

## Chadwick Dam

- 4.2.3. This scheme generated the most feedback, with 32 questionnaires completed. This may reflect the fact that the scheme had a well-developed preliminary design, and that it was made clear that there would be no further consultation, other than any legal consultation associated for example with traffic orders.
- 4.2.4. A total of 22 (69%) of the responses indicated some level of support, including 6 that were clearly strongly in favour of the proposals. A further 9 (28%) indicated no preference or identified a specific issue. Only 1 response (3%) indicated an objection to the proposals.
- 4.2.5. Specific issues, comments and themes identified:
- Local Environment:
    - A wide range of comments and suggestions were made in relation to the local environment, support expressed as follows:
      - Rest areas, including seating and / or picnic tables – 8 responses.
      - Concerns about potential vandalism of new infrastructure – 4 responses.
      - Clearing vegetation to improve visibility, safety and security – 1 response.
      - To develop a nature trail within the park – 1 response.
      - Provision of additional bins within the park – 6 responses.
      - Additional artwork within the park – 1 response.
      - To ensuring that the scheme does not adversely affect local wildlife – 1 response.
      - New or improved vegetation and tree planting – 3 responses.
      - Highlighting the importance of maintenance of new infrastructure – 3 responses.
      - Coordination with BIG Local in delivering a sensory garden – 5 responses.
      - New play equipment within the park – 2 responses for and 1 against.
      - Measures to reduce vehicular speeds on the local road network – 3 responses.
      - Highlighting a local drainage issue near to the Lake View park access – 2 responses.
      - Improved parking for disabled people – 1 response.
      - Improved residential parking controls, in relation to the hospital and hospital staff, drop-off and pick-up for the local schools, and in relation to visibility and safety at the junction of Mossley Road and Rose Hill Road – 3 responses.
      - A suggestion to consider the provision of defibrillators in more rural areas – 1 response.
      - Protected space for the westbound bus stop on Mossley Road – 3 responses.
  - Access Controls:
    - Eight responses mentioned access controls. Six were supportive of improved accessibility and / or a reduced level of control to promote increased use, including one that mentioned specific support for the use of bollards. However, five expressed concerns about potential motorbike use within the park.
  - Resurfacing Options:
    - Four responses indicated specific support for the proposed resurfacing scheme. Two responses were against the use of bitmac surfacing within the park, one preferred granular materials because of the rural, parkland setting, and one that did not agree that the scope of work within the park was required.
    - Seven responses indicated concerns with surface water / slippery surfaces. The majority mentioned surface water and ice but there was also mention of steep gradients and leaf litter exacerbating the problem.
    - Two responses mentioned the possibility of making improvements to alternative access points to / from the Ridge Hill residential area.
  - Lighting:
    - Eight responses were broadly supportive of the proposed use of lighting on paths within the park, with four expressing specific support for the use of ground mounted, solar stud type lighting.

- Three responses raised concerns about the nature of the route through the park being unsuitable or unsafe after dark. One of these responses specifically noted that the ground mounted solar studs would not be sufficient to encourage greater use at night.
- Signs:
  - Only three responses mentioned signs. They were all supportive of improved signage for way-finding, and one supported signs being used to encourage considerate behaviours and the sharing of space for all users.
- Proposed Crossing of Mossley Road:
  - Seven responses were recorded in relation to the proposed crossing of Mossley Road. Six were supportive of the proposed new crossing, to improve access and safety. One was against the crossing, noting a concern that the crossing could increase congestion.
- Other comments:
  - A number of alternative suggestions were made in relation to improvements elsewhere on the network. These have been recorded for future consideration.
  - One response indicated the importance of promotion in advertising the available routes in and around Stamford Park to try and ensure that people can make best use of this area for walking, cycling, leisure and fitness.
  - One response indicated an alternative route using the old alignment of Mellor Road on the west side of the park.
  - One response indicated that it would be good to have a regular PCSO presence in the park to make people feel safer.

## Hill Street

- 4.2.6. This scheme generated 7 specific responses. This was considered to be low given that the scheme had a well-developed preliminary design, and that it was made clear that there would be no further consultation, other than any legal consultation associated for example with traffic orders. It is possible that this is because the scheme only has a limited impact on residential properties.
- 4.2.7. A total of 5 (71%) of the responses indicated some level of support, including 1 that was clearly strongly in favour of the proposals. A further 2 (29%) indicated no preference or identified a specific issue. There were no objections raised.
- 4.2.8. Specific issues, comments and themes identified:
- Local Environment:
    - One response indicated that improvements to the local environment would be appreciated, but there were no specific suggestions made.
  - Prioritising Space for Walking and Cycling:
    - Two responses identified the importance of segregation between cyclists and vehicular traffic and one response identified safety concerns associated with some of the existing local routes.
    - Two responses identified that the impacts on parking and loading spaces would need to be carefully considered to minimise impacts to residents and local businesses.
  - Proposed Crossing of Stockport Road:
    - One response identified support for the crossing of Stockport Road. [Does this sound weak (only 1!)?]
    - Five of the responses talked about the importance of wider linkages, including towards Guide Bridge, Portland Basin and local industrial heritage sites and to the local canal network.
  - Signs:
    - One response referenced the importance of signing local routes and destinations, including the local canal network and Portland Basin.