

# **TRAFFIC DAY CONSULTATION REPORT**

## **Norton St Philip Parish Council**

This report follows a Traffic Consultation Day held in the Palairet Hall on Saturday 9 October 2021 from 10am till 4pm

The Consultation Day was held in response to requests to deal with several areas of concern in the village regarding traffic problems; the Parish Council thought it best to seek the views of as many residents as possible before decisions were made about implementing solutions.

The problems included:

- school bus stops
- speeding
- parking
- school crossing on Church Street
- the role and management of the Traffic Action Group

Some 96 people attended the Consultation Day and villagers were invited to vote by placing red dots against their preferred solution. The solutions aimed to be reasonably concise so that a meaningful conclusion could be reached.

Parishioners also had the opportunity to write comments and suggestions on post-its. Members of the Parish Council were available to clarify any points.

Consequently correspondence was received from parishioners which the PC has noted.

This report aims to be as objective as possible and the Parish Council is aware that many of these problems do not have simple solutions. The cost implications for some solutions will also have to be borne in mind.

## **SCHOOL BUS PICK UP POINTS**

This consultation was in response to two concerns:

- The obstruction of the school buses stopping at the top of Bell Hill because of cars parking on the pavement side of the road
- The potential harm to waiting children from the fumes of cars queuing uphill to the crossroads at The George Inn.

### **Results of survey**

Do nothing	21
Relocate bus stop	19
Hatching at bus stop	0
Total	40

### **Conclusion**

This issue did not attract many votes. 'Do nothing' was the favoured option. It may be that the question of where the stop could be better located would be difficult to assess and so people abstained from giving an opinion. What can be said is that there was no support for hatching.

### **Recommendation**

The PC consider that, as the bus is stopping for a very short time whilst children board it, this is hardly an inconvenience for traffic coming up Bell Hill.

If there is a concern about fumes from standing traffic, it would be an option for children to wait at another pick up point in the village. Signage to encourage drivers to switch off engines could be used, but the nature of the moving traffic to a junction without traffic lights is unlikely to be effective. It is not a large village, so waiting at either of the other two bus stops (Ringwell Lane or Chatley Furlong) is an option for those concerned about air quality.

### **Action**

Consult parents of the children concerned (those at Bell Hill).

Maintain contact with the bus company to monitor future routes – Parish Councillor to be chosen for this liaison.

## **SPEEDING**

Speeding is a concern for a number of people. The questions asked may have needed to seek out more detail but we needed different options that worked with people only being able to place one dot.

### **Results of survey**

<b>Build outs</b>	2
<b>Proposal 1 – speed limits</b>	
reduce Tellisford Lane limit from 30mph to 20mph <b>plus</b>	
move 20mph zone Wells Road to Brooklyn Cottage <b>plus</b>	
move 20mph zone Frome Road to Barnfield	29
<b>Proposal 2 – speed limits</b>	
As above but move 20mph zone only to bus stop layby	28
<b>Do nothing</b>	31
Total	90

There were a lot of Post-it comments, from which we make some recommendations.

The SCC Traffic Engineer tells us that speed limits are ‘self-enforcing’ and only work when the road conditions make drivers think that 20mph is appropriate. This is supported by some Post-it comments.

### **Conclusions**

Build outs were not favoured.

‘Do nothing’ came out top although by a very small margin. It could be argued that 57/90 favoured a 20mph limit on Tellisford Lane and the moving of the 20mph on the Wells Road into the village adjacent to Brooklyn Cottage. Whether to move the 20mph further out on the Frome Road was less conclusive. In effect 65% were against moving them out to Barnfield. As the road is wide and has a good pavement, the movement of the 20mph zone on the Frome Road to the bus stop area is unlikely to result in much benefit. The speed humps are reasonably effective on this road.

More Speed Indicator Devices were suggested on a number of Post-its.

Better and more signage was suggested by several people.

## **Recommendations**

A member of TAG has secured a Speed Enforcement Unit location on Frome Road. This means we can now encourage residents of Chatley Furlong to participate in Community Speed Watch sessions on Frome Road. This is the best way of providing data to the Police which will result in their Road Safety Team using a camera in this location.

The PC should clarify with the SCC Traffic Engineer regarding how to proceed with a 20mph restriction on Tellisford Lane.

The PC needs to establish if there will be any cost to the Parish of moving the eastbound 20mph sign on Wells road to be adjacent to Brooklyn Cottage. Subject to cost, moving the 20ph sign (and the equivalent westbound 30mph sign) would be our recommendation.

Speed Indicator Devices are supported. At present there is only one in the Parish to cover 5 locations. Therefore the PC recommends purchasing another device, with a further device to be purchased as need and cash-flow determine. Note: recordings on Speed Indicator Devices assist police speed enforcement visits when used with Community Speed Watch records.

## **Action**

- Approach residents of Chatley Furlong/ Frome Road to join Community Speed Watch
- Liaise with SCC Traffic Engineer with regard to the moving of 20mph signs on Wells Road and to clarify the issues around 20mph signs on approaches to Tellisford Lane
- Research best type of SID and plan purchase. Seek volunteers to manage/ move SIDs around 5 locations in NSP and Farleigh Hungerford
- Arrange Chapter 8 training for moving SIDs
- Chris Cloke to establish possible costs of relocating 20mph signs and whether the school patrol sign is affected by this.

## **PARKING**

### **Results of survey**

#### **Parking 1 - Bath Road**

Extend existing double yellow lines	30
Do not extend double yellow lines	60
Total	90

#### **Parking 2 - Upper Farm Close**

Extend existing DYL – option 1	0
Extend existing DYL – option 2	3
Extend existing DYL – option 3	2
Extend existing DYL – option 4	6
Do not extend existing double yellow lines	64
Total	75

#### **Parking 3 - Bell Hill**

DYL from North St to Old Post Office, North side and from BT pole to opposite Chapel House entrance, South side	3
DYL from North St to Chapel House, North side and from BT pole to opposite Chapel House entrance, South side	8
Pavement bollards	73
Do nothing	6
Total	90

#### **Parking 4 - Chapel, High Street**

Double yellow lines	6
Fixed bollards	52
Drop or removable bollards	9
Do nothing	14
Total	81

## **Parking 5 - Town End and Fortescue Street**

Double yellow lines	12
Planters, trees and shrubs	64
Trees, shrubs in ground	17
Bollards	2
Do nothing	7
Total	102

## **Conclusions**

### **Parking 1 - Bath Road**

Two thirds voted for the DYLS not to be extended.

### **Parking 2 - Upper Farm Close**

64 out of 75 voted for not extending the DYLS. There was more support from UFC residents for a modest increase in DYLS, particularly for the turning point at the end of UFC.

### **Parking 3 - Bell Hill**

This area had the most support for pavement bollards.

Some Post-it comments were concerned with unintended consequences of installing bollards: parked cars will be pushed further into the road or into other roads.

### **Parking 4 - Chapel, High Street**

Bollards outside the Chapel on the High Street had support from over half the total of votes.

### **Parking 5 - Town End and Fortescue Street**

These two areas might have been better judged by separating the survey into the two areas but more than 60% were in favour of planters and trees generally, rather than double yellow lines. This will need more research, and the involvement of the Coop and other stakeholders.

Post-its showed a concern with the lack of clear Coop car park signage.

## **Recommendations**

### **Parking 1 – Bath Road**

In view of how seldom this is a problem area, the PC recommends no change but we recommend future monitoring of safety issues.

### **Parking 2 – Upper Farm Close**

We recommend exploring the erection of a Parish Council sign requesting that vehicles do not park in the turning head. There is a precedent in Rode which could be followed. Discussions with the Rode residents will be useful.

### **Parking 3 – Bell Hill and**

### **Parking 4 – Chapel, High Street**

The bollards on Bell Hill and outside the High Street Chapel need further research with the SCC Traffic Engineer as to cost, style, who would pay and feasibility.

### **Parking 5 – Town End and Fortescue Street**

Further discussion is needed with the Coop and Aster homes regarding: contributing to the costs of planters; parking outside the garages linked to Town End; and the Coop stopping their delivery drivers parking on the pavement outside the shop.

Size, design, plants to be used and a maintenance plan for planters needs to be worked up, in conjunction with the stakeholders.

## **Action**

Chris Cloke to meet manager of the shop to explore how to progress the recommendations.

Val Fox/ Nikki Duke to approach Aster Homes and SCC re parking by garages and planter option

Val Fox to get proposal and costings for planters.

## **SCHOOL CROSSING, CHURCH STREET**

### **Results of survey**

Zig-Zag lines on pavement side of road	5
Zig-Zag lines both sides of the road	0
A-Board signs at times of School Crossing Patrol	57
Do nothing	3
Total	65

### **Conclusion**

Clear majority for A-Board signs. Zig-Zag lines were considered intrusive and requiring significant signage in the Conservation Area.

7 volunteers recruited to School Crossing Patrol

### **Recommendation**

A-Board signs to be sought from safety group *Think* and training of volunteers.

### **Action**

- Training of volunteers has been undertaken
- Michael Walker is in the process of obtaining DBS certifications
- A licence is to be obtained from SCC.



## **TRAFFIC ACTION GROUP**

A new 'Terms of Reference' (ToR) was drawn up to reflect a clearer policy for this Parish Council sub-group than the previous guidelines had provided.

### **Results of survey**

Agree with draft ToR	19
Do not agree	1
Total	20

### **Conclusion**

The issue did not attract many votes but of those that held views, approval was overwhelming. Suggested amendments have been incorporated into the final version. The amended ToR is annexed to this report.

### **Recommendations**

PC to set up a new group comprising existing members if willing plus new recruits.

### **Action**

Chris Cloke and Val Fox to advertise in the Parish News and approach potential Chairs to help with formation of group.

## **WINDSCREEN PARKING NOTICES**

There were 26 votes in favour of a notice that could be supplied to residents for placing on windscreens of vehicles parked inconsiderately.

Many suggestions for improving the notices included: be brief, keep it anonymous, polite.

### **Recommendations**

PC to consider creation of a printable notice to be downloaded from the website or printed in the Parish News for residents to use.

### **Action**

Val Fox to draft note based on original, simplified.

# **NORTON ST PHILIP PARISH COUNCIL**

## **TRAFFIC ACTION GROUP**

### **Terms of Reference (Final draft)**

#### **1 Background**

The Traffic Action Group (TAG) was originally established as an outcome of the Parish Plan which was produced between 2002 – 2005. At that time, when the village had around 280 homes, traffic and transport was identified by more people than any other as the main issue in the village. Although TAG has never had a formal remit or constitution it has helped address a number of problems in the Parish, notably via the introduction of weight limits and speed restrictions. However, nearly 20 years since its formation, with the number of homes in the village having increased by more than 40% together with an even greater increase in the car population the time has come to review the way TAG works if we are to make further progress on all the traffic and transport issues. And with the resignation of the current Chair of TAG it is a logical time to review how TAG should operate into the future.

#### **2 Aims and Objectives**

The Traffic Action Group will act as an advisory group to the Parish Council; its aims and objectives should be twofold – both day-to-day operational and also project related. On some occasions it may be necessary to liaise with other authorities.

##### **2.1 Operational**

All traffic management matters related to the quality of life and safety of residents and visitors in the Civil Parish of Norton St Philip such as speeding, HGV infringements, speed limits, bus services, parking, road signage and pedestrian safety.

##### **2.2 Project work**

This might include one-off research, liaison with other villages, bus services etc.

#### **3. Establishment**

TAG is constituted as an advisory group of the Parish Council. The work carried out by TAG is to be formally agreed with the Parish Council as part of its regular reporting mechanism.

## **4. Responsibilities**

TAG holds no delegated authority to make decisions on behalf of the Parish Council nor to commit the Parish Council to any expenditure. It may however be necessary to arrange consultation with the wider community in the Parish, District or County, the Police and County Councillor and for this to be managed and agreed by the Parish Council.

## **5. Day to Day Operations**

### **5.1 Number of Members**

There is no maximum for the number of group members but a minimum number of 5 is required to comprise a representative group at all times. Each meeting must have 4 members present in order to proceed.

### **5.2 Meetings**

A minimum of 4 meetings per annum to be held. A TAG Report is to be sent to the Parish Clerk for dissemination to the Parish Council as soon as practicable and will be an agenda item at the Parish Council.

### **5.3 Parish Council Representation**

At least one Parish Councillor will be a member of TAG and shall act as liaison between TAG and the Parish Council. This will normally be the Portfolio holder.

### **5.4 Structure**

The group shall appoint a member to act as Chair of the group; other roles to be determined by the Chair.