

Cabinet 18th Feb 2019. Supplementary Information -
Agenda Item 17

Davies, Gareth J

Subject: FW: Today's Cabinet Item17. Penarth Heights Sustainable Transport Consultation Report

From: max wallis [REDACTED]

Sent: 18 February 2019 10:28

To: Leader; Cox, Geoff A (Cllr); Parker, Andrew (Cllr); Kemp, Gordon C (Cllr); Penrose, Bob (Cllr); Bird, Jonathan (Cllr); Jarvie, Hunter (Cllr)

Cc: ccc [REDACTED]; green keith; Hugh Mackay; Johnson, Ian J (Cllr) (Home); Wilson, Mark (Cllr) (Home)

Subject: Today's Cabinet Item17. Penarth Heights Sustainable Transport Consultation Report

The Plassey St/Windsor Rd junction is essentially a fork; it currently works pretty well for traffic.

Don't let the engineers with "Option 1" force in a standard 2-lane roundabout at high cost £860k. It wrongly takes "sustainable transport" funds for this, when they have a separate fund for "highways work". The Windsor Rd route is a designated 'Active Travel' route, but Option 1 roundabout would worsen the route for cyclists.



FoE suggest moving the central Island slightly left (eastwards, displacing the parked car), so that a bus/cycle lane could be inserted on the right, for a short section of Windsor Road downhill through the junction to by-pass a short section of queuing traffic. Bus stops could also be

included with simple pedestrian crossings across the two upper arms. FoE has also put forward genuine 'sustainable transport' proposals for cyclists and pedestrians close-by.

Max Wallis, Keith Stockdale

Friends of the Earth Barry&Vale



Davies, Gareth J

Subject: FW: Plassey St/Windsor Rd, Penarth Heights S106 consultation

From: Leader
Sent: 18 February 2019 10:38
To: 'max wallis'
Subject: Plassey St/Windsor Rd, Penarth Heights S106 consultation

Dear Mr Wallis

Thank you for your below email which I acknowledge and have passed to Cllr Geoff Cox and the Director for attention

Yours sincerely

Cllr John Thomas
Leader of the Council

*Consider the environment. Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.
Ystyriwch yr amgylchedd. Peidiwch ag argraffu'r neges hon oni bai fod gwir angen.*

Visit our Website at www.valeofglamorgan.gov.uk
Ewch i'n gwefan yn www.bromorgannwg.gov.uk

[Find us on Facebook / Cewch ddod o hyd i ni ar Facebook](#)
[Follow us on Twitter / Dilynwch ni ar Twitter](#)

Correspondence is welcomed in Welsh or English / Croesewir Gohebiaeth yn y Gymraeg neu yn Saesneg.

From: max wallis [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 February 2019 12:05
To: Leader
Cc: [REDACTED] Wilson, Mark (Cllr) (Home); Johnson, Ian J (Cllr) (Home); green keith; Hugh Mackay
Subject: Fwd: Plassey St/Windsor Rd, Penarth Heights S106 consultation

John Thomas,
Leader VoG Council.

Dear Mr Thomas,

I object most strongly to the treatment of my representations on behalf of Cardiff Cycling Campaign in the papers to the Cabinet on item 17 "Penarth Heights Sustainable Transport Consultation Report".
the Consultation report in Appendix A reproduces the representations sent by e-mail below but in scarcely readable form (a picture of micro-text in very long lines that's not e-readable, as attached jpg and in picture at end)
the Consultation report fails to address our criticisms, in particular that the proposal worsens conditions/safety of cyclists using the 'active travel' designated route.

The report (Appendix A, s.6) says "I have summarised the responses below". It doesn't summarise ours, still less address the points, but reproduces it in unreadable form. It fails to refer to the designated 'active travel' route that the proposals would worsen. The assurance of the officer (C L Pugh, e-mail below) that our " comments will be considered fully as part of the consultation report" is not met. In making your decision, you and your colleagues would need to consider our representations yourself.

We ask that you defer the item from Monday's Cabinet meeting and require the report be amended to properly report or reproduce our representations, in view of the requirements on you and the Cabinet to genuinely consider public representations.

Regards,
Max Wallis [REDACTED]
Cardiff Cycling Campaign

----- Forwarded message -----

From: max wallis <[REDACTED]>
Date: Mon, 2 Jul 2018 at 11:29
Subject: Plassey St/Windsor Rd, Penarth Heights S106 consultation
To: Charlotte Pugh <clpugh@valeofglamorgan.gov.uk>
Cc: Hugh Mackay <[REDACTED]> Phillips, Kyle W <kwphillips@valeofglamorgan.gov.uk>, Jane <[REDACTED]> Paul Kinnersley <[REDACTED]>

Charlotte Pugh,
VoG Senior Planner [responsible for S106 schemes]

I attended one of the consultation sessions - and argued strongly as a cyclist that the planning criteria were wrong.

Under active-travel criteria, there needs to be priority for commuting cyclists; we need to improve the right turn uphill on Windsor Rd to the centre, as this is the main route we use and the right turn is problematic.

All the options worsen this primary 'active travel' cycling demand.

This as the designer/officer insisted on planning for leisure cyclists and child cyclists to use the Toucan crossings with all the delay that causes. He admitted that it is not and cannot be a 'leisure' cycling route (narrow pavement/rail bridge). He would not know that inserting extra forced stops/lights on an active travel route is judged as bad; uphill as here, such stops are especially bad and deter any commuter cyclists from using the Toucans.

Option 1 (large roundabout) is bad for cyclists like all two-lane roundabouts. Normal traffic flow calculations are irrelevant when, as often, vehicles are queuing through this roundabout and backed up on both Windsor Rd and Plassey St. At present we cyclists can get through downhill; with two lines of cars moving slowly through the roundabout, our route will become more risky.

For the few leisure or child cyclists using the Windsor Rd route, there is no point in providing a Toucan at the bottom of Plassey St for them, when they can (as at present) proceed via Dingle Park. That Toucan should be moved up Plassey St to cater for schoolkid pedestrians, as others have pointed out, as they cross into Windsor Lane on the way to either secondary school (and to the Welsh and Fairfield schools).

I proposed contacting Clare Cameron, as the active-travel officer in whom we have confidence as she understands cycling. The defined 'integrated network' map for cycling has no link up Windsor Rd - the Plassey St route just ends - pending the rail/Metro route (below). However the network map for walking includes Windsor Road (as is unavoidable). There are two cycling projects shown, codes PEN-C0060 and PN-C390. Information should be supplied on these.

As Clare recently went on extended leave, do I understand right that Kyle Phillips is filling in? If so, is it in order to seek the information and explain the problem to him? Though I made these points at the session, no officer recorded them and I have no confidence that they were taken on board.

In wider terms, I'd want to argue that with the money linked to Penarth Heights, the route to schools from there should have priority, not just provide a crossing to Windsor Lane as an afterthought. there's also a crossing of Windsor Rd from Windsor Lane and a better route through Dingle Park to the railway crossing.

Second, with changing the rail-line to metro-trams, there could be

- a) a commuter/leisure route alongside the tramline, bypassing the nasty Windsor Road from the railbridge down, with potential access via Hill Terrace;
 - b) removal of the Dingle footbridge for an at-grade crossing with a link into Dingle Park.
- Therefore no rushed infrastructure spending that may turn out redundant.

Regards,
Max Wallis [REDACTED]
Cardiff Cycling Campaign

On Tue, 3 Jul 2018 at 10:12, Pugh, Charlotte L <clpugh@valeofglamorgan.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Mr. Wallis,

Thank you for your email. Your comments will be considered fully as part of the consultation report. As I said at the consultation event, the purpose of this consultation is to get feedback from all users of the highway network in relation to initial draft proposals at this junction, but also in relation to other walking/cycling schemes people feel should be considered in the immediate area. Any final schemes will be fully considered alongside the Active Travel criteria. Kyle Phillips is now the Active Travel lead within the Council.

If you haven't already done so, I would urge you to complete the survey on the Council's website as well.

Thank you for taking the time to comment.

Kind regards,

Charlotte Pugh

Senior Planner

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes that this is crucial for ensuring transparency and accountability in the organization's operations.

2. The second part of the document outlines the various methods and tools used to collect and analyze data. It highlights the need for consistent and reliable data collection processes to support informed decision-making.

3. The third part of the document focuses on the role of technology in modern data management. It discusses how advanced software solutions can streamline data collection, storage, and analysis, leading to more efficient and accurate results.

4. The fourth part of the document addresses the challenges associated with data management, such as data quality, security, and privacy. It provides strategies to mitigate these risks and ensure that data is used responsibly and ethically.

5. The fifth part of the document concludes by summarizing the key findings and recommendations. It stresses the importance of ongoing monitoring and evaluation to ensure that data management practices remain effective and up-to-date.