



Dear Councillor Harmer,  
Thank you for your email.

I am delighted to read that the spirit of the proposals was welcomed by those residents in attendance at last night's meeting.

In response to your email, I have taken this opportunity to share my initial thoughts from a technical perspective regarding these items. If you and the Parish would like WSP to undertake further investigations or review – particularly with regards to the **Traffic Enforcement Systems** – we can, but this would be subject to an additional cost against the CIL budget. To manage expectations, I should advise that any further investigations would delay progressing the design.

- **Solid Crash Barrier** (adjacent to [redacted])

Following the collision into [redacted] it is completely understandable that the residents would be interested in further measures. During the early design phase, several options including crash barriers, were reviewed but were discounted due to an incompatibility with the technical standards, site conditions or constraints.

With regards to a crash barrier, the relevant standards set a strict criterion which this location does not meet – particular concern would be that in the event of a collision, the road layout, and limited arrangements of a crash barrier, would provide insufficient deflection of the vehicle. In practice, this would mean that in the event of direct impact the barriers would receive the full impact and, depending on the speed, offer limited protection. In addition, there is insufficient space to install barriers alongside the boundary fence.

In contrast to crash barriers and working in accordance with the road layout and existing constraints, the proposal intends to instead increase awareness of the bend. Awareness should be improved emphasising the bend with a kerb delineation and application of a larger Chevron on a yellow-backing board.

- **Double-White Lines**

As you may already be aware, the application of double-white lines in the centre of the carriageway is to prohibit over-taking manoeuvres due to potential risks prevalent along that length of road. According to the relevant regulations, double-white lines are provided because visibility is restricted, each direction of travel is marked separately according to the degree of visibility in that direction, which is not applicable along that length of road throughout the village extents.

In contrast to double-white lines, the proposal instead implements a revised arrangement of centre 'warning lines' that are designed in respect of the proposed 40mph limit (and below). The application of this arrangement of 'warning lines' is in accordance with the relevant regulations and deemed appropriate from a technical perspective.

- **Traffic Enforcement System** (outside Cooper & Williams)

Please could you clarify what is understood by a 'traffic enforcement system' – does the Parish have a specific product or solution in mind, or is this a general request? As I hope you can appreciate, a 'traffic enforcement system' can be open to interpretation, so I would like to understand the expectation so I can comment accordingly.

Depending on the type of 'traffic enforcement system' and without further investigation, I should comment that we could only install features on the adopted public highway – so the ownership of the land outside Cooper & Williams would need to be clarified. A second concern

would be the risk of collision between any installed feature and any vehicles travelling along this parcel of land (as illustrated on the [Google Streetview](#)). Third, the installation of physical measures would need to be in respect to any existing utility assets.

Further to this email, I would appreciate if the Parish and Councillor Picton could consider the above and confirm whether you would like me to investigate these features for possible incorporation within the design, or progress the design as proposed (including making the arrangements for a consultation on changing the speed limit).

Kindest regards,

Jon Eastwood

[REDACTED]

**Subject:** Re: Forton Heath - CIL - Traffic Safety Scheme

Hi Jon

At the Parish Council meeting this evening we reviewed the plans, 70109344-WSP-FRH-SK-CH-100-101 P01 & 70109344-WSP-FRH-SK-CH-100-102 P01.

We invited 3 members from the parish who reside in Forton Heath. The resident that we met who lives on the junction where the vehicle crashed has noted that he is pleased with the proposals, but strongly requested that the scheme adds a solid crash barrier to the bend behind the proposed kerb line. [REDACTED] was strong in his comments that this would be the only thing that would make him sleep safe at night. The Parish Council would request that this be strongly considered.

In addition, [REDACTED] made the comment that Double White lines be considered on the main road.

The speaker for the residents expressed gratitude for the proposals and keen that the works be approved and put into action as soon as possible.

We were joined by a member of the speed enforcement team, who also lives in Forton Heath. It was his opinion that the space is sufficient to place a new traffic enforcement system, but requires the signage to be 3/4 miles away from the set up point for enforcement. It was proposed that the speed camera location be outside Cooper & Williams site and that signage positioning be considered to allow enforcement from that location.

Can the above please be considered, but other than these comments, the Parish Council is satisfied with the proposals.

Regards

Dan Harmer

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Dear Councillor Cowley,

Thank you for your patience whilst I investigated your enquiry.

Following your email, I have raised this to the attention of Shropshire Council and they have

agreed that the proposals can be shared with the public at the discretion of local representatives. I have attached an approved version that I would ask be disseminated, the content is exactly the same but it does include a 'DRAFT' stamp. As I trust you will appreciate, we are keen to emphasise that until we receive confirmation to proceed from the Parish and Councillor Picton, this is only a proposal.

Unless you, Councillor Harmer or Councillor Picton feel otherwise, I will await for any feedback and further instruction following the upcoming Parish meeting (8<sup>th</sup> May 2024).

Kindest regards,

Jon Eastwood

[REDACTED]

**Subject:** Re: Forton Heath - CIL - Traffic Safety Scheme

Dear Jon

Thank you for your response which was really informative and helpful.

The traffic safety scheme for Forton Heath will be on the Agenda for next month's meeting on May 8th.

The Forton Heath speed reduction measures were instigated by residents back in 2019 and I have an email address for one of the residents. The Mytton residents contacted the Parish Council in 2023 about the hazards of the school bus pick up at the Mytton turn - likewise I have an email address for that group. It is great that you have combined these two issues in this plan.

Is there any reason why I cannot share the plans with the residents in Forton Heath and Mytton?

My thoughts are that it would be good to share the plans with the people who are going to be directly affected and hopefully a representative/s from both can come to the PC meeting when the subject is up for discussion.

Let me know if that is allowed!

Many thanks

Louise

I

T My thoughts are that if they have a chance to look over the plans - they would have the opportunity to come to the PC meeting in May could come to the PC meeting

On Tue, Apr 23, 2024 at 9:50 AM Eastwood, Jon <[Jon.Eastwood@wsp.com](mailto:Jon.Eastwood@wsp.com)> wrote:

Dear Councillor Cowley,

Please accept my apology for the delay in replying to your correspondence dated 17<sup>th</sup> April 2024.

#### **Glasdon Village Gates**

Unfortunately the available widths of verge are particularly narrow and were deemed to be insufficient to support the minimum standard Glasdon product (960mm). In addition to the width of the village gate itself, there is a requirement for sufficient space from the kerb to install it. Whenever any assets are installed on that part of the public highway segregated by a kerbline – such as a pavement or verge – best practice is to ensure a minimum distance of 450mm from the kerb. This 450mm is to provide enough clearance from any side mirrors

or instances of vehicles mounting the kerb. Therefore, the verge would have to have a minimum width of at least 1,140mm to ensure both this minimum clearance (450mm) and the 960mm gate.

With regards to any non-standard village gates, custom-made for the available verge widths, Glasdon, as the manufacturer, should be able to advise on available options. However, from a Designer's perspective, I would advise caution with pursuing any custom-made gates due to an increased expense in maintaining and replacing the asset in the event of damage (the Parish may be expected to assume ongoing liability of the asset as it is non-standard), questionable visibility due to its smaller size and the possibility of attracting vandalism.

### **Central and Edge of Carriageway Markings**

On review of the options available, the decision was taken to influence driver behaviour by changing the existing road markings, including the installation of more apparent features (the yellow bus stop markings) and more subtle measures. The central and edging markings fall into the category of 'subtle measures'. The idea is that motorists drive to the conditions of the road by assessing a range of conditions, including obvious things (like traffic or potholes) and subtle measures, including the presence of road markings – for example, drivers tend to feel more confident driving along those roads with a central road markings, than those rural roads without. On this scheme, the principle was to change the driver's perception of their travelling speed along this road by changing the size and spacing of the central markings to give the impression that they are travelling in excess of the road conditions.

In contrast to the subtle application of the central markings, the usage of edge of carriageway markings will give a more immediate impression that the road is narrower. In addition to giving the impression that the road is narrower, the road markings will help emphasise various accesses along the road, including to the adjoining fields.

### **Speed Limits**

In response to your question about the process and timescales to change a speed limit, I'm afraid it is a difficult to say. As I hope you will appreciate, any changes to the movement of traffic on the public highway – including speed limits – require undertaking a process to change the legal status of the road (via a Traffic Regulation Order). The relevant legislation does detail a process which allows local highway authorities to design, consult and potentially implement the changes. Since the proposal has been designed, the next stage would be to undertake a consultation exercise where the public and interest groups (the police, freight association, etc.) have an opportunity to express support or objections to the proposal. The consultation phase will take place over 21 days, and at its close there will be a period where any received feedback will be reviewed and the council will take a final decision to either proceed with the proposal as advertised, make changes (and re-advertise) or abandon it outright.

To improve the chances of a proposal successfully passing through the consultation exercise and proceeding in the most expeditious manner, I have shared the proposal with the most relevant stakeholders (including Councillor Picton and the Parish Council) for their consideration. In addition to sharing the proposal with you as local representatives of the community for your consideration, I have also liaised with the council and police to ensure that it at least enjoyed their support. If Councillor Picton and the Parish Council are satisfied with the proposals, I will need to receive written confirmation to proceed. At this point, I can make the arrangements for the proposal to be advertised for consultation.

Kindest regards,

Jon Eastwood

---

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Safety Scheme

Dear Jon

Thank you for the Forton Heath traffic plans.

Hopefully the yellow bus markings will help with the two school bus pickup/drop off locations.

I have a couple of thoughts/questions:

It is a shame that you think there is not enough space for village gates on the southside. I know that Glasdon supplies village gates with 3 different widths - if we used their narrowest which is 96 cm wide would there be enough space? If not, could we custom make one?

You mention a change in the 'central markings and edge of carriageway markings' - how are they going to be changed and how is this supposed to influence a reduction in speed?

I note the next stage is to apply for a speed limit change, in your experience how long does this stage take?

Thank you for your input so far.

Best wishes

Louise Cowley

On Fri, Apr 12, 2024 at 2:03 PM Eastwood, Jon <[Jon.Eastwood@wsp.com](mailto:Jon.Eastwood@wsp.com)> wrote:

Dear Councillor Picton and Parish Councillors,

I hope this email finds each of you safe and well.

I would like to start by apologising for the lack of acknowledgements or earlier updates concerning progress on this scheme. Despite my intention to progress this design for review by yourselves in Summer 2023, there have been a number of complications that have prolonged the design. Again, I do sincerely apologise for the delay.

At this stage, I would like to share with you and the Parish Council the proposed designs.

The design includes the following components:

- Revise the speed limit:
  - Reduce the existing speed limit from 60mph to an extended length of 50mph on the northbound approach to the village; in addition to,
  - Reduce the speed limit to 40mph limit throughout the village's extents;
- Revise the existing signage
  - Remove signage that has been deemed unnecessary to the streetscene;
  - Install repeater signs to emphasise speed limits;
  - Install new yellow-backed signage, including Give Way signs at junctions;
  - Install larger Chicane signage to emphasise sharp bend;
- Revise road markings
  - Change centre markings to be in accordance with revised speed limits;

- Introduce edge of carriageway markings to encourage better driver behaviour;
- Introduce new yellow bus cages at sites where school buses load and unload children;
- Install two Vehicle Activated Signs (VAS) at the north and south access points in the village to encourage considerate speeds.

Further to this design, I have recently received approval from the Council and Police to incorporate the additional components listed below, if supported by the local community:

- The installation of additional Verge Marker Posts parallel to those Terminal signs (where the speed limit changes), subject to appropriate spaces;
- The installation of “Dragon’s Teeth” markings on both approaches into the village (I’ve inserted an image of similar application along the A458 at the village of Cressage).

Please can you review the attached proposals and consider whether you would like those additional components incorporated into the design. If you are satisfied with the proposal, please let me know so I can then initiate the next step which will be preparing the paperwork to change the speed limit (which I will advise upon at the earliest opportunity).

Kindest regards,

Jon Eastwood



**Jonathan Eastwood** EngTech MCIHT BA(Hons)

Senior Traffic Engineer

*Pronouns: he/his*

**Advanced notice of leave:**

WSP

2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Shirehall

Abbey Foregate

Shrewsbury

SY2 6ND

[wsp.com](http://wsp.com)

**Confidential**

This message, including any document or file attached, is intended only for the addressee and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any other person is strictly prohibited from reading, using, disclosing or copying this message. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and delete the message. Thank you. WSP UK Limited, a limited company registered in England & Wales with registered number 01383511. Registered office: WSP House, 70 Chancery Lane, London, WC2A 1AF.

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain information which is privileged, confidential, proprietary or otherwise subject to restricted disclosure under applicable law. This message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on, this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized or intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies.