



Appendix B – Summary of Consultation Feedback & Responses

	Might Support	Object	Support	Grand Total
<b>Bromyard</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Panniers Lane</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>
20MPH			5	5
One way		5		5
<b>Town Centre</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>31</b>
20MPH	2	2	8	12
Parking suspension	2	17		19
<b>Hereford</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>94</b>
<b>All</b>			<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
20MPH			1	1
<b>Aubrey st</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>17</b>
Closure		14	1	15
One way	1		1	2
<b>City Centre</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>44</b>
20MPH			1	1
Parking suspension	1	19	3	23
Extended Timed Closure	1	18	1	20
<b>Commercial Rd</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
On-road cycle lane		1	2	3
<b>Ledbury Rd</b>			<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
On-road cycle lane			1	1
<b>Newmarket/Blueschool</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>
Cycle lane		2	2	4
<b>Old Wye Bridge</b>		<b>14</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>16</b>
Vehicle Restrictions		14	2	16
<b>Walnut Tree Ave</b>		<b>6</b>		<b>6</b>
Closure		6		6
<b>Eign St/Barton Rd</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
Lane closure		1	1	2
<b>Kington</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>All</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>10</b>
20MPH		3	7	10
<b>High Street</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>29</b>
Timed Closure	1	25	3	29
<b>Ledbury</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>All</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>15</b>
20MPH	3	9	3	15
<b>Church St</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>11</b>
Limited access	1	9	1	11
<b>Market Sq</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>25</b>
Adjusted Parking Bays	1	23	1	25
<b>Woodleigh Rd</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>11</b>
One way	1	8	2	11
<b>Leominster</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>South Street</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>

20MPH		1	4	5
<b>Town Centre</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>74</b>
20MPH		1	11	12
Timed Closure	13	17	32	62
<b>West St</b>		<b>9</b>		<b>9</b>
Timed Closure		9		9
<b>Ross on Wye</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>Town Centre</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>43</b>
20MPH			5	5
Timed Closure	4	27	7	38
<b>Wilton</b>		<b>1</b>		<b>1</b>
20MPH		1		1
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>369</b>

### Emergency response Active Travel Measures Consultation - Overview (Friday 26/6/20)

A series of calls with Local Members, Town Councillors and local business associations were held initially and informed the consultation documents. Notes outlining their feedback have been circulated and should be considered along with these consultation responses.

#### Overarching comments:

##### Blue Light / Emergency services

*West Mercia Police:* Police have confirmed they would have limited resources to enforce 20 zones and while many of the roads could be considered to be self-enforcing, some of them would not and they would like to see measures included to assist else they feel the limits will not be observed. They suggested we also consider part time 20s around the schools.

*Response:* Covered on a location by location basis below. Additional measures would require more permanent features which is beyond the scope the current phase of funding. Where part time 20 zones have been tried in the past, they have had less success in observance than full time ones.

There was concern about trip hazards as pedestrians made use of the new carriageway being made available for footway widening, and road closures needing advance warning to motorists before they get stuck in roads too narrow to turn around. How would any road closures be enforced?

*Response:* The temporary measures will be supported by barriers and signage as appropriate and include transitions between footway and temporary footways as required.

##### Hereford & Worcester Fire Service

Fire Service commented they have two issues to deal with – part time fire service responders have to be able to reach the local station within 5 minutes obeying all traffic restrictions to meet their 6 minute response time. They are positively recruited on their ability to respond within this time e.g proximity to fire station and route to access it.

While responding appliances are permitted to breach traffic restrictions they would also need to factor in any delays from going round them or temporarily moving barriers. They will report back impact on individual stations.

*Response:* This seems to be particularly pertinent in town wide 20s and road closures discussed below but could be accommodated longer term if fire service is given notice, however a follow up response having surveyed the stations, indicates that they already have difficulty maintaining their full complement of responders as things stand.

##### General comments

A large proportion of concerns related to accommodating deliveries, often out of the control of affected premises and allowing disabled access.

*Response:* Covered by each location below

One or two respondents questioned, with the relaxation of distancing from two to one metre, whether some of the measures were still appropriate.

*Response:* The measures aim to improve safety while encouraging the increasing levels of walking and cycling and are not just about social distancing. The 2m requirement has been relaxed to “one metre plus”

and national guidance still recommend maintaining 2m where possible. These measures aim to offer that possibility.

*Other general responses to comments received:*

There seems to be a general feeling with the relaxation of restrictions nationally that the pandemic threat has passed and that these measures will only serve to hamper recovery of businesses only just being permitted to resume.

There was little general objection to suggestions of the introduction of 20 zones, however the guidance specifically advises that the funding is intended to facilitate more significant reallocations of road space than that enabled by 20 zones. For this reason our suggestions of 20 zones have been where they support other measures. It is unlikely the funding will be permitted to be used for 20 zones alone.

Finally there seemed to be an assumption that these were to be permanent measures rather than a response to permit safe pedestrian and cycle movement in the town and city. It would be useful to emphasise that for these measures to be made permanent a further full consultation would be required.

## **Comments & recommendations by location**

---

### **Hereford**

*Walnut Tree Avenue closure:* There were only objections received to the closure of **Walnut Tree Avenue** and the impact this would have on the local community. This measure was one of the interventions proposed and consulted on previously as part of the SWTP and at the time received at that time more support than objection.

*Response:* On the basis of the level of response and the strength of feeling, recommend this measure is not taken forward at this stage.

*Broad Street, King Street, Bridge Street & Old Wye Bridge:* Two local traders have canvassed local businesses objecting to the parking restrictions and measures around **Broad Street King Street** and **Bridge Street**, and indicate that the concerns were shared by 10 businesses in the vicinity. There was concern that this was a back door route to introducing hospitality measures on Broad Street. They also questioned whether the measures are still necessary in the light of distancing relaxation? Broad Street is already wide and queuing is more of an issue on the east side of Broad Street rather than on the west side where the parking is being suggested for removal.

The foot fall is also already low in these streets and the parking removal would make the streets feel even less busy and active. They suggested that the closure of the Old Wye Bridge would impact the use of car parks on the south of the river as they would likely be only used by drivers accessing the city from the south.

*Response:* Suspending parking except for disabled and loading will reduce demand for Broad Street and with the **Old Bridge, Bridge Street** and **King Street** will create a significant walking corridor into town from the south, including from the large off street car parks south of the river at Wye Street and the Leisure Pool. The closure of Aubrey Street addresses a safety issue of conflicts with the cycle contraflow lane on King Street while still maintaining access to the private parking in the vicinity. It also gives the opportunity to introduce more parking spaces on the north side of King Street.

Recommend that as these measures reallocate space for a strong walking and cycling route into the city centre from the south, and could compliment any further measures proposed for hospitality businesses, they are implemented.

*Barton Road / St Nicholas Street and Eign Street junctions:* This suggestion for footway widening at **Barton Road / St Nicholas Street** and **Eign Street** junctions was neutral in response overall.

*Response:* Suggest that given the challenges around how the detail of these elements can be implemented in a temporary way, and the need to secure cooperation with Highways England they are not taken forward at this stage but considered further in a later stage.

Other measures were either also neutral or supported:

*Pop Up cycle lanes on Newmarket St and Blueschool St:* Response on these measures was either neutral or in support.

*Response:* Recommend proceeding with pop-up cycle / bus lane on **Newmarket Street** eastbound and, because there are no bus stops on **Blueschool Street**, making this section a pop-up cycle lane only. On Blueschool Street westbound we recommend a pop-up cycle lane on the main carriageway with buses using **Maylord Orchards** slip as at present. On Newmarket Street westbound we recommend a pop-up cycle /

bus lane and an advance stop line at **Edgar Street roundabout** to assist buses and those cyclists travelling toward Whitecross.

*Widemarsh Street extended closure:* Responses to the proposed **Widemarsh Street** extending closure hours raised concerns regarding the impact of the extended closure on the ability of businesses to have deliveries, which was already challenging with the existing hours. Similar concerns were raised for those who have limited mobility and require vehicular access to High Town.

*Response:* Recommend as footfall is low until 10:30, the closure is moderated to 10:30 - 17:30.

*Commercial Road and Ledbury Road on road cycle lanes:* There was limited feedback on this measure with one response for and one against.

*Response:* On the basis of the responses we recommend that we proceed with this measure as tis represents a key walking and cycling corridor between the hospital, rail station and north east of the city and the city centre.

*St Owen's Street contraflow:* There were a number of respondents, including the local ward councillor Cllr Milln, who suggested that the proposed **St Owen St** contraflow be introduced as part of these measures.

*Response:* The proposed St Owen St Contraflow scheme would be difficult to achieve safely with temporary measures. We recommend that with the design being already well progressed and the permanent TRO consultation already undertaken, we proceed to completion of the full scheme or consider this more substantial intervention as part of a later stage.

## **Bromyard**

---

*Town centre parking changes:* Parking suspension in the town centre was vigorously objected to although footway queueing was acknowledged as an issue for certain key shops.

*Response:* Recommend using barriers to allow footway widening along the abused existing sections of double yellow lines which to help deter parking in these sections of the town centre, but not progress any removal of parking bays.

*Winslow Road (St Peters Primary School):* 20 zone - no objections received, other than the police suggesting this be a part-time zone

*Response:* Recommend with the schools being off until September, that this measure is considered for part 2 of Tranche 1. With limited compliance in the past with part time 20 zones and more substantial measures required to support them, a full time zone be installed initially. This can be reviewed following introduction.

*Panniers Lane (Q E High School):* **Panniers Lane** received support from the school, but objections from those using **Pencombe Lane** about the impact on access to the town via that route.

*Response:* With the schools being off until September, recommend consideration in part 2 of Tranche 1 of proceeding with an adjusted scheme comprising a short point section of one way southbound, south of the Pencombe Lane junction and school, to discourage rat running between A465 and A44 while allowing Pencombe Lane access to A44 and the town centre via a local 20 zone. Rat running traffic will be required to use Hereford Rd / A44 junction instead.

## **Kington**

---

*High Street Closure:* There was strong opposition to a part time closure of the **High Street** The main impacts identified resulting from the closure are on deliveries, buses and emergency vehicles especially considering the 2 mile detour that would be required to get round the 150yd closure.

*Response:* Recommend this is not pursued at this time. An alternative to a full barrier closure was considered, comprising a chicane at either end of the High Street be introduced to reduce speeds and indicate that it is an area where there may be pedestrians in the road. It was felt this would be less effective but would still incur a cost.

*20 Mph Zone:* There was support for the town wide 20 mph zone in the responses.

*Response:* We note that the guidance published by DfT for this funding indicates that 20mph zones should not be introduced without any other measures reallocating road space away from motor vehicles.

Recommend not pursuing on this basis.

## **Ledbury**

---

*Church Street Closure:* There were a number of objections to closure of **Church Street**, on the basis of the impact on deliveries and access to properties in this area.

*Response:* On the basis of the level of objection to this measure recommend that it is not taken forward at this stage.

*Market Square Parking Adjustment:* There was significant concern about any loss of parking in the **Market Square** from local traders and local ward member. It does however appear that this is based on an expectation that the measure would remove parking in this location when in fact it would simply re-orientate the parking. A clarification of this has been sent to local members confirming this, and while no formal response has been received a strong objection to any change still remains.

*Response:* Recommend this measure not be pursued. Should acceptance of the measure's retention of existing levels of parking be forthcoming this could be revisited at a later stage.

*Woodleigh Road One Way:* There were objections from people living either side of the bridge over the Town Trail to the suggested **Woodleigh Road** one way working to provide on road footway. The cycle forum indicated they would like to see a cycle contraflow to the one way working too.

*Response:* A cycle contraflow would reduce space available for an on road footway even further and therefore whilst beneficial to cycles would be detrimental to pedestrians and so is not considered appropriate. We recommend that the one way working is not implemented, but consideration could be given to signs and road markings being added to indicate pedestrians may be in the road in a future stage.

*20 Mph Zone* The 20 zone was originally supported and opposed in equal measures with one "maybe", but opposition increased toward the end of the consultation period. As noted in the general comments above, the Police are concerned zone is too large, and in particular Hereford Road and north end of Homend would be unenforceable, especially given these are areas where the police regularly have difficulty enforcing speeding above the current 30mph limit.

The Fire Service were also concerned it would impact their ability for responders to reach the station within the required five minutes to achieve an overall response time of 6minutes.

A smaller 20mph zone has been considered but with the residential and school areas it would be appropriate to cover, it does not significantly reduce the amount of the town covered and would increase the amount of signage required.

*Response:* As noted above the guidance states that 20mph zones should not be used as the only measure and so the zone could only be implemented if the town centre parking adjustment was included. It is also noted that the scale of the 20mph zone in Ledbury makes the emergency services' comments more significant in this town. We would recommend implementing only if the parking measures in the market square were implemented.

## **Leominster**

---

*Town Centre Closure:* Suggested closure hours were 10-1 Mon-Sat, to allow cycles and mobility vehicles. There was general support for measures on **High Street** and **Corn Square** although again there were concerns from one or two notable objectors regarding ability to accommodate deliveries and a number of key businesses commented that during the lockdown they introduced informal click and collect and local delivery services requiring access to their shop frontage throughout the day. Some traders do not have alternative accesses and one or two take deliveries of heavy furniture and carpets which cannot be specifically timed outside the suggested restrictions.

It was noted that during Leominster's May Fair the closure is flexible enough to allow traders to assist passage of deliveries through the closure.

There was greater concern about including **West Street** in the part time closure too.

*Response:* Although there were concerns from businesses regarding deliveries, given High Street is very narrow and the proposed closure is only for three hours a day we recommend proceeding with original proposals with the exclusion of West Street at this stage. Consideration could be given on how deliveries could be accommodated during closure.

*20 Mph Zone:* Like in other towns there was concern from police about enforceability of the 20mph zone

in **South Street & Etnam Street**. Others however supported the South Street 20 mph zone.

*Response:* Recommend proceeding with the 20mph zone but with Etnam St zone reduced to the midway point where buildouts already exist.

**Additional calls were made to specific stakeholders who had expressed concerns to the town council. Their responses are summarised and included in the table in Appendix 1 below.**

### **Ross-on-Wye**

---

*Broad Street Closure:* The timed closure of **Broad Street** (10-3 Wednesdays – Saturdays) objected to by a significant majority of respondents, mainly because of deliveries and disabled access requirements, around 20% were concerned about loss of parking outside their premises. Noted market days on Thursdays and Saturdays.

*Response:* Suggest not proceeding with measures in Ross-on-Wye. Alternative options were considered including converting existing parking bays on Broad Street to loading and disabled parking 10-2, extended all week long (Mon – Sat) to simplify compliance. It was felt that this did not provide safety and encouragement to walking and cycling, as required by the funding guidelines, while still inconveniencing traders.

*20 zones:* No objections were received

*Response:* Unable to proceed with measures unless it supported other measures.

