f.d.king@dorsetcc.gov.uk

For the attention of DCC Cabinet Meeting on $16^{\rm th}$ January 2019

Vallemar Charberry Rise Charmouth DT6 6BN DORSET Tel. 01297 561510 Mob. Mike 07817732489 Mob. Judy 07970926193 Michael.haines5@btinternet.com

Date 2nd January 2019

Dear Ms Knox

I am writing in support of a Puffin crossing in Lyme Regis and to record my opposition to the LRT Council's withdrawal of its support for the crossing.

The need for a crossing was brought to the attention of LRTC in 2016 when 600 people signed a petition in favour. The campaign was started in 2015 by a visually impaired lady, who had been refused a guide dog, due to the lack of a crossing. At that time, the LRTC supported the petition and in February 2018 this lady won her long battle for a guide dog. No doubt the support for a crossing by LRTC weighed in her favour.

The long decision making process for the crossing was almost complete. However this seems to have been jeopardised by a last minute U turn made by LRTC, unpicking it's own decision just before Christmas.

A report signed off by Mike Harries on the 18th. Nov 2018 recommended that the crossing not be implemented. No doubt you will be considering this report again, in which case I would also like to point out the following flaws:

- Clause 1.3 this states that crossing in the face of a vehicle going at 20mph is "not arduous". This is a personal opinion and not one which we agree with.
- Clause 1.4 this states that, the lack of crossing was not cited as a causation factor in the accident reports. Causation is a legal term that refers to the factors causing an accident. A factor will not be considered if it is too "remote". So the crossing or lack thereof was likely too remote to be considered. It would not be feasible to say that "had there been a crossing" the accident would not have happened. Although it **is** possible to say that a crossing would prevent children stepping out, that a car would stop for a crossing and that children are taught to only use a crossing.

Two reasons were highlighted in the conclusion; (1) the loss of parking spaces and (2) that there were 34 objections (9 in support) during the public notice period. The report however also went on the state:

- Clause 3.5 (officer a) that it was unlikely there would be a traffic tailback caused by a crossing,
- Clause 3.7 (Officer c) that a crossing would bring benefit to vulnerable groups.

Clause 4.2 states that the loss of on street parking is the main dis-benefit but this is stated out of context of the approximately 80+ public spaces in 3 car parks immediately off Broad Street. The spaces lost are a small percentage of the total available. Also it would be safer to have fewer cars manoeuvering to park on a steep narrow street and holding up traffic. This has not been considered.

On December 6th 2018 a meeting of the regulatory committee at DCC took place. This considered the report and further representations made by attendees at that meeting. We understand this committee decided, in spite of Mr Harries report and his conclusions, that the benefits <u>did</u> outweigh the dis-benefits and they would recommend to the Cabinet Committee that the crossing be implemented.

At this point, it is our understanding that this recommendation, in light of LRTCs previous declaration of support, would simply go on to be finalised by the Cabinet Committee at their next meeting.

On December 19th an extraordinary meeting was held by the LRTC. Instead of the matter of the crossing now following the usual passage, LRTC was convinced to re-open the issue by County Councillor Mr D. Turner. It appears that his persuasion resulted in LRTC voting to retract its support for a crossing. This is a most unusual U-turn to make in the light of a petition of 600 people and a visually impaired resident being denied a guide dog for three long years due to the lack of a crossing.

Please take into account that there has been no change in circumstances to affect either the original support for a crossing by LRTC earlier this year, or the recommendation for a crossing made by the regulatory committee on December 6th 2018. The 600 people who signed the petition for a crossing far outweighs the 43 objections made at the public notice phase. In addition, 21 traders stated they were in favour of the crossing to 8 who didn't mind and 6 against, which again shows that the majority are for this crossing.

A comprehensive traffic plan for Lyme Regis is years down the road and I am sure Councillor D. Turner will work diligently for this as always. However a crossing has been requested by the public, supported by the regulatory committee and is needed NOW.

The public are not simplistic! They have declared what they want in 600 signatures. Councillors I urge you to endorse the Puffin crossing as the start of a comprehensive traffic plan for Lyme Regis. It is inconceivable that such a plan would not include a crossing, and it would be discriminatory if visually impaired residents are in future refused guide dogs because of the lack of such a crossing.

Yours faithfully

J.A. Haines M.R. Haenes

J. A. Haines M. R. Haines

Sources

- Screen shot Daryl Turner social media post 18th. December 2018 (reposted Lyme Regis notice board (Facebook) 23rd. December 2018)
- Mike Harries report to the regulatory committee November 18th 2018
- Lyme on Lyme 20th. December 2018
- Lyme on Lyme 23rd. February 2018
- Bridport news 14th December
- Bridport news 3rd November 2015
- Councillor Reynolds for details of the Regulatory Committee meeting December 6th. 2018
- Google maps of Lyme Regis

A 📰 🖾 …		🖇 🔃 🖘 📶 59% 🖻 08:55	
← Q Se	arch in <mark>Ly</mark> i	me Regis Notice	•••
DISCUSSION	CHATS	ANNOUNCEMENTS	PHO
	v	V V	



18 Dec at 13:20 • 🕄

Excellent meeting early this morning in Lyme with Highways Officers looking at Broad Street issues as a package, too simplistic to look at a single matter.

Now off to Trowbridge for the Western Gateway Sub Regional Transport Body where I represent Dorset 😎

