

HIW/18/29

Torridge Highways and Traffic Orders Committee
27 April 2018

Northam Town Council – Various requests

Report of the Chief Officer for Highways, Infrastructure Development and Waste

Please note that the following recommendations are subject to consideration and determination by the Committee before taking effect.

Recommendation: It is recommended that the officer responses and recommendations given in section 2 of this report in respect of each of the issues raised are noted and agreed.

1. Background/Introduction

At the Torridge Highways and Traffic Orders Committee on 10 October 2017 Councillor Eastman raised various issues in Northam, and it was agreed that officers of the County Council would report back on these at the next meeting of the Committee. Many of the identified issues have been raised before in other forums.

2. Main Text/Proposal

This report sets out a number of issues in Northam that were raised at the Torridge HATOC on 10 October 2017 and gives officer responses to each issue.

- (a) Installation of a crossing in Northam Square, or some form of traffic calming.

There is no budget identified for any works at this location, monitored traffic speeds do not raise concerns, there is no record of a collision history and the current road surface is not scheduled for renewal.

It is estimated that installing traffic calming at this location would cost in excess of £50,000, depending on the type of traffic calming selected. As an example, part of The Square could be raised, and a different surface used to highlight that it is a town centre.

Any traffic calming scheme would have to accommodate the bus stops and the echelon parking on the east side of The Square.

It is recommended that no further action is taken as there is no justification based on traffic speeds or collisions and no budget is available.

- (b) Speeding issues particularly in Churchill Way, Fore Street and the Square.

Issues of traffic speeds are normally resolved by the Speed Compliance And Review Forum (SCARF) process. Traffic speeds are being measured at these sites, those undertaken to date do not indicate any issues that would qualify for action under the SCARF process.

It is recommended that traffic speeding issues continue to be reviewed through the SCARF process.

- (c) Would the junction at Bayview Road, Buckleigh Road and Cornborough Road be suitable for a much-needed roundabout?

There is no budget identified for any works at this location and there is no relevant recorded collision history.

It would be technically difficult to construct a roundabout at this location because:

- The junctions with Bay View Road and Cornborough Road are staggered;
- The area required to construct a roundabout is constrained by private land ownership, and additional land would have to be purchased;
- There are visibility issues from adjacent walls and structures, particularly on Bay View Road and Stanwell Hill. Traffic from Bay View road would have to give way to traffic from Stanwell Hill, with very limited visibility. Although this is also true in the current situation a roundabout would require the give way line to be brought further back to accommodate the geometry for a roundabout. Traffic travelling down Buckleigh Road to Stanwell Hill would have to give way to traffic on Bay View Road, again with limited visibility.
- Roundabouts work well where the traffic is balanced on all arms, in this case the major route traffic would be required to give way to traffic on more minor roads with lower traffic levels.
- A roundabout would have to accommodate the junctions with Fosceth Hill and College Close.

Construction of a roundabout would therefore require the acquisition of private land, including dwellings, which is an expensive process and is likely to attract objections.

It is recommended that no further action is taken as there is no justification based on traffic delay or collisions, no budget is available, and a roundabout would require the purchase of additional land and dwellings.

- (d) Signage is required at the approach to the roundabout at Heywood Road warning "Pedestrians Ahead".

A warning sign to diagram 544.1 warns of pedestrians in the road and is intended to indicate where pedestrians are walking along the road (i.e. where there is no footway). It is not applicable to a situation where pedestrians are crossing the road.

There is no prescribed sign to warn of pedestrians crossing the road as this would be expected at any junction.

It is recommended that no further action is taken

- (e) Signage warning of pedestrians crossing from the top of Raleigh Hill over the link road following the public footpath.

There is no prescribed sign to warn of pedestrians crossing the road.

This road layout in this area will be changed with the planned improvements on the A39.

In the meantime, **it is recommended that** area of grass in advance of the crossing point is cut on either side in order to improve its visibility.

- (f) A proposal for a pedestrian central refuge at the widest point for Pedestrians to cross in Chanters Road.

There is no collision record at this junction, and no identified budget.

There is an alternative route for pedestrians, which is safer to use and avoids crossing Chanters Road. This is by crossing Kingsley Road, using the existing traffic islands, crossing Alexandra Terrace, which is narrower and has much lower traffic flows, and recrossing Kingsley Road by the traffic island on the other side.

A traffic island would be likely to interfere with the movement of larger vehicles at the junction, this would need to be tested using swept path software during the design process.

Given the low number of pedestrians using this junction, and lack of an identified budget, **it is recommended that** no further action is taken.

3. Options/Alternatives

In each of the issues outlined above consideration must be given as to whether any additional work is required.

4. Consultations/Representations/Technical Data

The issues have been raised by the local Member for Northam, many of them have previously been raised in other forums.

5. Financial Considerations

Currently no budget has been identified for the design or construction of any of the schemes raised.

6. Environmental Impact Considerations

There are not considered to be any environmental issues in regard to this report. If any of the items are progressed the details would have to be considered for each one in turn.

7. Equality Considerations

There are not considered to be any equality issues in regard to this report. If any of the items are progressed the details would have to be considered for each one in turn.

8. Legal Considerations.

There are not considered to be any legal issues in regard to this report. If any of the items are progressed the details would have to be considered for each one in turn.

9. Risk Management Considerations

There are not considered to be any risk management issues in regard to this report. If any of the items are progressed the details would have to be considered for each one in turn.

10. Public Health Impact

There are no public health impacts. If any of the items are progressed the details would have to be considered for each one in turn.

11. Summary/Conclusions/Reasons for Recommendations

It is recommended that the officer responses and recommendations given in section 2 of this report in respect of each of the issues raised are noted and agreed.

Meg Booth
Chief Officer for Highways, Infrastructure Development and Waste

Electoral Divisions: Bideford East, and Northam

Local Government Act 1972: List of Background Papers

Contact for enquiries: John Fewings

Room No: Ryefields, Avery Hill, Rydon Road, Kingsteignton, TQ12 3QG

Tel No: 01392 383000

Background Paper	Date	File Ref.
None		

jf120418torh
sc/cr/northam town council various requests
04 170418