

Agenda Item 8

Annex 2

High Street St Lawrence, Ramsgate - Proposed Zebra Crossing - Consultation responses

The following are comments returned by the public to the consultation and KCC Highways response to the issues raised.

Do you support the proposed zebra crossing in High Street St Lawrence?	
Yes	No
86% (12)	14% (2)

Item	Comment received	KCC response
1.	Supports the need for a crossing but, does not want to lose parking in the area. A better scheme could be produced to return some parking by altering the junction of Chapel Road.	Due to several vehicular accesses nearby and cost implications a more substantial scheme cannot be produced in High Street St Lawrence. The proposed scheme will result in the loss of only one on street parking space. It is not possible to provide extra parking in conjunction with a pedestrian crossing scheme in this location.
2.	I support the need for a zebra crossing but, feel that the site proposed is dangerous. Chapel Road is now one way and cars exiting do tend to look one way. Cars leaving the garage very often leave at high speed and would be at the crossing within a few metres.	The one way system will not have a negative effect on the safety of the crossing. Previously Chapel Road at the junction of the High Street experienced regular right and left turn manoeuvres in and out of the junction. By making the road one way it has simplified turning movements. We cannot assume drivers will speed, if residents have concerns that drivers are travelling at excess speed along High Street St Lawrence then this is an enforcement issue and Kent Police should be notified.
3.	The crossing will disrupt loading and unloading for the church hall.	The scheme will not remove any loading / unloading space. The existing refuge island already narrows the carriageway in this location which means that parking / loading in this area is not possible. To load and unload drivers should use the on street parking bays.
4.	Speed humps before and after would make the crossing safer. Some cars accelerate too fast after turning out of the petrol station.	The introduction of speed humps / traffic calming features is beyond the scope of this scheme. Please see KCC response to item 2.

5.	It would benefit residents if they made double yellow lines outside houses 46-56. All the residents have their driveways blocked at least daily; I have yet to see a traffic warden in the High Street.	The removal of further parking in the area would likely make the scheme very unpopular with many residents. However, if drivers are parking across driveways and/or accesses this is a case of obstruction and Kent Police should be notified. Thanet District Council (TDC) to comment on parking enforcement matters.
6.	I do not agree with the scheme, there are islands in the road so people can cross. I can't park outside my house; this will only bring more congestion on the High Street. Everyone parks in Chapel Road, even people who do not live here. I will support this scheme if the people of Chapel Road get residents only parking permits.	The introduction of any pedestrian crossing will increase vehicle stop/start movements. However, the introduction of a zebra crossing will cause significantly less congestion than a signalised crossing. Please see KCC response to item 1. TDC to comment.
7.	I live at number 52 and as can be seen from the drawing there is no parking space outside of this property. A number of residents in the surrounding area park in front of my house and block the dropped kerb which serves my driveway. If you are going to be putting the markings in for the crossing please can you remove the KEEP CLEAR markings outside of my drive and replace with NO PARKING? I need access 24 hours a day because of my job.	Please see KCC response to item 5. The introduction of No Parking markings would not have any greater effect than the existing Keep Clear markings. An existing white access highlight marking is already present in this location which is an indication of what would constitute obstruction of the public highway, this is enforceable by Kent Police.
8.	We feel that the current crossing system in place is not suitable for the road. The scheme will be a good thing for pedestrians and motorists alike.	Comment noted.
9.	I am a rehabilitation officer; working with people with varying degrees of sight loss I welcome this improvement to pedestrian crossing / access in the area.	Comment noted.
10.	This will be a step forward in respect of safety for pedestrians.	Comment noted.
11.	Supports the scheme. But would like to be assured that hi friction surfacing and markings will be properly applied to the crossing, and markings should be topped up to bring them up to the level of the hi-friction surfacing.	The requested improvements are included in the scheme proposals.