Report for Resolution

Report to	Norwich Highways Agency Committee 24 July 2008	Item 12
Report of	Head of Transportation and Landscape	
Subject	Aylsham Road Pedestrian Refuges	

Purpose

To inform Members of the results of the public consultation carried out on a proposal to install three pedestrian refuges between Penn Grove and St Martin's Road.

Recommendations

That the Committee approves the construction of the three pedestrian refuges, with associated amendments to waiting restrictions as shown on plan number 08-HD-056-07, attached as Appendix 1.

Financial Consequences

The Local Transport Plan budget has allocated £40,000 for this scheme.

Strategic Objective/Service Priorities

The report helps to achieve the corporate objective to ensure the City has a clean and healthy environment and the service plan priority of implementing the Local Transport Plan.

Contact Officers

Keith Duncan, Technical Officer	01603 213455
Joanne Deverick, Transportation Manager	01603 213430

Background Documents

Consultation material

Background

- 1. For many years residents have been asking for improved crossing facilities at various points on Aylsham Road between Bakers Road and Press Lane. The majority of representations have come from residents of Edmund Bacon Court and Press Lane.
- 2. Under the pedestrian crossing assessment method adopted by the City Council this length of Aylsham Road is No. 2 on the pedestrian crossing priority list.
- 3. The residents of Edmund Bacon Court in particular are anxious to see a signalled crossing in the area. However there is no clear desire line for pedestrians as they could want to be crossing to both the north and the south of the development, and the numbers of pedestrians involved is low. For this reason pedestrian refuges have been proposed, as they can be introduced at 3 locations for half the cost of one signalled crossing. They will also have the added benefit of generally reducing vehicle speeds.

Public Consultation

- 4. A letter and plan showing the proposed positions of the three refuges was sent to approximately 85 local residents as well as various interest groups. The proposed layout is shown as Appendix 1.
- 5. Four responses were received. Two in support of the scheme and two raising concerns regarding access to off street parking and reduced on street parking that would be caused by the necessary introduction of double yellow lines adjacent to the new refuges, see Appendices 2,3,4,5.
- 6. Cllr Gihawi also asked that the concerns of the residents at No's 94a & b were given due consideration.

Assessment

- 7. It should be noted that although there are concerns by nos. 70a, 94a and 94b regarding reduced on street parking it is considered that the benefits of the pedestrian crossing facilities that will serve the wider community, outweigh the disadvantages of a few individuals no longer being able to park on the highway directly outside their property. The proposed positions of the refuges were a result of strategic assessment of the highway layout ensuring minimal adverse affect on traffic flow and vehicle access to properties. All but the largest of vehicles will be able to pass any bus waiting at the bus stops.
- 8. The residents have been asked to suggest alternative locations in the immediate vicinity, but to date no response has been received.

Conclusion

9. It is suggested that the pedestrian refuges are implemented as advertised

Appendix 1





Residents of 94a and 94b Aylsham Road Norwich Norfolk NR3 2HZ

13th May 2008

Dear Keith.

Thank you for the letter outlining details for the proposed pedestrian crossing outside our properties (reference 08.HD.056). And although we realise that safety for pedestrians is a priority we do unfortunately have reservations about the size and the position of the proposed crossing which leaves us with many questions with regards to effect it will have.

As you are aware Aylsham Road is a very busy arterial route in and out of the city, especially during the rush hour, which surely needs to keep traffic flowing. Assuming you agree with this statement this brings us to our first of several reservations.

As the road layout is at the moment we (the residents) are able to park our cars safely outside our houses without disturbing the flow of the traffic. Taking into consideration that there is a Bus Stop on either side of the road and 2 junctions, one of which serves a busy medical centre, this cannot be a bad thing. Putting a pedestrian refuge in this location would not only leave us with nowhere to park our vehicles safely but it would also severely restrict the flow of the traffic (due to the width of the carriageway being reduced) when the buses stop to pick up and let off passengers. This would surely have a big effect on traffic congestion, especially during busy times.

2

1.

If the proposed refuge was to be put at this location where would we be able to park our vehicles. Although we appreciate that both properties have driveways the complications involved for us to gain access in and out of our driveways, especially during busy periods, would be massive. And if it was not possible to safely gain access to our driveways we assume that it would not be possible to park on Aylsham Road (between our properties and the Press Lane junction). And seeing as both families consist of young children, six boys aged between 2 and 7, gaining access to our properties safely is of paramount importance to us. The parking situation is bad enough around this area so if you were not to allow vehicles to park in the area between our properties and Press Lane it would make the situation even worse. There is a high possibility that our driveways would be inaccessible during the day leaving us with no alternative but to park elsewhere in an area where parking spaces can be at a premium. And with reference to 94a the location of the island would make it very difficult to turn left out of the driveway in one motion. This could be dangerous during busy times. This also causes a problem if reversing into the driveway if facing northbound. The situation is bad enough at this moment in time with the road layout as it is. Putting the island at that location would mean that it would be impossible to reverse the car into the driveway in one motion. It would also mean that the turning circle of the vehicle would encroach into the 'citybound' carriageway therefore making this manoeuvre dangerous, especially at busy times. With reference to 94b the position of the refuge would make it very difficult to turn right out of the driveway in one motion. During busy periods of traffic this manoeuvre would, in our opinion, be unable to be undertaken safely. These examples only reinforce our views that our driveways would become inaccessible during the day and at busy times. At the moment we keep our vehicles parked on the road during the day. We find this is the safest option.

Having seen the proposal for the traffic refuge we have reservations about how safe these are once you are actually standing on there with traffic flowing either side of you. And again during the morning rush hour, which is around the time when parents are taking their children to school, the traffic would be at a premium. We are not confident that a refuge of this size would give adequate protection to families like us who have to use that refuge to cross Aylsham Road with young children (including a pushchair). There would also have to be a lot of reliance on the oncoming coming traffic slowing down to let the pedestrians cross.

We also fear that through ongoing experiences cyclists will be encouraged to use the pavement outside our properties at busy times if there is a queue of traffic waiting for someone to turn into Penn Grove. At the moment the northbound cyclists will come off the Aylsham Road (at the Press Lane junction) and cycle on the pavement past our properties until they are past the queue of traffic at Penn Grove. They will then get back onto the road. This also applies to `citybound` cyclists who use the pavement to gain access to Press Lane and Stone Road. We are not against cyclists demounting their cycles and gaining access to the junctions in a safe manner but after talking to the Police Community Support Officers about this issue I was informed that Aylsham Road is one of many `hotspots` around this area for cyclists riding on the pavement. This pedestrian refuge would cause the traffic to come to a standstill at regular intervals (due to the width of the road being reduced not allowing traffic to flow

4

3

when the buses stop) giving the cyclists more inclination to put our families and other pedestrians at risk by cycling on the pavement. This is a big problem at the moment. Our children should be able to walk from our house to the car on the pavement without fear of getting hit by a cyclist. This risk happens on a regular basis.

The parking spaces on Aylsham Road (between our properties and Press Lane) are not only used by us and our friends and family they are also used by a number of people who live around this area. They are also used by people who attend the medical centre etc. Getting rid of these spaces will again make life harder for the people who want to park in this area.

I hope you take into consideration the above reservations that we have about your proposals for the pedestrian refuge. Again I must stress that we are all in favour of a safer environment for pedestrians but we, as families with young children, have talked about the issues as stated above and we would be grateful if we could be involved in furthér consultations about this scheme. Please feel free to contact me (Paul Hawes) on Or alternatively you can contact me by

emau at Any feedback provided by you or Norwich City Council concerning this matter would be much appreciated.

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter. We await your response with interest.

Yours Sincerely

(94a)

And

5

Page 1 of 2

Deverick, Joanne

Subject: FW: Aylsham Road Pedestrian Plan

From: Eric Steward [mailto:crienteward] Online Sent: 20 May 2008 20:40 To: Duncan, Keith Cc: Self Subject: re: Aylsham Road Pedestrian Plan

Attention of Keith Duncan

Hello Keith.

Re: your ref: 08.HD.056 Aylsham Road Draft Proposal Pedestrian Crossings Consultation Plan.

Thank you for your letter and the opportunity to comment on this proposal and I believe in being constructive rather than negative and write as follows.

Having suggested a crossing by the pharmacy at Penn Grove as early as 2002 whilst commenting on changes to waiting restrictions at Aylsham Road - Waterloo Park Avenue I received a copy of planning decisions that a crossing was 7th on a list of 18 but due budget restrictions would take some 2 - 3 years before implementation, I am delighted that something is now being considered.

I have also mentioned the subject of crossings with Steve Morphew in conversation whilst opposing the T-Mobile Mast application outside the Edward VII public house in 2008.

In general I support the proposals but with some reservations.

Crossing 1 - an ideal place which causes little disruption to residents

Crossing 2 - whilst not wishing to sound 'not in my backyard syndrome' this is not a very suitable location. Residents at 70A and 77 would have extreme difficulty turning right out of drives and to a lesser extent Nos. 72 and 79 would also be restricted. The yellow lines which stop at the gateway to 70A would by necessity have to be extended causing less resident/visitor stopping.

Crossing 3 - for traffic leaving the city this crossing would appear over the brow of a hill, traffic turning left from St. Martins Road would be concentrating on traffic flow from their right, not looking to see pedestrians attempting to cross.

I therefore offer the following suggestion for consideration:

Crossing 1 - leave as proposed. Crossing 2 and 3 - delete from proposals

Insert a crossing 2 midway between suggested 2 and 3 positions. This would not interfere with access to and from the Edward VII, nor the temporary car sales, the site of which currently has outline residential planning approval, would be plainly visible for all traffic both entering and leaving the city, would still give acceptable crossing for Edward Bacon Court.

There would be a saving on costs over the original scheme which could be used to upgrade either crossing to lights, or be used on schemes elsewhere in the city.

Trusting you find the above comments useful.

I would be happy to put this to any consultative meeting should it be acceptable, my daytime telephone number is 01603

02/07/2008

or mar

Page 1 of 1

Deverick, Joanne

Subject: FW: Aylsham Rd changes

From: Cameo Photographic Ltd [mailto:info@cameophotographic.co.uk] Sent: 12 May 2008 09:49 To: Duncan, Keith Subject: Aylsham Rd changes

CAMEO PHOTOGRAPHIC Ltd.

58-68 Aylsham Road

Norwich

NR3 2HE

01603

@cameophotographic.co.uk

www.cameophotographic.co.uk

12 May 2008

Your Ref. 08HD056

Proposed Pedestrian Refuge (3)

Dear Mr Duncan,

Thank you for informing us of your intentions, may I make the following comments.

There has been a fatal accident at this spot and numerous smaller collisions nearly all involving traffic pulling out into the Aylsham Road.

I contacted the Highways dept only a fortnight ago, in regard to the closeness of the double yellows to the entrance of the British Legion. Mainly elderly drivers exit here and have no visibility up the Aylsham road due to vehicles being allowed to park almost up to the junction. We helped clear up once again the debris from another collision only last week.

With two bus stops at this point any effort to slow the traffic here would be welcomed.

Yours sincerely

R J Clarke

LMPA. LBIPP.

Reg No. 5552482

Vat No. 324 5716 64

02/07/2008

Deverick, Joanne

From:Page, Colin [PageC@norfolk.pnn.police.uk]Sent:13 May 2008 12:03To:Duncan, KeithSubject:Aylsham Road refuges

Dear Mr. Duncan,

I refer to your letter dated 7th May 2008, regarding three new central refuges on Aylsham Road, Norwich, and have to inform you that the police support the proposals.

Regards

Colin Page, Traffic Management Officer, Norfolk Police, Bethel Street, Norwich, NR2 1NN. Tel.no. 01603 276662 Fax.no. 01603 276704

It takes'24 trees to produce 1 ton of office paper! Think... is it really necessary to print this email?

This e-mail carries a disclaimer

Go here to view Norfolk Constabulary Disclaimer

02/07/2008