

Summary of Formal Objections to the Experimental One Way

Comments	Officer Comments
<p>A resident of Waterside Drive commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. This proposal by eliminating oncoming vehicles will encourage traffic to increase speeds.</li> <li>ii. The proposal is inconvenient to residents who are regular users.</li> <li>iii. The proposal will entrap residents on the regular occasions that the New Hill railway bridge is closed for repair.</li> <li>iv. Proposal will involve unnecessary expense, impose more visual pollution and 'urbanise' the village aspect.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The results of the traffic surveys, shown in Appendix B, do not support this comment. In fact the majority of locations show traffic speeds have increased marginally since the experimental one way system was removed.</li> <li>ii. It is noted that the residents who live within the one way system will be slightly inconvenienced if the one way is introduced.  Regular users from the River Estate can still use the road when travelling towards Pangbourne. When returning they can use the A329 and New Hill, which is a shorter route than using Nursery Gardens, Purley Lane and Purley Village.</li> <li>iii. If the one way was made permanent and there was a planned closure of New Hill alternative access would be provided for residents. This would include the temporary suspension of the one way order and traffic management measures where the road is too narrow for two way traffic. The temporary suspension of traffic orders is very common to facilitate planned works.  The situation is no different should an incident occur between Purley Village and Colyton Way where there is no alternative route.</li> <li>iv. There is always a cost to introduce any engineering scheme. If the one way were made permanent the signing would be kept to a minimum whilst still ensuring that the one way system was legally signed.</li> </ul>
<p>A resident of Purley Lane commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. I object to the order as the scheme has been introduced without proper consultation of all those affected by the scheme. Several residents have noticed drivers travelling much faster than before and there is a real risk that the one way system will result in a serious injury. Given the safety history of the area there is no valid reason for the scheme. The money spent on alterations to accommodate the scheme could be spent on more deserving causes. Finally the extra carbon emissions as a result of local residents having to drive further are unnecessary and should not be forced upon us.</li> <li>ii. I would like to take this as high as possible as I suspect that the information being supplied in defence of the scheme is flawed. I also believe that the mere collection of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. A letter was sent on 14 January 2011 to all properties on Purley Village and Purley Lane explaining the reasons why an experimental one way system was to be introduced. Results of traffic speeds, detailed in Appendix B, show that the one way has not increased vehicle speeds. It is accepted that some residents will have to travel slightly further to their properties but the one way is not being forced upon them as there has been a full consultation the results of which are the subject of this report.</li> <li>ii. The results of the traffic data is factual and used to establish the effect of the one way system. Traffic speeds may not necessarily increase over time as results of traffic speeds on another one way system, which has been in place for many years, showed that the average and 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds are still below the 30mph speed limit.  This comment seems to contradict the objection in (i) as the resident indicates that Purley Lane</li> </ul>

Summary of Formal Objections to the Experimental One Way

Comments	Officer Comments
<p>data is not enough to justify the changes as the habits of drivers will gradually change toward a more dangerous speed profile. I would like to inspect the data particularly data covering Purley Lane itself as this is a particularly dangerous lane to meddle with given that there is no lighting, no pavements and no policing of speed limits is ever undertaken.</p>	<p>is dangerous given there is no lighting and no pavements. However if the one way were to be made permanent a road marking would be introduced on Purley Lane to designate an area for pedestrians and thus reducing the risk of a collision.</p>
<p>A resident of Mapledurham Drive commented that:</p> <p>I was coming down the hill to cross the railway bridge (17:25, 22/02/11), 2 cars barged past my car against the priority flow. Both cars clipped my wing mirror and forced me to make an emergency stop. I have reported this to the police. My husband and I have noticed increasing impatience in this area since the experimental one-way system has increased the downward flow of traffic at peak times. As downward flowing traffic has priority, upward travelling vehicles have to wait to cross the bridge for longer, and are resorting to forcing their way through in spite of the blind dip. The situation is becoming dangerous so I would like to make a formal objection to the trial of the one-way system.</p>	<p>A vehicle proceeding against the priority signs may not be as a direct result of the one way system. Results of traffic surveys on Purley Village prior to the experimental one way system being introduced show that a daily average of 287 vehicles would now be using New Hill.</p> <p>This is only a very slight increase in the volume of traffic using New Hill and it is unlikely to have any adverse effect on the working of the priority system or the length of time a driver has to wait to traverse the bridge.</p>
<p>A resident of Mapledurham Drive who lives at the same property as the objector above commented that:</p> <p>I wish to formally object to the Purley Lane Experimental one way system becoming a permanent safety scheme. I object on 4 grounds :</p> <p>1. It actually reduces safety on Purley Lane and New Hill -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By removing the hazard of potential on-coming traffic around a sharp bend creates a classic morale hazard dilemma- where drivers feel safer to drive less carefully and with greater speed. From the traffic data we can see average speeds have risen but 85th percentile speeds have not. This suggests that 15% of traffic is driving at a significantly greater speed. A combination of a sharp bend and greater speeds represents an increased risk for pedestrians.</li> <li>• The issue of cars driving the wrong way down the one way system – the data shows the majority of these vehicles are not local cars that could be expected to comply once the system is made permanent. I myself have had a near collision as a consequence of this. I believe this represents a major risk. Presumably mitigation requires a permanent camera and warning signs which would increase cost and create further environmental damage as per point 4</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The results of the traffic surveys detailed in Appendix B show that vehicle speeds have not increased as a result of the one way system. As part of the one way system the footways would be made wider thereby improving pedestrian safety and by halving the volume of traffic reduces the risk of a collision occurring with a pedestrian.</li> </ol> <p>If the one way were made permanent with permanent signing it is likely to be respected. The longer a one way is in place the more likely that drivers become use to it and respect it.</p> <p>The traffic data for New Hill prior to the one way was in July 2006 and showed an average daily volume of 1,522 for northbound traffic. Surveys carried out during the experimental one way showed that the average northbound daily volume was 1,550, 990 and 1,267. A survey undertaken following the removal of the one way showed an average daily volume of 1,311 for northbound traffic. The traffic volumes are generally below that of the 2006 survey when no concerns were expressed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. There have been two recorded injury accidents albeit a few years ago. The footways are approximately 800mm wide which are sub standard for pedestrian use. Should a person be walking on the footway another person has to walk on the road to pass them. The narrow width of the footway and there being no footway on Purley Lane increases the risk of a pedestrian being</li> </ol>

## Summary of Formal Objections to the Experimental One Way

Comments	Officer Comments
<p>below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The data is inconclusive with regard to increased traffic on New Hill as there could well be seasonal variation in the reference point ( July 2006) in the data held by the council. It would seem reasonable to expect the 287 vehicles shown as driving southeast on Purley Lane for the 7 day period from July 15th 2010, now have to drive across New Hill. This seems to be placing extra pressure on the priority system over New Hill where vehicles required to give way are taking increased risks, presumably due to increased wait times, forcing cars with the right of way to stop. In the last few weeks I have had to stop twice on the bridge whilst cars failing to give way, pull up on the pavement to get round me. My wife has had her wing mirror clipped twice in similar circumstances. Neither of us had problems like this before the one on Purley Lane was introduced.</li> </ul> <p>2. There has been no cost / benefit case created to justify the council spending the estimated £30k of tax payer's money.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are no recorded accidents or near accidents and the traffic data shows speeds on the roads are relatively low. There is little real risk. The lack of pavement and narrow pavements force both drivers and pedestrians to take extra care, so why spend money to remove this extra care mentality.</li> </ul> <p>3. The methodology adopted to justify the expenditure is flawed and thus the proposed outcome of a one way system may not be the best value for money option.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The flaw is in the lack of a clear set of objectives for the proposed safety investment. If there are clear objectives they are not laid out on the consultation web-site and they were not presented at the recent consultation meeting in the village. It is not clear whether the scheme is to improve safety for school children walking to school along Purley Lane in both directions or pedestrians in general or whether its to reduce rat running through Nursery Gardens or all of the above. Without this clarity its impossible to assess whether there is a real or just a perceived problem, what the best option to tackle the problem is and how to judge any potential improvement. A one way system is an opportunistic solution created to primarily resolve a bridge repair issue – it may or may not be the best way to improve safety and the environment in the Nursery Gardens / Purely Lane Locale. As someone working in the private sector assessing cases for capital investment on a regular basis, I'm very disappointed at the lack of rigour being applied here to create a very clear case for residents to see the need to</li> </ul>	<p>hit.</p> <p>3. The reasons why the experimental one way system was introduced was quite clear in the letter dated 14<sup>th</sup> January 2011 to the residents and at the public meeting. The one way system would address the concerns expressed by pedestrians, including children, using Purley Village and Purley Lane and the volume of through traffic using Nursery Gardens.</p> <p>To Improve the pedestrian facilities can only be achieved by widening the footway which would result in the narrowing of the carriageway to a width that would be unsafe for two way traffic. It is expected that with all engineering schemes there is a cost to implement a proposed scheme.</p> <p>4. If the one way were made permanent the signing would be kept to a minimum whilst still ensuring that the one way system was legally signed.</p>

Summary of Formal Objections to the Experimental One Way

Comments	Officer Comments
<p>spend £30k of their money.</p> <p>4. The proposed works would have a detrimental impact on the local environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It has been expressed to me by residents on Purley Lane and I concur as a regular pedestrian along Purley Lane, that the Lane possesses a wonderful, natural, country lane aesthetic and ambience. It would be an act of vandalism to spoil this with the inevitable extra street furniture, road marking, etc.</li> </ul>	
<p>A resident of Lister Close commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The only two way road into the village has width restriction on the railway bridge.</li> <li>ii. Access of emergency vehicles will be restricted.</li> <li>iii. School traffic is the biggest volume of traffic in Purley Lane.</li> <li>iv. School and visitor traffic park in Lister Close (this is already happening with people parking on the bends, which is very dangerous).</li> <li>v. If the primary school is to increase it's intake, parking should be provided.</li> <li>vi. An accident on the bridge on New Hill would prevent any access into the village.</li> <li>vii. If the railway bridge in Purley Lane has been weakened as was suggested at the meeting in Purley why not put a weight limit on the bridge.</li> <li>viii. The people who will be mostly affected by this one way system are in the minority of those who have been consulted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The width of the road over the railway bridge is sufficient for large vehicles to access the River Estate and it is a bus route.</li> <li>ii. The emergency services were consulted on the experimental one way order and would be consulted again if the order were made permanent.</li> <li>iii. Results of surveys show that 75% of pupils walk to Purley Infant School. Results of traffic surveys indicate that the school traffic is not the majority of traffic using Purley Village and Purley Lane.</li> <li>iv. Parking in Lister Close will be included as part of the review of the parking restrictions in Purley that is programmed for this financial year.</li> <li>v. This is a planning matter and not part of the one way system.</li> <li>vi. Should an incident occur on New Hill then the road may be temporarily blocked and if prolonged then temporary measures would be introduced. If there was to be a planned closure then alternative measures would form part of the closure proposals. The situation is no different should an incident occur between Purley Village and Colyton Way where there is no alternative route.</li> <li>vii. To prevent the damage of the railway bridge from getting worse traffic had to be restricted to single lane working as it had to be kept away from the western parapet. The bridge had not been weakened and therefore does not require a weight limit.</li> <li>viii. Responses to the public consultation have seen both support and opposition to the one way from residents who live within the experimental one way system and from other residents within Purley.</li> </ul>