

Annexe A – Representations received to the public consultation in Spring 2013

Officers wrote to local residents on 2nd April 2013, and provided a copy of the detailed design drawing. Residents were invited to contact the County Council should they wish to express their views about the proposed scheme. A letter was received from the Old Nursery Place Residents Association, with 10 signatories. The text of the letter has been reproduced verbatim below.

27th July 2013

Attn: Jefferson Nwokeoma

Dear Sir

Zebra Crossing Feltham Hill Road

We are writing to you about the proposal to install a zebra crossing in Feltham Hill Road outside number 150 Feltham Hill Road.

We, as residents of Old Nursery Place, fully supported this proposal as it

- Improves the pedestrian crossing facilities where most parents and children are crossing the road to go to Park Road school
- Reflects the set-up at the other end of Park Road (Chalmers Road East), which appears to work well
- Finally provides the facilities that parents have been lobbying for. As far as we are aware there have been at least 2 petitions for this

We were disappointed to hear that this proposal may now not happen and that the zebra crossing is likely to be moved up to Woodlands Parade, which in our opinion is too far away. We appreciate you have to go ahead based on all feedback but we would like to lodge our support for the original scheme, if it is not too late.

Individual written comments were also received from two households. These have been reproduced verbatim in the table below. The comments have been made anonymous, but the household from which the comments were received have been given a letter, to enable Members to see which household made which comment.

Comment	Officer response
Household A ...this proposal was rejected some 7 or so years ago.	The original proposal was withdrawn from the construction programme. It was anticipated at the time that the scheme might be reconsidered at some future date, and recommendations made to ensure adequate consultation with local residents in this event.
Household A The new suggestion has all the same problems and indeed at least one new one.	The resident describes these in detail, and so the officer comments below respond to each in turn.

<p>Household A Kerb height: for a crossing they must be a defended kerb of a minimum height. Due to the gradual slope of the ground toward the river Ash (and its underground tributary near this point) the kerb on the south side of Feltham Hill road is very low. The pavement would have to be raised to an unacceptable level to accommodate the required height and raising just the kerb edge would create a trip hazard.</p>	<p>Guidance states that for urban areas such as this a kerb height of between 100mm and 125mm is <i>desirable</i> (obviously apart from at dropped kerbs or other accesses). With regard to the southern side of Feltham Hill Road, a short length of raised (defended) kerb should be achievable between the existing driveways and the proposed crossing. An area of footway may need to be resurfaced to suit the new level. Note that this is a desirable, not an essential design feature.</p>
<p>Household A Width of raised kerb: the minimum required width of the defended kerb would intrude into the drop kerbs of the driveways on either side.</p>	<p>The achievable lengths of raised kerbs on either side of the crossing are short due to the nearby driveways. There is a requirement for a minimum <i>dropped kerb</i> width of 2.4 metres at the crossing point however there is no requirement for a minimum <i>raised kerb</i> length. As such, the raised kerb length in this case is of no consequence. In any case the detailed design has been modified to centre the crossing between the two driveways, and thereby maximise the length of raised kerb adjacent to the Zebra Crossing.</p>
<p>Household A BT box: there is an access points for British Telecom cables which would be within the entrance area of crossing. Any maintenance, which I can tell from experience is all too frequent) would require that the crossing be closed temporarily.</p>	<p>Access chambers are a common occurrence in footways and therefore it is inevitable that there will be some instances where they are at or very close to crossing locations. In such cases it is for the utility companies to ensure the safety of the public during any maintenance works, and there are well established methods for this.</p>

<p>Household A The proposed site for the relocated bus stop. The length of a bus would mean stopping in existing yellow lines for the corner of Park Road and Feltham Hill Road. This is contravention of Highway code section 238.</p> <p>The frequent [occasions] when a second bus stops at the same time would necessitate it either stopping across the entrance to Park Road or on the crossing itself. Neither seems a reasonable or safe action.</p>	<p>The proposed new location for the bus stop is approximately 32m from the end of the proposed zigzag lines. Even with the longest bus operating on Surrey’s network at 12m there is a sufficient length of un-controlled kerb to accommodate two buses without overlapping the proposed zigzag markings that accompany the proposed new crossing. Other representations suggest that it would be beneficial to move the bus stop further to the east to accommodate three buses at the same time, as there are a number of buses that use this stop during the school run. Unfortunately it is not feasible to move the bus stop further to the east as this would conflict with the junction of Chessholme Road. It is unlikely that three 12m long buses will attempt to use the stop at the same time, and therefore the current proposed solution is considered to be the best compromise. The location of the bus stop could be reviewed again at a future date if problems do arise.</p>
<p>Household A Buses indicating to stop would appear to traffic to be turning left into Park Road. This would be likely to increase the chances of an accident.</p>	<p>This is not considered to be a significant risk as the front of the bus stop is approximately 35m to the east of Park Road.</p>
<p>Household A The location of the bus stop itself would appear to actually be on top of another BT junction box, for the cable ducts which run along the edge of the pavement at this point.</p>	<p>The post would be located around the trenches and inspection covers in that location rather than on top of the BT junction box. The exact location is immediately adjacent to lamp column 29.</p>

Household A

...the original surveyors' report concluded that an uncontrolled crossing, as is now proposed, would be too dangerous due to the ambient traffic speed. Traffic levels and speeds have not altered in the intervening time. Why is it now considered safe?

A Zebra Crossing is a controlled crossing. Officers have asked the resident to provide the "original surveyor's report", but this has not been provided. It may be that the resident is referring to the Road Safety Audit (RSA) report from the original detailed design in 2005 / 2006. This RSA report is dated 2nd December 2005, and raised the problem that the 85th percentile speed on the approaches to the proposed crossing was 35mph. LTN 1/95 recommends that Zebra Crossings should not be installed on roads with an 85th percentile speed of 35mph or above. The risk is that drivers may be required to brake suddenly and fail to give way, especially in wet / icy conditions, resulting in loss of control and / or conflicts with pedestrians or other vehicles. The RSA recommended *"do not provide a Zebra Crossing at this location, as the 85th percentile speed is 35mph and hence exceeds the recommendation for a Zebra Crossing"*. The RSA went on to recommend that *"If ... a Zebra Crossing is to be installed ... provide SLOW road markings ... to increase driver awareness of the proposed crossing ahead"*. The detailed design at the time already included "Zebra Crossing Ahead" signs and high friction surfacing on the approaches.

The recent detailed design has been subject to the same RSA scrutiny. The RSA report relating to the recent detailed design, dated 30th May 2012, asks for 85th percentile speed data to be provided, and recommends that a Zebra Crossing is not provided if the 85th percentile speed is greater than or equal to 35mph. A speed survey was carried out on Feltham Hill Road at point where new zebra crossing point on 06/09/12 at 3.45pm. 100 vehicles were surveyed in each direction in dry/fine conditions during free-flowing traffic. 85th percentile speeds in both directions were measured to be 34mph. Therefore there is no longer a concern over the speed of traffic as there had been in 2005. Furthermore, the RSA report of December 2005 made provision for the installation of the crossing in spite of the 85th percentile speed being measured at 35mph at the time, recommending a SLOW marking to be installed to mitigate the risk identified.

The latest detailed design already included provision of high friction surfacing and advanced warning signs. In view of the concern raised by this resident SLOW markings have also been included in the latest design.

<p>Household A</p> <p>Few people cross at this point: those who do so mostly are not local residents, but parents of children at Echelford school. They park in Southfields Avenue or along Feltham Hill Road and cross here merely to avoid the congestion along Park Road. If a crossing is sited here it would prevent many of them parking anyway.</p> <p>Most parents who walk their children to the school do not come from the south side of Feltham Hill Road in the vicinity of the proposed crossing (their catchment area leads them to St. Michaels or the CofE school in School Road).</p>	<p>The demand for improved pedestrian crossing facilities was identified in the Safe Routes to Schools study reported to Committee in 2003. Subsequent correspondence mentions pedestrian surveys, but these were disputed at the time and officers have not been able to find these survey results.</p> <p>In terms of technical justification, the anticipated usage of a pedestrian crossing is an important consideration, but not the be all and end all. Pedestrian counts were completed on 10th September 2013. Between 0800 and 0900 21 people crossed the road within 50m of Poplar Road, and 78 people crossed the road within 50m of Park Road. Between 1440 and 1540 16 people crossed the road within 50m of Poplar Road, and 89 people crossed within 50m of Park Road. Poor provision for pedestrians can discourage pedestrian activity. Conversely provision of pedestrian crossing facilities can encourage people to walk – this can include local residents, as well as children and parents en route to local schools. The chosen location for the Zebra Crossing would serve all pedestrians approaching Echelford Primary School from the southern side of Feltham Hill Road, together with local residents wishing to use the bus stops near Park Road. On 10th September approximately 15-20 pedestrians were observed to use Poplar Road to get to Echelford School; these pedestrians came from the direction of Approach Road on the north side of Feltham Hill Road so they did not cross the road at either survey point. The concerns over loss of parking are noted. However the provision of a pedestrian crossing is considered to be a higher priority than provision of parking in this case.</p>
---	--

<p>Household A</p> <p>...many parents do cross nearer to Poplar Road, then continue to the school via New Park Road. They have actively campaigned for a crossing nearer to them, which would not involve relocating a bus stop. Why does the highways department persist in proposing a crossing where they would not use it.</p>	<p>Apart from the petition received in 2010 officers are not aware of an ongoing campaign for a new crossing of Feltham Hill Road near Poplar Road. It may be feasible to install a pedestrian crossing at this alternative location, either instead of or in addition to the proposed new Zebra Crossing at Park Road. However the feasibility of this alternative location has not been assessed. It is likely that many of the same technical challenges would be encountered – for example the proximity of driveways and road junctions. Pedestrian counts were completed on 10th September 2013. Between 0800 and 0900 21 people crossed the road within 50m of Poplar Road, and 78 people crossed the road within 50m of Park Road. Between 1440 and 1540 16 people crossed the road within 50m of Poplar Road, and 89 people crossed within 50m of Park Road. Approximately 15-20 pedestrians were observed to use Poplar Road and New Park Road to get to Echelford School; these pedestrians came from the direction of Approach Road on the north side of Feltham Hill Road so they did not cross the road at either survey point.</p>
<p>Household A</p> <p>Also moving the bus stop would greatly inconvenience the elder people living in sheltered accommodation in Metcalf road who do make use of the existing bus stop.</p>	<p>The westbound bus stop is already to the east of Chessholme Road, further away from Metcalf Road than the proposed new location for the eastbound bus stop.</p>
<p>Household A</p> <p>The Highways department seems short of funds – see the article in the local newspaper featuring Carol Coleman our councillor – and I understand that private funding from the development of housing in Poplar Road has been used to further this proposal. I cannot see that this crossing would be at all relevant to that development project, but the requested crossing nearer to Poplar Road and Woodlands Parade could be of benefit.</p>	<p>The terms of the s106 agreement relating to the development of land at the former British Telecom Site in Poplar Road provide for monies to be contributed by the developer for “the design and construction of a pedestrian crossing on Feltham Hill Road, Ashford”. The proposed Zebra Crossing is fully in accordance with the terms of the s106 agreement.</p>

<p>Household A</p> <p>When this scheme was proposed seven years ago, local objections with assistance from the Local Authority Ombudsman were escalated to a level 3 enquiry and resulted in the scheme being dropped. I have records of the original surveyors' report (which recommended that the crossing was not placed at this location), the meetings of meetings and transcripts of emails between the highways department and various councillors.</p>	<p>Objections should always be considered, but it is for the Local Committee to decide how to respond to those objections.</p> <p>The original scheme was not abandoned indefinitely in 2006, as discussed in the main body of this report.</p> <p>As mentioned above, officers have requested the resident to provide the "surveyor's report" but this has not been forthcoming. If this is the original RSA report, then the officer comments above are germane.</p> <p>If the meeting minutes and e-mail transcripts described were to be provided, then this would provide interesting background information, but would not change the current situation. In the design and development of the most recent proposal, none of the officers and engineers were involved in the previous proposal, and therefore the site has been approached afresh. Nothing raised by any of the representations amounts to a compelling technical reason not to proceed with the scheme.</p>
<p>Household A</p> <p>I understand from a communication from Mrs Coleman that this scheme has now been dropped. Could you please confirm that this is so?</p>	<p>The officer recommendation is for the scheme to proceed, with the modifications to the detailed design that have been made in response to the representations received. The decision is for the Local Committee.</p>
<p>Household B</p> <p>I have lived in my house for the last eight years and was opposed to the initial proposal over 5 years ago when you last raised this it. At that point it raised several concerns and was eventually overturned, so I am surprised that it has again been requested especially as the main reasons it was declined have not been resolved.</p>	<p>See officer comments above. In summary the previous proposal dating from 2005-06 was not abandoned indefinitely. The specific concerns raised by this respondent are addressed below in turn.</p>

<p>Household B</p> <p>The drawing ... shows you want to place the zebra crossing outside number 150 Feltham Hill Road which is the last house before the entrance to Southfields Avenue. How can this be a safe place to put a zebra crossing? It is almost on top of a crossroad of roads so people turning out of these side roads will be on top of the crossing before they realise it. This makes it a very dangerous place. This proposal is more likely to cause an accident than all people to cross safely. I also note that there has never been an accident or near miss for people crossing the road in this area...</p>	<p>As mentioned above the crossing location itself has been moved west (away from Southfields Avenue) by approximately 1m in order for it to be centred between the driveways of numbers 148 and 150. Guidance suggests an absolute minimum distance of 5m measured from the location of a driver waiting to pull out of the side road. On that basis, the distance achieved by this design is nearer to 10m so this is acceptable.</p>
<p>Household B</p> <p>...the main people crossing the road for the school are parking in the very place you want to put this zebra crossing as traffic is so bad down Park Road. So this crossing will not encourage people to walk to school but cause more problems with parking.</p>	<p>See officer comments above.</p>
<p>Household B</p> <p>Moving the bus stop to the new position shown will mean that all the school traffic that comes out of Park Road which is very busy at peak times due to school runs will be restricted from a safe view as the bus will block this.</p>	<p>This would be a risk if three buses were to arrive at the bus stop at the same time. However it would not be any worse than the existing situation, with the bus stop just to the west of Park Road.</p> <p>See also officer comments above, and the comments of Surrey Police in the main body of the report.</p>
<p>Household B</p> <p>Also if two buses arrive at the stop together where will the second one wait, it will either block Park Road or the zebra crossing you are trying to create.</p>	<p>See officer comments above.</p>
<p>Household B</p> <p>Also the sheltered housing residents would be expected to walk a further 36 meters to get to the bus stop. These are elderly people who rely on the bus and may not be able to manage to walk that much further.</p>	<p>See officer comments above.</p>
<p>I am very disappointed with this proposal especially as there is no mention of the previous proposal and the reasons it was rejected. I would have thought the reasons should have been addressed and local residents contacted with how they had been resolved or if they have not been resolved as is thought then how can it go ahead?</p>	<p>The previous proposal from 2005-06 was never abandoned. It was anticipated at the time that it may be proposed at some stage in the future, and recommendations made to ensure adequate consultation. As this report demonstrates, local residents have been consulted and their comments and concerns are now reported to Committee for consideration.</p>

A number of residents provided comments by telephone, raising the following concerns:

- Questioning the resurrection of the scheme from 2005-06, which was perceived to have been abandoned at the time – this is covered by officer comments above;
- Questioning the need to relocate the bus stop from a “no man’s land” location to a new location in front of residential properties – it is necessary to relocate the bus stop away from the location of the crossing, to avoid a conflict between the bus stop and the zigzag markings that accompany the crossing;
- Questioning whether the proposed new location for the bus stop would be hazardous given its proximity to the junction with Park Road – this is covered by officer comments above;
- Questioning the need for a crossing in this location, suggesting that an alternative location would be preferable – this is covered by officer comments above;
- Questioning what safety measures had been taken to ensure that the location is now safe given that the previous proposal was perceived to have been abandoned on safety grounds – this is covered by officer comments above in part – the scheme includes high friction surfacing, advanced warning signs and SLOW markings on both approaches to the crossing;
- Questioning whether the proposed new location for the bus stop would have a detrimental effect on the values of the properties adjacent to the proposed new location – no officer comment.

This page is intentionally left blank