

SUPPORT

<u>Ref</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
1	I support the idea of a pedestrian crossing on this road which can be quite busy, especially at rush hours. This will improve the safety of pedestrians.	The comments in support of the installation of the Zebra pedestrian crossing are noted.
2	<p>As a volunteer at Lacock Abbey, who has also on occasions been a steward helping visitors from the car park to the centre of the village, I have always thought the current situation is very dangerous.</p> <p>Large numbers of pedestrians cross the road at the proposed Zebra crossing location, often in semidarkness when evening events take place.</p> <p>A signalised crossing would be preferable, due to the limited sighting distances, but as a minimum, I strongly support the provision of a pedestrian priority crossing such as a 'zebra'.</p>	<p>Provision of street lighting will be required as part of the installation and will alleviate safety concerns in the hours of darkness.</p> <p>The comments in support of the installation of the Zebra pedestrian crossing are noted.</p>
3	<p>The National Trust supports the installation of a Zebra crossing over Hither Way to make the road crossing from the main car park into the village safer.</p> <p>We raised the subject of improving the road crossing and are pleased that Wiltshire Council have responded positively to come up with a scheme to achieve this.</p> <p>Since Hither Way was constructed both traffic movements and visitor numbers have increased as the population in the wider area has grown. Therefore, we feel there is a need to take action now and make crossing safer for pedestrians.</p>	The comments in support of the installation of the Zebra pedestrian crossing are noted.
4	I am instructed to confirm that Lacock Parish Council supports the proposal for the installation of a Zebra crossing at Hither Way, Lacock	The comments in support of the installation of the Zebra pedestrian crossing are noted.

<u>Ref</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
5	<p>As both local residents and National Trust members we welcome this development to improve the safety of pedestrians.</p> <p>Our only concern is the site is very near bends in the road for both east and west bound traffic. We recognise there is no other appropriate siting for a crossing so hope that it is well signposted in both directions.</p>	<p>The comments in support of the installation of the Zebra pedestrian crossing are noted.</p> <p>Provision of advance warnings signs are proposed on both approaches to the crossing location.</p>

OBJECTION

<u>Ref</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
1	<p>I would like to object to the proposed installation of a zebra crossing on Hither Way in Lacock. As a resident I strongly disagree with this proposal due to the impact on traffic during busy visitor times.</p> <p>At times we can potentially have two or three coaches arrive at the same time and I think holding traffic to wait for that volume of people to cross along with other visitors is not acceptable and very unfair to residents.</p> <p>I feel an alternative option needs to be considered such as some sort of signal controlled crossing.</p>	<p>At Hither Way the recorded vehicle volumes are considered to be light with the Annual Average Daily Traffic figure being recorded as approximately 4,400 vehicles. Looking at the hourly breakdown of traffic during the working day (9am to 4pm) the frequency of vehicles passing the crossing location varies on average between 13 to 16 seconds. At Hither Way the assessed crossing time for pedestrians is 5 to 10 seconds.</p> <p>It is acknowledged at peak times the volume of traffic will increase and small delays may occur. Zebra crossings are responsive to demand and will create a more balanced result for both vehicular traffic and pedestrians.</p>
2	<p>I object to this proposal for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current situation isn't broken and there have been no accidents or injuries. • Queues of traffic will build in both directions when a coach load of pedestrians are crossing, with the risk of vehicles from the river bridge direction coming round the bend and meeting stationary cars. • Queues of traffic from the Melksham Road direction waiting at the crossing will be further held up by cars turning into the National Trust car park. <p>If there needs to be any crossing installed it should be a pelican crossing, which will only allow a limited number of people to cross at any one time.</p>	<p>There has been one recorded injury collision on this section of Hither Way in the preceding 36 months to the date of this report. Vehicle travelling east lost control whilst turning right causing vehicle to leave carriageway and collide with brick wall. Severity of injury was recorded as slight. There are no recorded collisions involving pedestrians at this location. The collision history of a site forms part of the assessment process, but it is not the only factor taken into account when investigating the proposal as a whole.</p> <p>Provision of advance warnings signs are proposed on both approaches to the crossing location.</p> <p>Please refer to the information provided at ref 1 above regarding traffic volumes.</p> <p>Whilst a signal controlled crossing has been considered, and it will satisfy the demand, the use of a Zebra crossing is considered to be more responsive to both pedestrian and vehicle demand.</p>

<p>3</p>	<p>Anecdotal information given on the history of Hither Way and an opinion on the most appropriate long term solution for the route.</p> <p>My objections to the installation of a Zebra crossing are based around this being yet another stand-alone led and isolated National Trust scheme, which is considered necessary as a result of closing off the High Street to all traffic in May 2013. This diverts more traffic, heading east in the direction of Bowden Hill onto Hither Way.</p> <p>Comments made on when the pedestrian survey and vehicle data was collected within the assessment report. Including difficulty in the justification for a formal crossing based on the accident rate of zero over the last 6 and half years.</p> <p>From information given in the assessment report, as well as my own research I have concluded that reversing the priority from the motorist to the pedestrian, in my opinion, in this particular case is a recipe for accidents. Government information states Zebra crossings first introduced in Slough in 1951, have been gradually phased out following the introduction of more sophisticated light controlled crossings.</p> <p>The village is open all through the year with many coaches parking with up to 100 passengers in each, this generates heavy flows of pedestrians and will cause considerable delay to drivers while they are negotiating the Zebra crossing. Access in and out of the car park by coaches is a difficult manoeuvre and will reduce traffic flow, without the added difficulty of a queue forming due to delays caused by the installation of a crossing, in particular a Zebra crossing, but also a signal controlled crossing. Road capacity will be reduced.</p> <p>No lighting has been proposed in the TRO.</p> <p>The installation of any type of formal crossing will inevitably cause delays to drivers. The crossing is too close to both the junction and the entrance to the car/coach park. The lack of right turn lane already causes tail backs and these will increase if a signal controlled or uncontrolled crossing is installed.</p>	<p>This is a scheme which has been endorsed by Lacock Parish Council, Corsham Community Area Board as well as the National Trust to improve pedestrian safety.</p> <p>Please refer to the information provided at ref 2 above regarding collision record.</p> <p>This comment is factually incorrect. Zebra crossings remain an effective facility which Highway Authorities are able to install. There is no evidence or documents released from the Department for Transport to remove or limit their use on the Public Highway.</p> <p>Please refer to the information provided at ref 1 above regarding traffic volumes.</p> <p>There is no legal requirement to advertise and consult on the street lighting. This will form part of the overall design to accommodate the installation of the proposed crossing. The Parish Council has been made aware of the lighting requirements.</p> <p>Unfortunately, due to the existing geometry and width of Hither Way it is not a viable option to consider the installation of a separate right hand turn lane at the car park entrance.</p>
----------	--	--

	<p>My own preference for a crossing, if it is considered one should still be installed following the public consultation, is an enhanced dropped kerb crossing.</p>	<p>The comments on the preferred type of crossing are noted.</p>
4	<p>I have contacted you with concern for safety of pedestrians if a Zebra crossing is installed on the proposed site on Hither way.</p> <p>Traffic will come around the corner with no time to see the crossing and due to the type of crossing individuals will feel safe to just step onto the crossing and be knocked over.</p> <p>Refers to an undocumented highway report.</p> <p>In holiday season traffic will continually be tailed back. The road has been like it since 1985, without any accidents.</p> <p>Furthermore, this crossing has no benefit for the locals, only to the National Trust as the car park is not used by locals. Therefore any crossings or changes should be funded fully by the National Trust and not from the local Council funds.</p>	<p>Provision of street lighting and advance warning signs are proposed on both approaches to the crossing location.</p> <p>Please refer to the information provided at ref 2 above regarding collision record.</p> <p>This is a proposal to improve the overall safety of pedestrians in Lacock Village and as such is being jointly funded. Firstly, from a successful application for a substantive bid from the Community Area Board, along with funding from both the National Trust and Lacock Parish Council.</p>
5	<p>My main contention with the referenced report upon which the decision to install a Zebra crossing was based, is that the recommendation of a Zebra crossing is based on incorrect data.</p> <p>Concerns raised over elements within the assessment report and the initial outline costs of the scheme.</p> <p>According to the report analysis, signal controlled crossings are used where vehicle speeds are high and crossing difficulty is high. The response from an FOI request to Wiltshire Highways indicates that this statement is not true. There are 115 signal controlled crossings in Wiltshire on roads with speed limits of 40mph or less, compared with only 4 on roads with speed limits greater than 40mph. So signal controlled crossings are used on the same speed roads as Zebra crossings.</p> <p>The report notes that during peak periods pedestrian demand results in pedestrians not being able to establish suitable gaps in traffic, in</p>	<p>The estimated cost of £40,000 quoted in the report was based on early design work. The revised figure quoted to the Parish Council of £55,000 was an updated figure following receipt of a detailed quote for the electrical and street lighting works.</p> <p>It is possible to provide both signal controlled and Zebra crossings on roads subject to 40 mph or less. It is the actual driven speeds at the particular location that are taken into account as one of the factors in the overall assessment. Light controlled crossings are installed at sites that meet the higher speed and/or higher traffic or pedestrian flows.</p> <p>Please refer to the information provided at ref 1 above regarding traffic volumes.</p>

	<p>other words high crossing difficulty.</p> <p>This seems to leave us with a small cost benefit for a Zebra crossing. One unforgivable omission is the relative safety of each type of crossing. The response to another FOI request revealed that Puffin crossings are almost 4 times safer than Zebra crossings (0.03 v 0.11 accidents per crossing per year) in Wiltshire.</p> <p>This report requires revision to correct the fundamental flaws. The National Trust and Wiltshire Council are in danger of financing the wrong type of crossing and putting visitors of Lacock at risk.</p> <p>If there must be a pedestrian crossing on Hither Way, I truly believe that a Zebra crossing is the wrong solution.</p>	<p>All crossings installed on the network carry with them an additional safety risk due to the fact that it takes some of the onus away from the pedestrian and increases their confidence to cross safely.</p> <p>The comments on the report and preferred type of crossing are noted.</p>
--	--	---

GENERAL COMMENTS

<u>Ref</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
<p>1</p>	<p>I work for the National Trust and I am also a volunteer at the Abbey, so I am constantly in the National Trust car park.</p> <p>Hither Way, which separates the car park with the centre of the village is extremely dangerous and on a number of occasions I have witnessed quite a few ‘near misses’ between oncoming vehicles and members of the public crossing the road.</p> <p>Families, adults and children alike are constantly in danger every time they wish to cross the road. Speeding traffic around the bend does not help the situation. Requests for additional traffic calming features at this location would also reduce traffic speed.</p>	<p>The concerns in relation to pedestrian safety when crossing Hither Way are noted. It is recommended that any concerns not directly related to this proposal can be raised as an issue through the Community Area Board process.</p>
<p>2</p>	<p>I personally believe there is a need for a pedestrian crossing in the proposed location. But not the Zebra crossing that is proposed.</p> <p>A puffin crossing has a safety record in Wiltshire as being 400% safer than a Zebra crossing, which are rarely installed anywhere now. Also, in this location a Puffin crossing will group pedestrians and result in fewer vehicle stops with better traffic flows.</p> <p>Concerns raised over the costs not being the paramount consideration in making a decision.</p> <p>In conclusion, I believe more in depth analysis should be given to assessing the benefits of a Puffin crossing.</p>	<p>All crossings installed on the network carry with them an additional safety risk due to the fact that it takes some of the onus away from the pedestrian and increases their confidence to cross safely.</p> <p>Whilst cost has been taken into account as part of the overall assessment, it is not the only factor considered during the decision making process.</p>
<p>3</p>	<p>As a member of staff I regularly lock the Hither Way car park and have had to run to avoid traffic numerous times. I have also seen it happen with other members of the public, especially pedestrians with push chairs or dogs on leads.</p> <p>It is a matter of time before a serious accident happens here. Cars go so fast that on two occasions they have lost control and hit the wall opposite.</p>	<p>The concerns in relation to pedestrian safety when crossing Hither Way are noted.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">4</p>	<p>I would have thought that a zebra crossing will result in problems for drivers at peak visitor flow times. There are a number of 'intelligent' methods of controlling pedestrian movements that would serve road traffic in a better way.</p> <p>e.g. Pelican or Puffin signal controlled crossings.</p>	<p>At Hither Way the recorded vehicle volumes are considered to be light with the Annual Average Daily Traffic figure being recorded as approximately 4,400 vehicles. Looking at the hourly breakdown of traffic during the working day (9am to 4pm) the frequency of vehicles passing the crossing location varies on average between 13 to 16 seconds. At Hither Way the assessed crossing time for pedestrians is 5 to 10 seconds.</p> <p>It is acknowledged at peak times the volume of traffic will increase and small delays may occur. Zebra crossings are responsive to demand and will create a more balanced result for both vehicular traffic and pedestrians.</p>
---	---	---