

Hounster Hill Feasibility Study Review TEAMs meeting held on Tuesday 14th June 2022 Notes from meeting and supporting information.

Attendees:

Cormac: Mr Will Glassup (WG), Highways Manager and Mr Chris Sentance (CS), Principal Engineer

Aecom: Mr Jason Fricker (JF),

Cornwall Council: CC Kate Ewert (KE)

Millbrook Parish Council Traffic & Transport Advisory Task Group (TTATG) : Cllr Nicky Roberts (NR), Cllr Elisa Woffenden (EW), Mr Jim Woffenden (JW)

Professional adviser (on behalf of TTATG): Professor Tony May (AM)

The meeting was Chaired by Cllr Woffenden.

Apologies received from Cllrs Lewis, C Wilton, S Woffenden and H Wood

The meeting commenced at 18:00hrs

Cllr E Woffenden and Mr Jim Woffenden both declared an interest because they live in the vicinity of Hounster Hill./ The Narrows.

Prof May declared an interest because he is a relative of the Woffenden family.

1. Introductions

The TTATG had asked Prof Tony May, an independent professional, who due to having relatives living in the area, has visited Millbrook many times over several decades, to review the report.

Prof Tony May's credentials: Emeritus Professor of Transport Engineering, the University of Leeds, fellow of the Royal Academy of Engineering, Chartered Engineer, Fellow of the Institute of Engineers.

2. Questions and answers – Prof Tony May

AM had advised he needed to leave by 6pm. Feedback from AM shown below:

The report provides an excellent compilation of the problems experienced in the study area. It is, however, much less effective in generating options for overcoming these problems or assessing their relevant measures. In particular:

- it overlooks some of the possible solutions identified in the 2014 report
- it only assesses seven of the 13 options which it identifies
- it does not fully address the different types of problem in its assessment



- it appears to overlook the analysis carried out for some of these options in the 2014 report.

Option generation is by far the most challenging element of any such study. I have suggested below other options which might be considered, and I suggest that the Parish Council might discuss whether there are other solutions which might be considered. I suggest an alternative basis for assessing the options. It will be for the Parish Council to discuss with the consultants how this wider set of options is best identified, and how the full list of options is more appropriately assessed. If the consultants argue that their budget has been fully committed, there may be alternative ways of completing the study.

3. Presentation and review of the Feasibility Study from Mr Jason Fricker.

Having spoken to JF on the telephone explaining AM has to leave the meeting by 6:30pm the Parish Clerk submitted a proposed agenda at 13:50hrs on 14th June 2022.

An email was subsequently received from JF at 17:04hrs on 14/06/2022:

“Thanks for sending this through and good to speak to you earlier.

Just a heads up, my presentation will last longer than initially stated – probably around 20-30 mins.

For the benefit of all attendees, I'll do a high-level overview of key points on all aspects of the study, with the sections outlined below:

- *Study Introduction*
- *Existing Conditions*
- *Methodology*
- *Site Assessment*
- *ATC + Camera Surveys*
- *Options Study*
- *Recommendations*

When we get on to the options and recommendations, I'll facilitate discussion on the key points which will lead nicely into Professor May's review.”

4. Feedback from Traffic & Transport Group

Millbrook Parish Council (MPC) representatives raised queries and put forwarded suggested amendments - see appendix i (pages 4 to 6). Possible solutions and preferred options have been recommended – see appendix ii (pages 7 & 8)



During the meeting MPC representatives were informed that all the budgeted time for amendments had already been used.

Following the meeting, on behalf of the TTATG, the Parish Clerk sent an email to CP. See appendix iii (pages 8,9 & 10)

5. Agreed next steps

The following were agreed:

- i. Arrange a meeting of the committee to discuss the recommendations of the report and assess each one against a set of criteria and come up with the preferred solution, which can then be presented to Cormac.
- ii. Councillor Kate Ewert to plan to meet with the Portfolio holder for Transport for Cornwall to update him on developments

Due to time constraints JF was unable to present the high-level presentation, talk through the recommendations in detail and explain the methodology behind the Feasibility Study recommendations.

i Recommended amendments

Ref	Comment
General	Cycle flows are not included in the data
General	The solutions have not been assessed on the basis of the objectives
Issue & revision record	<p>States a meeting took place on 9th June addressing comments from the ‘client.’</p> <p>Millbrook Parish Council (the client) were not asked for any comments or asked to attend a meeting.</p> <p>NR (or was this JW or EW? but I think it was me): Cormac should cover any additional costs as MPC did not get the opportunity to review the draft of our own study.</p>
2.4.4 Page 14	<p>Virtual footway</p> <p>JW: The report is critical of the virtual footway but my view is that it has substantially improved the situation, all other things being equal - if it is agreed that this is the case, then it ought to be acknowledged in the report otherwise there is the risk it may be removed in the future.</p>
MILL-03 Page 34	<p>MILL-03</p> <p>States “At B3247 West Street, south of junction with West Street and north of bus stop (see Figure 37).”</p> <p>JW: MILL-03 is to the south of the bus stop, not the north of it.</p>
7.2.2 Page 62	<p>Diversion of HGVs to alternative routes</p> <p>JW: Include why Military Road is rejected by Cornwall Council as an option for HGVs</p> <p>EW: Rerouting HGVs along Military Road is not considered a viable option by Cornwall Council or Aecom because of subsidence and other structural problems.</p>



<p>7.2.4 Page 63</p>	<p>Physical restrictions [and traffic calming]</p> <p>JW: For an audit trail explain why traffic calming including cushions was rejected.</p> <p>Cushions may be an option here as there is not the same flooding issue and certainly vehicle speeds are quite high given the width of the footway https://www.google.co.uk/maps/</p> <p>Other measures that could help improve the pedestrian environment and slow vehicles:</p> <p>Vehicle crossover to emphasise pedestrian priority across the entrance to the car park here: https://www.google.co.uk/maps/@50.3462111</p> <p>Consider exempting cycles from the no entry here.</p> <p>Consider buildout of northern footway here outside number 68 West Street</p>
<p>7.2.8 Page 65</p>	<p>Wig wag warning lights with a detector</p> <p>JW: This would provide absolute priority to eastbound vehicles which may increase speeds and may worsen risk to pedestrians.</p> <p>How do cyclists fit into that system? They would need to trigger the system. Cyclists can in reality currently make their way through even with oncoming traffic, this would disadvantage westbound cyclists compared to the current situation, some may be tempted to carry on I suspect it may create additional queueing, rather like the previous priority/giveaway system did - could this be trialled on a temporary basis?</p> <hr/> <p>Wasn't this about traffic lights, not wig-wags? (review won't let me put comments in the usual way, probably because this is in a table)</p> <p>AM: If the signals were placed at the foot of Hounster Hill (visible from Radford Lane) and on the approach to the bend outside Dodbrook House the time to clear the section between them can be kept small. And if West Street operates in the other direction, only two stages are needed. Both of these keep the delay, and hence queues, down. My site inspection suggested that it should then be possible to manage the queues at either end, with yellow boxes to show where vehicles should not queue. I don't agree that this would encourage speeding. The need to take the bend will keep speeds low, and build-outs can be used (e.g. on Hounster Hill) to discourage speeding to catch a green signal.</p>
<p>7.2.9 Page 66</p>	<p>Standard signalised junction</p> <p>JW: This would not address vehicle strikes on buildings or pedestrians, and by providing certainty to vehicles it could make pedestrians more at risk</p>
<p>7.2.10 Page 67</p>	<p>Improvement of existing highway features</p> <p>JW: This reduces pedestrian facilities and could worsen the risk of vehicle strikes on pedestrians</p>



7.2.11 Page 67	Improvement of non-physical highway features JW: I am not convinced that additional warning signs will make a great deal of difference - flashing warning signs perhaps?
7.2.12 Page 68	Removing property JW: This doesn't solve the traffic problems further into the village which are also constrained.
7.2.13 Page 69	Diversion of general traffic around Millbrook using Military Road JW: For audit trail, an inclusion why this has been assessed as unacceptable should be provided. To provide an audit trail, text should also be included that the route through West Street car park was rejected for structural reasons and the car park is not to adoptable standard.
8 Page Page 73/74	Recommendations JW: Include recommendation to implement change of surfacing/psychological measures to help emphasise to traffic that they are entering an area with limited space/pedestrians in the road. Include supplementary recommendation for MPC and CC to implement wider sustainable transport strategy to help limit traffic growth - supporting active travel and could include subsidy of Cremyll ferry especially and buses could help reduce vehicle flows. Torpoint ferry is subsidised making it many times cheaper to take car on Torpoint ferry compared to using Cremyll ferry.
Summary of options Page 70	JW: The report presents this as the ideal long-term solution but this would address the issues in this local area, NOT MILLBROOK AS A WHOLE, and ultimately could be expected to generate additional traffic and so increase congestion around the Tanyard et cetera. Millbrook Parish Council and Cornwall Council have both declared climate emergency and so the carbon and ecological impact of a new road plus the potentially generated additional traffic should be acknowledged.



ii Possible solutions and preferred options

AM: Recommended Solutions

I think in practice you have the following types of solution:

1. Controlling heavy vehicles

- a. A length limit (which would really need to be less than 16.5m, and could not have an access exemption - since all such vehicle drivers could claim that they were accessing the locality)
- b. Delivery Service Plan (which would probably have to cover the whole Peninsula)

2. Physical and information measures

- a. Build-outs to manage speed and queues
- b. Warning signs and yellow boxes

3. Traffic management measures

- a. Changing the direction of traffic on West Street
- b. Using the car park access for some traffic

4. Signal - based measures

- a. Detectors and wig-wag signals or variable message signs
- b. Traffic signal control.

There is no reason why you should not use a package of several of these.

Recommended options:

- 1a or 1b
- 2a or 2b
- 3a
- 4b

Councillors decide preferred option using some form of multi-criteria appraisal table (of options against criteria)

EW: Preferred solution

Establish a length TRO on vehicles entering and leaving the Rame Peninsula - together with DSP (Delivery Service Plan) working with businesses and developers to encourage them to use smaller vehicles



Problem of conflicts with pedestrians/cyclists and between vehicles in opposing directions:

Possible solution:

1. Install Wig-wag traffic light system on Dodbrook corner together with Intelligent Transport System technology (ITS) to regulate traffic and ease traffic flow
2. Use of granite setts or other change in road surface and other psychological road features to reduce vehicle speed (which the above has the potential to exacerbate) and create a shared type space/ pedestrian priority zone - while vehicle speeds are not excessive per se (Aecom suggested speed was not a primary concern), they are nevertheless far too high given the narrowness of the road, the close proximity of pedestrians and vehicles and the large numbers of pedestrians including children, who walk along the stretch of to access their homes and have no alternative.

iii. Follow up email sent to Cormac

From: Karenza Heald <theclerk@millbrook-pc.gov.uk>

Sent: 17 June 2022 15:28

To: Chris Sentance <chris.sentance@cormactd.co.uk>

Cc: Kate Dixon <Kate.Dixon@cormactd.co.uk>; Cllr Kate Ewert <cllr.kate.ewert@cornwall.gov.uk>

Subject: Re: Millbrook CE-0384_002 - Additional Tasks from Survey Delays and Draft Report (02) to MPC

The letter explained MPC had very little time to review the report (87 pages)

Extracts of email below:

Thank you for your email. I had intended to email you today but shall now amend my draft email to

To be told that all the budgeted time for amendments had already been used up and that you had had the report for a full week before we, the organisation footing the bill with local taxpayers' money, even had sight of it, has come as a complete surprise. MPC has not had any input to the apparently now final report, even though we had clearly stated much earlier in the process that we expected to see the draft before it was completely signed off (please refer to the attached email sent 20th October 2021).

MPC feels these amendments should be made without further charge, and if a fee is required by AECOM, that Cormac should pay it as it was Cormac that took up the budget allowed for amendments.

Suggested timeframe:

1. The Traffic & Transport Advisory Task Group meets w/c 4th July 2022 to finalise recommended feedback
2. The feedback is submitted to the full council for approval (the Council meeting is on 19th July



2022).

3. The approved feedback is submitted to Cormac by Friday 22nd July 2022.

4. Aecom provides the final report

5. MPC & Cormac approve the final report.

6. Invoice is issued and the payment made by 25th September 2022 (In accordance with the law, proper practices and the Council's financial regulations).

The Traffic & Transport Advisory Group is not a committee. The group has Terms of Reference which require recommendations to be made to the full Council. It does not have delegated powers to approve the report. The report must, therefore, be approved by the full Parish Council. The Parish Council does not usually meet in August but to improve on the above timeframes it may be necessary to have an August meeting.

A lot of time and effort has been spent producing the report. I am aware that some of the delays have been due to a change of Aecom staff. As the report will be reviewed in many years to come it is important we get it right. Discussions regarding the study have been going on since the summer of last year. Any organisation paying for a product or service approval would be expected to scrutinise what has been provided prior to approval but more so with local authorities.