



**Henleaze, Stoke Bishop and Westbury-on-Trym  
Neighbourhood Partnership (NP3)**

**Notes of the Transport Working Group Meeting  
Tuesday 21<sup>st</sup> January 2014, W-O-T Academy**

**Present:** Alan Aburrow (Chairman & WOT Ward Rep), Rob Grieve (BCC Highways Engineer), Councillor Alastair Watson, Andrew McGrath (NP Area Coordinator)

**NP3 Ward Reps:** Gay Huggins (SB), Alan Preece (SB), Mark Baker (SB), David Mayer (WOT), Simon Tomlinson (HEN)

Lionel Hart (Westbury Park Traffic Group); Neil Franks, George Tute, Keith Yeandel, Mike Rodway, Graham Donald, Susan Mayer, Philippa Gardom, Sheila Preece, Julian Carey, Terry Miller & David Moore

**1. Apologies & Introductions**

Peter Hobbs, Stephanie French, Harvey Logan, Jenny Hodges, Mike Batten

Alan Aburrow welcomed all present and introduced Dr Adrienn Tomer, Senior Lecturer & Bridge Engineer, working for the University of the West of England. She gave a short presentation of her plans to build a pedestrian/cycle bridge over the top of Bridge Valley Road. There is an Open Day on 22<sup>nd</sup> February in Engineers' House, The Promenade, from 10am – noon.

**2. Notes from previous meeting on 28<sup>th</sup> October 2013: Agreed.**

**Matters Arising:** None, other than items to be raised later.

**3. GBBN:** A letter from the Mayor, George Ferguson, regarding the Westbury Road bus lane had been circulated with the Agenda. This identified that the post-scheme traffic counts had not yet been completed. Sue Mayer requested that traffic counts should also take place through Westbury village and Coombe Lane where she opined that detours were now taking place.

It was reported by Lionel Hart that the increased size of the island at the end of North View was causing big traffic delays, and that the cycle lane on Westbury Park was unused but caused long delays, as it had reduced traffic to one lane. All these issues were requested to be included in the post-scheme review for possible rectification. David Mayer had already requested, as NP3 Chairman, that the Terms of Reference for the traffic survey should be submitted to the NP for its approval before implementation.

**4. Proposed bus lane on Parry's Lane:** There is a meeting next week between BCC Officers and Bristol University to seek removal of the requirements for a bus lane from the original Planning Application which was granted for redeveloping the Hyatt Baker site. Alternative traffic arrangements would be pursued and agreed. David Mayer asked that the Councillors get involved with the possible changes. Sue Mayer asked for the safety of pedestrians not to be overlooked.

**5. 20mph Rollout Scheme:** Implementation of Phase 1 of this scheme, for Central Bristol, had commenced this week. The majority of our NP's area is included in Phase 3, for which consultation

finished last October. We now await publication of the final proposals, which will form the basis of the formal Speed Limit Order (SLO). A further formal consultation is required, as part of the SLO process, which is planned for February this year - with implementation planned to follow in August/September. Sue Mayer raised the issue of Coombe Lane being retained at 30mph and she was advised to challenge the TRO consultation process. It was felt that the Council should wait and see how the current Phase 1 rollout progressed before committing to taking the rollout further into other areas. However, this is very unlikely.

Simon had forwarded a very well written critique of the 20mph consultation process to Alan, which had been written by a resident of Westbury Park. This critique is appended to these Notes (as Attachment 1) for information/education but please do not shoot the messenger!

**6. Local Sustainable Transport (LST) Grants:** No further grants had been applied for through the final (Round 3) stage of LST grants, as Capital Works were specifically excluded - unless it is related to Safe Routes to School projects. However, the maximum Round 3 grant that could be applied for was only £3k and there was nothing on the WG's current list of Highway Issues which came within the scope of the Round 3 grant criteria.

**7. Current Highway Issues:** Rob Grieve reported on the list as follows:-

**H105: Parking Restrictions ("Yellow-lining") in the Westbury Park area** - still outstanding.

**H111: Junction of Southmead Road, Henleaze Road and Eastfield Road** – a feasibility/design study was sanctioned at the last NP. However, outline proposals for a new development on the "Quarry Leaze" site could refocus the need for improvements at this junction.

**H114: Waitrose Entrance:** - a Planning Application has been submitted by Waitrose to revamp their car park arrangements, including a redesigned entrance. Discussions are on-going and Planning Permission has not yet been granted. Henleaze Councillors could call for the Application to go to the Planning Committee for a decision (rather than an Officer's delegated decision).

**H115: Tesco Entrance, Henleaze Road** – the site investigation by Halcrow (now rebranded "CH2M HILL") has been completed and their final report should be available in about two weeks.

**H117: Henleaze Road/Northumbria Drive Junction** – as H115, above.

**H118: Park Grove crossing point** – another Halcrow project; awaiting a progress report.

**H122: Lime Trees Road Roundabout** - it was believed that Tesco had put up new signs.

**H123: West Broadway/South Croft traffic calming:** - traffic counts have been completed; report to be commissioned (with Halcrow?).

**H125: Coldharbour Road Pedestrian Crossing** – design study currently with Halcrow; update to follow shortly.

**H126: Springfield Grove** - build-outs to be inspected for compliance with current standards.

**H127 to H132: Road Junctions in Henleaze** - a parking restriction review and subsequent TRO (after public consultation) for many road junctions in Henleaze - including Downs Park West/Henleaze Road; Wanscow Walk/Henleaze Road, Henley Grove/Henleaze Road; Brean Down Avenue/White Tree Road; Eastfield/Eastfield Road; Grange Park/Brecon Road/Waterford Road/Antrim Road - was sanctioned at the last NP.

**H133: 10 Road Junctions in Henleaze** – reported as being deficient in the provision of dropped kerbs for use by disabled buggies. This issue will be reviewed by Highway Engineers to establish the extent of the problem and to identify funding sources for any remedial work.

**H134: Brecon Road, around St Ursula's School** - traffic surveys (by the Developer) will need to be undertaken to support any Planning Application for the expansion of the school site.

**S101: Junction of Sea Mills Lane and Shirehampton Road** – yellow lines outstanding.

**S103: Old Sneed Ave junction with Stoke Hill** – yellow lines completed (at last!)

**S106, S111, S113, S114: Parking Restrictions around The Downs** - public consultation to commence in February with subsequent TRO to be progressed for completion before the end of 2014.

**S107: Kewstoke Road junction with Stoke Hill** - yellow lines completed.

**S109: Stoke Paddock Road junction with Shirehampton Road** - yellow lines outstanding.

**S115: Avon Way Junction with Sea Mills Lane** - yellow lines completed.

**S116: Sea Mills Lane (leading to Sea Mills station)** - yellow lines outstanding.

**W109: Eastfield Road (at top of Waters Lane)** – Rob tabled his Report detailing a design study for a pedestrian crossing point and pavement realignment. There were two options for consideration and Rob felt the dropped kerbs was preferable and could be completed with the funds originally allocated by the NP for the design study. The draft Report would be presented to the next NP for information.

**W112: Stoke Lane Area Parking Review** – the Public Consultation had closed on 12 January and the results will be evaluated, prior to progressing the requisite Traffic Regulation Order for implementation. The public response had been very good but Mike Rodway felt that not all residents had been contacted as he had had several local residents ask him what it was all about! Residents of Lampeter Road were asking for double yellow lines down one side of “their” road. David Mayer asked for details on the number of leaflets and responses to be sent to him by next Tuesday for noting at the WoT Open Forum. **Secretary’s Note:** Rob’s response is appended to these Notes, as Attachment 2.

**W114: Chock Lane** - Rob tabled his Report detailing a review and design proposals for additional traffic calming measures in Chock Lane. Two options were proposed, Option 1 at a cost of £17,000 and Option 2, at a cost of £11,000 for additional work, if Option 1 proved ineffective. Alan Aburrow suggested holding a local meeting when the Report had been circulated amongst residents and other interested parties. The draft Report would be presented to the next NP for information.

**W117: Southmead Road Pedestrian Crossing** - design study with Halcrow; update to follow shortly.

**W119 & W133: Falcondale Road/Greystoke Avenue Junction** - funding for a design study was approved at the last NP and includes the provision of an additional crossing point on Falcondale Road.

**W121: Falcondale Road/Westbury Road Junction** - funding for a design study was approved at the last NP and will address the locations of the current Zebra Crossings.

**W129: Canford Lane** - provision of a Zebra Crossing and/or pedestrian refuges will be reviewed in the light of any supporting evidence, eg SpeedWatch results and traffic counts.

**W132: Eastfield Road at Cote Lea Park Junction** - Rob will visit the site to confirm if any improvements can be made to the crossing point that was provided as part of the Safe Walk to School scheme c2010.

**W134: Coombe Lane Junction with Canford Lane** - funding for a design study was approved at the last NP.

**W135 & W136: Cote Lea Park/Pinewood Close, Holmwood Gardens, Passage Road and Shipley Road** - parking restrictions should be reviewed with a view to providing double yellow lines to protect the junctions and/or sections of road from inconsiderate parking. Alan had also recently received a complaint about parking in Westfield Road, which could be included with W136.

**W137: Channells Hill** – Rob is currently reviewing the adequacy of the signage at the bottom of Channells Hill with a view to reducing the number of vehicles that are reported to be driving the “wrong way” up this one-way street.

**8. Highway Maintenance Issues:** footway refurbishment on Priory Avenue (M108) had recently commenced but no feedback was available for other roads sanctioned by the NP for footway maintenance during 2013/14, except Glen Drive (M113) which should start in about two weeks.

**Waters Lane (M125):-** It was suggested that the cost of £700 to remove the deep step in the footway half way down Waters Lane (outside “Ash Cottage”) should be funded from an application to the NP’s Local Community Small Grants fund and Alan agreed to take this forward.

**Secretary’s Note:** Following enquiries after the Meeting, it transpired that this work had been completed a few days earlier, from the Council’s maintenance budget - a vast improvement!



**9. A.O.B.**

**Section 106 money - ZCD.967:** Alan and Simon had looked at using this S106 funding (approx £8k) to provide Real Time Information (RTI) display boards at two bus stops on Henleaze Road (near Rockside Drive). However, it had also been suggested by the Henleaze councillors that the money could go towards funding a complete new bus stop facility, at a total cost of £30k. The source of any additional funding had yet to be identified!

Simon Tomlinson reminded us of plans by South Glos to build in excess of 5000 houses on land at Cribbs Causeway/Patchway. Local drop-in exhibitions were planned for the very near future and further information was available on the NP’s website ([www.activenp.co.uk](http://www.activenp.co.uk)). Julian Carey was very concerned that all these potential new residents would be using Falcondale Road to commute into Bristol. Andrew McGrath advised that a public meeting was being planned for mid-February by Bristol City Council.

**10. Dates for Next Meetings:**

- Wednesday **30<sup>th</sup> April**
- Thursday **24<sup>th</sup> July** (to include the AGM)
- Tuesday **7<sup>th</sup> October**
- Tuesday **20<sup>th</sup> January** (2015)

The meeting closed at 9.10pm.

Dear Mr Mann

5 January 2014

## **20 MPH SPEED LIMIT PILOT AREAS**

### **Monitoring Report**

**March 2012**

I wish to comment on the above report as part of the on-going public consultation and response to the proposed roll-out of 20mph speed-limited roads across the city. Unfortunately I only saw the above report for the first time just before Christmas. I suspect more people will access, read, and comment upon the report when the full impact of the 20 mph speed limit is felt.

I was hoping for an evidence-based document which would use the results of scientific enquiry to justify the case for 20mph speed limits. However the report makes a far from convincing argument for the imposition of a blanket 20mph speed limit. Instead the report is partial, relies heavily upon rhetoric, and glosses over the metrics which do not support the principal hypothesis i.e.

That the introduction of 20mph speed limit in the pilot areas will:-

- Encourage more people to walk and cycle [*Objective 1*]
- Improve road safety (in line with BCC's (Road) Casualty Reduction Targets) [*Objective 2*]
- Help create more pleasant and shared community space [*Objective 3*]

In fact the findings are hardly a ringing endorsement for the adoption of 20 mph speed limits per se as the results are at best inconclusive i.e.

- Residential roads in both areas only saw a 0.4 mph reduction in mean average speed;
- Main roads experienced an average reduction in mean average speeds of only 1.3mph (ISB) and 1.7mph (IEB);
- Accident data did not show significant indications to any trend either way;
- There was a negligible effect on traffic noise;
- The effect on air quality too small to be measurable.

Central to the lack of rigor in the document is the failure to define exactly what types of road are being assessed. 'Residential road', 'residential area', 'main road' and 'through-route' are used interchangeably with no regard for a clear definition.

What is a main road? I am sure you have criteria to make this judgement.

What is a residential road? May I suggest one less than 24 feet between gutters with parking down both sides.

What is a through route? May I suggest 'bus routes and/or gritting routes. At least this definition would use route-choice criteria already adjudged as vital to the day-to-day facilitation of business and commerce. Indeed the principal requirement of a road network – to expedite the commercial needs of the city - has been completely ignored throughout the report.

Such is the confusion with the type of road under consideration that the results of public consultation are rendered meaningless. As pollsters will avow - the answers the public give

depend upon their understanding of what the question means – as well as the way in which it is asked.

The choice of metrics is also suspect.

Why are arithmetic mean speeds the most relevant measure of driver behaviour? Surely it is the speed profile that is important because it is reckless driving behaviour which needs addressing. I presume that if you are calculating average speeds you must have data on top end speed and how this was affected by the introduction of the 20mph zones.

The report says that the (thankfully) small number of accidents did not allow mass interpretation. However if travelling at more than 20mph is thought to be the most significant factor directly responsible for accidents then what would be of interest is the extent to which speed played a part in the most serious accidents and to what extent other factors e.g. driver/ pedal cyclist/ pedestrian perception of risk, time of day or night, vehicle volumes, school holidays etc. were also significant. You must have plenty of data with which to establish primary causes, secondary causes, and consequential effects – both before and after the introduction of the 20 mph speed limits.

On pollution it would have been useful to know how restricting vehicles to the 20mph limit modified the European urban driving cycle and affected engine efficiency.

On congestion it would be helpful to have recognition that road loading capacity increases at lower speeds.

All in all your Monitoring Report is very far from satisfactory - although it does have the honesty to admit that:-

*'support for 20mph limits on 'main roads' is less strong than residential roads – this will need to be carefully considered when developing any strategy to go city wide in terms of which roads should be considered'.*

Why this sound advice has been ignored has not been satisfactorily explained.

Yours sincerely

Roger Pinder  
12 St Albans Road  
Westbury Park  
Bristol  
BS6 7SJ

0117 9423 127

cc Westbury Park Community Association

**Note from Rob Grieve (24 January 2014), re Stoke Lane Parking Consultation:**

Here are the details that were asked for at the Meeting:

750 leaflets were printed and supplied to the team of enumerators tasked with delivering. There were 691 addresses (including flats) within the area shown on the attached plan.

89 responses have been received (13%) which whilst not sounding high, it is rare to receive more than 10% for a scheme.

We have had similar complaints where leaflets were sent by the Royal Mail so there is no way to guarantee that everyone actually sees the leaflet and whether it is a case of addresses being missed out or being delivered and then treated as junk mail, eaten by the dog, etc. is impossible to predict.

With Stoke Lane we appear to have a fairly even spread of responses so it would not suggest that particular areas were missed out.

I can't remember who asked for this but can you either include this in the minutes or pass to the relevant person.

Thanks

Rob Grieve  
Principal Officer

