

INCOMING EMAIL

From: [REDACTED]  
To: Highways <EX:/O=TORBAY COUNCIL/OU=CIVIC OFFICES  
SERVER/CN=ENVIRONMENT/CN=HIGHWAYS/CN=HIGHWAYS.>  
Date: 13/09/2012 11:51:13  
Subject: RE: New pedestrian crossing facility 'Waterside' Dartmouth Road, Paignton

Dear Mr Clewer,

I am writing regarding the changes regarding the pedestrian crossing at the Waterside, Dartmouth road, Paignton. I am from [REDACTED] and I would like to strongly object to the proposed changes for a number of reasons, the first being that due to the positioning we would lose all outside parking for my business, a business that relies on the parking due to older clientele that simply cannot walk much further. This would therefore cause a loss of earnings for my business and many of my current clients may be forced to go elsewhere, which at a time of great difficulties faced by myself and all small businesses seems ridiculous. My second reason is from a financial point of view for yourselves it is a waste of valuable time and money, the current crossing is in a very suitable place and I would ask just how many issues have come about by its close proximity to the garage, to my recollection nil. Another point I would like to make is that due to being so near holiday camps we get a lot of unsure drivers who may not be used to the area! If they happen to come back and the current crossing is not there or changed could there be a greater risk of silly accidents? I know originally the idea to change was either brought about or pushed ahead by a member of the local community that had sight issues, I would like to suggest that changes would possibly implicate other members of the community with sight issues, the reason being if they are used to a crossing which is 100 yards down the road could they accidentally walk into the path of traffic if it is moved. I think all of these points and probably others by local businesses and members of the community need to be listened to before any decisions are made. From our point of view the big issues are the parking loss directly outside our premises and I think if it does go ahead you will ruin a thriving area and cause more harm than it is worth!

Thank you for taking the time to read this and I hope the correct decision is met.

Yours

[REDACTED]

INCOMING EMAIL

From: [REDACTED]  
To: Highways <EX:/O=TORBAY COUNCIL/OU=CIVIC OFFICES  
SERVER/CN=ENVIRONMENT/CN=HIGHWAYS/CN=HIGHWAYS.>  
Date: 18/09/2012 07:21:18  
Subject: New Pedestrian Crossing Facility - 'Waterside', Dartmouth Road, Paignton

Further to your letter of the 7th September 2012 I am emailing you in support of the scheme.

The current crossing is exceptionally dangerous to use with many cars ignoring pedestrians leaving them at considerable risk.

Over the years my family and neighbours have all had many serious near misses with cars failing to stop or not seeing you while you are crossing and having to run out of the way.

It is unfortunate that there will be some loss of parking spaces but this should be more than compensated by the increase in footfall from local residents who feel it is unsafe to cross the road and visit the local shops.

During the summer time the crossing is very busy with many holidaymakers from the campsites trying to cross a road that with summer traffic is exceptionally busy. A puffin crossing will not only make it safer for the many young families trying to cross but will help improve traffic flow by having a timed/regulated crossing.

We do look forward to this crossing which the residents have been requesting for over a decade.

Many thanks

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

INCOMING EMAIL

From: [REDACTED]  
To: Highways <EX:/O=TORBAY COUNCIL/OU=CIVIC OFFICES  
SERVER/CN=ENVIRONMENT/CN=HIGHWAYS/CN=HIGHWAYS.>  
Date: 18/09/2012 17:11:18  
Subject: Pedestrian Crossing Waterside Dartmouth Road, Paignton

I Have received a copy of the proposed plan to resite the pedestrian crossing near thr Waterside ,Dartmouth Road, and the conversion to a Pelican stye crossing. I live in Knapp Park Road and find the junction with Dartmouth Road and the entrance to the very busy petrol station can be testing. . It is then compounded by the crossing in close awareness. I am aware of at least two pedestrians being knocked down by cars at the crossing (neither involved hospital injury ) Perhaps the siting of the crossing further from the junction will be less intensive. I hope lighting in the area willbe sufficent.

INCOMING EMAIL

From: [REDACTED]  
To: Highways <EX:/O=TORBAY COUNCIL/OU=CIVIC OFFICES  
SERVER/CN=ENVIRONMENT/CN=HIGHWAYS/CN=HIGHWAYS.>  
Date: 21/09/2012 15:32:21  
Subject: New Pedestrian Crossing Facility - 'Waterside', Dartmouth Road, Paignton

For the attention of Mr John Clewer, Senior Engineer

We write in response to your letter received on 12th September 2012 regarding the proposed relocation of the crossing on Dartmouth Road, Goodrington. We currently own the business of [REDACTED], a [REDACTED] business, which will be affected by this change and we strongly object to the proposed changes. We only acquired the business in July last year so were not aware of the consultation carried out with the local businesses in March 2011.

Being located on the main road, the success of our business is governed strongly by the passing trade and the weather, the latter of which we have not had a lot of this year! This fact, combined with the current recession everyone is experiencing, business is a struggle to say the least, without changes that will affect ours and other businesses greatly - i.e. losing the pull in parking outside, for customers and deliveries. Personally we do not understand how relocating the crossing such a short distance from its current location, justifies the huge expense or upheaval and effect on the local businesses, which appears to be being made for the minority and not the majority.

A point raised in your letter is one reason for the move is the close proximity of the garage entrance and the junction with Knapp Park Road. Does that not apply the same for the entrance of the Waterside Inn and Cliff Park Road? Why could it not be relocated for example outside the church, near to the bus stops? This is also where two people were apparently knocked over in the summer crossing the road, which maybe could have been avoided had there been a crossing there. If it was located there, could it not be a direct crossing rather than a staggered one? It would be convenient for the bus stop and near enough for people crossing for the shops and not affecting all the businesses in the row. Or even the approach up to the shops near our business and The Waterside Inn. Also it would prevent losing precious parking spaces, of which there are few left in this area following developments over the years. Further loss of parking spaces could deter people from using the shops, especially holiday makers and could lead to further decline of people coming to the area if this proposal goes ahead.

The issue has also been raised that cars could possibly cut through the Waterside Inn Car Park to avoid the crossing, which would be dangerous especially in the summertime when families with children are about. Also it could pose a danger to sight impaired people who are used to the crossing being where it is presently located. Being directly opposite to one of the entrances to the Waterside Inn, we see how delivery lorries struggle to manoeuvre onto the car park at present and feel the changes would make it even more difficult for them.

If it is not possible to leave the crossing where it is currently located or moved to the other places identified, it would be helpful to ourselves and the businesses in the vicinity to have at least two parking bays at the start of the crossing zig zags outside our business for passing pull in trade.

We would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt of this email and answer the questions raised within it.

Yours

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the sender.

Highways Management  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor Roebuck House  
Abbey Road  
Torquay  
TQ2 5TF

[REDACTED]

2<sup>nd</sup> October 2012

**Proposed alteration to pedestrian crossing – Dartmouth Road – Paignton**

I am writing in regards to the advertised proposal to alter both the type of and location of the pedestrian crossing at Three Beaches on Dartmouth Road.

I cannot see how, especially in the current financial situation, this crossing has any need to be altered.

The current staggered Zebra crossing works well for the vast majority of the people who use it, and is flexible enough that it can still allow parking behind the Zig Zag markings.

Also as the crossing is not signalised, the period for vehicles to wait for pedestrians to cross is generally less.

With a signalised crossing, not only will people have to wait longer to cross the road, which may well result in pedestrians taking a chance and dashing across the road, it will cause far greater tailbacks of traffic, especially in the Summer months when the demand for this crossing is higher and the lights are being placed on demand more frequently.

The problems with this change in crossing type is further compounded by the fact that the Council is proposing to relocate the crossing further down the road, away from the desire line for pedestrians to cross. Whilst I understand the reasoning why this type of crossing would not be suitable at the current location, I feel changing the crossing point will reduce its effectiveness as a greater number of pedestrians will take a chance to cross where the desire line is (By the Garage) rather than walk the few extra meters down and back.

The result of this would be the relocation of an existing crossing which works well to a new location, and also the additional cost to set up and wire in new signals as well as a net loss of 4 car parking spaces on the highway.

As the position is a local shopping area, it seems a bad idea to remove parking which is heavily used at the present time.

I feel that the Council should reconsider the decision to alter this crossing, give the reduced benefits that it would bring to the overall community, as well as the increased congestion it will cause on a major route especially during the Summer.

Yours Sincerely

[REDACTED]

Mr J Clewer

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
8 October 2012

Dear Sir

Re: New Pedestrian Crossing Facility – "Waterside" Dartmouth Road, Paignton.

Thank you for your letter 7 September 2012 outlining the loss of parking spaces that will result from implementation of the Puffin crossing.

I wish to object to the proposal.

My objections are based on the following:

1. Cost
2. I am not aware of any incident has taken place on the current crossing which is 10 meters from my business and residence and I therefore do not think that the current crossing is unsafe.
3. Location – you state that the close proximity to the garage entrance and Knapp Park Road render the existing location unsuitable. The proposed new location is in just as close in proximity to both entrances to the pub car park on one side of the road and within a few meters of the turning into Cliff Park Road on the other. I cannot see that the guidelines are being applied consistently.
4. Loss of car parking spaces means loss of trade. During the current economic climate the businesses in this parade of shops are trading in the most difficult of circumstances. Increased costs of fuel are pushing up prices to businesses and lack of finance increases pressure. The disastrous weather throughout this year's summer season has additionally put pressure on these businesses. There is support from the local community for these businesses but customers require the ability to be able to park.
5. Many customers are elderly and have reduced mobility. They are being discriminated against in being required to park further away.
6. The misuse of a puffin crossing by hitting the button will increase noise at night time. I live above my business and I consider this as an unnecessary infringement of my right to sleep. Please advise me of the following:
  - The decibel level of the crossing signal sound
  - The duration of the crossing signal sound

7. Disruption to my business while works are carried out and severe loss of trade both before and after. I would like clarification on the following points:
- The exact duration of the works and the proposed start and finish dates.
  - Start and finish times that the works will be carried out each day. Please confirm that work will **NOT** be carried out at night.
  - The number of parking spaces that will be unusable at each stage of the duration of the works. A schedule of the exact number of parking spaces that will remain operational from the commencement of the works to the final decommissioning of the existing crossing and reinstatement of the 2/3 parking bays in that area.
  - How will the above will impact on the ability of elderly/less mobile customers to use the shops in this area( one shop is a mobility shop and one a hairdressers with many elderly clients)
  - Arrangements for the secure storage of plant and equipment for the duration of the works or confirmation that the plant and equipment will be removed from the site on a daily basis.
  - Will the work be carried out on each side of the road simultaneously or consecutively?
8. My business is a [REDACTED] and I require unrestricted access for the daily delivery and collection of [REDACTED] and for loading of my delivery round [REDACTED] Please can you confirm that access will not be restricted at any time for the duration of the works?
9. What compensation is available for businesses during the period of the works?
10. Finally please may I have your assurance that the road will **NOT** be closed at any time during the installation of the Puffin crossing and the decommissioning of the existing crossing?

As I am sure you can appreciate there are very strong feelings from all the proprietors of the businesses that will be affected and I would like to suggest that a way forward with this would be for you to meet with them and out local Counsellor to discuss the matter.

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]



1 of 2

RECEIVED  
09 OCT 2012

your ref  
5CC

Dear Mr Clewer,

Thank you for your letter concerning the relocation of the waterside pedestrian crossing.

I wish to object to this crossing on the following grounds

- 1) The existing crossing is working well, does not cause undue traffic congestion and is not a health and safety issue.
- 2) The loss of parking is unacceptable and will affect the viability of the the businesses in this area.
- 3) There is already a crossing by the Danton Court flats
- 4) This will give 2 crossings within 100 yards of each other meters.
- 5) The cost spent so far on this project is unacceptable.
- 6) The cost to be spent in relocating and disruption is a total waste of time and money.
- 7) The re-siting of the crossing, does this mean the money spent on putting the existing crossing in place was wasted due to poor planning, lack of attention to detail or incompetence in the highways dept? If so will those responsible be disciplined and their managers sacked for not being in control of their finances? Who did it? Who passed it?

- 8) If the crossing has to be resited then it should be at the other end of Dartmouth Road by the Church. Co-op bus stops it would be of better service to the local community.
- 9) I have not heard or seen any evidence of a health and safety problem with the existing crossing.
- 10) The new crossing position will create health and safety issues with vehicles using the Waterside car-park as a short cut to by pass the crossing. Children use the car-park.
- 11) Does the public crossing have an audio signal if so does it operate 24/7/365? if so this will disrupt the peace and quiet of residents at night
- 12) This is the second time this crossing has been visited. Is your dept awaiting funding? and it will go ahead anyway? Maybe a budget cut and staff reduction is required in the highway dept to put this issue down once and for all.
- 13) The re-siting of this crossing will cause a health and safety issue. caused by vehicles parking across my drive way. This blocking will mean I have to wait for the vehicles to move. Some can be there for 10 minutes or more during the summer. This waiting for access will cause major tail backs along Dartmouth Road. and disrupt the emergency service vehicles along the road. On one occasion one vehicle was parked all day with myself not being able to exit my drive. The police were informed but did nothing. I will have no hesitation in stopping the traffic if this happens. The existing yellow lines means nothing.

This issue needs to be stopped once and for all. and no further money wasted by the dept.

Yours sincerely



Dear Mr Clewer,

I recall discussing this matter with you in March/April 2011. I confirm the contents of my earlier objection remain valid. Please would you make sure that you link this letter to the e-mails etc. sent to you in April 2011.

The reasons for my objections are as follows:

1. The cost minimum £50,000 is not cost effective.
2. No reason to alter location based on safety there being no reported incidents.
3. This money could be used better elsewhere on higher priority projects.
4. Loss of ten car parking spaces reducing footfall to shops.
5. Potential loss of at least 20 jobs.
6. Loss of several struggling businesses and potentially boarded-up shops
7. Nobody, other than ourselves carried out a professional impact assessment on local businesses in Three Beaches.
8. The motives of [REDACTED] have been questioned
9. The authenticity of the petition has been brought into question
10. All of the local traders are opposed to this scheme.
11. The Highways Management Services are opposed to this scheme.

I have read disclosures in Liberal Democrat literature from Councillor Christine Carter and [REDACTED] which states that this was agreed to go ahead back in 2010. Has this been agreed by the working party in a manner not consistent with proper consultation.

I am most aware that there is a shortage of cash to finance roadworks in Torbay which makes this decision more suspicious where other urgent work will be put back on the agenda. Recently, you have carried out work at Furzeham School which due to children's health and safety had been on the urgent list since 2006, so why has this Puffin crossing been brought to the top of the list essential to satisfy the whims of one resident.

Ian Doggett confirmed to me in an e-mail that this initiative to relocate the crossing and making it a "Puffin" all began with a lady called [REDACTED] who attended a council meeting on 20 September 2010. Aided by other councillors [REDACTED] presented herself as a visually impaired local resident expressing difficulty in crossing the road at the existing facility, she was aided by several councillors.

The committee was not informed that [REDACTED] is an actively employed lobbyist on road traffic safety schemes and apparently travels widely in that pursuit. The committee was also misled that

local traders supported the scheme and had helped in collecting signatures to a 500 name petition whereas the local traders had no knowledge of the petition and neither did any regular shoppers in the parade. I have suggested that the petition should therefore be ignored or closely scrutinised

Yours sincerely,

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

Our Ref. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Mr John Clewer  
Highways Management  
Resident & Visitor Services  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor Roebuck House  
Abbey Road  
Torquay  
TQ2 5TF

Dear Mr Clewer,

#### **NEW PEDESTRIAN CROSSING FACILITY, WATERSIDE**

We refer to your letter dated 14 March 2011.

We must express an interest since the principal of this firm has a financial interest in [REDACTED] and in addition, we represent three clients who have businesses trading in this shopping parade. **We are opposed to these proposals.**

#### **COMMERCIAL IMPACT**

On street limited parking and main road location are vital to the survival of the businesses in this parade of shops. The impact of sacrificing 6 to 7 of the car parking spaces (see Moot Points) will reduce the customer flow putting local businesses at risk. Everyone who has an interest in this resort should be aware of the impact of businesses being forced to close. This is a very difficult trading period, and this proposed is a further attack on business profits and will force some traders out of business. Visitors will diminish if there are no local shops, the image of the locality will suffer and local house prices will fall.

#### **DANGEROUS CONSEQUENCES**

- The car park at the Waterside Pub is already used by motorists travelling towards Paignton as a legal way to do U-Turns at the Waterside to facilitate parking in the on street parking bays and then again to continue the journey into Paignton. To this we can add other motorists who will wish to avoid waiting at traffic lights.
- Children congregate on the wall outside the Waterside pub, waiting for their parents who are inside the pub. Additional traffic entering and exiting the Waterside Pub car park will further endanger the lives of those children. The attraction of buttons to push will keep them occupied and motorists will suffer the delays as a consequence of their game. This could delay the emergency services for which there are no alternative routes.

## GENERAL INFORMATION REQUIRED

Please would you let us have copies of the following :-

1. The petition to which you refer.
2. Minutes relating to instructions to design and progress to consultation
3. A full list of members of the Transportation Working Party
4. Disclosure of vested interests of the members of the Transportation Working Party
5. The Department for Transport guidelines to which you refer
6. Any reports from the Police of accidents at the existing crossing.
7. Any reports from the Police relating to motoring offences near the existing crossing
8. Reports of surveys conducted regarding the impact on the flow of traffic with the new crossing. It is my opinion that the proximity to Cliff Park Road (why is this not shown on your map) will suffer restriction of access denying entry to the only off street parking at Three Beaches.

## MOOT POINTS

- As far as I understand, since October 2010, any support or objection to a matter of planning must be penned in writing in the form of a letter delivered by post or on the Torbay Council web-site. It would appear that since October 2010, any representation in any other media is invalid. Therefore, from Torbay Council point of view the petition must be ignored.
- Assuming that the petition is recognised, albeit in contravention of Torbay Council regulations, how many of the petitioners support moving the crossing to a new location and how many support the loss of parking spaces and how many support the loss of businesses in the parade of shops and how many approve the closure of Dartmouth Road for several weeks (it was over a month last time) and how many petitioners will support that road closure if the Tweenaway Cross Junction project (fiasco) is still in progress.
- Remember that the petition is in support of a suggestion to install lights at the existing pedestrian crossing facility. As I understand from your letter, guidelines suggest this should not be done, but do regulations prohibit this course of action.
- The plan which you circulated with your letter refers to a business called [REDACTED] which does not exist, and does not include the Off-licence at Three Beaches. Furthermore, whilst the drawing is not to scale it would appear that the loss of parking spaces will extend beyond the garage driveway (which according to your drawing is about 20 ft wider than it is in reality) at 103 Dartmouth Road, therefore, if the plan is drawn to scale the loss of parking spaces will be more than 4 spaces. In my opinion, I have counted the 9 to 10 spaces will be lost below 105 Dartmouth Road, and there will be no more than 3 new places where the present crossing is located.
- According to Councillor Christine Carter, and campaigner [REDACTED], the plans to move the crossing at Waterside has been decided and it is a done deal. I am hoping that we are only dealing with an over exuberant politician media hungry lady seeking to promote her party in the forthcoming elections, and this is not an example of corruption at Town Hall.

This is a bad idea!

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

INCOMING EMAIL

[REDACTED]  
To: Highways <EX:/O=TORBAY COUNCIL/OU=CIVIC OFFICES  
SERVER/CN=ENVIRONMENT/CN=HIGHWAYS/CN=HIGHWAYS.>

Date: 12/10/2012 16:11:12

Subject: Puffin crossing 101 Dartmouth Road

Dear Mr Clewer,

I object to the change to a Puffin style crossing outside my premises

The reasons for my objections are as follows:

1.  
The cost minimum 50,000 is not cost effective.
2.  
No reason to alter location based on safety there being no reported incidents.
3.  
This money could be used better elsewhere on higher priority projects.
4.  
Loss of ten car parking spaces reducing footfall to shops.
5.  
It will destroy my business
6.  
Loss of several struggling businesses and potentially boarded-up shops
7.  
Nobody, other than [REDACTED] carried out a professional impact assessment on local businesses in Three Beaches.
8.  
The motives of [REDACTED] have been questioned
9.  
The authenticity of the petition has been brought into question
10.  
All of the local traders are opposed to this scheme.
11.  
The Highways Management Services are opposed to this scheme.  
I have read disclosures in Liberal Democrat literature from Councillor Christine Carter and Sue Biles which states that this was agreed to go ahead back in 2010. Has this been agreed by the working party in a manner not consistent with proper consultation.

I am most aware that there is a shortage of cash to finance roadworks in Torbay which makes this decision more suspicious where other urgent work will be put back on the agenda. Recently, you have carried out work at Furzeham School which due to childrens health and safety had been

on the urgent list since 2006, so why has this Puffin crossing been brought to the top of the list  
essential to satisfy the whims of one resident.

The committee was not informed that [REDACTED] is an actively employed lobbyist on road traffic safety schemes and apparently travels widely in that pursuit. The committee was also misled that

local traders supported the scheme and had helped in collecting signatures to a 500 name petition  
whereas the local traders had no knowledge of the petition and neither did any regular shoppers in the parade. I have suggested that the petition should therefore be ignored or closely scrutinised

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]