undertaking this proposal as originally designed would not be in keeping with the results of the consultation.

## **6.5 Recommended Option**

6.5.1. Following the results of the consultation the recommended option is to approve proceeding with undertaking a detailed design based on Proposal 1 with the following amendments resulting from the consultation.

- i) Clifton Road to remain open in both directions. The situation will be monitored for a period of 12 calendar months from completion of the scheme as to its effect on traffic flows, congestion and safety
- ii) The on street (adopted) parking bays to be reduced in length and additional street trees to be included to improve the aesthetic

appearance. Parking within the parking bays to be subject to restrictions of 60 minutes with no return with 1 hour.

- iii) Officers to work with Transport for Greater Manchester to ensure traffic light sequencing is maximised to reduce congestion.

## **7.0 TIMEFRAME AND PROPOSED NEXT STEPS**

- 7.1 Detailed design work will commence following scheme approval. The timescale for completion of the final design will be approximately 4 months.
- 7.2 The table below provides an indicative timeframe for delivering the scheme.

Complete additional surveys and commence consultation on the detailed designs.	June 2016
Complete the detailed design	June 2016
Tenders requested	July 2016
Contract awarded	September 2016
Start on site	October 2016
Completion	June 2017

- 7.3 It is proposed that works will be suspended during the Christmas period.

## **8.0 RISKS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

- 8.1 **Risk** – The costs of delivery may exceed the budget

**Mitigation(a)** – Before final commitment the Council will undertake robust cost estimates and tenders to ensure that the scheme can be delivered within budget.

**Mitigation(b)** – The Council’s Engineering Consultancy will project manage the scheme delivery and will be able to make adjustments to the project to account for risks associated with costs.

**Risk** – The match funding is not received from TfGM

**Mitigation** – The funds have been provisionally allocated to this scheme by TfGM Growth Deal 2 Minor Works Scheme with the allocation being during 2016/17.

**Risk** – The project could be delayed and additional costs incurred to deal with uncharted services.

**Mitigation** – It is normal practice to include provisional sums within the Bill of Quantities to cover any contingencies/unforeseen circumstances arising from the works.

## **9.0 COMMENTS FROM THE HEAD OF STRATEGIC PROCUREMENT AND PROJECT PLANNING**

9.1 The procurement process will be conducted in accordance with Public Contracts Regulations 2015 and designed to ensure the Council achieves best value for money.

## **10.0 CONCLUSIONS AND PROPOSED NEXT STEPS**

10.1 A 'do nothing' option would not deliver the benefits as outlined in the Prestwich masterplan.

10.2 With the prospect of surplus funds from the redevelopment of the Longfield centre no longer being a realistic possibility then in order to realise the scheme benefits the Council will need to undertake a more direct intervention.

10.3 Following consultation the recommended option is that the Council proceeds with the High Street Regeneration scheme as outlined above.

10.4 If the Council approves the recommendations the next step will see Proposal 1 (as amended) taken through to produce a detailed design which will be tendered. On receipt of acceptable tenders the Council will commence with the improvements in summer 2016.

**COUNCILLOR MIKE CONNOLLY  
LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**

**COUNCILLOR TONY ISHERWOOD  
EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ENVIROMENT**

---

### **Background documents:**

Consultation documentation can be viewed by going to [www.bury.gov.uk/prestwichhighst](http://www.bury.gov.uk/prestwichhighst)

### **For further information on the details of this report, please contact:**

Steve Hopley – Regeneration and Estates Manager - Property & Asset Management  
Tel: 0161 253 5991  
Email: [s.hopley@bury.gov.uk](mailto:s.hopley@bury.gov.uk)

Appendix 1 Plans showing Proposals  
Appendix 2 TfGM modelling of peak hour traffic times  
Appendix 3 Consultation Process  
Appendix 4 Consultation analysis of questionnaire and responses plus proposed Council responses

## Appendix 2 – Traffic Flow modelling

The tables below show the current average time it takes to travel during the morning and evening weekday peak rush hours between Hilton Lane and the M60 (for Northbound) and the M60 to Hilton lane(Southbound), and also the projected times for each of the proposals. .

### Existing position

	Morning Peak		Evening Peak	
	Northbound	Southbound	Northbound	Southbound
Average Travel time	3 minutes 7 seconds	5 minutes 26 seconds	9 minutes 30 seconds	6 minutes 24 seconds

### Proposal 1

	Morning Peak		Evening Peak	
	Northbound	Southbound	Northbound	Southbound
Average Travel time	3 minutes 1 seconds	5 minutes 3 seconds	13 minutes 23 seconds	4 minutes 5 seconds

In respect to proposal 1, three of the 4 peak hour travel times are reduced when compared to the existing position.

The exception is the evening northbound(which shows an increase of 3 minutes),

It is anticipated that through changes to the traffic lights sequencing, especially at Fairfax Road this time can be reduced to very close to the existing travel time.

### Proposal 2

	Morning Peak		Evening Peak	
	Northbound	Southbound	Northbound	Southbound
Average Travel time	6 minutes 19 seconds	6minutes 13 seconds	16 minutes 39 seconds	4 minutes 55 seconds

The peak rush-hour times are Monday to Friday 7:30am –8:30am and 5pm to 6pm

### Appendix 3 – Consultation process

- 1 The consultation was promoted via the press, on social media, and launched through a presentation at the Prestwich Township Forum Meeting and with a press release in the local press (12 November).
- 2 Prestwich businesses were emailed via Bury Council's business database and council staff hand delivered posters/flyers to businesses along Bury New Road area and the Longfield Centre.
- 3 The consultation process gave people the opportunity to view the proposals on line [www.bury.gov.uk/prestwichhighst](http://www.bury.gov.uk/prestwichhighst) or in person at Prestwich Library. Exhibition stands raising awareness of the consultation were also displayed in high footfall areas in M&S and Tesco through the consultation period.
- 4 The consultation ran initially until 23 December 2015; however, in response to requests the online consultation was extended until 30 December 2015.
- 5 The consultation information included:
  - Proposed designs,
  - Background information,
  - Frequently asked questions,
  - Dates and times of staffed consultation sessions
  - Questionnaire.
- 6 Responses could be submitted either online or using a printed form submitted at Prestwich Library.
- 7 There were a series of staffed sessions and meetings held throughout the consultation period including:
  - 12 sessions at Prestwich Library – including daytime, evenings and weekends
  - Presentation session in the Longfield Suite (7 Dec)
  - An additional session for resident's and businesses in the Clifton Road/Warwick Street/Chester St area. (21 Dec)
  - Additional meetings with Greater Manchester Cycling Campaign and Red Rose Forest
- 6 Prestwich Councillors also distributed leaflets to promote the presentation session on 7 December and leafleted streets around Clifton Road/ Warwick Street area in advance of the meeting on 21 December.

## **Appendix 4 Consultation analysis of questionnaire and responses plus proposed Council responses**

### 1. Response analysis

1.1 There were a total of 594 fully completed questionnaires comprising of:

- 490 submitted online and
- 104 paper copies.
- 77% (458) were from prestwich residents (This includes those who both live and work or live and own a business in Prestwich)
- 22% (127) of responses were from people who lived elsewhere.
- 6% (33) of the responses were from businesses based in Prestwich.

1.2 In addition we received 18 incomplete paper questionnaires, 2 written and 19 email responses.

1.3 Respondents were invited to include detailed comments. As a result 504 comments were received, the majority covering numerous elements of the proposals in detail.

1.4 Written responses were also been received from:

- Greater Manchester Cycling Campaign
- United Utilities
- Historic England
- Village Greens
- Red Rose Forest
- Liberal Democrat Councillors
- One Way/No Way Residents Group
- Accessibility representative from Prestwich Township Forum

1.5 The comments were read and collated and shared with the Prestwich High Street Consultation Team.

### 2.0 Questionnaire responses

2.1 The questionnaire asked responders to provide their opinion on 10 specific questions relating to the regeneration proposals and to provide any other feedback/ points of clarification that they felt was appropriate.

2.2 Respondents were asked to rate 10 questions on a scale ranging from being 'unimportant' through to being 'very important'.

2.3 Appendix 3 provides a more detailed analysis of each of the questions.

2.4 A brief summary of the 10 questions and responses is outlined in table 2 below:

<b>Question</b>	<b>Minor or Unimportant (%)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important (%)</b>
<u>1.Public Realm</u> How important is it to improve the on-street environment by upgrading paving, improving street furniture and lighting, planting street trees?	30	70
<u>2.Improved Crossing Points</u> How important is it to create crossing points at key locations to improve pedestrian access?	30	70
<u>3. Wider pavements</u> How important is it to widen the pavements where possible to improve the pedestrian environment?	53	47
<u>4. Permanent Parking Bays</u> How important is it to create permanent parking bays in order to improve parking provision and to help streamline traffic flows?	54	46
<u>5. Shared Bus/Cycle Lane</u> How important is it to provide a shared bus/cycle lane (northbound carriageway only) running from Chapel Street to Clifton Road and operating at peak times only?	78	22
<u>6. Dedicated Cycle Lanes</u> How important is it to provide dedicated cycle lanes within the scheme?	60	40
<u>7. Create new Bus Lay-bys</u> How important is it to create bus lay-bys at key locations within the scheme?	39	61
<u>8. Bus Stop Relocation</u> How important is it to re-locate the bus stop currently located outside 491 Bury New Road to 463 Bury New Road to help reduce congestion at the junction of Fairfax Road?	38	62
<u>9. Closure of Warwick Street</u> How important do you think it is to close the Warwick Street junction to help reduce traffic hold ups caused by turning traffic and to allow for a new bus lay-by?	55	45
<u>10. Clifton Road one -way system</u> How important do you think it is to introduce a one way system along Clifton Road to improve traffic flow and provide additional parking?	59	41

*Table 2 – Summary of questionnaire responses*



## 2.3 Key feedback from consultation and proposed responses

### 2.3.1 **Public realm**

#### Comments

- There was a view that the pavements were cluttered with unnecessary signage and other furniture
- Poor quality of the existing pavements was a key feature as well as resolving some existing drainage problems
- Improvements were welcomed, in particular the addition of street trees with requests for increased numbers to be included

#### Response

The Council should look at decluttering the existing street furniture and adding into the scheme additional street trees. The design should look to improve the quality of the pavements and incorporate drainage solutions were possible to resolve existing issues.

### 2.3.2 **Crossing Points**

#### Comments

- There are currently too many traffic lights/crossing points and the sequencing causes congestion and stop/start traffic at peak times
- Cars regularly go through red lights at pedestrian crossings as drivers focus on the crossing/lights further ahead or, due to the number of crossings, fail to notice the sets of lights
- Pedestrian lights are needed at the Fairfax road crossing
- Improvements are required to the drainage at existing crossings

#### Response

The Council will look to review the number of crossings and ensure they are located at key locations

The Council will work closely with TfGM both during the design stage and after implementation to ensure the crossing point designs and locations plus the traffic light sequencing minimises congestion and provide adequate times for pedestrians to cross safely.

### 2.3.3 **Wider Pavements**

#### Comments

- The pavements are an issue for mobility impaired and visually impaired people due to poor quality and uneven levels. Unauthorised street furniture makes this worse-particularly on the west pavement. Could the new scheme include restrictions on specific sections of the pavement to prevent this happening
- The pavements are already wide enough, making them wider would be at the expense of 2 lanes of traffic in each direction
- The problem is street furniture/clutter rather than pavement width
- The pavements are too wide east and too narrow west

- Wider pavements will benefit pedestrians and businesses

### Response

The Council will look in detail at those areas where the pavements require widening and those which are already adequate.

Detailed designs will take into account the needs of a wide range of users including those with disabilities and mobility needs as well as those with young children.

As part of the detailed design the Council will undertake a road safety audit. The audit includes an independent review of the designs from both a user and safety impact.

## 2.3.4 **Parking Bays**

### Comments

A large number and range of comments were received about permanent, on road, parking bays and focused around the following themes

- More off road parking spaces are needed. Some suggested adding a time- restricted multi storey to the existing Fairfax Road Car Park
- Businesses on Bury New road need parking bays for customers, but time restrictions (30 mins to 1 hour) and enforcement are required
- All parking bays should be removed in favour of creating 2 lanes of traffic in each direction to improve traffic flow
- Traffic flows are disrupted as vehicles manoeuvre between lanes to avoid parked/parking cars. Adding more parking bays, even 'permanent parking bays' will still cause delays as vehicles park/pull out
- There is adequate 'off road' parking at the Longfield Centre/Fairfax Road car parks. Rather than parking bays introduce time restrictions on existing car parks e.g. 3-4 hours to prevent them being used by commuters to Manchester

### Response

The Council should look to review the number of car parking spaces being incorporated into the scheme in line with the wider Prestwich parking Strategy.

In response to the feedback the scheme design should look to reduce length of the car parking bays proposed which will itself act to reduce the total number of spaces being provided. The proposed parking bays will be designed to clearly segregate the parking areas from the running lanes which will better regulate the flow of traffic when compared to the current position.

Restrictions on parking within the bays will be introduced. It is proposed this will be a maximum waiting time of 60 minutes with no return within 1 hour. The waiting restrictions can be reviewed following completion of the scheme.

### 2.3.5 **Shared Bus / Cycle lane** (This question only related to proposal 2)

#### Comments

Although some positive comments were received the majority were unresponsive of a shared bus/cycle lane.

- Bus lanes add to congestion as cars swap between lanes and the times are confusing making drivers reluctant to use them outside operating times
- Other towns/cities e.g. Liverpool have removed bus lanes, and Bury Council has suspended them on some routes, so why are they being considered in this scheme?
- There is insufficient demand for a bus lane; the majority of bus services to/from Manchester use the bus lane along Bury Old Road
- A shared bus cycle lane is dangerous for cyclists
- The length of the bus/cycle lane is too short to be of benefit
- Comprehensive comments were also received from the Greater Manchester Cycle Forum. They rejected Proposal 2 on the basis that the plan for a bus/cycle lane contained 'low-quality, time-limited, intermittent provision for cycling'.

#### Response

Given low level of support in respect to Proposal 2 then this proposal should be rejected.

### 2.3.6 **Dedicated cycle lanes**

#### Comments

Of the comments received many focused on the design and that the proposed cycle lane:-

- is unsafe as it is not segregated from the traffic
- is intermittent and in isolation of other routes, coordination is required with other local authorities to improve provision
- will not encourage current non-cyclists to start cycling
- would be improved by removing parking bays to create the cycle lanes

Some felt that cyclists should be encouraged to use existing cycle routes:

- Instead of introducing cycle lanes sign alternative routes through Prestwich e.g. Prestwich Clough and Rectory Lane
- Detailed comments were also submitted by the Greater Manchester Cycling Campaign(GMCC):
  - These are not dedicated cycle lanes as buses/cars will drive over them
  - The proposed layout of 1.5m cycle ways next to parking bays will result in people cycling in the 'door zone'
  - Instead place the cycle lane adjacent to the footway and introduce a buffer zone between the cycle lane, parking bays and bus lay-bys

#### Response

Whilst the A56 is not the designated cycle route, the Prestwich High Street Regeneration scheme aims to support Bury Council's Climate Change Plan by

promoting sustainable travel. This means including cycling provision in new schemes where ever possible.

The Council has also looked at proposals put forward by GMCC which would see the cycle lane separated from the main road. The additional cost of implementing the proposal would however be in the region of £200,000. In addition the GMCC proposal would also restrict the ability to safely incorporate parking bays into the scheme and more importantly it would significantly reduce the width available for the footway improvements.

The recommendation is therefore that the cycle lane remains as per Proposal One, with the Council taking into account, as part of the detailed design, how to incorporate the cycle lane safely.

### 2.3.7 **Bus lay-by's**

#### Comments

This is an area that attracted relatively few comments. Respondents felt that bus lay-bys

- were welcomed in order to allow the traffic to flow more quickly
- may not be needed with the introduction of smart ticketing which would reduce delays
- do not offer improvements for passengers but instead prioritise car users

and

- An additional bus lay-by outside the Red Lion was proposed

#### Response

The Council will work with TfGM in respect to the detailed design of the bus lay-bys.

### 2.3.8 **Bus stop relocation**

#### Comments

- The proposal to move the bus stop away from the Fairfax Road junction was welcomed
- The new location (463 Bury New Road) was questioned as many felt this would obstruct traffic turning left into Clifton Road. (also mentioned in relation to Q9/Q10). Suggested locations included opposite the bus stop on the Southbound carriageway. (No 449 Bury New Road)

#### Response

The bus stop positioning would be looked at in detail as part of the detailed design however it is thought that moving the bus stop slightly south would assist with traffic turning into Clifton Road.

### 2.3.9 Closure of Warwick Street and making Clifton Road one way

#### Comments

Questions 9 and 10 generated numerous comments/suggestions which were submitted via the questionnaire, via local residents' group (One Way, No Way) and through an additional meeting held on 21 December with local residents and business most affected.

The comments covered the following

- Changes will have a negative impact on access to/ from the surrounding residential streets and businesses as vehicles will have to use the already congested Chester St junction
- There is already additional traffic from housing developments and from KFC, with vehicles using Dashwood/Kingswood for u-turns
- This will increase traffic using 'rat runs' in the residential streets, particularly Dashwood Road as vehicles try to avoid the Chester St /Fairfax Road junction
- A one way system is not needed. Issue is caused by vehicles parking illegally e.g. near Nat West Bank. Needs enforcement not road closures
- Adding parking bays on Clifton Road will cause parking issues for residents with people parking to access businesses on Bury New Road

Those who supported the proposals felt that these changes would also require

- Traffic calming measures E.g mini roundabouts at Clifton Road/Gardner Street junction
- Changes to the sequencing of the lights at Chester Road to allow more cars to exit at peak times
- Measures to ensure delivery vehicles have adequate access to businesses on Warwick Street/Greengate Lane. (Large vehicles are currently unable to turn left out of Chester Street)
- That Warwick Street remains accessible to cyclists
- Residents parking permits should be issued for any parking bays on Clifton Road

#### Response

The modelling of the proposals by Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) included simulations for traffic accessing and egressing onto all of the side streets serviced off the A56 and included modelling of the effects on the immediate local network.

The modelling showed how the changes (specifically closing Warwick and making Clifton 1 way) would impact on traffic movements in the local area and the key junctions. The modelling however assumed no changes to traffic light sequences.

The TfGM modelling indicated no significant increase on Clifton Road, Chester St and Kingswood Road as a result of the proposals

However following consideration of the comments submitted through the consultation process (including those raised at the public meetings by effected residents/ business), it is proposed that the changes that would see

Clifton Road altered to 'one-way only' is not to be implemented. Detailed design is required in respect to the precise location of the bus lay-by (in order to reduce potential conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians using and crossing Clifton Road).

It is recommended however that the effect of this be monitored for a period of 12 months post completion to assess the effects of the change on traffic flow, congestion and safety.

It is proposed that the closure of Warwick Street will still go ahead. Careful consideration in respect to the design as to the length of Warwick Street that is to be closed and the public realm that will be put in place to be undertaken.

### **3.0 General feedback**

#### **3.1 Environmental concerns and road safety issues**

##### Comments

- The scheme Lacks of information about current and possible increase in pollution levels that may arise as a result of proposed changes
- The scheme may create an increase in traffic jumping the lights and using side streets as rat runs
- There is no evidence of a Stage 1 safety audit

##### Response

The risk of increased pollution levels and safety were mentioned in the responses quite frequently.

It should be noted that the scheme is not designed to either encourage or increase the capacity of the A56 as it passes through Prestwich and as such should be relatively neutral in respect to pollution.

That said this is one of the factors that will be taken into account in the scheme design and issues around traffic light sequencing.

In terms of road safety and rat running the detailed design will seek to maximise the safety of all road and pavement users especially in respect to the design of the crossing points, bus and car laybys and the cycle lanes. Modelling of the proposals did not indicate any significant changes to the side streets being used as rat runs.

#### **3.2 Single Lane Running**

A large proportion of the comments received were concerned about the plans to create single lane running in each direction

Respondents thought that the proposals will create increased congestion resulting in:-

- a negative impact on traffic flow along this main arterial route
- higher levels of pollution
- even more 'rat-runs' as drivers try to avoid Bury New Road
- a negative impact on Prestwich businesses as shoppers will be unable to access the town centre

Also included were suggestions for:

- 4 lane running/double yellow lines to move traffic through Prestwich as quickly as possible would be preferable
- Bury New Road should be kept as a main commuter route with investment instead focused around the redevelopment of the Longfield Centre

Other comments of note:

- The proposal to regenerate Prestwich High Street and reduce the dominance of the traffic and improve the environment for other users was welcomed
- Some saw difficulties in introducing a scheme which would bring benefits to all stakeholders
- Some felt that any proposals to change Bury New Road should also consider the impact on Bury Old Road

### Response

The scheme is not being designed to increase the capacity for traffic to pass through the town centre but to improve the environment for pedestrians/residents/shoppers users of Prestwich Town centre.

Modelling undertaken by TfGM does not support the concerns raised in respect to an overall increase in congestion. Properly designed/controlled traffic lanes together with reducing the number of crossing points and the re-sequencing of traffic lights should act to reduce congestion.

Due to the width of Bury New Road (i.e the distance from shop front to shop front including the footpath and road) it is not possible to provide two lanes in either direction without reducing some of the existing footways to sub-standard widths. The associated costs of diverting services (gas, water, telecoms) in these footways would also considerably increase the cost of the scheme.

It is believed that two lanes of traffic in either direction would not benefit the centre of Prestwich but would likely encourage more through-traffic.

## **3.3 Traffic Delays caused by works on the Scheme**

### Comments

There was some concern about the negative impact on traffic while the construction works take place. Businesses on Bury New Road, particularly those relying on passing trade were concerned that their premises be accessible, especially during key shopping periods.

### Response

Inevitably the works will create disruption for local residents, businesses and road users. The Council will endeavour to keep this to a minimum.

The intention is to implement the work in sections in order to cause the least impact on traffic as is possible. Where possible works will also be planned to reduce the impact on businesses trading on Bury New Road and keep access open, especially at key times.

Despite the scale of the works traffic will be able to continue using Bury New Road throughout the construction phase and the Council will ensure that there is always a point of contact to discuss any problems or to answer enquiries. During office hours, a Council officer in the Engineering Consultancy will be the first point of contact for enquiries.

### **3.4 Current Traffic and Parking Issues**

#### Comments

The consultation highlighted specific areas of concern which respondents felt were already an issue in particular

- Traffic hold-ups caused by traffic turning right off Bury New Road. In particular :-
- Church Lane
- Right turn into Aldi- issue made worse by on road parking bays
- St Mary's Road- issue made worse with parking along Bury New Road near St Marys' Park
- Parking issues on residential streets has increased- e.g. Rectory lane
- Parking on Chester St and near the Post Office already causes congestion

#### Response

The Prestwich Parking strategy aims to address parking issues and provision in Prestwich and therefore feedback received via the Prestwich High Street Consultation will be incorporated into the strategy.

In some cases measures to address these issues are already being taken:-

- Introduction of double yellow lines on Bury New Road at St Marys Park
- Process underway to remove the parking bays located opposite the entrance to Aldi

### **3.5 Wider Issues**

#### Comment

- The poor quality of the Longfield Centre and buildings on Bury New Road were seen as a major problem. Some saw this as the priority in order to improve the visual amenity and also the quality of businesses
- Money would be better spent on improving the Longfield Centre, rather than Bury New Road

#### Response

Extensive consultation was undertaken for the 'Prestwich Regeneration Strategy'. This identified the improvement of Prestwich High Street as a key priority for Prestwich, with the potential to act as a catalyst in regenerating both the High Street and the wider Prestwich area/town centre.

The redevelopment of the Longfield Centre remains a key project within the wider Prestwich Regeneration Strategy. The Longfield Shopping centre is privately owned and the Council own the Library, Longfield Suite and car park area. The Council have been in discussion with the current owners who



have been actively pursuing redevelopment options. However current market and financial conditions have so far prevented a scheme being brought forward. The council will continue this dialogue with the owners to who are supportive of the High Street Regeneration proposals and will explore all possible options and opportunities.

### **3.6 Public Transport**

#### Comments

- Poor bus service along Bury New Road resulting in more people using their cars.
- Affordability of tram tickets

#### Response

The Council will forward these comments to TfGM who have responsibility for public transport in Greater Manchester.