

**HIGHWAY AUTHORITY'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSES TO INTERMODAL  
DRAWING NO. IT2211/SK/002 Rev. C – "Option B Variant".**

**NOTE**

These are the Highway Authority's preliminary responses to "Option B Variant" bearing in mind that it was received by email date 28<sup>th</sup> February 2022.

These comments should not be assumed to be exhaustive.

**COMMENTS**

1. The scheme shown is still a traffic calming scheme, the principle of which remains unacceptable as it still represents misuse of traffic calming to enable a sub-standard access to be provided
2. Where there is insufficient opposing traffic, vehicles can tend to 'race' to get through before an opposing vehicle or vehicles, which undermines the calming effect of a scheme, particularly in terms of speeding vehicles. I think this would be the case here
3. No swept paths have been provided. I think the same concerns apply here, particularly for larger vehicles such as a large refuse vehicle and standard rigid bus. Are some of the required manoeuvres physically possible? Would much overhanging of the footways and centre lines occur? Of particular concern is a large refuse vehicle turning left in and right out of the proposed site access
4. The site access is at quite an extreme angle. It should be perpendicular to East Road. This could affect the amount of visibility available for exiting vehicles due to them not being positioned correctly because of the angle of the site access
5. A vehicle turning right out of the site access would not be able to see a vehicle waiting at the give way line or one which had already moved off from the give way line and potentially already committed to the narrowing, which could lead to a vehicle or vehicles having to reverse, worst case scenario, in East Road. Some vehicles may not reverse but instead bump over the footway or use a dropped kerb if in the right position to go around the opposing vehicle or vehicles
6. A vehicle turning right out of the site access and a vehicle turning left out of The Fox Inn PH car park would not be able to see each other and therefore could end up facing each other in the narrowing. Again, some vehicles may not reverse but instead bump over the footway or use a dropped kerb if in the right position to go around the opposing vehicle or vehicles

7. The proposed uncontrolled dropped kerb pedestrian crossing point in front of 131 East Road would lead to an excessively long section of dropped kerb, which may exacerbate the problem mentioned above whereby vehicles may mount the footways to go around each other in the narrowing. Also, it likely it would be continually driven over by vehicles entering and leaving 131, East Road, which would likely break up the tactile paving which could lead to a trip hazard and maintenance liability for ECC as the Highway Authority
8. Street lighting: the same concern applies here. Is it possible to provide street lighting within the extent of highway and/or land under the control of the Appellant? Para 2.8.3 of Local Transport Note 1/07 (March 2007) states: "Chicanes and narrowings should be conspicuous in both day and night-time conditions for drivers, and there should always be adequate street lighting in the areas around chicanes (Howard, 1998). Regular checks may be needed to ensure that damage has not occurred to the chicane or lighting. The local highway authority should satisfy itself that the lighting is to the standard required for the introduction of any new traffic calming features." We would want street lighting to satisfy this requirement and to ensure highway safety is maximised as far as possible in both day and night-time conditions
9. Again, the scheme would require waiting restrictions and therefore a Traffic Regulation Order or Orders. Also, how would those dwellings on the north side of East Road accept deliveries e.g. a food delivery? It's unlikely the van would park some distance from the relevant dwelling with the driver having to carry the delivery back to the dwelling. It's more likely the van would park on the footway outside the relevant dwelling, either partially or fully blocking the carriageway or footway
10. As with previous iterations of a proposed traffic calming scheme, I do not think any informal or formal consultation has taken place with comments made known and responded to by the Appellant

Martin Mason  
1 March 2022