

Bradford on Avon - Historic Core Zone: January 2013 - Public Consultation Feedback Summary

Subject	Issue	Number of individuals providing feedback	%
Commerce	Beware of making BoA too closed - scheme will discourage visitors to commercial area	11	5%
Cost	Waste of resources / expensive	17	8%
Crossings (General)	Courtesy crossings are largely ignored by motorists and to a lesser extent by pedestrians	13	6%
Crossing (at Swan)	New crossing of Market Street by The Swan will be dangerous	12	6%
Crossing (Zebra)	Retain Zebra crossing as well as provide additional courtesy crossings	2	1%
Crossing (Zebra)	Unspecified safety concerns regarding removal - feel safer on zebra crossing	38	18%
Crossing (Zebra)	Safety concerns regarding removal - no obligation for cars to stop / no legal standing	49	23%
Crossing (Zebra)	Safety concerns regarding removal - lack of beacons indicating crossing location	3	1%
Crossing (Zebra)	Safety concerns regarding removal - elderly / mobility issues	17	8%
Crossing (Zebra)	Safety concerns regarding removal - visually impaired	9	4%
Crossing (Zebra)	Safety concerns regarding removal - volume and speed of traffic	1	0%
Crossing (Zebra)	Install Signalised Crossing	8	4%
Cycling	No provision for cyclists	1	0%
Deliveries	Impact assessment on deliveries and refuse collections	2	1%
Drainage	Concern that the scheme will increase possibility of flooding of properties	14	6%
Env: Air Quality	General concerns about the current air quality and negative impact of the scheme	18	8%
Env: Noise	Ramps / slower traffic will increase road traffic noise	3	1%
Env: Noise	Noisy road surface helps	1	0%
Equality	Safety concerns relating to visually impaired / visually impaired rely on zebra crossing	17	8%
Equality	Lack of kerb upstand creates difficulties for visually impaired in identifying road edge	2	1%
Equality	Children will be vulnerable - how will they be taught to cross safely	27	12%
Equality	Elderly / mobility impaired will be vulnerable	38	18%
Equality	Very helpful to wheelchair users, prams etc	1	0%
Gateways	Should control traffic flow	1	0%
Gateways	Gateways will be ineffective	2	1%
Gateways	Inner Gateways - Text is poor	1	0%
Gateways	Need to communicate clear message / clarify courtesy crossings / parking info	5	2%
Kerbs	Lack of confidence in safety with the removal of kerb face - overrun concerns	34	16%
Kerbs	No protection in snow & ice / Snow cover will loose definition of carriageway edge	3	1%
Kerbs	Extend 'dropped kerb' further along Church Street	1	0%
Maintenance	Current roads surface poorly maintained	2	1%
Pedestrians	Concerns about how drivers will behave in the new layout & pedestrian safety	1	0%
Pedestrians	Should be allowed to cross where they like	1	0%
Pedestrians	Install barriers to direct pedestrians to crossings	6	3%
Pedestrians	I am not convinced there is a safety issue crossing roads	1	0%
Parking	Concern about loss of car parking	3	1%
Parking	Parking restrictions without enforcement will be ineffective	3	1%
Ramps	Disadvantage disabled drivers	1	0%
Ramps	Ramps will be ineffective / are not required	3	1%
Ramps	Ramps will discourage high speed / like ramps	4	2%
Ramps	Ramps are hazards (including for emergency vehicles)	3	1%
Road Markings	Lack of road markings will lead to greater intimidation by traffic	1	0%
Road Markings	Yellow boxes should be retained - removal will cause congestion	11	5%
Road Markings	Support removal of yellow boxes	2	1%
Signs	No warning signs for changed priorities / ramps	2	1%
Signs	Wayfinding needs to be addressed	1	0%
Signs	Clearer indication needed that Church Street is a cul-de-sac (not the main road - SatNav)	3	1%
Speed	20mph (or reduced) speed limit is required	13	6%
Traffic	Downgrade highway to a B road	3	1%
Traffic	A Bypass should be considered	18	8%
Traffic	A One Way traffic system should be considered	18	8%
Traffic	Concerns about congestion build up / volume of traffic - scheme will increase queuing	49	23%
Traffic	General concerns about the volume of heavy through traffic	13	6%
Traffic	Concerns regarding access/egress of Church Street	7	3%
Traffic	Concern that emergency vehicle access will be hindered	1	0%
Furniture	General concerns about proliferation of street furniture	1	0%
Furniture	Clutter from shop / pub signs needs addressing	1	0%
Furniture	Provide bollards to protect footway	1	0%
Furniture	Use traditional style street furniture	3	1%
Furniture	Reinstate old fountain	1	0%
Furniture	Inner Gateways show relevance to BoA - have public input	2	1%
Furniture	Would benefit with soft landscaping (eg. planters)	3	1%
Furniture	Pedestrian crossings are ugly - they are better integrated in many European towns	1	0%
Materials	Buff colour - Against	1	0%
Materials	Coloured roads detract from historic BoA	2	1%
Materials	Preference for traditional materials	6	3%
Materials	Traditional materials will be expensive	1	0%
Materials	Maintenance concerns about broken paving, deterioration in colours	4	2%
Materials	Concern about visibility of courtesy crossing in dark	2	1%
Materials	Ramps will need to be robust for heavy vehicle loading	1	0%
Materials	Concern about slippery surface and lichen	1	0%
Materials	Contrast between surfaces should be greater / will be ineffective	4	2%
Materials	Contrasting tactile paving following DfT guidelines needed	1	0%
Overall	Positive in general	54	25%
	- like decluttering / appearance improvement	14	6%
	- uncertainty to drivers should produce excellent results	5	2%
	- surface delimitation good	1	0%
	- will alter driver behaviour	2	1%
	- good to remind motorists of pedestrian presence	1	0%
	- narrowing carriageway at right places welcomed	2	1%
	- inner gateways look good	1	0%
	- additional crossings provide benefits / are on desire lines	4	2%
	- making the Street furniture and paving consistent would be great	1	0%

127 59%

Individuals signing attendance record at Public Exhibitions

Morning of 15 January 2013 (10:00-13:00)	= 107
Afternoon of 23 January 2013 (14:00-17:00)	= 87
Evening of 31 January 2013 (18:00- 21:00)	= 94
Total	= 288