

MEMO

TO	Harberton Parish Council Devon County Council	FROM	Matthew Coleman
DATE	16 June 2023	CONFIDENTIALITY	Public
SUBJECT	Harbertonford Zebra Crossing – Responses to questions raised at consultation		

1. Local observation or a desk exercise?

- Did the engineers who drew up the plans actually visit the area before drafting their plan?*

The proposal put forward has been put together following a combination of site visits, a topographical survey and desk-based exercises including swept path analysis. This also includes a site visit from a road safety audit team for the initial assessment.

2. Can there be more than one crossing?

- The village would benefit from additional crossings, three in total. One near the garage and one at the foot of Moreleigh Road. These points are where people ACTUALLY cross the road to get to the shop, school, home, village hall, park or footy field and back. Did the engineers who drew up the plans actually visit the area before drafting their plan?*

There is currently no plan to install additional crossings within the village. With a single crossing location, the objective is to place this at a location that will provide the best overlap of safety, convenience and accessibility needs.

3. Could there be traffic lights/pelican crossing?

- Can there be pedestrian crossing lights there too? Ie traffic lights?*
- Have traffic lights been considered?*
- The only viable option that would work is leave the crossing where it is so that the most people use it and make it a pelican crossing with traffic lights that is really well signed on the blind side of the bridge so that all traffic slows down.*

With the improvement in visibility, this proposed location should work well as a zebra crossing, allowing pedestrians to cross without the delay of having to wait for signals to change each time.

A signalised pedestrian crossing would cost more to install due to the additional infrastructure and hardware required and hence DCC spending in the village would be in a “stricter” hierarchy of need list. There is not evidence that a zebra crossing is not working and therefore it is difficult to justify the need or benefit attained by installing a signal-controlled crossing. DCC’s current parameter for identifying as a high priority site for safety improvement (Casualty Severity Reduction scheme) spending is 5 collisions within 50m of a site over a 5-year period.

4. Can there be more road markings?

Can we add reflective horizontal SLOW lines or midline frogs' eyes in the lead up on both sides to the crossing please? this way the crossing's shifting away from its long-standing place since 2003 will be really clocked by motorists. Without the extra visibility markers on the road to highlight the new priority....I fear that the shift isn't far enough to 'register' with road users who are habitually used to the crossing at the pub door and across to the tarmac verge. Make the move VERY obvious and without a doubt graphically 'underlined' in any way possible as the road is a canvas to draw people's attention to it.

New road markings will be installed with some reflectivity. The zig-zags on the approaches to the crossing can be installed further in advance than as currently shown to provide more advanced warning of the crossing. NEW ROAD LAYOUT AHEAD red and white signs can be installed for a 3-month period after the scheme to support the bedding in of a new crossing location.

5. Can there be more traffic calming or measures to reduce speeds?

- *Any other interventions that can encourage or enforce slower vehicle through the village should be fully explored.*
- *Would Another "slow down" speed recognition sign at the start of the village Totnes bound not be a good idea.*
- *The electronic sign north of the crossing has definitely improved speeding in the village, one on the north would also help*

Speed survey data from 2019 and 2021 both provide evidence that the 30mph speed limit is complied with. There are already a number of speed awareness and visual traffic calming features that will be retained following resurfacing works to maintain the existing compliance. These include the yellow bars to warn drivers of their speed on the village approaches, speed roundels on the village gateways, SLOW markings and electronic warning sign for the crossing.

Any request to implement a lower speed limit will need to be considered by DCC's traffic policy team. A lower speed limit will need to be "self-enforcing". This means physical traffic calming features that provide horizontal or vertical deflection to slow traffic such as ramps or gateways are generally used when a disproportionate amount of traffic is not compliant.

6. Could cameras/speed cameras be installed as well?

- *Could there be a camera installed too, to prevent any cars from not stopping.*
- *A speed camera would slow the traffic down.*
- *Can they install a speed camera*

This is a police enforcement matter. It is understood from the response provided by the Police Operations Manager for Safety Camera Units in 2019 that as the speed limit is generally complied with, and no serious collisions having occurred, this currently does not support prioritising this site for funding to provide speed enforcement measures.

7. Can speed limits be reduced?

- *Not specifically but I would like to know why the 30mph speed limit cannot start earlier (as it does in halwell) and why there cannot be a 20mph speed limit in the village (as there is in halwell). It is a larger village that's halwell with many more people crossing the road as the main road cuts through the village.*
- *Please can we reconsider a lower speed limit through village and surrounding roads? Cars race through and do not stop. I live on woodland Road and cats race down there too when it should be 20mph max.*
- *Given the constraints placed upon them I think they have made a decent fist of it, but I do question the refusal to implement 20 mph speed limits on main A roads. This is clearly not the case in other counties. Glastonbury for example has a 20mph speed limit on the A361 throughout the approaches and whole town which is very effective. Bristol is pretty much 20mph everywhere.*

Any request to reduce the speed limit needs to be made through DCC's Traffic Policy Team. There is a current rollout of new 20mph schemes for communities that have an interest in implementing this, with requests made by the local council. Applications are assessed to ensure communities that would benefit most from lower speeds are prioritised.

8. Can pavements be widened?

- *Any opportunity to widen the pavement running past the old pub building would be much appreciated. Cars travel very quickly along the road at that point and you can't fit an adult/child side by side on the pavement. It's also the main walking route up to the school*
- *Can you also widen the pavement outside the pub?*
- *Is there any more you can do to widen pavements more to ensure pavements are as wide and safe as possible?*

The section between Old Road and the crossing is where the existing footway along the main road is most narrow, whilst also expected to have the greatest demand due to the crossing. It is not proposed to undertake any further widening to existing footways other than as shown on the alternative crossing proposal drawing. Due to the highway alignment, unreasonable land acquisition requirements and limited width, additional widening is constrained, but the proposal improves the width as much as physically possible.

9. Concerns about impact of installing the crossing at the bus stop

- *How will it work when there is a bus present? Will it be a case of edging out and hoping cars coming from the garage side see you in time?*

Whilst a bus is waiting at the bus stop, there will be a short period of inter-visibility between southbound traffic and pedestrians wishing to cross from the west side. If wishing to use the crossing during this time, there will be no change to visibility for traffic travelling north bound when stepping onto the crossing to activate it. Pedestrians will only need to cross part of the northbound lane before becoming visible to southbound traffic, showing drivers that the crossing is active. They would need to be cautious that drivers are stopping before walking into the southbound lane section of the crossing. Although not ideal, this risk can be managed more easily than the existing situation

that requires users to step onto the crossing without reasonably being able to assess vehicular proximity and driver intention, due to permanently reduced visibility. It has been assessed that relocation to a location providing full visibility would render it not being in the desire line, implying an increase in the likelihood of foot crossings of the carriageway in informal locations.

10. Concerns/comments about impact of loss of parking in the Woodland Road splay

- *Also, I do have concerns over the parking at the entrance of Woodland Road. Currently cars park everywhere there. In the proposal, some of the road being taken to create the safe crossing. There will be no room for cars to park. I see there will be double yellow lines but will this be enforced? Also where are you proposing these cars will park?*
- *I assume the car space is included so not to lose valuable parking spaces in the village, however it's location does feel a bit incongruous right next to the crossing. Could the bus shelter and parking location be swapped so there is more parking provision in the car park?*

The proposal seeks to formalise a parking space as uncontrolled parking already occurs in this area and can be incorporated within the layout for little additional cost. Reviewing and revising the existing car parking and shelter would add significant cost, risking making the proposed crossing scheme financially unviable.

11. Concerns/comments about potential congestion/reduction of traffic flow at Woodland Road

- *Please also consider the flow of traffic on Woodland Road. It is single track along the majority of the side of the church and could result in traffic backing up on to the A381.*
- *Without seeing a swept path analysis the tightening of the junction with Woodland rd may cause problems turning into the A381 going north. Currently if a bus is parked you have to negotiate oncoming traffic blind or rely on others to let you know it's clear plus with a tighter turn you risk over spilling into the oncoming lane, without a bus there. Another aspect is larger vehicles, which use woodland rd- tractors, dust cart, delivery vehicles etc...*

It is considered the proposal will not make the issue of turning out of Woodland Road any worse than the existing situation when a bus is at the stop.

The proposed junction will allow a 7.5m long LGV to turn left out of Woodland Road without encroaching into the A381 southbound lane. For any occasional larger vehicle such as a bin lorry, this will require the vehicle to use the southbound lane to make the turn. If HGVs, or very long tractor trailers are expected, these would not be able to turn left easily, if at all. Any need for these types of vehicles to access and egress Woodland Road would need to be to/from the A381 south of the junction.

The reduced size of the junction will unlikely support highway parking as it is currently used. The layout will remain wide enough for two-way traffic to pass as per the current extents, before reaching the single-track section, however, parking may need to be more considered to maintain this accessibility.

12. Concerns/comments about impact on traffic turning out of Old Road

- *Has any consideration been given to traffic turning right out of Old Road onto the A381? This is a completely blind corner and the only way to proceed is to gently nudge out, hoping traffic coming westbound see the front of your car before you can see them. Moving the zebra crossing will only make this worse, as cars will be going faster pulling away from the zebra crossing.*

Is there a way to complement any change with a mirror to help drivers see traffic coming to this blind corner, to prevent a serious accident occurring?

Turning out of Old Road has not been assessed as part of this proposal other than to ensure the crossing would not create any further issues to the junction. We need to define a scheme remit to ensure targeted funding otherwise we risk not being able to improve the situation with the current pedestrian crossing. With regard to the use of mirrors, DCC will not allow the use of mirrors on the public highway because experience shows that mirrors can increase safety risks, which include; reflect light and interfere with a driver's vision, reduce the ability to judge an oncoming vehicle's speed, create an unreasonable dependence on the mirror, if dirty, distort or restrict the view, and be an easy target for vandals.