

Jenny Hill HT Engineer

From: Dian Van Eyck Road Safety Engineering Technician
Sent: 18 June 2010 16:50
To: Jenny Hill HT Engineer
Cc: Chris Whinney Safety Engineer
Subject: FW: Footpath Steam Mill Road Bradfield
Attachments: Steam Mill Base NF - 8-4-10.pdf; STEAM MILL ROAD.pdf

Jenny/Chris – there were no recorded incidents at the location in the past 5 years (please see attached)
 Regards,
 Dian

From: Chris Whinney Safety Engineer
Sent: 17 June 2010 09:00
To: Jenny Hill HT Engineer
Cc: Dian Van Eyck Road Safety Engineering Technician; Gary Webster HT Safety Engineer
Subject: FW: Footpath Steam Mill Road Bradfield

Jenny,

Steam Mill Road, Bradfield

I have been to site and the reviewed drawing. Please see comments/observations below:

- 1) Scaling from the drawing the carriageway width between Chainage 0-30 appears to be 5.6m, between 30 – 65, 5.2m and between 65 – 135 up to 5.4m. After chainage 135 widths vary between 5.2 and 5.4 but I note this section is not based on a topo. The existing width over the extent of the topo appears to be 5.6m.
- 2) A centre line is shown throughout the scheme. This should not be provided as there is insufficient width to accommodate it. See extract below from TSM Chapter 5 Para 4.6:

On rural roads below 5.5 m in width, overrunning of the carriageway edge can occur if centre line markings are provided, causing maintenance problems. Drivers might also expect a road marked with a centre line to be wide enough for opposing lanes of traffic to pass. In these circumstances the centre line should be omitted, but it would be helpful if edge of carriageway markings are then used.

- 3) We did see a couple of buses whilst on site. With bus/HGV widths usually being around 2.5m if two met head-on they would have to come to a near standstill to pass each other due to insufficient clearance and may also be tempted to overrun the footway or verge. Narrowing the carriageway could lead to large vehicles clipping wing mirrors. Therefore road narrows warning signs would have to be erected on both approaches to the scheme.
- 4) I suggest that in order to make a decision whether to go ahead you need collision data for the whole length (to identify if there have been collisions involving pedestrians or collisions relating to the width of the existing carriageway), pedestrian volumes and a traffic survey showing HGV/bus volumes. Basically we would need to demonstrate the benefit to pedestrians outweighs any possible conflict created for other road users and that we have undertaken measures mitigate those conflicts. (It is also worth noting that narrowing the road could have

traffic calming effect and that the footway construction either side of the junction of 'Lavendale' and 'The Corner House' will bring the give way line forward, improving visibility from the side road which is currently very poor).

I am on leave now until the 28th but I will be happy to discuss on my return.

Dian,

Can you provide Jenny with 5 year collision data for the extent of the scheme and copy me in?

Regards

Chris

From: Jenny Hill HT Engineer
Sent: Tue 01/06/2010 12:08
To: Chris Whinney Safety Engineer
Subject: FW: Footpath Steam Mill Road Bradfield

From: Nigel Finch Senior Engineer
Sent: 08 April 2010 12:50
To: Jenny Hill HT Engineer
Cc: Peter Wright District Manager HT
Subject: RE: Footpath Steam Mill Road Bradfield

Jenny,

Having just read your email, I assume that part of the meeting this evening is to discuss the new footway proposals??? I've attached a copy of the scheme layout for your info, please feel free to distribute for use at the meeting. Hope this is OK.

The drawing shows the realignment of the junction, which gives a maximum width of 5.8m. The remainder of the road has been designed to achieve a minimum carriageway width of 5.2m (the same as the existing minimum width) with a 1.2m wide footway. It may be necessary to overlay part of the carriageway through the junction, as the centre line will move across by up to 1m. There will also be drainage issues, as the existing gullies along the southern side of the road will conflict with the new footway, however it is thought that repositioning these gullies and utilising the existing connections will be a straight forward process.

You will also see on the drawing that on the whole we do not need to acquire any land from the adjoining properties (assuming hedge root line to be highway boundary?), however a 'severe trimming' of the hedge at Endfield would need to be carried out along with other localised trimming of boundary hedges. The other pinch point is at Moss Rose Cottage, but there is sufficient width to achieve the minimum widths at this location.

I hope this is all satisfactory, but please give me a call if you need further information / clarification.

I will forward Frinton Road asap.

Regards,

Nigel

Nigel Finch
Senior Engineer
Highways and Transportation - South Area Office

Essex County Council | telephone: 01268 297549 | extension: 46749 | email: nigel.finch@essex.gov.uk



Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

From: Jenny Hill HT Engineer
Sent: 08 April 2010 10:21
To: 'DAVETUCKE@aol.com'
Cc: Nigel Finch Senior Engineer
Subject: RE: Footpath Steam Mill Road Bradfield

Hi Dave

I am still waiting for the design to be completed - it should be with me this week, unfortunately too late for your meeting but I will contact you once I have received it.

Kind Regards
Jenny

From: DAVETUCKE@aol.com [mailto:DAVETUCKE@aol.com]
Sent: 08 April 2010 07:07
To: Jenny Hill HT Engineer
Subject: Footpath Steam Mill Road Bradfield

Morning Jenny,

Any further word on the footpath (have meeting tonight so would like to give them an update

Best Regards,

Dave T

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.