



SW Exeter,  
Room 120,  
County Hall,  
Topsham Road,  
Exeter, EX2 4QD  
*By email*  
swexeter@devon.gov.uk

26 July 2023

Dear SW Exeter Transport Team

Alphington Village Public Realm Enhancements Consultation. July 2023.

Dear Sirs,

This consultation states the aims of the proposals are to 'reduce speeds, improve the public realm and improve facilities for sustainable travel'. The actual proposals do very little to improve facilities for sustainable travel. Indeed, the increase in the proposed parking spaces runs contrary to the aims for greater sustainability. The increase in legitimate parking spaces seems to run directly contrary to the aim of sustainability and will encourage greater car use. There are clearly alternatives mechanisms to slow cars other than more parking – they could also benefit cyclists.

Exeter Civic Society absolutely supports these aims, but the proposals don't go far enough to meet those and in some cases seem directly contrary to them. Cyclists get no mention whatsoever and it isn't clear whether the implications of increased parking and narrower roads for cyclists have been considered and mitigated, even if vehicle speeds may be slower. Your LCWIP aims to encourage 50% of journeys by Exeter residents to be made other than by car, but whilst these proposals are aimed at controlling traffic speed, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists are hardly mentioned, and not given sufficient priority. Much of the problem traffic in this area emanates from outside of the city but there appears to be no initiatives by the county council to restrict this commuter traffic and to provide them with infrastructure to assist them in traveling by sustainable means. This is even more disappointing, as Devon County Council has the political and planning reach to develop and implement integrated traffic solutions to support a more holistic solution, which will include a wider range of traffic management options. Piecemeal solutions like the well-intended ones here do not deliver or even contribute to the modal change DCC aims for in the Exeter LCWIP. The Draft LCWIP proposes Cycle Route E16 to use Dawlish Road as a 'Quietway', and this includes the proposed Alphington enhancements, but these enhancements do not have a single line on cycle traffic, let alone any link to this route.

Below are our comments in respect of the proposals:

**Proposal 1) Pavement widening Church Road.**

We support this proposal to provide more space for pedestrians by widening pavements. Many of the kerb heights on Church Road are less than the recommended height, providing little protection to pedestrians from vehicles mounting the pavement. Increasing the kerb height on parts of the west side may be difficult due to the lower pavement level, but this must be achieved to protect pedestrians.

The provision of tactile paving at the two side road crossing points is welcome, as well as at the zebra crossing adjacent to the New Inn. Here it would be beneficial to provide a raised platform to assist in reducing vehicle speeds and supporting pedestrian movements. We assume that a 20mph speed limit will be in place for this length of highway. In addition, we hope that a weight restriction will be introduced at the junction with Alphin Brook Road to 7.5 tonnes or less.

**Proposal 2a) Parking Church Road.**

We do not support introducing parking in this location because passengers alighting vehicles on the pavement side will have to negotiate the lower pavement level which may lead to accidents. Passengers alighting into the road will be confronted by traffic on what is recognised as a busy road, which may see an increase in traffic once new homes are completed in the Teignbridge area.

**Proposal 2b) Existing parking area by the church.**

We support this proposal to discourage long term parking.

**Proposal 2c) Parking in former bus layby.**

We agree that the current parking across the former bus layby and onto the pavement must be stopped and parallel parking introduced. The existing kerb height is very low which may encourage this parking arrangement in the absence of any law to prevent parking on a pavement.

Whilst we understand that the provision of on-street parking outside numbers 30-36 on Chudleigh Road is being provided to slow traffic speeds, we consider that this will encourage more car use and is contrary to DCC's strategy to reduce car use in the city.

The pavement on the east side of Chudleigh Road, and just south of the bus layby diminishes to nothing, but there is no provision to assist people to safely cross the road here. We recommend that the build out proposed in Proposal 3 is moved to this location to provide a safer and narrower crossing of the road. A build out on the west side will offer protection to the proposed new parking on Chudleigh Road if the council insists on this proposal.

### **Proposal 2d) Parking on the western side of Chudleigh Road.**

We see little justification in establishing new parking provision on this length of highway outside 50 and 52 Chudleigh Road to help reduce vehicle speeds – who will park here? The homes in this area all have parking provision on-site. With no time limit for parking, workers at Marsh Barton may park here and walk to work. Additional parking is contrary to DCC's sustainable transport strategy. We would prefer another build-out in this location to slow vehicles.

### **Proposal 3) Build out and give way Chudleigh Road.**

We agree that build outs will slow traffic but we do not believe that this is the best location. As set out above, we recommend that build outs are provided at the former bus layby and at Cludens Close.

### **Proposal 4) Crossing point at double mini roundabouts.**

We are very disappointed that the proposed zebra crossing at this location has been dropped. A zebra crossing will afford greater priority for pedestrians and cyclists crossing Chudleigh Road, whilst the provision of a wider traffic island will still give priority to vehicles. This does not support the council's LCWIP proposals. This crossing may be part of parent's and children's route to Alphington Primary School, either via Chudleigh Rd and Ide Lane, or via Shillingford Rd and Fairfield Rd, so it is essential that these users are given priority.

### **Proposal 5) Increased height of roundabout markings.**

We agree that this may help reduce vehicle speeds.

### **Proposal 6) Changes to signage.**

We agree that changes to signage will help direct vehicles through Marsh Barton to Dawlish rather than through Alphington. Changes to signage should start with signage for Dawlish at the Cowick Lane roundabout, and reinforced by signage at the roundabout at the end of Alphin Brook Road. We wonder whether it would be possible to add directional lines on the highway at the roundabout at the end of Alphin Brook Rd to encourage vehicles to turn left into Marsh Barton.

In fact, we wonder if signage on Church Road should just refer to Alphington village, and all other routes to the south of Alphington should be directed through Marsh Barton, including those heading west.

### **Proposal 7) Centre line removal.**

We do not object to the removal of the centre lines in parts where two vehicles may find it difficult pass.

Yours faithfully

*K Lewis*  
Chairman