

## **Response To Planning Proposal For Land Between Mangotsfield School and Cossham St Application ref PK09/5811/O**

This response is submitted by Governors of the School, which is on the immediately adjacent site and is in the same traffic zone as the proposed development. This response was approved by Governors at the Full Governing Body meeting on 19 November 2009.

The responsibility for negotiation on key traffic issues and Sec 106 lies with South Gloucestershire Council. We recognise that Sec 106 contributions have to be “proportionate”, but believe that it is essential that first priority be given to the safety of students.

The Governors wish the planning authority and developer agents to be very clearly aware of their major concerns. They are willing to discuss these further on the basis of an open sharing of information.

The following sets these out in detail, and may be supplemented by further comments on traffic issues.: -

### **CONTEXT**

The County school has 1300 students, aged 11-18, supplemented at times with regular supervised groups of 30, occasionally 60, primary students on visits. Some 80% of these latter arrive on foot.

It is popular and fully subscribed. It has grown by a third in recent years. Its location, by busy Rodway Hill Road, creates major concerns over traffic, mitigated to a very considerable extent by the use by many pupils of existing statutory and informal paths across the proposed development site as a route to Mangotsfield village and the estates beyond. Normally some 300 cross both ways on school days. We expect and hope this proportion will increase with improved paths. It is also likely to rise due to a larger proportion of students coming from other major housing developments being considered to the East towards Pucklechurch (where Mangotsfield has first area responsibilities for Pucklechurch and surrounding villages).

The school site (owned by South Gloucestershire) is cramped for its current size. Further major building works to replace huts and 60's buildings are expected in the next 4-8 years. It is not expected to expand further.

The school is also the site of the Tennis Centre which, while it operates independently, shares access and uses school car parking.

The school playing fields are adjacent to the East, on Pomphrey Hill. The applicant owns some of this land. South Gloucestershire holds it on a relatively short lease. The developer has tentatively offered to transfer this land to South Gloucestershire under sec 106 if the development is approved. .

Prior to the application, the developer felled the rapidly maturing trees approx 10 yrs old on the proposed development site. The field had also become an attractive haven for wildlife, now sadly destroyed.

### ***County Policy and the Green Belt***

The school is in the designated Green Belt. The school has neither time nor expertise to comment on the extensive details of County Green Belt policies. We recognise the pressure to find building land, but regard it as **essential that the overarching objective of Green Belt policy in preserving an open environment for all, and especially children**, is retained even if some development takes place.

Should any development take place it must in absolutely no way detract from or diminish the educational objectives and policies of the school, **especially child safety**. The school is the long established user of the adjacent site and requires its established rights to be fully respected.

### ***Green Cordon***

The school is currently effectively fully surrounded by a green cordon, (1). Rodway Hill Road on one side is well away from the buildings. This creates a calm environment for learning and examinations. Students are able to exercise and play games in breaks without any risk of upsetting neighbours, because there aren't any.

### ***Green Status***

The school is a silver-rated ***Eco-School***. It has recently installed a 9kW peak £50,000 solar PV roof. The first electric vehicle charging point in the locality is due to be installed at the school in December. The school is pursuing a range of further substantial eco-initiatives including, hopefully, an electric minibus. As an Engineering and Science Specialist College, developing students' knowledge of green technology is of special interest to us, and reinforcing that understanding through the local environment is also important.

### ***Bike It***

Mangotsfield is a ***Bike It*** school, with up to 65 students cycling to school, a significant increase from last year, and the increase consisting mainly of younger 11 year olds. We would hope and expect to see this increase steadily to address national green and health agendas with a target of 200 in three years time, especially in view of the proposed cycle path improvements. Cycle safety is therefore of growing importance.

### ***Road Safety and Safe Routes to School***

After many years of requests, significant improvements to the road at the school entrance on Rodway Hill Road were made in 2001. This has enhanced safety outside the school gate, but it remains a serious ongoing concern, with many near misses. Many accidents still take place within the traffic zone around the school and proposed site -- 12 injury accidents in the last 3 years, including 5 children according to police statistics. In 1999 a girl was knocked down outside the school and suffered serious, life-long injuries. A year 9 student was killed in Cossham Street approximately 20 years ago. Cossham Street, since chicanes were put in by Avon County, has been reasonably safe with no reported injury accidents along its length for the past 10 years. (2).

Mangotsfield thus appears to be a weak area within South Gloucestershire's good overall road safety record.

## **THE PROPOSAL**

### ***Development***

The scheme is for 180 homes built over approximately 4 years occupying the larger part of the site and extending to the stone wall that runs parallel to the school fence to the North of the school site.

### ***Consultation Process***

The pre-application consultation consisted of a single day at Cleeve Rugby Club, and one week on the agent's website.

No governor was able to visit either presentation. We believe it is highly unsatisfactory that the plans were not delivered to the school with a copy for each Governor at the same time as the consultation. We were not consulted at all on the Transport Assessment, despite our students being a major issue.

Common courtesy, as well as the Council's Adopted Statement of Community Consultation (3), requires account to be taken of the specific needs of different consultee groups. The developers agents have ignored this policy, despite, we understand, specific advice that it should be followed.

The numbers of dwellings may be slightly below the formal Adopted Statement threshold, but this does not absolve the developer's agents from acting in a professional manner within the intent of this guidance.

Representatives from the developer and developer agents met informally with the Head and Chair of Governors in April and September 2009. A range of issues was raised with them, many of which have been substantially rejected.

The (500 page) full Transport Assessment Report was delivered to the school on an unreadable disc. A useable hard copy with detailed plans of proposed safety works was not received till 23rd November.

The school has extensive contact with parents via newsletter, website and email. No attempt was made by the developer to use this to secure pre-application input e.g. by a home-to-school survey.

### ***School Council***

Despite specific advice from the Head at that meeting, and the specific recommendations in the Adopted Statement (p42), on consultation with users and young people, further reinforced by advice from the Planning Department, there was no pre-application consultation with the largest user group of the site, i.e. the students themselves (1300 +). The removal of the web site after a few days was notably unhelpful.

The school has a well established School Council as part of its commitment to "student voice" which we take very seriously indeed.

At the School Council meeting on 11 November 2009 it was established that none of the School Council, apart from the Chair, were aware of the consultation, nor had any of them had an opportunity to discuss the implications as no appropriate written information had been provided.

**None of the proposals therefore reflects the views of by far the largest current user group of the proposed development site.**

The Governors will facilitate and encourage the independent views of the School Council .and the wider student body.

### ***Transport Assessment Report***

The application includes a traffic survey, forecasts and proposals prepared by Peter Brett Associates.

The survey was commissioned in November 2008 with terms of reference agreed by South Gloucestershire traffic engineers. The school was not consulted in any way, and the survey did not include any home to school data and therefore lacks any information on the details of pupil movements, which would enable a full safety assessment to be made.

Since the safety of children is at issue, it is exceptionally unhelpful that the developers have not discussed, at the earliest possible stage and in an open way, the traffic data they collected.

Further comments may be added when it has been possible to study this document in detail.

### ***Conclusion***

It is therefore very clear that the developer's agents have not followed best practice consultation guidance.

## **PROPOSED PLANS IN DETAIL (see Appendix 6 for map)**

### **Road Safety and Parking**

#### ***Background***

Safety is of paramount concern and should be considered **first**.

#### ***Site Traffic***

The site is used throughout the day; 1300 students arriving during the morning peak (school starts at 8.45)

Almost all depart at 3.15 in the space of about 10 minutes. The present arrangement for users of the paths is out of the school gate and onto Rodway Hill Road and then back onto the paths. This is very unsatisfactory. Students heading North are normally shepherded at this time by senior staff and encouraged to use the paths across the site, but it is not always possible to fully cover this, and the school has no obligation, and cannot guarantee, that this supervision will always take place. It is not a substitute for physical measures to prevent students and traffic mixing. One group of approximately 80 arrives and departs by school bus to Pucklechurch. Some students use the East path and East gate.

In addition there are significant student movements, mainly by minibus, throughout the day as a member of the Kingswood Partnership of sixth forms. Groups of 16-18yr old students leave the site/arrive from other sites, usually 3 minibus movements 3 times each day. Further traffic arises from sports trips and school trips throughout the year at any time, though many will leave during the morning peak.

The site facilities are let out and used throughout the evening for many events as well as school ones. The Tennis Centre generates traffic in the evening every day.

All the coach traffic currently has to use the narrow school entrances onto Rodway Hill Road. There is no safe coach parking anywhere outside the boundaries near the school.

Large service vehicles e.g. waste lorries, have to back into the site, blocking Rodway Hill Road as they do so, and pose a hazard within the car park.

### ***Accident History***

The accident rate in the general area of the development site remains high. The police records show 12 injury accidents in the past 3 years, including 5 to under-18's in the site traffic zone. One of these was a student knocked over by a bus in 2008, adjacent to the development site. A student was seriously injured some 10 years ago outside the school gate. The developer was not aware, as he had not consulted, that a student death took place on Cossham St approximately 20 years ago (2). Cossham St has been accident free for 10 years.

The senior staff are also aware of near misses unrecorded in official statistics.

### ***Traffic generation***

We note the proposals will generate at least 121 extra vehicle movements in the am peak hour. This figure assumes, optimistically, that the proposed Traffic Plan will reduce the normal proportion of peak car users. (If it fails students would be put at additional risk) We consider this number of additional peak vehicles highly excessive.

This will increase the flow on Cossham Street by a very substantial percentage, doubling on the stretch between the new entrance and the estate roundabout to the West of the new entrance, and adding 50% beyond that.

There is no mitigation along the whole frontage from the proposed cycle crossing to the new entrance, where a sizeable group of students will now face crossing this road with much heavier traffic and no assistance.

This is the context of this section of road not having had any injury accidents for the past 10 years.

As Cossham Street has chicanes and Richmond Road has bumps, we would expect with current layout, much of the am additional peak flow to seek to reach the ring road via Rodway Hill Road and past the school. (N.B. Routes to the N and W are already subject to very long queues in the am peak.)

We also note that the chicanes and queues in Cossham street, much augmented by the new estate, creates a temptation for drivers coming from the east and travelling South to accelerate on coming out of the village, especially as the mini roundabout is to be removed, posing a serious hazard to those students who, despite the school's best efforts, do use the narrow pathway and sometimes walk in the road on the East side of Rodway Hill Road - demonstrated by the most serious recent accident in 2008.

Students walk in groups and fall off paths. The 20mph limit past the entrance in school hours is already widely ignored, and long queues build up at the lights, which has not been modelled in the study. The additional flow on Rodway Hill Road, whilst it may seem modest in percentage terms, will we consider, increase this risk disproportionately. Impatient drivers are a particular hazard.

The continuing flow of accidents, even **before** the substantial additional traffic generated by the scheme, make it imperative that substantial further mitigation measures take place, to separate students and traffic at all possible times. The location of many accidents at the village triangle also suggests that further works in that locality will be required to enable fully safe routes to school. The developer recognises this. We will comment further on the details of the Traffic Assessment Report now it has been received, but note the removal of the mini roundabout appears to require narrowing of pavements, to the detriment of safety of students heading for Tesco etc after school, undoubtedly a "desire line".

We consider physical calming should be extended from the village roundabout/junction to about the South boundary of the school, and the school hour 20 mph limit N towards the village, to mitigate the hazard caused by extra traffic flow in front of the school. A full safety study is clearly required which the developer has chosen not to do.

### ***Paths on the site***

The initial proposals retained the current unsatisfactory "out and back" onto Rodway Hill Road before students enter the site. The school does not own the stone wall to the North so has not been able to do anything about this. Continuation of this is wholly unacceptable in a new scheme; students must be kept

off the road wherever possible, by creating an entrance to the school through the school's North boundary, which, in principle, we would be happy to discuss further as part of wider entrance remodelling. The agents have now indicated they are prepared to discuss this. **We regard this as an absolute essential.** The developer should note that we would expect this to become the main entrance for most students, and size accordingly with regard to standard crowd control criteria.

### ***West Path***

The West path, subject to proposed enhancements as part of Cycle City, comes out at a T-junction opposite Elmleigh road. One of the effects of the developer's proposals is that without the proposed enhancements, queues of vehicles will build up even more across the path entrance in the morning peak. (4). This will in practice require children to cross the road through queued traffic, at a T-junction, rather than wait till the road is clear. We would look to a light controlled crossing enabling students to cross this queue to mitigate this risk.

The proposal to switch the chicane from the North to the South side will give additional limited queuing space for morning, West bound, traffic, but site inspection shows that queues build very rapidly and this will not, in our view, be sufficient to protect the crossing from queues.

The new estate traffic will, in the experience of some staff, be quite likely to "rat-run" through Elmleigh Road to the North. This would lead to a considerable volume of traffic turning right over the proposed new crossing (which has yet to be approved). This could, of course, be stopped by Elmleigh Rd being one-way, but other users may object. Elmleigh Road is also used by a significant number of students on the way to school and is currently a quiet road.

Apart from this, the proposed West path and its upgrade is satisfactory in location within the development, though the width and boundary must not be reduced from that shown, to cope with the volume of pedestrian traffic from the school and ensure resident's boundaries are not compromised. The volume will increase with the very welcome proposal to improve the N entrance onto Rodway Hill Road (Note: we understand this is to be done by Cycle City, not the developer and is not a Sec 106 component). Drainage arrangements must not compromise this entrance, which is below the site.

### ***Eastern path***

The East path currently is concrete, over 3m wide from the entrance in the SE corner of the site to the exit onto Cossham street. The proposals now delete most of this, putting students (especially those on bikes) on the site roads with traffic, from the SW entrance to the site to the start of the path paralleling the exit road to Cossham Street. This traffic for 4 years will include construction vehicles. This is totally unacceptable. The existing path width must be maintained throughout, entirely off road, with a fence to the road if adjacent. No degradation of safety is acceptable.

We are surprised that the developer's agents would even consider such a dangerous reduction in child safety; removing an established fully safe route to school and replacing it with a markedly inferior arrangement. We consider it fails to comply with standard good practice guidelines. We would question the legality of the proposals as they stand.

We note the line of mature conifers on the West side of the proposed road entrance to Cossham Street appears to belong to the Football club. They overhang the proposed narrow entrance by 2m or more. We are concerned that during development the road is not in practice built closer to the path than shown. We would expect fencing between the path and the road.

Students currently cross Cossham Street at a wide variety of points along its length. Some use the chicanes if they follow an easy route. Students, however, do sometimes ignore advice on best places to cross.

The pedestrian crossing of Cossham Street at the site of the proposed entrance is currently a straight crossing of a chicaned road. This will become very much more hazardous for children, especially those arriving in the morning peak, by the creation of the new T-junction entrance to the site. The proposals imply at least 121 vehicles in the peak am hour will emerge from the new T-junction onto Cossham Street,

into the existing flow of traffic (a flow which will also increase in future years if other proposals for development in the Pucklechurch direction are approved). They will turn at a point where children may be crossing the road. It is also a bus stop which creates further hazard (which the developer has acknowledged) .

A light controlled pedestrian crossing covering the new entrance to Cossham Street and Cossham Street itself would be one mitigation at this point for a markedly increased hazard. Further study would be required to achieve the safest option.

### ***Cossham St St James Place junction and village centre***

The proposed additional crossing lights and refuge here are welcome. Nonetheless, it is unacceptable to improve the risk for some students whilst reducing it for others. The “no detriment” principle must be applied to all significant pedestrian routes to school. We note the proposal to slim pavements in the village centre , and regard this as unacceptable.

### ***Parking***

Parking within the school boundary is inadequate, and there is no space for significant further permanent parking.

Many parents and school visitors use the informal car park on the common opposite. The owners, the Parish Council, have repeatedly objected to school users doing this. This unsurfaced informal car park is also a significant road safety hazard, as many users back out into oncoming traffic, and it is not possible in practice to ensure that students dropped at some distance, use the crossing at the North end. The proposals will increase this risk because of the extra traffic flow especially at key peak times, undermining improvements at the school gate achieved by the light crossing etc put in place 8 years ago. It is also subject to proposals by Cycle City, the outcome and impact of which is uncertain.

We believe any development should provide approx 25 public parking places, well screened, in the SW corner adjacent to a remodelled school entrance.

### **Remodelled Entrance**

In 1998 the County architects produced plans for a roundabout at the Rodway Hill Road / Manor Road junction. We believe the remodelling of the entrance to the school to permit safe access combined with access to needed public parking space (see above) is essential in the long term to protect students from ever increasing traffic flows. Such access should be to the school and combine with pedestrian access across the current North boundary to the site and paths across it. The school could then close the current main gate to students, to ensure they start their journey home either off-road across the development site or via the pelican crossing on Rodway Hill Road.

A large group of students use this crossing, for destinations to the North and West, the cycle path, etc. The additional traffic, especially in the am peak, represents a significant additional hazard to these students, and for this reason physical measures need to be extended to the Southern boundary of the school, to ensure that speed limits are adhered to.

This clearly needs more detailed discussion and specialist review, but the additional traffic generated by the developer’s proposals makes it essential that this is addressed.

To protect the possibility of a remodelled entrance scheme being developed, it is essential that a suitable triangle of land on the site is held undeveloped in the SW corner. The developer was asked at the consultation meeting with the Head and Chair of Governors to retain a strip along the whole of the N boundary, but has chosen not to do so, and the plans show development where a safe entrance might be planned.

## ***Conclusion***

We therefore consider that any development should be accompanied by a substantial remodelling of the school entrance to permit:

- A safe entrance for students on bikes and on foot directly onto the development site paths, accompanied by the closure to students of the direct access onto Rodway Hill Road.
- Traffic calming extended along Rodway Hill Road from the village to the school's South boundary
- Sufficient community parking (c. 25 spaces) in the SW corner of the site to create safe parking for all users
- A safe drop off/pickup location for Pucklechurch buses and school sports trips etc
- A safe drop off /pickup point for parents
- Safe entrance for service vehicles

We also consider that given the additional traffic that any development will generate, there should be:

- Further safety works in Cossham Street, especially at the exit of the paths e.g. light controlled crossings
- The developer has made proposals for the Cossham Street/St James junction, which would be a marked improvement, but has not committed to funding them, just a "proportionate contribution" which does not appear to guarantee the works will take place within a reasonable time frame. We will comment further when the plans have been studied in more detail.
- All lights and path related safety works should be completed prior to main site construction.

## **Green Cordon**

It is essential that, if any development takes place, the green cordon around the school is retained. The school considers approx 70m is the minimum to ensure the effective separation of homes from the school, **and retain the existing feel of openness that is the essence of what the Green Belt is about.** The school enjoys the benefit of calm from the site, "green services", and the proposal would lose this forever.

It is also essential in terms of noise pollution from construction during teaching and examinations. The proposals involve major ground remodelling and the sewer re-routing, which will involve heavy and noisy plant operation, as well as the construction of homes and roads very close to the school boundary. Whilst we are aware that in a formal sense this is not a planning issue, it is a significant concern over such a long period, and it is a surprise that a reputable major developer should choose to impose such a burden on a school.

The developer has tentatively offered to transfer ownership of the path adjacent to the school to South Gloucestershire to facilitate emergency access. This would be helpful, but is no substitute for a wide strip of open space that fully separate homes from the school.

The row of trees on the site S boundary is essential to the developers noise case. These will require effective protection, as they will block the sun from the new houses and gardens, and new owners might choose to fell them. We regard the retention of a "green screen" as essential.

### ***School development***

The school redevelopment, due in about 5 years, will involve extensive works on a cramped site. Contractor access via the path as mentioned above will be very helpful, indeed essential, in executing this work, and reciprocally, a green cordon will minimize noise nuisance to the new homeowners.

### **Green Homes in the Green Belt - Quality of Development**

The proposals, despite the developers claims, appear to be dense developments of standard estate homes, with limited green credentials (level 4). We consider the proposed overall development is substantially excessive in relation to the site size and Green belt location. .

The school goes to great efforts to explain current environmental issues to students and has its own green programme, as indicated above.

“Business as usual” construction, passed by students every day on the way to school, subtly undermines the work we do. In effect it says to students, environmental issues don’t really matter.

This is not in accord with the exhortations of the agent’s professional body, RTPI, who place great emphasis on education on green issues.

We also note that if, say, 50 genuine (level 6) eco-homes were built on the site, we would not only see a sharply reduced traffic burden because of reduced dwelling numbers, but could reasonably assume that the proposed Travel Plan might really work because buyers would be far more likely to travel by bike etc. We would like to see evidence to substantiate the Travel Plan claim for a standard estate.

Should the developer choose to reconsider, we note that a development of elderly persons housing and/or a nursing home on a much smaller scale would also greatly reduce the peak hour traffic flow, and be far more acceptable.

### ***Lights***

We also note that the many sports centre lights, including the tennis centre lights based on the school site, illuminate much of the site. Currently these pose no problem on an empty field. These are pre-existing rights, but may be subject to some changes with time. Whilst the lights on the school site are a tennis centre responsibility, the school does not wish a situation to arise in which it is drawn into controversy with new neighbours because of ill designed layouts that fail to reflect existing rights – yet a further reason to leave a wide green cordon between the school and any development.

### **Implementation Issues**

The establishment of a major construction site next to the tidal wave of students for a period of 4 years or so poses an additional health and safety risk. Site management will need to be of an especially high standard.

In particular, it would be unacceptable to have students on bikes mixed in with construction traffic at any time.

Apart from this, the existing off road access points to the school will need to be maintained safely throughout the construction period. The developer has promised this, but we need to be sure this will be retained at all times.

We assume there will be temporary closure of the entrance for construction of the new access road, all students going to Cossham St will funnel through the existing West path. The upgrade to this, part of which

appears to be the responsibility of Bristol Bike Plan, should therefore take place in advance of any other works so that students can pass the site safely in large numbers. It would also be a sign of good faith if this, and all the associated safety works on Cossham St, were completed at an early stage.

The proposed relocation of the sewer will need especial careful handling. As with all school related works, any interruption to the availability must take place in the school holiday with contingency time for difficulties to still be rectified in holiday period.

We therefore expect a binding Traffic Management plan which gives a solid guarantee that students will not be exposed to risk or disrupted in their education..

### **Developer credibility and risk of non-completion**

The very limited nature of public pre-application consultation undertaken, combined with the enthusiasm shown on the agents website for making full use of the new powers for variation of permissions in the 2008 Act, do not give us a great deal of confidence in delivery . This is reinforced by the current general financial uncertainty in the construction trade.

Failure to complete any development as agreed within an agreed timeframe would leave the students crossing a building site for an even more extended period, with potential health and safety hazards.

Any permission should therefore seek to ensure that any Sec106 is fully bonded by the main holding company, and that appropriate conditions to ensure security is always in place, also bonded.

## Conclusion

Our concerns are summarised, along with positive elements, on the plan Appendix 6

- The starting point for a major development next to a large school must be student safety. This is a paramount obligation. The agent has not even shared traffic data with us in advance of the application, and has not been willing to accept the “no detriment” principle, that improvements for one stream of students cannot be at the expense of greater hazard for another.
- The school reject the proposals for over cramped developments as submitted. The addition to the traffic flow is excessive and even with mitigation, poses unacceptable hazard to the students. We consider that the absolute maximum acceptable increase would be 50 vehicles peak /hr if mitigation takes place
- The school considers a substantially reduced development of approximately 50 genuine eco-homes or elderly persons dwellings on the North East of the site, fully reflecting the points made above, could in principle be acceptable.
- In particular, any new submission must leave a substantial (approx 70m) green cordon between the current school boundary and the developments to protect the open environment and prevent noise pollution especially during construction.
- We expect the developer to ensure adequate traffic arrangements as detailed above including leaving land free for a safe remodelled entrance to the school, with adequate public parking (minimum 25 spaces); a safe coach and parent drop off space.
- Safe, **totally off- road** and adequately wide paths for students to pass without road or crowd risks, accessed directly from the school, and with appropriate enhanced crossing arrangements on Cossham St.
- We consider minor modifications will be unable to meet the core needs identified above. We will however, listen to any firm and credible commitments made by the developer.
- Any commitment from the developer should be fully bonded against the risk of bankruptcy or non-compliance.

## Appendices

(1) Apart from 3 dwellings on the SW boundary, which in practice are well separated from buildings and play areas and screened by mature trees

(2) School records 2008 “At approx 3.15pm a female student stepped from the kerb on Rodway Hill due to congestion caused by too many pedestrians on a very narrow pavement. She was talking and failed to notice the passing bus. She was knocked to the floor across the kerb. The air ambulance arrived and she was whisked to hospital. She sustained a number of cuts and bruises and made a full recovery.”

Deputy Head who attended at the scene “In approx 1999 a Yr 8 girl (name withheld) had a serious accident right outside the school gate. Her leg was caught by a passing lorry. She suffered multiple injuries, was hospitalised for months , and was on crutches for the rest of her school career.”

Previous Head comments: "(Student name withheld) was a Year 9 pupil who died sometime between 1986-88 I think; I am fairly sure Graham Kaye was still Head - I can still remember the great upset in Lower School at the time with lots of girls crying in the corridors."

10 year figure from County police statistics

(3) Adopted Statement of Community Consultation, approved 2008 SGC website

(5) The am peak is of concern to the largest number of students, but the pm peak still creates hazard for students and other visitors using the site after school day has ended. The applicants traffic study , indicates 121 and 126 veh/hr/peak am and pm respectively, on the optimistic assumption that the Travel Plan actually works. No pedestrian count has been done



(4) Cossham St – W. path exit onto road

W bound traffic queue about to move after E bound vehicle passes chicane showing that only 2-3 vehicles at most can wait before blocking the crossing point 8.15 –845 November 17th

( below) W bound Traffic queues across the crossing whilst E bound bus passes chicane



## Appendix 6 New Development at Mangotsfield



### Key

- 1 All along Cossham Street – 2 extra cars per minute during morning peak time.No injury accident for the past ten years. Many children cross.
- 2 Chicane change- outcome uncertain
- 3 New Cycle crossing – possibly a problem
- 4 New Crossing lights - Good
- 5 New mini-roundabout removal – will block parents coming by car from Staple Hill direction. Pavement reduced in width , traffic speed increased
- 6 Pedestrian Crossing – possibly wrong place
- 7 New entrance point and better path – Good
- 8 Keep small piece free for possible safer new entrance
- 9 Houses next to school – We have been “green” for 50 years, keep a green strip. Noise from building work disturbing teaching.
- 10 More traffic across entrance – no help here
- 11 Path transferred to school - Good
- 12 Pomphrey Hill fields transfer to school - Good
- 13 Path removed – walking on pavements/cycling on estate roads – construction traffic for four years.