

Memo

To File
cc Steve Hind (Wiltshire Council)
Laura Gosling (Wiltshire Council)

From David Minshall **Tel** 0117 9062341
Title/Dept Principal Engineer **Mob** 07976 344011
E-mail david.minshall@mouchel.com

To Ref - **From Ref** 1041416/dbm

Date 30 October 2012 **Page Total** 4

Bradford on Avon Historic Core Zone – Vulnerable User Consultation

The following pages summarise feedback from the vulnerable user group consultation for the first phase development of Bradford on Avon Historic Core Zone.

Three consultation sessions were held with invitations issued by Bradford on Avon Town Council to groups representing vulnerable users. The consultation was held at St. Margaret's Hall, Bradford on Avon on the following dates:

- Wednesday, 26 September 2012 – 14:00-16:00
- Friday, 28 September 2012 – 10:00-12:00
- Thursday, 4 October – 18:00-20:00

Regards



David Minshall
Principal Engineer
For and on behalf of Mouchel

Subject	Issues	Mouchel Comment
Children	Parental concern was raised about introducing confusion for children. A school representative however was confident that “children adapt very quickly,” although had concerns about the initial period following the installation of the scheme.	Information packs to schools that explain the scheme may provide benefit.
Courtesy Crossings	<p>There was suspicion that courtesy crossing would not function as intended due to the volume of traffic.</p> <p>There may be lack of awareness for blind and partially sighted people of the location of informal crossing points and feelings of vulnerability.</p> <p>The additional crossing of Market Street by The Swan was welcomed by some but criticised by others.</p>	If the Zebra Crossing is maintained then the safety aspects of this crossing in such close proximity would need consideration.
Gateways	<p>Issues with regards to heightening awareness of the changes for all who enter the Historic Core Zone were raised.</p> <p>The Inner Gateways inform road users they are entering the HCZ, but do not provide sufficient notice for drivers to change route.</p>	The gateways will address some of this, but wider issues of education, training and publicity may need consideration.
Raised Table	<p>Concerns were raised about possible encroachment onto footways by road traffic at the raised table areas.</p> <p>Loss of definition of the footway and blurring the distinction between vehicle and pedestrian street space were stated by some as reducing pedestrian perception of security.</p> <p>Some agreed with raising the carriageway, but these were in the minority of those providing feedback.</p> <p>Loss of kerb face (upstand) increases potential for visually impaired to stray onto the carriageway.</p>	<p>Market Street existing kerbs vary in height and in some sections are generally less than 100mm high, providing little protection from errant vehicles. Strong colour contrast between carriageway and footway helps confirm segregation. Bollards (with reflective strips) at pedestrian crossings would further highlight carriageway/footway, and specifically crossing locations.</p> <p>Research commissioned by “The Guide Dogs for the Blind Association” recommends a minimum kerb face of 60mm for the kerb to be detectable by blind and partially sighted people.</p> <p>Less than 40mm kerb heights appear to be less consistent in detection.</p> <p>Given the proximity of property thresholds to the carriageway and complications associated with cellars, to achieve a 60mm kerb face at the kerb build outs may require localised reduction in the current road level which would increase construction costs.</p>

Subject	Issues	Mouchel Comment
<p>Removal of Controlled (Zebra) Crossing</p>	<p>Most feedback raised concerns about the removal of the Zebra Crossing citing disadvantage to various vulnerable user groups including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children • Elderly • Mobility impaired • Visually impaired <p>It is noted that occupants of a nearby shop observed that the “zebra crossing gives no advantage to pedestrians at present.”</p> <p>Views also expressed the familiarity of Zebra Crossings to road users and pedestrians, in giving pedestrians precedence.</p> <p>The conspicuity of the Zebra Crossing in all weather / light conditions was highlighted.</p>	<p>Installation of a Zebra Crossing will include associated zig-zag road markings and Belisha Beacons.</p> <p>Visibility of the Zebra Crossing is often restricted by slow moving traffic, and the beacons cannot always be seen due to the presence of canopies. Visibility of the beacons may be improved by the addition of footway widening.</p>
<p>Road Markings</p>	<p>Visually impaired confirmed that strong colour contrast aided navigation. Double yellow lines further helped identify carriageway edge.</p>	
<p>Street Furniture & Surface Finishes</p>	<p>Decluttering was welcomed. Some specific feedback was received including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desire for benches/seats to have arms at each end • Paving to be anti-slip • Use black cast iron bollards to highlight the location of courtesy crossings • The proposed tactile paving does not provide colour contrast 	
<p>Traffic</p>	<p>By providing additional crossing points it was suggested that traffic congestion would increase with consequent decrease in air quality.</p>	
<p>Traffic Calming</p>	<p>The principles of traffic calming were generally welcomed.</p>	
<p>Visually Impaired</p>	<p>There is merit in the kerb buildouts in introducing traffic calming effects.</p> <p>Lack of kerbed footway edge and removal of the zebra crossing were raised as problems for guide dog users.</p> <p>“A guide dog cannot see the edge if there is no depth or good contrast in colour” (GDftBA)</p> <p>Loss of ability for visually impaired walkers to travel independently was raised due to ambiguity of the pedestrian crossings.</p>	<p>Pedestrian crossing widths will also be reduced.</p> <p>Strong colour contrast between carriageway and footway are proposed.</p>

Subject	Issues	Mouchel Comment
Other Issues	<p>Air Quality was discussed by some and the possible detrimental effect caused by additional crossing points and slowing traffic movement.</p> <p>Reference was made to several locations outside of the scope of this consultation. These have not been addressed here, but are retained for future reference.</p> <p>Any loss of parking may have a detrimental effect on commerce.</p>	