

Evesham Transport Strategy

Update on proposals that won't be progressed further

Summer 2019

Proposals that have been ruled out or that won't be progressed at this time	The proposals in this section came from members of the public.
Remove "Keep Clear" from the carriageway surface on Davies Road (near to junction with Cheltenham Road): no longer needed now that the ambulance station has moved.	The 'keep clear' is within an area of buff-coloured anti-skid surfacing, which means it can't be 'burnt-off', nor can it be removed by hydro-blasting as this would likely pull up the anti-skid material beneath/beside it. 'Overpainting' it would leave a shadow effect that would, arguably, be as visible as the marking itself and certainly wouldn't be very long lasting. Since the marking is already worn, it makes most sense to allow it to continue 'fading'.
Extend the bypass, from the football club roundabout to Pershore Road, or extend it to Worcester Road.	Such a 'bypass extension' would completely undermine the business case for improving the A46 Trunk Road. Assessing what can be done to improve the A46 (and how it interacts with Evesham) must be the priority.
A number of alternative ideas have been put forward relating to pedestrian crossing facilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• More needed/ pedestrians need to be given more precedence;• Signalised crossings need to be synchronised, and;• Raised tables.	Changes to pedestrian facilities are considered on a case-by-case basis rather than as central components of a transport strategy, and the need (or otherwise) for any raised table is assessed in the same way. It is worth noting that there has been local support for a new crossing to be installed on the northern end of High Street. The trees, side roads, private accesses and on-street parking don't currently allow the space for such a crossing, but the Parking Strategy might free-up some space; this will be assessed on the conclusion of that Strategy. Linking of signalised pedestrian crossings can only occur where those signals are relatively close together and where the road between them is relatively 'simple': unfortunately the pedestrian crossing signals in Evesham are too far apart, with too much on-street parking and too many side roads or other accesses in between them for linking to work.
Prohibit right turns in to Port Street Lidl.	This would not improve traffic flow since those heading east on Port Street wishing to access Lidl would be forced to 'u-turn' at the nearby roundabout, adding extra unnecessary vehicle movements to that junction. This will not be pursued.

Cont./

Proposals that have been ruled out or that won't be progressed at this time (continued)	
<p>A number of different suggestions for changes to parking have been made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove High Street and Vine Street chevron parking (replace with parallel parking); • Place parking in High Street in the centre of the carriageway; • Pedestrianisation of part of High Street, with Park and Ride facilities based at Twyford and at the football club; • Prohibit parking in Market Place, and; • Coach parking needed 	<p>All parking-related proposals will be considered within the separate Evesham Parking Strategy.</p>
<p>Close Cheltenham Road to through traffic, near to its junction with the A46.</p>	<p>With minimal cost and no requirement for the acquisition of land, this proposal would appear promising. However it would simply transfer traffic to other roads and it would add considerable distance/ time to very many journeys, both of which would exacerbate congestion. This proposal was ruled out for these reasons.</p>

Proposals that have been independently assessed in a Pre-Feasibility Study and ruled out	The proposals in this section came from members of the public.
20 MPH Limit throughout Evesham.	The need for such has not been established. It is worth noting that Department for Transport guidance recommends that 20 mph limit schemes can be 'signed only' in locations where speeds are already low (<24mph) and that traffic calming should be utilised where speeds exceed 24mph. Speeds on many of Evesham's outer-lying roads are likely to exceed 24mph.
Abbey Road/ Waterside/ Cheltenham Road/ Pershore Road junction; add a right-turn filter signal (from Cheltenham Road).	The cost would far exceed the benefit as land acquisition would be required.
Replace the Abbey Road/ Waterside/ Cheltenham Road/ Pershore Road junction traffic signals with a roundabout.	The amount of land that would need to be acquired, the negative impacts of such a scheme and the costs would all add up to greatly outweigh the limited benefits that might be possible.
New roundabout at the Worcester Road/ Tesco entrance.	Some considerable amount of land would need to be acquired (to the detriment of the businesses on either side of the road) and some considerable construction work would be needed to offset level differences: all to address an unquantified problem.
New roundabout to replace Cheltenham Road/ Davies Road junction signals.	The existing signals work well; introduction of a roundabout would necessitate the removal of pedestrian signals which would be highly detrimental for those walking to/ from Evesham College.
Proposed new road to link between Common Road and the A46.	This couldn't meet guidance, wouldn't deliver much 'capacity', couldn't meet safety and environmental concerns and would be very costly. But perhaps even more fundamentally; a new junction on the A46, as proposed, so close to an existing junction, would not be possible.

Cont./

Proposals that have been independently assessed in a Pre-Feasibility Study and ruled out (continued)	
New traffic signals at the junction of Elm Road/ Offenham Road.	The relatively recently installed mini roundabout at this location functions well and does not need to be replaced.
High Street/ Greenhill/ Worcester Road junction; add a left-filter signal (on the Worcester Road arm of the junction).	There would be very limited benefit against a high cost, ruling this out.
Six different proposals for introducing two-way traffic to Mill Street.	<p>These six differing proposals all had in common the introduction of two-way traffic on Mill Street: they differed in how they proposed the adjacent roads should be reconfigured to accommodate/ capitalise on the change to Mill Street.</p> <p>The junction of Bridge Street/ Mill Street and the deflection in Mill Street (where it meets Mill Bank) are both very tight turns, without any onwards visibility. There would be a high risk of collisions and a high risk of large vehicles that are heading in opposite directions becoming 'stuck' at these points. This alone rules out all six of the proposals. The Pre-Feasibility Study did find other reasons, unique to each of the six proposals, that further added to why they had to be ruled out.</p> <p>It is important to note that when High Street is closed for the Mop Fair, and diverted traffic is sent along Mill Street in both directions, this can only be achieved through the use of temporary traffic signals, which restrict the flow along Mill Street to one direction at a time. For more information on these proposals and on the assessment of them, as well as other information on the development of the Evesham Transport Strategy, please visit Worcestershire County Council's Evesham Transport Strategy page: http://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/evesham</p> <p>The full Pre-Feasibility Study report can be downloaded from this link, and a summary of the Study can be downloaded from this link.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Cont./</p>

Proposals that have been independently assessed in a Pre-Feasibility Study and ruled out (continued)	
Convert Abbey Road/ Vine Street/ High Street/ Swan Lane/ Chapel Street, Mill Street, Bridge Street and Waterside to a one-way 'gyratory'.	<p>Trip distance for any kind of access to the town centre- whether for the private motorist, for HGVs servicing the town centre shops or those on bikes- would be greatly increased which would inevitably increase congestion. This alone rules out the proposal.</p> <p>Access for each of the emergency services would be significantly worsened. This too would be reason enough to rule the proposal out.</p> <p>Access to any number of homes, businesses and public services would be severely affected, as mentioned, but perhaps special regard should be given to Evesham Community Hospital, which would be in the middle of the proposed town-centre-wide gyratory. This would be highly unlikely to be seen as feasible.</p>
Assessments of proposals that have been superseded	
Greenhill/ High Street/ Worcester Road junction: creation of more left-turning queuing capacity on the Worcester Road arm of the junction.	<p>The working assumption was that the highway would need to be widened to accommodate this improvement. This would have made the improvement rather expensive and so to give some measure of the benefit, its effectiveness was to be tested in the traffic model. The recent extension of the parking prohibition on Worcester Road (lengthening of the double yellow lines, away from the junction) has freed-up some carriageway width. If this extra width is sufficient for more queuing capacity to be created via a simple realignment of the road markings, modelling the effect of the improvement is no longer warranted.</p> <p>The feasibility of realigning the markings is currently under assessment.</p>
Testing in the Evesham Traffic Model the combined effect of creating more left-turning queuing capacity on the Worcester Road arm of the Greenhill/ High Street junction, together with converting the Avon Street arm of the Swan Lane/ High Street/ junction to one-way (away from high Street).	<p>This test was provisionally 'booked' in case a combined effect of the two proposals needed to be assessed.</p> <p>For the same reason that model-testing the proposal to create extra queuing capacity on Worcester Road is no longer necessary –as described above– neither is this combined test needed now.</p>