



## St John's Road Road Safety Improvements Board

### Attendees:

Deputy Inna Gardiner (IG)	Chair
██████████	Haute Vallee School Lead Representative
██████████	Haute Vallee School Delegated Representative
██████████	Resident and St Helier Roads Committee
██████████	Parish of St Helier Representative
██████████	IHE Technical Principal
██████████	IHE Technical Lead
██████████	IHE Technical Officer
██████████	Principal Planner Historic Environment

Item		Action
Background	<p>████ gave a presentation and noted the background to the scheme including concerns received from members of the public. Issues were raised at the Visite Royale and suggestions made for a barrier to be erected. Data was collected from Haute Vallee School which showed that a large number of students walk to school and many cross at the Pet Cabin.</p>	
Community Engagement Overview	<p>Local residents and parents of students were contacted seeking their views on proposals, together with a questionnaire. 89% noted the need to improve safety. The consultation remained live after installation of the crossing and safety measures until 18.12.20 and 75% of respondents noted that the scheme did improve safety. Main comments received were to do with street furniture, narrow footways and the reasons for the raised table. The Historic Report's main comments were about street furniture. Also that the temporary arrangement obscured the arches. Possible mitigations were noted, including changing steel bollards, removing signage and relocating the lamp column and rubbish bin, and using quality materials.</p>	
Existing layout of Pilot Scheme	Slides were shown of the scheme as it is currently set out.	
Heritage Style Public Realm option	The Heritage Option used timber rails and planters, in keeping with a rural setting and included less features intruding on the view of the arches from the bend to the south. It also included mitigation of decluttering signage and street furniture.	
St John's Road – Road Safety Project Board Preferred Option	The St Johns Road Project Board preferred option was shown which included black railings which would guide students fully to the crossing point and tall bollards to prevent pull up 'parking' obscuring pedestrian visibility at the crossing	
Group discussion	IG queried whether a mixed option would be acceptable with low bollards and long railings.	

	<p>■■■ felt that the wooden fence was too low and would provide a temptation to jump over it.</p> <p>■■■ noted his understanding and respect for the heritage feature.</p> <p>■■■ noted concerns that the low height roadside rail option although attractive gave no protection for students and accidents would be possible with dangers still present. ■■■ felt the planter doesn't direct students to the crossing.</p> <p>■■■ preferred the Board's option and stressed the need to direct students to the crossing.</p>	
	<p>IG invited ■■■ to speak and noted a solution was required to keep the view as well as guiding students to the crossing. IG noted the need to also consider primary school children from Janvrin and D'Auvergne Primary Schools who may use the crossing.</p>	
	<p>■■■ noted that ■■■■■■■■■■ and was pleased to see the number of students walking in the area. ■■■ also noted the importance of road safety.</p> <p>■■■ noted the arch was a high grade listed feature and the only triple arch of this style in Jersey.</p> <p>■■■ noted the need to have a lower guard on the side of the road and guiding students to the crossing. ■■■ stated a well-designed railing could blend in and add heritage value.</p>	
	<p>■■■ noted concerns with students accessing the whole area and would not want students to be able to climb over a railing. ■■■ suggested the need to bring the railings as far to the crossing as possible.</p> <p>■■■ noted that the railings could not be standard but would need to be bespoke.</p> <p>■■■ noted that the area on the left would not require railings but a space for gathering outside the arch could be created without seating.</p> <p>The parking issue to the south was noted and ■■■ suggested a bell cast fencing option would be suitable. ■■■ noted the need for policing the area to prevent parking.</p>	
	<p>■■■ noted there would be a road safety issue with railings on the road edge. If anyone jumped they would be in the live carriageway and there have been injuries elsewhere as a consequence.</p> <p>■■■ noted that heritage is about materials and compromise is required. ■■■ noted the fence on the left has an impact on the setting and suggested different materials could work.</p>	
	<p>■■■■■ suggested a site meeting. ■■■ was concerned with low fencing and the need to direct students to the crossing and suggested planters.</p> <p>■■■ noted the need for aesthetics and safety. ■■■ noted the school ushers students down the lane to the crossing and stated there needs to be a safe solution, which is what works now.</p>	
	<p>■■■ noted the Board were looking for guidance and all appreciated the arch.</p> <p>■■■ agreed the temporary railing intrudes and the current option guides students to the correct location. ■■■ noted the materials used on site were the best available due to Covid. ■■■ requested a steer of what would be acceptable.</p>	
	<p>IG suggested using timber railings to guide instead of black.</p> <p>■■■ suggested if the longer rail is more open and in black it will be less dominant.</p> <p>■■■ noted from a heritage point a truncated rail is the best solution. A long rail is the best option for the School and Highways and so there is a need to minimise the impact. An 'estate' rail would be acceptable. If bollards are being installed to prevent parking there is no need for them to be tall. ■■■ noted that bell bollards are not good for the visually impaired and would require a white top.</p>	
	<p>■■■ queried whether a barrier with black railings and bell form bollards would be acceptable.</p> <p>■■■ agreed and also suggested removal of signage and the bin.</p>	

	<p>█ thanked █ for █ compromise suggestion and noted that a similar solution to what is there now is required. █ thought bell bollards would work and would like to see the scheme drawn up.</p> <p>█ agreed and would like to see a drawing. █ uses the crossing frequently and wondered whether a rising bollard could be installed. The area cannot be policed constantly. Via meeting chat █ agreed to review bollard positions to minimise the attraction for vehicles to pull up on the crossing.</p> <p>█ agreed this was a positive way forward.</p> <p>█ agreed a higher fence should be used and noted concerns were with students crossing the road. █ was not worried which materials were used.</p>	
	<p>IG thanked █ for providing a solution, and IHE for their patience and providing options, and the Board for their input.</p>	
	<p>█ will have a drawing prepared and will circulate.</p>	█

End of notes █ 15.04.21