

Dear Community Council,

I refer to your enquiry above (following on from your recent site visit with Nikki) and advise I have received a response from the Service as detailed below:-

“Good morning Joan and Riverside Community Council,

Thank you for your time and that of your colleague and residents on Thursday 16th of October on our walk on Forth Crescent and Goosecroft Road. Below is a summary of the issues that were highlighted on the walk, with my responses included in red.

1. The existing surface of the footway and carriageway along Forth Crescent are sub-standard and cause issues for wheelchair users. **Having reviewed the proposals for the new active travel route along Forth Crescent, I can confirm that the road surface is to be renewed as part of the works. There are no proposals to resurface the footway on Forth Crescent as part of the works. The footway condition is a maintenance issue and should be raised with Roads Maintenance through official channels so that the enquiry is logged, and a response will be provided in the prescribed timescale.**
2. The existing cobbled crossing area at the junction to Ronald Place is in poor condition and is difficult to negotiate, particularly during wet weather when the surface becomes slippery. **I can confirm that the active travel route proposals include removal of this cobbled area and replacement with a raised table pedestrian crossing at this junction.**
3. The existing drainage gullies in the junction of Forth Crescent and Forth Street. **I can confirm that these gullies will be relocated within the works to provide adequate drainage in the low spots adjacent to the raised table crossings.**
4. The existing path between Shore Road and Forth Place issues with cyclists travelling at speed downhill towards Forth Place. A query raised whether this would be a pedestrian only route on completion of the works. **There are no proposals to prohibit cyclists using the path as they do at present, and this path will remain a shared-use path on completion of the works.**
5. Traffic signals at Goosecroft Road / Shore Road junction
 - The green man sometimes starts before the audible signals starts. **I did witness this on a couple of occasions on site but is not a consistent issue. I will ask the signals maintenance contractor to investigate this when next in attendance at this site.**
 - It's considered that the pedestrian phase of the signals is not long enough should be extended. **As explained, the green man signal and the audible signal are present only to alert pedestrians to start their travel across the crossing and is not intended to be present for the duration of them crossing. If the green man and audible signal were present for the entire journey, following pedestrians approaching the crossing would expect to be able to enter the crossing which would extend the pedestrian phase. I appreciate that this may not be well known by road users and will investigate whether this could be incorporated into some potential future education campaigns.**

- There is only a single pedestrian signal unit to each side of the crossing, which gets obscured by pedestrians waiting to cross and cannot be seen by other users, and those in wheelchairs in particular. Unfortunately, this was missed in the design stage and when the signals were installed. Additional units could have been included at a higher level and / or with the other pedestrian demand unit to the left of the crossing. I will investigate whether it is possible to retrofit additional units to the signals to provide high-level indicators, and if so whether we can secure a budget for these to be provided.
6. Vehicle access into the station car park:
- While there is a continuous footway across the vehicle access, this leads to confusion for users over where the vehicle area is and who has right of way. As discussed, there has been previous deliberations whether the inclusion of tactile blister paving either side of the vehicle access at a continuous footway would provide clarity or cause confusion for non-motorised road users intending to cross. While the presence of the continuous footway should indicate that pedestrians have right of way, it is acknowledged that this isn't always clear, particularly at this location where the surfacing through the access is not consistent with the surfacing on the footways. Stirling Council are now including tactile blister paving at shared vehicle accesses where continuous footways are provided. I will investigate whether some stick-down tactile blister paving could be added at this junction to provide greater clarity for non-motorised road users crossing the vehicle access.
 - Vehicles egressing from the car park are stopping on the cycleway while waiting to enter Goosecroft Road, causing cyclists to have to enter the footway to manoeuvre around these vehicles. While there is a give way marking providing for vehicles egressing the car park, which is placed in advance of the ramp onto the continuous footway crossing, this is some distance from the edge of the carriageway of Goosecroft Road, meaning that drivers may not have full visibility to see approaching pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles. This then leads to vehicles waiting on the cycleway as observed. While I can appreciate how frustrating this issue is, particularly for cyclists, I'm afraid that this isn't an easy issue to resolve. It is preferable to have vehicles pause across the cycleway to determine when it is safe to enter Goosecroft Road, than to make a decision from the give-way line, cross the footway and cycleway and enter Goosecroft Road, potentially without clear visibility of oncoming vehicles. Oncoming cyclists have clear visibility to any vehicles that may be stationary on the cycleway at the access and can take action to manoeuvre around the stopped vehicle if it is safe to do so, or to stop and wait for the vehicle to clear the cycleway.
7. Traffic Signals at Station Road junction
- It's considered that the pedestrian phase of the signals is not long enough should be extended. As above, this was explained, the green man signal and the audible signal are present only to alert pedestrians to start their travel across the crossing and is not

intended to be present for the duration of them crossing. If the green man and audible signal were present for the entire journey, following pedestrians approaching the crossing would expect to be able to enter the crossing which would extend the pedestrian phase. I appreciate that this may not be well known by road users and will investigate whether this could be incorporated into some potential future education campaigns.

- Vehicles exiting Station Road and turning left are being confused by the presence of the red signal at the crossing point on Goosecroft Road and are stopping thinking this signal is for the pedestrian crossing. As explained, this signal does not relate directly to the pedestrian crossing and is a secondary signal head for north-eastbound traffic on Goosecroft Road. All traffic signals should comprise a primary signal head, which is placed in the vicinity of the stop line, and a secondary signal head, placed further away. The purpose of the secondary signal head is so that if a large vehicle is stopped at the stop line and is obscuring the primary signal head for following vehicles, they can see which light is active on the secondary signal head. It is unfortunate placement that the secondary signal head at this location is located where it can be seen by drivers turning left out of Station Road. To prevent this, there have been extra-long cowls added to the signals, and the signal head has been rotated as much as possible to prevent drivers turning left from Station Road seeing the signals.

While I can appreciate it may cause momentary confusion for some drivers, a competent driver should know that there would not be two independent signal operations in such proximity and there is no stop line associated with this signal head, therefore no traffic should be stopping at this location. As discussed on site, there will be no conflict between vehicles travelling through the junction and pedestrians crossing at this location both showing green lights. Therefore, should a vehicle misunderstand the signals and stop when they have a green signal to travel through the crossing, this would not result in a collision between a vehicle and a pedestrian. All drivers should leave sufficient space to the car in front to stop if required.

A suggestion was made to relocate the secondary signal head further south-east to prevent the signal head being seen by drivers turning left out of Station Road. While this is technically possible, it would cost tens of thousands of pounds. There were complaints received about this issue when the signals were first introduced, which prompted the amendments detailed above. However, since the angle of signal head has been amended and the extra-long shrouds fitted, there have been no further issues raised. It is therefore not considered appropriate to relocate the signal head at this time. While I appreciate this may be disappointing and acknowledge from your comments that it may seem like we need to wait for someone to be injured to act, we must consider carefully any measures to be taken when determining the best use of restricted budgets, and any works undertaken must be considered to be proportional to the problem. When this location is considered, the vast majority of drivers are using the junction correctly, there have

been no recent complaints raised through the council contact options, and no collisions have been recorded at this location within the last five years, there is not sufficient justification for the relocation of the signal head.

The following items were also discussed during the meeting:

8. I have raised a preliminary query with the active travel team and have suggested that on completion of the current works at Forth Crescent / Shore Road that an accessibility / walking and cycling audit alongside the Stage 3 Road Safety Audit. This will ensure that the new infrastructure is of good quality for all users including pedestrians, and those users who may be physically or visually impaired.
9. A discussion has been started regarding the potential for an education campaign around the following:
 - Recent changes to the Highway Code, including but not limited to:
 - Hierarchy of road users; the hierarchy places those road users most at risk in the event of a collision at the top of the hierarchy. It does not remove the need for everyone to behave responsibly.
 - Giving way to pedestrians and cyclists at junctions; when people are crossing or waiting to cross at a junction, other traffic should give way.
 - Walking, cycling or riding in shared spaces; people cycling, riding a horse or driving a horse-drawn vehicle should respect the safety of people walking in these spaces, but people walking should also take care not to obstruct or endanger them.
 - How to use the new active travel infrastructure installed in the Stirling area, including but not limited to:
 - The difference between a segregated footway and cycleway and a shared-use path.
 - How to use pedestrian crossings on a cycleway.
 - How to use pedestrian crossings including how the equipment works such as the pedestrian lights, sounds and tactile cones for visually impaired.
 - Different types of crossings within the Stirling area.

The discussions around an education campaign are at a very preliminary level and will require significant resource to be able to deliver as envisioned. The road safety and traffic management team will work with the active travel team to discuss the scope of the campaign, the methods for delivery and the potential routes for funding to be able to take this forward.

I trust the above notes are an accurate reflection of our conversations at the meeting, however if you feel there are inaccuracies or there have been issues missed, please do let me know and I will update.

Kind regards

Nikki

Nikki Slack, Senior Road Safety and Traffic Management Engineer"