

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Metrowest1](#)
Subject: Issue Specific Hearing 2, Day 1, Agenda item 4 - Permanent Public Right of Way Diversions and Alternatives
Date: 11 January 2021 22:08:41

Hello. I was asked by the Examiner to send you my comments regarding National Cycle Route (NCN) 26 due to time running short when discussing Agenda Item 4, bullet 5, today. It was suggested that Mr Berry, a Pill resident, and I should provide a joint e-mail because we had similar views regarding the proposed changes to NCN 26 but this proved to be impracticable since I don't have his email address. Hence, here is what I would have raised had the time been available this morning:

1. Bridleway Crossing Royal Portbury Dock Road. Mr Berry spoke first and raised his concern about providing a bridleway at road level to cross Portbury Dock Road. Although he thought that the posted speed limit was higher than the actual 30 mph, I concur with him that vehicles frequently travel much faster along this stretch of road. I know because I use it several times every week as my preferred route between the M5 or and my home in Easton-in-Gordano. Therefore, I share his view that providing an uncontrolled crossing on this road would invite a serious accident. I don't think I've ever seen a pedestrian or horse attempting to cross this stretch of road in the past nine years and with good reason. It is very wide, sometimes busy with HGVs and lighter vehicles, occasionally exceeding the 30 mph limit by a significant margin, so crossing on foot or with a horse, would be potentially very hazardous, unless the traffic was brought to a halt. Also, I walk and cycle along NCR 26 fairly often, although not as frequently as Mr Berry, and I also have never seen a horse on it. I entirely agree with the objective of providing a route for horse traffic that avoids the need to pass under the Portbury Dock Road overbridge close to the live tracks. However, unless pedestrian/rider controlled traffic lights are provided for the crossing, I believe that it would be extremely dangerous to encourage horse riders (or pedestrians) to cross that road.

2. Proposed Diversion Route for NCN 26. I am also very concerned about the proposal to divert NCN26 southbound from its junction with Marsh Lane to the junction with Church Road in Easton-in-Gordano. I disagree with the view expressed today by the Applicant's representative that because Marsh Lane is a minor route the proposed diversion would not significantly increase the hazard to users of the diverted section of NCN 26. I walk this road several times a week and often cycle along it to reach NCN26 from my home. Almost the entire stretch of the diversion route is subject to a 40 mph speed limit, dropping to 30 mph just before reaching Church Road. Arguably, this is still too high. Until recently the speed limit was 60 mph and a significant number of drivers continue to treat it as such. There is also a hump-backed bridge on a bend over the railway about 100 metres south of the NCN26 junction with Marsh Lane. Finally, Marsh Lane is narrow at this point and there is no footpath for a distance of 100 metres either side of the bridge. At certain times of day, the road is also relatively busy with local traffic. This combination of factors makes the road hazardous and, although I know this stretch of road well and am keenly aware of the dangers, I ride or walk along it with considerable trepidation. As mentioned by Mr Berry, NCN26 is becoming increasingly busy, and not just because of the pandemic. Very often there are groups of cyclists, including small children/novices, who are perfectly safe on the current route of NCN26. There is a short road crossing at Marsh Lane to negotiate but, since there is reasonable visibility in both directions, this is safe for all NCN26 users. However, I think it would be incredibly unwise to direct cyclists, perhaps unknowingly, southbound down Marsh Lane and thus having to mix with fast moving traffic for several hundred metres on a narrow road with a blind crest over the bridge. In my opinion a lot more work would have to be done to make this diversion route safe until the permanent route could be restored at the end of the two year construction period. I am thinking here in

terms of aggressive speed reduction measures such as speed humps and warning signage to impress on drivers the need to drive slowly and exercise extreme caution. I have seen no such active measures proposed in the DCO, other than an annotation on a chart that “no construction traffic shall use this route” for that section of Marsh Lane.

Regards,

Bill Ovel

Pill & Easton-in-Gordano Parish Council