

## **Post Consultation Report**

### **Dorchester Avenue and Winchester Avenue – Tabled Junction Build Outs**

#### **Project No: CO17126**

A consultation was held on the above scheme proposals between 19<sup>th</sup> September 2017 – 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2017, although any correspondence that was received shortly after the deadline was still included as part of this report. The purpose of the consultation was to obtain information from the local community in order to improve the scheme and if possible address any local concerns.

From the approximately 260 properties consulted and 8 site notices displayed on site, 17 individual responses were received, these have been summarised as follows:

- 11 - Support the proposal
- 6 - Object to the proposal

The above figures are broken down as follows:

- Dorchester Avenue – 9 in support and 1 object
- Winchester Avenue – 1 in support
- Other Streets – 1 in support and 5 object

It is worth noting that the majority of the comments against the proposed scheme are not from residents of Dorchester Avenue and Winchester Avenue where the actual tabled junction build-outs are being introduced. Correspondence which was received from residents of streets other than Dorchester Avenue and Winchester Avenue were grouped together as "Other Streets".

### **Recommendation**

In view of the below it is proposed to **proceed** with the proposal subject to available funding. The scheme will introduce tabled junctions with build-outs around the junctions of Dorchester Avenue and Winchester Avenue and also the introduction of double yellow lines indicating "No Waiting At Any Time".

**The below are comments received during the consultation period that are against the proposal:**

"It appears to me that because 'an amount of money' has been allocated to the project, regardless of whether it is appropriate, it will be spent 'come what may', when it could be put to better use elsewhere in the City if necessary. Unless the job is going to be done effectively i.e. closing the road completely, then it is better not to do anything at all. Yet another waste of hard earned taxpayers money by local government."

"It is my view that this scheme is unnecessary and would in fact have a negative effect. Although it is said to be "funded", I would suggest that these funds should be made available for other schemes offering a real benefit."

*The monies available for this proposed scheme have been allocated from a S106 (Section 106) Agreement. Section 106 (S106) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 allows a local planning authority (LPA) to enter into a legally-binding agreement or planning obligation with a landowner in association with the granting of planning permission. The obligation is termed a Section 106 Agreement.*

*This funding has been allocated towards road safety improvements and as it is scheme specific, it cannot be reallocated to other projects, other locations or other services within the Council.*

"We fail to see how having traffic calming measures at junctions will prevent people using these streets as short cuts and / or speeding"

"In my opinion, a small number of determined short-cut users would not be put-off by this scheme."

*This scheme has not been developed in order to try to deter vehicles travelling along the identified roads; it has been developed as a road safety scheme to improve general road safety for all road users around the identified junctions. Speed tables at the junctions will reduce vehicle speeds which will improve road safety and accessibility for pedestrians at these locations.*

"If new funding is available then pedestrian safety at the junction of Colchester Avenue and Penylan Hill should be a higher priority as local residents have been asking for years. The old persons residence requires safe facilities at the main traffic lighted junction and should take precedence - residents of Winchester and Dorchester can cross there and walk up. Pupils at 2 High Schools also require safe crossing at this junction- rectify that first."

"I do not believe there is a need for such a scheme especially within 100 yards of the Penylan Hill / Colchester Ave junction. I regularly see pedestrians (and cyclists) struggling at this junction whereas the roads in the proposed project are extremely quiet and pose no difficulty to any road user."

*Transport Projects have investigated Road Safety issues throughout Cardiff by carrying out a series of Area Studies. The investigations have taken into account new issues raised by Councillors and members of the Public, along with existing issues and areas of concern.*

*The comprehensive investigation of road safety and accessibility issues has included an evaluation of the police injury related incident record, traffic and pedestrian surveys, planned developments and other relevant data. I can advise that previous concerns have been raised regarding this location and there is a "Pedestrian Crossing Facilities" scheme on the future programme list for the junction of Colchester Avenue and Pen-y-Lan Road. However,*

*as this is subject to funding becoming available we are unable to give a timescale of when this scheme can be progressed. The provision of pedestrian facilities at this location will cost well in excess of the available Section 106 funding.*

*As mentioned earlier in this report the money that is being used for this proposed scheme has been allocated from an S106 (Section 106) Agreement that has specifically been allocated to be used at this location and this money cannot be reallocated to other projects, other locations or other services within the Council.*

*“The Access Only status of Winchester and Dorchester is surely in this day and age questionable - what earthly reason is there for these addresses to be spared the traffic deluge we all have to deal with?”*

*Access Only is shorthand for special residents only advantages? It's time those demanding special treatment got into the real world!*

*Dorchester Avenue and Winchester Avenue have “Access Only” Traffic Regulation Order's (TRO'S) which have been in operation for a number of years. These Traffic Orders are moving traffic offences which are not enforceable by Civil Parking Enforcement Officers as the stopping of vehicles and questioning of drivers is required to substantiate any possible offence and therefore the enforcement of these Orders are a matter for which only the Police may enforce.*

*Whilst Cardiff Council no longer look to introduce “Access Only” Traffic Regulation Orders, where there are streets with existing Access Only Traffic Orders these will remain on site if and not be revoked as the signage may act as a deterrent to drivers who may wish to drive through these locations.*

*“The reason the original plan was rejected is because the advice letter asked only for OBJECTIONS to the scheme and NOT confirmation of those in agreement. Neighbours on either side of me were in agreement but didn't respond because your letter was worded incorrectly. You should have stipulated that everyone was to respond regardless of their views.”*

*It is standard Council practice that all properties within 100 metres of a proposed Transport Projects scheme are letter dropped in order to raise awareness of a proposed Transport Projects scheme. The purpose of the consultation was to obtain information from the local community in order to improve the scheme and if possible address any local concerns. The wording used on the consultation documents is standard with all Transport Project Consultations we undertake as we are not undertaking a “vote based” consultation in which we are looking for a majority support for the scheme.*

*Therefore this leaves the decision up to the public should they feel the need to write in to “support” or “object” to a proposed scheme. The feedback is used as further information in our decision of how or whether to proceed with a scheme. It is re-assuring to hear that there is local support for a scheme but this will not necessarily influence the decision on how to proceed.*

“The proposed plan is horrendous. Nothing but chaos will ensue and I am certain a major accident will occur at some point. Nobody will be able to get in or out of Dorchester Avenue at certain times. There will be a backlog of traffic onto Penylan Hill and the widening of the pavement will mean that traffic will not flow easily as cars will need to go wide to accommodate it.”

“We are concerned that the tabled junction could mean that the narrowing of the entry and exit to both roads could cause most problems for drivers coming off the hill who meet a car entering the tabled (restricted ) junction, with effect that traffic on Penylan hill (a main arterial route) will be backed up.”

*Whilst there will be a reduction in road width around these junctions, sufficient road width will remain for two way traffic flow through these junctions. Due to the road width being narrowed this will mean vehicles will have to reduce their speed when approaching the junction.*

*“Track-runs” have been undertaken during the concept design stage that identify vehicles can undertake turning manoeuvres without being obstructed by the proposed junction layout. However, during the detailed design stage, the junction layout will be looked at in more depth to see if any alterations are required to the proposed tabled junction build-outs.*

“Cars have to slow down at these junctions as they are. Introducing a speed bump will serve no constructive purpose at these locations.”

*Whilst it is normal for a vehicle to reduce their speed on approach to a junction, if a junction mouth is wide drivers may be inclined to not reduce their speed sufficiently and undertake a turning manoeuvre at an in-appropriate speed. As part of this proposal the road width will be narrowed which will force vehicles to reduce their speed when undertaking this manoeuvre. This will therefore improve safety for both drivers and pedestrians around these locations.*

“The proposals will stop me safely parking a car right outside my own property in a primarily residential road as I have done for the last thirty years.”

*The Highway Code states that ‘you must not leave your vehicle or trailer in a dangerous position or where it causes unnecessary obstruction of the road’. It also states ‘Do Not stop or Park opposite or within 10 metres of a junction’. These restrictions are required to improve safety for pedestrians crossing the junctions, to protect driver sight lines and to facilitate vehicle manoeuvres. Vehicles may have previously parked in close proximity to these junctions and so this proposal will improve road safety, as this unsafe parking will be prevented at all times. The proposed scheme implementation would remove only a low number of parked vehicles which, if parked at this location, would be causing an obstruction.*

*Whilst we understand residents want to park as close to their homes as possible, road safety has to be the paramount consideration and should not be compromised in the interests of parking convenience. After this Transport Project Consultation process is formalised and an agreed decision has been made on how to proceed with this scheme, we will instruct the Traffic Regulation Order team to start a legal Traffic Order process to support the introduction of these restrictions on the road. As part of the Traffic Regulation Order process, site notices will be placed on site to make the public aware of the proposals, these site notices will list exact dimensions of any proposed Traffic Regulation Orders for the area should the public wish to object to the proposed restrictions.*

“The inclusion of a tabled junction will, through traffic generated vibrations, adversely affect the structural integrity of my dwelling house which has foundations in a substrate of clay.”

*Regarding vibrations to properties, the guidance from the Department for Transport on road humps and ground-borne vibrations is based on British Standard 7385: Part 2 which gives threshold values of vibration exposure which may give rise to minor cosmetic damage to buildings. These values were used to calculate minimum distances at which it would be desirable for road humps to be sited from dwellings, according to soil type. This table shows that even very minor hairline cracking should not occur unless the road humps are placed less than 4m from a dwelling, even for the softest soil. During the detailed design stage, we will ensure that no ramps are within 4m of a building.*

“The new proposals are also not properly engineered, in that they take no account of the road drainage gully located outside my house, which is now shown buried under the tabled junction!”

*The initial plans we consult on at this stage are “concept plans” and these are always subject to change when the “detailed design” stage is undertaken. Any drainage issues will be identified during the detailed design stage and any relevant amendments will be made to the proposed scheme.*

“I would also like to suggest reverting to making the build outs equidistant from either kerb line, rather than biased to one side in order to offer some small parking protection to my own reasonable high-banded rate Council Tax needs?”

*Firstly, it must be noted that junction build-outs are not introduced to “protect” vehicles from the flow of through traffic, they are introduced as a way of reducing carriageway width at a certain location in order to improve road safety for all road users. The feature will be a disciplined, safe and controlled manoeuvre at all times irrespective of whether there is parking nearby.*

*The concept plan shows the build out introduced on one side of the road. This will mean that any vehicles parked directly behind this build-out (which is approximately the width of a car) would be protected behind this built out. If the proposed build-out area was shared over two sides of the road, parked vehicles would protrude beyond the buildout on both sides. This is not necessarily an improvement on the concept plan proposals. However, either of these options would achieve the desired road traffic calming effect with improved pedestrian accessibility. This is not considered to be a fundamental decision and will therefore be determined during the detailed design process where other issues will be considered more closely (e.g. existing services, drainage, unforeseen ground conditions, existing and proposed signs and other street furniture and features).*

"I am very concerned that this scheme will significantly reduce the parking available, losing around 16 parking spaces. These are currently used, every evening, as an over-spill option, by residents unable to park outside their own homes."

"I believe that the present arrangement, whereby vehicles can park quite close to the junctions and on both sides of the road, already achieves a "traffic-calming" effect i.e. vehicles turning into Winchester Avenue and Dorchester Avenue have to slow down and negotiate the junctions with care."

*The Highway Code recommends that drivers do not park within 10 metres of junctions and also recommends drivers should not park on a road where it would endanger, inconvenience or obstruct pedestrians or other road users. Therefore, it is Council practice that parking restrictions around junctions are usually introduced around junctions for a distance of 10 metres. The implementation of double yellow lines as proposed would remove only a low number of parked vehicles which if parked in this location would be causing problems of safety and obstruction.*

*A figure of "16" lost parking spaces refers to cars that are parked in contravention of the guidance provided by the Highway Code and therefore vehicles should not be parked at these locations currently.*

**The below are comments received during the consultation period that are in favour of the proposal:**

"Re: Dorchester and Winchester Avenue - junction build outs, an excellent idea - fully supportive! This project will certainly have a positive effect on traffic using these avenues to beat the traffic lights at the Colchester Avenue junction with Penylan Road"

"I am in favour of the traffic calming scheme outlined."

"I agree with the proposal to improve access to Dorchester Avenue. This is desperately needed before a nasty accident occurs here"

"the proposals seem sensible and would hopefully provide safer junctions."

"Our views on this have never been favourably received, so we are in agreement with the apparently next best thing, build outs to discourage the "rat racers". We really hope they are successful for the good of all of us who live in this area."

"I agree with the proposal for tabled junctions with build-outs to the junction of Dorchester Avenue with Penylan Road and Waterloo Road in order to try and deter or just slow down traffic cutting through - at speed, in order to avoid traffic lights on Penylan Road with Colchester Avenue"

"We appreciate the council seeking to provide much needed calming measures at the junction of Dorchester Avenue and Penylan hill, especially as we have seen an increase in cars coming through of late, with some even showing displeasure/anger that we need to pull our car out onto the avenue and are 'interfering' with them cutting through."

"I agree with the proposal to improve access to Dorchester Avenue. This is desperately needed before a nasty accident occurs here."

**The below are additional comments that were received during the consultation period regarding other matters arising from the consultation:**

“In the lane between Winchester Avenue and Colchester Avenue we are plagued with rubbish being dumped and unauthorized vehicle parking obstructing garages. Could the Council give some future consideration to 'gating' this lane?”

*Regarding the closing of lanes to prevent anti-social behaviour, these require legal orders which are referred to as “Alley Gating” Orders. The introduction of such orders are dealt with by the Council’s “Housing” Service Area. They can be contacted via C2C 029 2080 2087 or emailed at [HousingAndCommunities.BusinessSupport@cardiff.gov.uk](mailto:HousingAndCommunities.BusinessSupport@cardiff.gov.uk).*

“Could you confirm that the council practice of consulting residents only includes those living within 100 metres of the proposed scheme is being followed in this case?”

*It is standard Council practice that all properties within 100 metres of a proposed Transport Projects scheme are letter dropped in order to raise awareness of a proposed scheme. It is not possible to consult every property in the area and therefore there are always going to be properties who are not letter dropped as part of the consultation. Site notices were also placed on site in the affected area that provided details of the proposal and also a link to the Council website where the public could view additional information about the scheme.*

“Can I suggest making the roads 20 mph as most of our area has been designated 20 mph now.”

*The Council is currently investigating the implementation of additional 20 mph areas throughout the City. Initial focus will be on residential areas adjacent to the city centre. In due course, and subject to funding, other areas will be considered for 20 mph limits.*

**Yn dilyn ymgynghoriadau diweddar ar gynnis rheoli traffig, mae'r Cyngor yn paratoui i weithredu'r cynllun rheoli traffig yn seiliedig ar y cynllun.**

Mae rhagor o fanylion am yr ymgynghori hwn ar gael yn [www.caerdydd.gov.uk/Projectautrafnidiaeth](http://www.caerdydd.gov.uk/Projectautrafnidiaeth) ar y ddolen 'gweld ymgynghoriadau'. Fel arall, e-bostiwch [Projectautrafnidiaeth@caerdydd.gov.uk](mailto:Projectautrafnidiaeth@caerdydd.gov.uk) neu ffoniwch 029 2087 3289 i ofyn am gopi papur o'r adroddiad ymgynghori.



**Following the recent consultation on a traffic management proposal, the Council is preparing to implement the scheme based on the plan shown.**

Further details about this consultation are available at [www.cardiff.gov.uk/TransportProjects](http://www.cardiff.gov.uk/TransportProjects) using the 'view consultations' link. Alternatively, please e-mail [TransportProjects@cardiff.gov.uk](mailto:TransportProjects@cardiff.gov.uk) or telephone 029 2087 3289 to request a paper copy of the post-consultation report.