



Initial Summary Report HRA ATZ Workshop 12 March 2024 – Plenary Group Responses

39 HRA members took part in the Workshop supported by 8 Group Facilitators who were HRA members, friends of HRA or HRA committee members. 5 other HRA committee members supported the event.

Apologies were received from Cllr Finn and Cllr Savage. 6 members who had registered withdrew due to illness or other business.

Attendees had been organised in advance into 8 groups each with a Group Facilitator. Groups sat around tables and had name badges. Background information, maps of example SCC ATZ schemes presented so far and the Session Questions had all been sent to attendees in advance.

Group Facilitators benefited from a briefing document and a short meeting with the HRA HonSec before the event began.

Prof. Roger Brown, HRA Chair, introduced the Workshop and explained the aims.

The HonSec led the proceedings, introduced each focus question and managed the timekeeping.

The workshop ran to time at 2 hours.

Evaluation emails were sent to all participants the following day. Received to date:

12 Attendee Evaluations

7 Facilitator Evaluations

2 Committee Evaluation

Plenary Group Responses

The group responses to the Plenary question from oral feedback (notes taken by RB and BC) and group sheet notes of the Plenary question have been compiled into the Summary Report below. A full report will be produced in due course to reflect the responses for each question from each group.

Session 6 Plenary

Q. What is the most significant Active Travel Zone discussion point / suggestion to come from your group?

The principle that local residents are being seriously disadvantaged by the scheme and it is non-residents who gain the advantage

Local residents are impacted full time but the Bus-gate is only part time

The stated objectives are not served by the proposed means

Resident engagement and transparency in on-going evaluation of the scheme is essential during the trial phase

Do nothing until we can evaluate

Don't block the roads with further obstacles or road blocks

Emergency vehicle access must not be compromised

Good support for do nothing until we have more information and see the effect of traffic flows

Wait and see – proper traffic surveys on the effect of part-time Bus-gate

There is no real data on which to make judgements, given a peak-time only Bus-gate

Previous traffic data / vehicle modelling must not be used to design the ATZ as this was on the basis of a permanent full time Bus-gate

Valid and reliable new data is needed – actual not modelled

Implement an 20mph (enforced?) and evaluate the effect of any extra traffic in the ATZ to see if it does improve bus use and bus times (wide support from all groups)

20mph is safer

Infrastructure has not been put in place to make the scheme work

Adequate signage is necessary

Beware of the effect of too much street furniture, road markings, too many signs
(NB Conservation areas)

Minimal support for modal filters - lots of community disadvantages

Maintain freedom of access for local residents

No division of the community

Will an ATZ zone mean less pollution? Data on pollution?

Queueing traffic, more fuel use: longer distances to drive, more fuel use – more emissions from idling traffic

A view that the imposition of ATZ measures would lead to an increase in journey times across Highfield and traffic jams on local roads e.g. Highfield Lane, Winn Road

Too many vehicles for Thomas Lewis Way

Support for ANPR in wider Highfield but this was not universal

Some have issues about surveillance

How wide is the ATZ area? Who would be eligible?

Why is there no park and ride?

Free buses for the first two months to encourage bus use and deter cars

Where is the bus-saving-times data for peak-times?

The Unilink bus to the station should be reinstated (or at least one bus in every three)