

APPENDIX B - Correspondence received and officer's comments

Committer	Comment (ad verbatim)	Officer comments
<p>A resident of Coisley Road</p>	<p>I received your letter about the proposed traffic calming measures for Coisley Hil today.</p> <p>I would like to give my full support to these proposals. I have recently moved to Coisley Road and am horrified how fast people speed past us on the main road. Especially considering there is a primary school there. It is a nightmare crossing the road due to these speeding motorists and buses so a zebra crossing would also be most welcome.</p> <p>We have just had a baby and intend to send her to Woodhouse West Primary in a few years. I was concerned about my wife crossing that road with her twice a day and these measures would put my mind at rest.</p> <p>If I can do anything else to show my support please let me know and I will do so. Hopefully we can stop another tragedy like the girl killed up the road before it happens again.</p>	<p>(no comments)</p>
<p>A resident of Ashpool Close</p>	<p>I am a resident on Ashpool Close, just off Sheffield Road by the Woodhouse School where the proposals are located.</p> <p>I would like to welcome the new scheme, not least because of the traffic jams at school drop off and pick up times, but also because of the other problems on this road. When a bus pulls up at the stop opposite the school, this blocks the traffic, with little chance of passing safely due to the poor vision ahead because of the brow in the hill - impossible to see if anything is approaching. The long bus stops proposed should hhopefully help with this.</p> <p>The other problem is the shop at plot 154 Sheffield road - cars constantly park on this main road and block it off in the same way. The new double yellow lines here should help enormously - as long as people don't park illegally!</p> <p>I also welcome the zebra crossing. As il said earlier, the brow on the hill makes it a dangerous road to cross, so This facility will make it much safer for all, children and residents.</p>	<p>Contrary to the comments, the proposed bus stop clearways are neither intended nor expected to make it easier for drivers to be able to pass stopped buses.</p> <p>The Council has powers to issue penalty charge notices against any vehicle found to be left unlawfully on the proposed double yellow lines.</p>

Commenter	Comment (ad verbatim)	Officer comments
A resident of Ashpool Fold	<p>We have seen the notice on the end of our road regarding parking restrictions on Ashpool Fold and Sheffield Road. We both work full-time therefore we are not able to come and view the plans.</p> <p>I am guessing that due to living at the end of Ashpool Fold we will have double yellow lines outside our home.</p> <p>I would like to ask where family and friends are going to park when visiting are there going to be other allocated spaces elsewhere we can use.</p> <p>I feel for the parents of the children at the school who need to park their cars due to having to go to work after dropping their children of at school.</p> <p>I cannot understand instead of making it harder for people to park in proximity to the school could the entrance to the school be changed round so the school could be accessible from Wolverley Road or Stradbroke Road. If not why not make an overspill car park on the old recreation ground at the back of the school and make accessible via Stradbroke Road where it is not as built up area.</p>	<p>The commenter was sent a copy of the plan, enclosed with the response to their letter.</p> <p>The proposals include double yellow lines extending across part of the commenter's frontage.</p> <p>The restrictions are only proposed to apply to the southernmost 6 metres of Ashpool Fold. Although no allocated or authorised parking places are proposed the remainder of the street will remain without kerbside waiting restrictions.</p> <p>The proposed waiting restrictions are required to ensure drivers and pedestrians are able to see each other in good time at the proposed pedestrian crossing, and to ensure that buses are able to negotiate the proposed speed cushions in a manner that is comfortable and safe for passengers.</p> <p>Whilst the proposed restrictions are expected to result in greater inconvenience to parents and pupils travelling by car to and from the school, only around 25% of pupils travel by car to the school (2013 figure). This compares against the 75% of pupils who walk, who would benefit from improved safety and convenience as a consequence of the proposed crossing, traffic calming and associated waiting restrictions.</p> <p>The school's access and private parking are a matter for the school and are not of relevance to the proposed traffic scheme.</p>

Committer	Comment (ad verbatim)	Officer comments
<p>A business proprietor on Sheffield Road, with supporting petition including 171 signatures.</p>	<p>I am writing in reference to your letter dated 21st October 2014 with a reference of: 1590LTP/C1. Your letter is proposing double yellow lines in allocated areas, a zebra crossing and speed bumps on sheffield Road. I am a local shop keeper who already struggles with competitors with my field of work, so having double yellow lines will affect my trade as approximately 80% of my customers park outside to use my shop.</p> <p>I understand you are looking at the safety of the public and i am completely for that, and not against it, so the speed bumps and zebra crossing are a fantastic idea if proposed to be allocated like they are on your plans. I feel the problem you have when it comes to parking is during the school drop off and pick up times which are between 8am-9am and then 2.30pm-3.30pm. Either a no parking restriction should be put across during these hours or a time limit on parking should be added. Also, when my husband goes to buy stock, he has to pull up outside the shop to unload so again this is another issue. Deliveries are made to my store daily so this will also become a problem. Even if two car park spaces were left outside the shop for our customers then that will be really good.</p> <p>I also have a four year old son with a disability who cannot walk so this is our only access through the shop with his wheelchair so i need the parking for him aswell.</p> <p>I have been here almost 7 years and me and my husband are already struggling with our business sales and keeping up with other competitors and with your proposal of double yellow lines it could possibly close me down. I need to put food on the table for my family aswell and i feel like this could have a huge impact on us all. With this email i was going to attach a petition which i have asked my customers who feel the same, to sign, but due to technical issues with my pc i will now be sending this via post along with this letter.</p> <p>I hope you will consider my appeal fairly which i am sure you will.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the proposed waiting restrictions will result in the loss of about 17 metres, or about 3 car lengths, of unrestricted kerbside suitable for the leaving of vehicles, and that this would likely have a detrimental impact on customer access to the commenter's premises. Free, unrestricted parking will remain available on Sheffield Road approximately 60 metres to the east, and on side streets.</p> <p>The restrictions are proposed in the vicinity of the commenter's premises to protect sightlines between pedestrians at the zebra crossing and approaching drivers. Sightlines would need to be maintained as far as is practicable throughout the day, not just a peak traffic periods.</p> <p>The proposed restrictions will allow vehicles to wait for as long as is necessary to load or unload. Loading restrictions that would prevent this are not proposed.</p> <p>The commenter's son may be eligible of a disabled person's blue badge. This allows for a vehicle carrying the permit holder to be left on yellow lines for up to three hours.</p>

Committer	Comment (ad verbatim)	Officer comments
<p>A resident of Sheffield Road</p>	<p>I am contacting you to formally object to the proposals put forwards for traffic calming , primarily on Sheffield Road Woodhouse and not on Coisley Hill Woodhouse as stated in your documents .</p> <p>I have lived at [REDACTED] Sheffield Road Woodhouse S13 for almost 20 years and throughout those years can confirm that the speed at which traffic travels up and down is in deed dangerous and as such I agree that speed calming measures are required.</p> <p>However,I feel that the additional proposed double yellow lines will punish the residents of Sheffield Road and surrounding smaller roads for the dire way the parents dropping children at Woodhouse West School park in the mornings and afternoons. It is only at these times that parking is an issue in this area , the parents are too lazy to park in the car park at Woodhouse West End Club and as such park ANYWHERE . They have a total disregard for the Highway Code and park on double yellow lines , zig zag lines,blocking drives and on the brow on the hill . This will I fear not change simply because additional parking restrictions have been added . How do you intend to enforce the additional restrictions as there is very little policing of the current parking restrictions.at best you are simply going to push the school parking problem further away from the school gate , at worse the parents will continue to park illegally.</p> <p>With regards to the proposed zebra crossing , I feel that this is in totally the wrong position and can only be planned to benefit the school, any local residents coming from Wolverley road , the Severn side estate or above number 167 Sheffield road that need to cross the road to go to the local shop , working men's club , bus stop or to get into Woodhouse village will have to walk in the opposite direction to where they are heading to use the crossing , which will result in the crossing not been used . Currently there is a crossing lady at the school 2 times a day , but this does not stop the dozens of parents and children crossing near the bus stop to get to the shop before and after school. Surely the crossing would serve the wider community better if it was placed closer to the local amenities of the club and the shop ??? Especially as there are a lot of old and disabled people who live on ashpool close who would benefit from a crossing being closer to them .</p> <p>I would also note that coaches that take weekly swimming groups and frequent trips from school and large lorries that have to deliver to the school and the local shop will cause traffic disruption at the brow of the hill if the road has been narrowed . As a driver who has to pass this area frequently I am concerned that your proposed plans will lead to the road not been improved the crossing been used only at school opening and closing times .</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you</p>	<p>The proposed traffic calming features are expected to reduce 85th percentile vehicle speeds from around 35mph to around 25mph.</p> <p>The proposed waiting restrictions are required to ensure drivers and pedestrians are able to see each other in good time at the proposed pedestrian crossing, and to ensure that buses are able to negotiate the proposed speed cushions in a manner that is comfortable and safe for passengers.</p> <p>The Council is able to issue penalty charges notices to motorists contravening the proposed no waiting and no stopping restrictions under the Civil Parking Enforcement régime.</p> <p>The crossing has been located on the basis of site observations, to serve busiest pedestrian flow. As the commenter alludes to, this is the flow of parents and their guardians travelling to and from the school.</p> <p>Observations indicated there was a flow of pedestrians crossing the road at other points on the street, in particular near the junction with Wolverley Road. However, these flows were observed to be very small in comparison with flows at the school gate. Therefore it was judged to provide the crossing in its proposed location to ensure the greatest number of pedestrians benefit, and to ensure this desire line was not 'underprotected' relative to other, lesser desire lines. This need not preclude the introduction of additional crossing(s) in future if budget were allocated for this.</p> <p>The localised carriageway widening is necessary to accommodate posts for beacons at the crossing whilst maintaining adequate clear footway width for the passage of pedestrians. As with the current carriageway width of approximately 6.3m, the proposed carriageway width of 6.0m would allow for two buses to pass, but would not allow two files of cars to pass a stopped bus or goods vehicle. The negative impact of the carriageway narrowing on traffic flow is therefore considered to be negligible, and would be more than outweighed by the effect of removing parking where yellow lines or zig-zag markings are proposed to maintain visibility of the proposed crossing.</p>

Commenter	Comment (ad verbatim)	Officer comments
A resident of Ashpool Close	<p>I would like to take this opportunity to oppose the planned changes to Sheffield Rd. Although I appreciate that the traffic needs slowing on this Rd I believe that the plans will not meet the needs of the local community.</p> <p>I feel that as a resident of Ashpool Close the proposal will have a significant impact on the parking on this Rd. We will be the first minor rd that traffic going to school will be able to legally park on. This will cause problems as a significant number of residents on this rd are either elderly or disabled.</p> <p>I also feel that the position of the proposed crossing is in the wrong place. I feel that as is the crossing will only be utilised for school and only at school times. I strongly feel that it would better meet the local communities needs if the crossing was placed nearer to the local shop. There are very few amenities in this locality and by placing the crossing there it can still be used by the school, but also people going to the shop and using the bus stop.</p> <p>I also feel that by placing the crossing in the planned location that this is a danger as the crossing is on the brow of an ill.</p> <p>If the rd has double yellow lines who will manage this? The Rd already has double yellow lines on a significant proportion and these are frequently ignored by parents dropping off their children at school times.</p> <p>For most of the time there is no problem with parking in that area as local residents do not park there car there for any significant amount of time.</p> <p>As an employee for a disabled client that lives on Sheffield Rd I oppose the plan as I collect him from his home at the time that parents are dropping off their children for school. As the plans are I will have to pull on to the crossing at its busiest time in order to pull on to my clients drive. I believe this to be a very dangerous situation and again cannot understand why the crossing can not be placed closer to the shop and bus stop alleviating this situation.</p> <p>I agree that a crossing and rd calming measure are needed in this area but disagree with then planned location. It appears that this is aimed towards those attending the school only as most other local residents will not use this crossing. It really should be located much closer to ashpool close so that the disabled residents in that location can access this.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you soon.</p>	<p>Whilst there may be a displacement of parking demand owing to the proposed waiting restrictions, it is considered that this would be dissipated across side streets. Coisley Road, Ashwell Road and Wolverley Road are all closer to the school than Ashpool Close, and it is therefore considered that any displacement into Ashpool Close would likely be relatively minor.</p> <p>Observations indicated there was a flow of pedestrians crossing the road at other points on the street away from the school, in particular near the junction with Wolverley Road. However, these flows were observed to be very small in comparison with flows at the school gate. Therefore it was judged to provide the crossing in its proposed location to ensure the greatest number of pedestrians benefit, and to ensure this desire line was not 'underprotected' relative to other, lesser desire lines. This need not preclude the introduction of additional crossing(s) in future if budget were allocated for this.</p> <p>The proposal has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit. This auditor did not identify an issue with the proposed location of the crossing.</p> <p>The Council has powers to enforce vehicles left unlawfully on double yellow lines, under the civil parking enforcement régime. It is permissible to wait on double yellow lines for as long as is necessary to pick up or set down passengers.</p> <p>Whilst the commenter may feel there is no issue with parking at present, the proposed restrictions are necessary to enable buses to traverse the proposed speed cushions in a manner that is safe and comfortable for passengers, as well to protect sightlines at the proposed zebra crossing.</p> <p>The proximity of the crossing to driveways is acknowledged to present a risk of conflict between users of the crossing and drivers manoeuvring in to or out of accesses</p> <p>It was judged to provide the crossing in its proposed location to ensure the greatest number of pedestrians benefit, and to ensure this desire line was not 'underprotected' relative to other, lesser desire lines. This need not preclude the introduction of additional crossing(s) in future if budget were allocated for this.</p>

Committer	Comment (ad verbatim)	Officer comments
A resident of Sheffield Road	<p>(1) I do agree that traffic does need slowing down. I object to the crossing position.</p> <p>(2) Zig-zag lines and yellow lines outside school does not stop people parking. Biggest culprits for parking on yellow lines during school times being the parents who start to arrive up to at least ½hr before school finished, blocking all side roads with or without yellow lines also on Sheffield Road and Coisley Hill. School closes gates so they can't park on the drive.</p> <p>(3) Coaches for school park on brow of hill and on zig-zag lines you can't see to cross road traffic can't see you, Lorries at times also park on zig-zag lines to deliver to school.</p> <p>(4) Position of crossing means this is only going to be used mainly at school times 15-20 mins in the morning and 15-20 mins when school is finished during term time which a crossing warden is provided.</p> <p>(5) Residents will have flashing lights for 52 weeks a year 24 hours a day.</p> <p>(6) Crossings to my understanding is you have to have got your foot on crossing for drivers to stop for you. The crossing on Tannary Street you have to take your life in your hands as drivers will not stop for you.</p> <p>(7) Both parents with children and children on their own cross the road near bus stop and the shop, they are not going to walk down to crossing and back up to the shop.</p> <p>(8) Crossing is going to be between two drives mine and school drive and that the footpath is going to be widened. There is no mention of how you intend to do this, no measurements and i am worried that it could make it more difficult to get on/off my drive. Both my brother and myself are disabled and need to have good access and do not know how this will effect this. Lorries delivering outside of the school have to reverse outside my house blocking road and footpath to get up school drive which could be dangerous on the crossing.</p> <p>(9) I have lived on Sheffield Road for almost 48 yrs and before that on Southsea Road for 15 yrs. Accidents involving pedestrians have been approx. between shop and west end club.</p> <p>(10) Residents need proper consultation to put their concerns, not only from school and parents who attend the school who cause a lot of the problems at school times.</p>	<p>The existing 'school keep clear' markings are advisory. The proposed scheme will make these mandatory, which would allow the Council's Parking Services team to issue Penalty Charges notices to vehicles left in contravention of the restrictions.</p> <p>This is acknowledged. Notwithstanding this, it was judged to provide the crossing in its proposed location to ensure the greatest number of pedestrians benefit, and to ensure this desire line was not 'underprotected' relative to other, lesser desire lines. This need not preclude the introduction of additional crossing(s) in future if budget were allocated for this.</p> <p>Bellisha beacons are to incorporate cowls to minimise light trespass. It is the case that drivers are not legally obliged to stop until a pedestrian has entered the crossing; however, drivers are expected to slow down or stop to let pedestrians cross (Highway Code rule 195).</p> <p>It is neither intended nor expected that the crossing will serve all pedestrian crossing movements across Sheffield Road.</p> <p>The proposed footway widening is minor and will leave 6m clear carriageway width. This is not anticipated to adversely impact upon manœuvres to or from the objector's driveway.</p> <p>The risk around vehicles manœuvring when gaining access to the school is acknowledged; it is however noted that the school closes their access during school starting and finishing times; these being the times during which the crossing is expected to see most of its use.</p> <p>Police records of collisions indicate collisions are distributed throughout Sheffield Road between Coisley Road and Ashpool Road. The proposed traffic calming is intended to reduce the incidence and impact of collisions. The crossing, whilst expected to make it easier to cross the road, is not expected to result in fewer collisions in itself.</p> <p>The scheme has been developed on the basis of collision records and site observations. It has not been developed specifically in response to concerns raised by the school.</p>

Committer	Comment (ad verbatim)	Officer comments
A resident of Sheffield Road (continued)	<p>(11) If all propose changes were to happen who is going to police them as they will be ignored as they are now.</p> <p>(12) Hope to hear from you in the very near future regards consultation with residents.</p>	<p>The proposed waiting and stopping restrictions can be enforced by the Council under the civil parking enforcement régime.</p> <p>Owing to time and funding constraints, it is not proposed to consult with residents further on this scheme.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank