

RESULTS FROM TRAFFIC QUESTIONNAIRE

These results are based on what residents have told us up to the end of August 2008.

Concern about traffic

Overall, 639 aspects of traffic problems were identified as **requiring action** compared with 111 where people judged action was unnecessary or undesirable.

The greatest concern was for:	Speed of Traffic	(204 for: 16 against)
followed by	Parking	(166 for: 35 against)
	Volume of Traffic	(160 for: 28 against)
	Size of vehicles	(109 for: 32 against)

The road attracting most concern was:	Village Road
followed by	Plough Lane
	Little Heath Road
	Birch Heath Lane

Residents naturally expressed most concern about the road they lived on, or had to use to reach home, but concerns expressed about other roads were for:

(overwhelmingly)	Village Road
followed by	Plough Lane
	Little Heath Road

97% of replies expressed concern for pedestrian and cyclists' safety.

Traffic calming measures

There was least support for:	'No calming measures required'
and:	'More fixed signs'

Three measures were significantly the most preferred,	
in order overall:	'Speed cushions'
	'Pinch points'
	'Vehicle actuated speed signs'

These three were the top preferences for most through roads (in differing orders), apart from Pepper Street (which favours fixed signs) and Quarry Lane (where 'No calming measures' are equally favoured).

'Road closure' was opposed (20% for: 60% against).

Parking in the village centre

Closely balanced views were expressed about wishing to park to use village facilities; 26% did value being able to park: 35% did not. However, preferences for changes in the village centre varied very little between these two groups.

Whether people wished to park in the village or not, the majority wished to be able to drive more easily through the village centre.

64% wished to see some control exercised over parking in the village centre:

- Views were more balanced about what sort of control that should be:
on balance the majority were in favour of a limited parking period and against a total ban.
- Most people (65%) agreed that any parking restrictions would only work if positively enforced
- There were mixed, and evenly balanced, views about:
 - (1) whether the village would be prepared to pay for a part-time enforcement officer:
overall marginally against
 - (2) whether introducing restrictions would be worse than the present situation:
overall marginally agreeing that restrictions were preferable
 - (3) whether something should be done or not:
marginally in favour of change.

Consequences of removing parked vehicles:

- 70% of people agreed that removing parked vehicles would increase the speed of traffic through the village centre
- 67% of people agreed that this would also make the village more attractive as a rat-run

Overall 39% of residents said that parking interfered with access to properties. Replies showed Village Road and areas around the village green and the schools were most affected.

Possible changes to the village centre

Views about whether changes to the village centre were needed were mixed and very balanced:

- overall marginally in favour of something being done.

None of the proposed alternatives received a majority of support:

- most options were strongly opposed
- laying a distinctive paving surface was the least disliked

Possible changes to the Plough Lane/Quarry Lane junction

There was strong support overall for all three proposals, particularly from frequent drivers and residents of Plough Lane, Quarry Lane and Rowton Bridge Road; the most support was for directing unsuitable vehicles away from Rowton Bridge (75% for: 6% against).

Parking near the High School

Of those living within 150m of the High School gates:

- 78% said they were affected by parking in this area
- 71% were prepared to see rates used to reduce the problems with 18% against

For those living outside this area:

- 36% said they were affected
- 31% were prepared to see rates used to reduce problems with 24% against

Parking in Birch Heath Lane

56% of those living in Birch Heath Lane and The Park said they were adversely affected by parking in Birch Heath Lane.

For these residents, local to the problem, and for respondents as a whole, the preferred means of dealing with this problem were:

- Strong support for banning parking
- On balance, against a restricted parking time
- Evenly balanced views about employing an enforcement officer: very marginally in favour

Clear areas of agreement

- The responses show there is widespread concern about traffic issues in the village.
- The themes that have come out in this survey so far are broadly consistent with the views expressed during doorstep conversations, and at the public meeting (See the Consultation document on this website).
- 97% of replies mentioned concern for pedestrian and cyclists' safety.
- There was positive support for using 'physically intrusive' methods to achieve traffic calming, such as speed cushions and pinch points, if necessary to reduce traffic speed.
- There was a general desire to see some control placed on parking in the village centre, however:
 - there was no clear agreement to the use of rates to provide enforcement
 - restricting parking was expected to result in increased traffic flow and speed.

How representative are these results?

Very many thanks to those of you who have returned questionnaire forms to us:

- 25% of those delivered were returned by the end of August.

Replies have been received from the following proportion of addresses:

The Park	47%
Pepper Street	47%
Badgers Close	44%
Plough Lane	36%
Birch Heath Lane	35%
Little Heath Road	34%
Rowton Bridge Road	33%
Sandrock Road	32%
Skips Lane	32%
Village Road	31%
Rowan Park	22%
Quarry Lane	19%
Woodfields	11%

150m from High School 50%

Other roads have returned 2 or fewer replies.

We will continue to include further replies, so if you wish to add your voice to the conclusions or feel your point of view has not been heard, please complete the questionnaire and send it to the addresses on the form. Additional copies of the questionnaire can be obtained from the contacts below.

Any comments on the conclusions to be drawn from these results can be sent by email to traffic@christleton.org or by telephone to 335839 or 335296.

Christleton Village Traffic Action Group
September 2008