

Royston Cross Development Brief Consultation Report

Part 1 – Summary of responses

1. In total 21 respondents made approximately 54 representations during the consultation period on the draft development brief. Many were supporting continued investment in Royston and the Cross in particular and wanted to see more detail for each of the potential options.
2. Those who did respond included Herts Highways, Hertfordshire Constabulary, Royston Town Council, Royston Chamber of Commerce, Butler Car Services as well as a number of local residents and companies. There was a varying degree of comment and opinion - some wanting the whole area pedestrianised. Others wanted the route to be maintained to enable traffic to pass freely through the Cross as it was viewed as an important route, not only to the station but to the North of the town.
3. There was a general consensus for improvement of the open space and general de-cluttering. The main issues arose with regard to the changes in highways.
4. Many who responded only identified one preferred option, however as not all options were mutually exclusive some identified more than one preference and some purely made detailed comments about each of the options and the specific features.
5. Many of the textual changes to the revised Brief have arisen from the change in format from an options based document to one containing a preferred strategy.
6. The preferred option takes forward features from Option 2a, progressing pedestrian and environmental enhancements as a priority. Option 2a was viewed as most popular by those that responded as it was seen as offering most pedestrian importance. Detailed assessment of the impacts of this approach will be required to ensure that there are no negative impacts on the road network as there are concerns that moving the stop line could impact on the free flow of traffic around the Morrison's roundabout.
7. This option is not completely ruling out the possibility of development in the future. There was a mixed response to building on the northern area of open space. Three people identified it as a preferred option, but 8 people noted specific negative comments about it. The idea of a 2 storey building in this small area was viewed as particularly imposing. A single storey building was identified as a possibility through the consultation, as was the possibility of creating space for something that is temporary i.e. a kiosk. The need for the area to be open was seen as particularly important. So the enhancement of the Cross area is considered as the preferred option in the Brief, but it doesn't rule out the potential for appropriate development in the future.
8. Many of the features suggested for Option 2a are being taken forward in the preferred option. These include:
 - i) Provide a raised pavement through the Cross area in the carriageway
 - ii) Widen footpath on Kneesworth Street but retain two lane turning at junction
 - iii) Move stop line on Baldock Street west to behind Lower King Street

- iv) Expand width of pedestrian crossing areas.
- v) Rationalise street furniture and make environmental improvements
- vi) Implement double yellow lines throughout Cross

9. A number of these were debated through the consultation. Most notably Points ii) and iii) in the above list.
10. A number of representations raised the issue for the need for businesses to be able to be serviced by HGVs. The feature to widen Kneesworth Street footpath could impact on the ability for loading as it was proposed to extend the road into the informal loading bay that currently exists, although this is also identified as being used by informal parking too.
11. Loading along this stretch of Road could be restricted to times when buses are not passing down this route to prevent an issue, however, an additional approach of incorporating a new loading bay in the area of open space provides another potential option to enable businesses to function as normal with additional importance and protection afforded to pedestrians.
12. With regard to moving the stop line on Baldock Street westwards behind the Lower King Street Junction, although there was the greatest amount of support expressed for this Option as it was identified affording the greatest level of pedestrian importance, there was some concern about the potential impact on the road network and in particular the Morrison's roundabout. A traffic assessment is identified as part of a detailed scheme to ensure that there is no negative impact on the network. This is specifically detailed in paragraphs 3.14 and 4.5 of the brief.
13. There were a number of ideas with regard to how to make the open space more useable and less cluttered, many of which have been incorporated with that feature.
14. Additional features suggested from representations have also been considered incorporating:
 - vii) Relocation of taxi rank to Lower King Street
 - viii) Implement vehicle weight limit through the Cross
15. The relocation of the taxi rank requires further consultation with the taxi operators. There is no point relocating it to an area that is not desirable, but this is included as a potential feature as the current location on Upper King Street is considered not desirable by the taxi operators.
16. With regard to the weight limit, it was considered that preventing large, heavy vehicles passing through the Cross would add to the perception of pedestrian importance. This idea was specifically detailed in Scheme D10 of the UTP but it will need to be the subject of further consultation with Hertfordshire Highways, the police, HGV representatives and other interested parties.
17. The retention of the public toilets were raised by the Town Council. Given that the future of these facilities is currently being debated by the Council, it is recognised that the retention/re-provision of the public toilets as part of any development/enhancement scheme on this site would need to be the subject of further discussion with the Council.

Part 2: Consultation Responses

Consultee	TOC Item	Full Representation Text	response
Royston Town council	Royston Cross Draft Development Brief 2010	<p>Councillors do not support Option 3</p> <p>Generally they support Option 1 and 2 They would like to ensure that any facilities already there are incorporated within the scheme.</p> <p>RTC members thank you for preparing the brief and welcome the proposals and need a more detailed study to consultant on.</p>	<p>The comments on each of the options are noted. Re-provision of existing facilities is also noted. The future of the toilets facilities is currently being debated by the Council and it is recognised that the retention/re-provision of the public toilets as part of any development/enhancement scheme on this site would need to be the subject of further discussion with the Council.</p> <p><i><u>Para 1.22 in the Brief has been amended to reflect this.</u></i></p>

<p>The Highways Authority</p>	<p>1. Introduction</p>	<p>There are various options presented within the Draft development brief to change the highway network. These may result in changes in traffic routing and operation of Royston Cross junction. Therefore it is essential to undertake a comprehensive assessment of the impacts of all the options presented. Such an exercise would also enable assess the difference in operational performance of the junctions and establish whether such proposals are viable. Methods of control of access, emergency access, servicing strategy will also be required. Preliminary designs need to be prepared by taking account of the recent traffic and parking surveys during peak periods together with personal injury accident (PIA) data. Also, any new design/any associated off-site highway infrastructure will have to undergo appropriate safety audits to ensure that it promotes highway safety, reduces casualty and does not compromise safety. In addition, a clear balance needs to be struck between the innovative designs and the required highway standards. The document makes reference to a scheme within the Urban Transport Plan to redirect the 331 bus route back down Kneesworth St. This will only be a viable option for the operator when effective parking restrictions are in place on this road and are enforced. Parking takes place in the vicinity of the shops which narrows the road to an extent that makes bus operation problematic. Paragraph 3.17 makes reference to a loading bay, the use of which may also be a determining factor in the bus route and whilst the widening of the footway is of obvious benefit to pedestrians, narrowing of the carriageway does not make it any more likely for buses to be able to use this route especially if the parking problem persists.</p>	<p>To inform any detailed scheme it is agreed that a detailed traffic assessment covering the issues listed will have to be undertaken to ensure that the proposed scheme does not negatively impact on the highway network. <i>This is detailed in paragraphs 3.14 and 4.5 of the Development Brief.</i></p> <p>The need for loading to continue to the businesses in the Cross is a key consideration. With regards to Kneesworth Street and the extension of the pavement, loading could be restricted to times when buses are not passing down this route to prevent an issue, however, <i>an additional sentence has been added to Paragraph 3.11 which reads: Alternatively consideration could be given to including provision for a loading bay within the area of open space to maintain the existing situation.</i> This provides another potential option to enable businesses to function as normal with additional importance and protection afforded to pedestrians.</p>
---------------------------------------	------------------------	--	---

Drake	Site history and background	<p>Unrelated open space 1.16, the raised tree brick surrounds, are a trip hazard. They must be either leveled (or built higher).</p> <p>The built up "pavement shrub bed" on the Morrison corner in Baldock Street should be removed. Again this is very dangerous and stops viability of pedestrians crossing in both directions. Many people cross from store to car park, both drivers and pedestrian need the visibility improved.</p> <p>Reduction in road width in Melbourn Street and Kneesworth Street and Lower King Street would all add to the street scene and could be used to reduce traffic speed and improve pedestrian safety.</p>	<p>The draft has been changed to incorporate the reference to raised planters. <i>Addition of a specific point to <u>Para 1.19</u> to acknowledge planters as a trip hazard.</i></p> <p>The shrub bed next to Morrison's is an issue. It is identified to be removed in a specific project in the Royston UTP. It is located just outside the boundary to this project, but its impact on the wider area is noted. A reduction in the road width would reduce the speed and enhance the pedestrian environment. Creating a balance between enhancing pedestrian safety and maintaining a safe through route for vehicles including buses is needed.</p>
-------	-----------------------------	---	--

Kennedy	Site history and background	<p>1.5 Ickniel Way pre-dates the Roman arrival in Britain by around 2,000 years, it would have been used by the Romans but should not be classified as a Roman Road.</p> <p>1.7 While many support the view that the stone supported a cross, there is no evidence that it did. It is unlikely the glacial erratic boulder could have supported a free-standing cross.</p> <p>1.8 Neither Goggle maps or Wikipedia should be used as the basis of comment on the centre of Royston. Most local people if asked to give directions for the centre of Royston would direct people to the Cross, that this does not fit the view the District Council would like to project does not alter people's directions. But does it matter if it is the town centre, it is the focal point of the town.</p> <p>1.9 Whether of not the Cross is the Town Centre, does not alter the fact that improvements are needed to make the area more pedestrian friendly, without preventing traffic flow.</p>	<p><i>Reference to Ickniel Way being a Roman Road in <u>Para 1.15</u> has been deleted.</i> Comment regarding the history of the Cross is noted.</p> <p>The reference to Google was merely to show the importance of the area, and that although it is the historic centre of the town it is also highway junction.</p>
Kennedy	Purpose of the brief	Immaterial of what option is chosen, the brief should provide guidance, otherwise why publish it?	Noted. The brief will provide guidance to any potential scheme.

Kennedy	Site issues and constraints	<p>a) Car Dominance 1.14 Parking is a minor issue, although illegal parking should be stopped, however, there is a need for service vehicles to make deliveries to local businesses.</p> <p>* The car does not have a dominate but clearly there is a need for traffic to be able to use the area to access other parts of Royston. * It is not a rat-run around the Morrison's mini-roundabout, but by design since the right turn down Lower King Street was blocked. * Parking near the Cave will not affect the structural integrity of the cave, the shape and depth of the cave will stand substantial loads. There was far more traffic passing through the area prior to the by-pass being opened, which did not seem to lead to any concern about the Cave. * Why a double-decker bus can safely use Kneesworth Street while a single decker cannot is a mystery. Maybe the competence of the bus driver should be questioned. It cannot be safer to use Green Drift and Tannery Drift, particularly with the primary school. * Narrow footpaths are unfortunately a problem in Royston, but it's more a case of narrow ancient streets that were not built for the motor vehicle. Not easily over-come without major demolition. * Parking on Kneesworth Street should be banned for all vehicles, except for loading/uploading. The biggest problem is with disabled badge holders parking to access the Conservative Club, if all parking was banned there would not be a significant problem.</p> <p>The lack of a pedestrian crossing over Lower King Street is not a significant problem, the traffic turning from Baldock Road is not such as to cause a major problem and most drivers are courteous enough to allow pedestrians to cross. It is of course the pedestrians responsibility to ensure they look before crossing.</p> <p>b) Barrier to Pedestrian Movement 1.15 The area could be made more pedestrian friendly while still allowing vehicle movements, by good design it can be made clear that the pedestrian has priority. That is what any improvement should aim to achieve.</p>	<p>Double yellow lines are proposed in the preferred option, as detailed in the UTP scheme, which would prevent parking that should not occur. Comments regarding the Cave are noted. <i>Reference to "Rat running" has been deleted from the brief.</i> As correctly pointed out it is the design of the junction which means vehicles have to u-turn around the roundabout.</p> <p>The need for loading to continue to the businesses in the Cross is a key consideration. With regards to Kneesworth Street and the extension of the pavement, loading could be restricted to times when buses are not passing down this route to prevent and issue, however, <i>an additional sentence has been added to Paragraph 3.11 which reads: Alternatively consideration could be given to including provision for a loading bay within the area of open space to maintain the existing situation</i> . This provides another potential option to enable businesses to function as normal with additional importance and protection afforded to pedestrians.</p> <p>The preferred option incorporates movement of the stop line behind Lower King Street as representations have shown that there is concern with those that use this area and cross this part of the road network that this would give the greatest level of priority to pedestrians.</p>
---------	-----------------------------	---	---

		<p>c) Unrelated Open Space 1.16 The highway is a barrier, but doesn't have to be. The area has been over-planted with trees and the area needs to be opened up with some trees and posts removed. A good start would be remove the large CCTV camera columns and find alternative mountings.</p> <p>d) Through Route 1.17 The through route for abnormal high loads should not be used as an excuse for not making the area pedestrian priority. Similarly closure of the bypass should not be used as an excuse. Neither events are common and last only a short time. Routing of abnormal loads is pre-planned in conjunction with the relevant traffic authorities and nay obstructions removed prior to the load transiting the location.</p> <p>e) Historic Environment 1.18 One would trust the only "development" would be an improvement of the highway/pedestrian interface and the street furniture, with no significant development of new building.</p> <p>f) Other on-site Constraints 1.19 Alternative provisions for public toilets should be considered.</p>	
Royston Town council	Site issues and constraints	Members of RTC do not agree that there is a problem with cars 'rat-running' to the station it is one of the main routes to the station.	By design vehicles complete a u-turn around the Morrison's roundabout and into Lower Kings Street as the right turn has been blocked, however this effectively means they move through the Cross twice. The word "rat-running" has been removed from the document.

<p>Letchworth Police Station</p>	<p>Site issues and constraints</p>	<p>"Royston Cave - there is a tendency for people to park on top of it, raising concerns about its protection." Several years ago whilst an abnormal load was negotiating its way through Royston it became stuck in the vicinity of the cross resulting in Herts Highways removing items of street furniture to enable the vehicle to proceed. Following that incident Herts Highways received a request that a weight restriction be introduced to prohibit goods vehicles from using the town centre, in part due to concerns about the fragility of the cave. Subsequent traffic surveys showed the proportion of goods vehicles using the town centre didn't justify the introduction of a weight restriction. Police now note renewed concerns in relation to parking and the Royston cave. If it's not already been done, may we suggest the Royston Cave is surveyed by a structural engineer to determine the structural integrity so that an informed decision on what measures may or may not be justified can be considered? "The bus route used to pass along Kneesworth Street, however it had to be redirected down Green Drift as a result of parking issues". Kneesworth Street is protected by waiting restrictions that prohibit parking on sections of the road. I understand that following utility company works on a section of Kneesworth Street a length of yellow line road marking was not reinstated following the works. This resulted in the restriction becoming temporarily unenforceable by your parking attendants and the affected section of road started to be used by people to park in, which in turn created access problems for buses and larger vehicles. Since the missing length of waiting restriction has now been replaced and is now enforceable, I believe this problem has been resolved. "There is a narrow path on the eastern side of Kneesworth Street, creating safety issues as cars pass close to the path". "Parking on Kneesworth Street, north of the Cross, creates difficulties for other vehicles. There is no pedestrian crossing across Lower Kings Street and cars aren't controlled by road signals turning from Baldock Street meaning this area is dangerous to cross". What evidence do you have that the existing arrangement creates safety issues or is dangerous? The Highways Act 1980 places a duty on the highway authority to maintain</p>	<p>As a result of the bypass the amount of traffic passing over the cave has substantially decreased. But there would still appear to be concerns that parking and the HGV movements do affect its integrity. <i>The implementation of a weight limit has been added as a potential feature to the Brief in paragraphs 3.6 and 3.24</i>, however a requirement for further consultation with Hertfordshire Highways, the police , HGV representatives and other interested parties has also been identified. <i>The word perceived has been added to the 5th bullet point in paragraph 1.15 to clarify comments raised regarding safety issues.</i></p>
--------------------------------------	--	---	---

		<p>the highway and to investigate and resolve problem locations. No roads within the area subject to this consultation currently justify intervention by the highway authority.</p> <p>The recorded road traffic collision history for the past three years shows two slight injury collisions within the area marked by a red line on a plan on page 4 of the consultation document. One involved an intoxicated pedestrian falling over in the carriageway having thrown a shoe at a Police vehicle. Neither involved the width of existing footways or carriageways or turning movements of vehicles from Baldock Road into Lower King Street.</p> <p>I suggest you should have evidence to substantiate statements re: safety issues and dangers or NHDC / Herts Highways may find themselves under pressure to remedy a "problem" for which there is no supporting evidence. In terms of what measures may be appropriate may I refer you to Herts Highways Speed Management Strategy that provides details about the range of measures potentially available to the highway authority together with the qualifying criteria. Any proposals for highway measures in relation to redevelopment of Royston Cross should take this document into consideration.</p> <p>http://www.hertsdirect.org/infobase/docs/pdfstore/SpeedManStrategy.pdf</p>	
--	--	--	--

Kennedy	Site Opportunities	<p>a) Improvements of the Public Realm 1.20 Trees are welcome but the number should not over-whelm the area as they currently do on the south side of the Cross. The small trees planted when the Town Centre was previously "enhanced" are now becoming significant trees and the number should be reduced to open the area.</p> <p>1.21 The Cross is well used on the south side but has potential for much greater use as a meeting place in the centre of the Town, this must be one of the prime objectives of any development.</p> <p>b) Extension of Town Centre 1.22 As an integral part of the centre of Royston the area must be developed to provide improved pedestrian linkage between the north and south of Royston.</p> <p>c) Bringing the Town Centre closer to the Station 1.23 It is unclear how improvements at the Cross will improve links from the station to the town centre, the distance of the station from the town centre is the barrier not crossing over the road at the Cross. As it is not possible to move the station access can best be encouraged by better signage from the station. Popping into the town centre for a quick shop from the station is not really an option. Why would a rail passenger want to break their journey to shop in Royston?</p>	<p>Noted. • <i>Fewer but more interesting trees has been added to <u>paragraph 3.20</u></i> and will be encouraged as part of the detailed scheme. Flexibility to use the space will be encouraged as well as space for meeting as the bullet point • <i>Making the area of open space more usable. This would add to the flexibility element and could make the area multi-functional has also been added to <u>paragraph 3.20</u></i>.</p> <p>Pedestrian linkage is an integral part of the scheme.</p> <p>With regard to the station becoming closer to the town centre, it is the perception that this distance would be less as a result of the enhancements as the road would not seem to be so much of a barrier.</p>
Drake	2. Policy Assessment	<p>Bus route using Tannery Drift should be stopped. Parking in Kneesworth Street in the southern area must be reduced to stop blocking bus route. Royston Cave could be protected by re-aligning the kerb, by narrowing the road around that area and bollard to stop pavement trespass. Please check. I believe abnormal load route is Old North Road to The Cross and left into Melbourn Street.</p>	<p>It is proposed that the bus route be redirected along Kneesworth Street again as double yellow lines have been implemented along this stretch of road to prevent parking.</p> <p><i>The abnormal load route has been clarified in <u>paragraph 1.20</u> of the text.</i></p>

Kennedy	2. Policy Assessment	<p>Royston Urban Transport Plan (UTP)</p> <p>2.10 The UTP Stage 2 Report introduced a weight limit along Baldock Street/Melbourn Street, quote:</p> <p>7.13 A number of modifications were made to existing schemes proposed in the UTP to take into account for further concerns highlighted in the consultation process, including adding a zebra crossing on Princes Mews, between Somerfield and the car park. Two additional measures were identified, assessed, and recommended for inclusion in the UTP. These being the introduction of a weight limit along the old A505 east/west route, and further prevention of turning right into and out of Sun Hill from the A10.</p> <p>For the sake of clarity the old A505 east/west route is Baldock Road, Baldock Street, Melbourn Road and Newmarket Road, there is already a weight limit on Newmarket Road, the proposed weight limit would complete the weight restricted access. This would not compromise the high vehicle load route as restrictions are lifted for such loads. Although this scheme was not included in the Town Centre Strategy, the UTP indicates few obstacles to implementation at a low cost. Introduction of a weight limit would make it easier to make the Cross junction more pedestrian friendly.</p> <p>2.11 With regard to Kneesworth Street, you cannot both have widening of the path and narrow road as Kneesworth Street. You can widen the path but to do that you have to narrow the road, which would mean a total ban on all parking at the southern end of Kneesworth Street.</p> <p>There is already no parking over the Cave, double yellow lines would reinforce this but delivery vehicles must still be allowed to stop to offload.</p> <p>2.12</p> <p>* Why was the bus allowed to be re-routed is a mystery. What is the problem for a single decker bus, it must be able to get round the corner from Kneesworth Street as the Green Drift/Tannery Drift corner is tighter and Tannery Drift is narrower, with cars often parked outside the school. The bus must use the pavement to pass parked cars.</p> <p>* A Pelican Crossing from Morrison's across Princes Mews is a nice idea</p>	<p>Inclusion of a weight limit in this area needs to be backed by evidence. There would not appear to be any survey data to suggest that a large amount of HCV movements are passing through the Cross that shouldn't be. Understandably implementing a weight limit in this area would afford greater pedestrian importance, and therefore <i>Implement weight limit through the Cross</i> has been added to the list of possible additional features for the brief in <u>paragraph 3.6</u>. However it will need to be the subject of further consultation with Hertfordshire Highways, the police , HGV representatives and other interested parties.</p> <p>The need for loading to continue to the businesses in the Cross is a key consideration. With regards to Kneesworth Street and the extension of the pavement, loading could be restricted to times when buses are not passing down this route to prevent and issue, however, <i>an additional sentence has been added to Paragraph 3.11 which reads: Alternatively consideration could be given to including provision for a loading bay within the area of open space to maintain the existing situation.</i> This provides another potential option to enable businesses to function as normal with additional importance and protection afforded to pedestrians.</p> <p>Double yellow lines will be implemented throughout the Cross.</p>
---------	----------------------	--	---

		<p>but expensive, if a crossing is needed then a simple Zebra Crossing would be sufficient.</p> <p>* The taxi rank at the northern end of the High Street was never used and its re-location into Lower King Street is long overdue.</p>	
Butler Car Services	2. Policy Assessment	<p>Moving back the lights, could this lead to traffic coming from Baldock St being able to turn right into Lower King St, thus reducing the rat run at Morrisons. Should there be a build up of traffic at the traffic lights ¿ this may push traffic to take the alternative route through Tannery/Green Drift during congested periods. Taxi Rank ¿ The position of the part-time rank presently on Upper King St is unworkable by the public and contains a negative cost factor with fares due to the one-way system. Not sure where the taxi rank is suggested to be placed in Lower King St.</p>	<p>There is a requirement in the Development Brief for a detailed traffic assessment of the impacts of moving the stop line behind lower King Street.</p> <p>The proposed taxi rank is located just north of the Baldock Street junction which will allow quick access to the north of the town, however whether this is acceptable will be subject to further consultation with the taxi companies.</p>
Kennedy	3. Site Strategy	<p>Aim</p> <p>3.1 This is a noble aim but the proposals do not go far enough in making the area one where it is clear that pedestrians have priority.</p> <p>Objectives</p> <p>3.2 Additional to the three points should be</p> <p>* to restrict the free flow of traffic with priority to pedestrians.</p> <p>Although designated an abnormal load through route, these are high loads which are unable to pass under the bye-pass railway bridge and the number is very limited. Possibly one in the last 10 years and should not be used as an excuse for not making the Cross a more pedestrian friendly area.</p> <p>Interestingly, on those occasions when there have been restrictions on traffic due to road works in the Cross area, drivers found alternative routes and there have been no reports, that I am aware, of problems with the diversions. So if drivers are deterred from using the Cross area they will find suitable alternative routes.</p> <p>There are a number of other measures which should be considered.</p> <p>* A 20mph speed limit along Melbourn Street and Baldock Street.</p> <p>* The proposed vehicle weight limit which would remove HGVs, except those making deliveries to local businesses. Lorries delivering to</p>	<p>Noted. <i>an additional objective has been added to Paragraph 3.2. which reads Rebalancing the needs of pedestrians and road users.</i></p> <p>With regard to a 20mph speed limit, it is my understanding that they need to be self enforcing, which would not be the case in this area and so under Hertfordshire County Guidance (Speed Management Strategy) it would not be appropriate to implement it here.</p> <p>Inclusion of a weight limit in this area needs to be backed by evidence. There would not appear to be any survey data to suggest that a large amount of HCV movements are passing through the Cross that shouldn't be. Understandably implementing a weight limit in this area would afford greater pedestrian importance, and therefore Implement weight</p>

	<p>Morrison's access the store from the west.</p> <p>*The road at the Cross should be narrowed to two single lanes. This would need to take account of the need for buses etc to be able to safely turn left from Kneesworth Street into Melbourn Street, with large vehicles banned from turning right.</p> <p>Existing traffic flows would be maintained, with the exception of a right turn for large vehicles from Kneesworth Street but delays at the traffic lights increased with pedestrian movements the priority.</p> <p>3.3 Other options to those in the Town Centre Strategy and UTP should be considered, an open mind on how the area can be improved must be maintained.</p> <p>3.5 Why is there a need for a new building? Accommodating a two storey building in this restricted space would over-power the site and be out-of-keeping. More appropriate would be a continental style single storey cafe built on the south flank of the Coach & Horses, with open seating but the ability to enclose it in inclement weather. Public toilets could be incorporated into this or into the Coach and Horse. It should be noted that the Coach and Horses is for sale and may not continue as a public house, so such a cafe would support the existing facility.</p> <p>3.6 A cafe need not necessarily conflict with the conservation aspects of the Coach and Horse, whereas building a two storey building in close proximity would conceal the facade of the public house, the aspect the conservation officer wishes to retain.</p>	<p><i>limit through the Cross</i> has been added to the list of possible additional features for the brief in <u>paragraph 3.6</u>. However it will need to be the subject of further consultation with Hertfordshire Highways, the police , HGV representatives and other interested parties.</p> <p>There was a mixed level of support for built development in this area, as the need to maintain openness was viewed as particularly important. A flexible approach to the future development of the Cross has been taken so that in the future, should any proposals come forward that do maintain openness and do enhance the area, they are considered in a fair and reasonable manner.</p> <p><i>An additional objective has been added to <u>paragraph 3.2</u> which reads • including a flexible approach to enhancement that does not preclude appropriate development in the future.</i></p>
--	---	--

Higginbotham	3. Site Strategy	<p>I have read with interest the options you have outlined in the Royston Cross Development Brief. I entirely agree with the objectives that it is an area that needs improvement, visually, for the safety of pedestrians and improvement of flow for vehicles. However I do not find any of your options particularly appealing. Personally I think there is a significant opportunity to create a space that is unique to Royston, especially given its historic value, so some ideas that are more adventurous would be appropriate. For example:</p> <p>Make the whole area feel pedestrianised, with traffic calming measures that reduces speeds significantly. Examples of removing traffic-related signs / lights / lines in other towns have shown that motorists can take care in such an environment. The work in Letchworth Town Centre (Leys Avenue I think) is a good example.</p> <p>Make the Roysia Stone a centre piece & re-build the cross</p> <p>Create an area that can be used for entertainment, specific markets, or events</p> <p>Plant fewer but interesting types of trees</p> <p>As a local resident I drive and walk through the area almost daily, and its especially depressing at rush hour when we queue through the town. But the Christmas lights at this time of year show it has real potential to be much much better. Please NHDC, be braver in what we can do with it!</p>	<p>Noted. All approaches under option 2 provided details of the enhancement of the open space. The option affording most priority to pedestrians has been taken forward in the preferred option, enabling pedestrians to cross the area in any direction when traffic lights are on red. Traffic still needs to be able to use the route and creating an appropriate balance between affording pedestrian priority and ensuring the junction is usable and fit for purpose is important.</p> <p><i>Additional points encompassing the suggestions have been made to <u>paragraph 3.20</u> as it now includes</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Making the Royston Stone more prominent and making it more of a feature. Potentially restoring the “Cross” on top of the stone</i> • <i>Making the area of open space more usable. This would add to the flexibility element and could make the area multi-functional.</i> • <i>Providing multi-purpose furniture which will enable the space to be used as a meeting place. However maintaining free-flow of pedestrian movement and reducing clutter is important.</i> • <i>Fewer but more interesting trees</i> • <i>Brighten the area using images that provide an historic element</i>
Kennedy	Option 1 - Development of a Building on Land to the North of	I would not support this option as it would be totally out of keeping with the setting of the Cross.	Noted.

	the Cross.		
Slater	Option 1 - Development of a Building on Land to the North of the Cross.	<p>* Optimum ease of flow of pedestrians a priority. * Lower King Street is difficult and hazardous for pedestrians. * A much higher quality of build and appearance of the surroundings of the Cross area is needed.</p> <p>1. There is a general need to improve the ease of flow of pedestrians, especially North/South. 2. There is a specific need to remove the obstacles and hazards on the route from Morrison's store to Lower King Street and Kneesworth Street. Lower King Street itself would not have met Health and Safety regulations surely before the time of motorised vehicles. I write as a car driver of long standings.</p>	Comments noted
Butler Car Services	Option 1 - Development of a Building on Land to the North of the Cross.	The new build could include both facilities of a café and toilets. As this is a focal point for the history of Royston and the Stone could this café also include a Tourist Information Bureau which our town very much lacks.	<p>Noted. The option chosen incorporates primarily enhancement features in line with comments received to the consultation.</p> <p>There was a mixed level of support for built development in this area, as the need to maintain openness was viewed as particularly important. A flexible approach to the future development of the Cross has been taken so that in the future, should any proposals come forward that do maintain openness and do enhance the area, they are considered in a fair and reasonable manner. <i>An additional objective has been added to <u>paragraph 3.2</u> which reads • including a flexible approach to enhancement that does not preclude appropriate development in the future.</i></p>

<p>Royston Town council</p>	<p>Option 1 - Development of a Building on Land to the North of the Cross.</p>	<p>Members of Royston Town Council would like to see a more detailed professional study plan of this suggestion which includes a building. Vehicle access to Lower King St should be retained. They support the idea of a suitable building on this site and the provision of toilets should be incorporated within the development. Suggestions for the ground floor building included an atrium area which could be used as a tourist information point, plus toilets.</p> <p>Careful consideration needs to be considered in relation to the Cave which is next to The Cross area and in relation to 7 1/2 ton weight limit for Melbourn ST.</p>	<p>The option chosen incorporates primarily enhancement features in line with comments received to the consultation.</p> <p>There was a mixed level of support for built development in this area, as the need to maintain openness was viewed as particularly important. A flexible approach to the future development of the Cross has been taken so that in the future, should any proposals come forward that do maintain openness and do enhance the area, they are considered in a fair and reasonable manner.</p> <p><i>An additional objective has been added to <u>paragraph 3.2</u> which reads • including a flexible approach to enhancement that does not preclude appropriate development in the future.</i></p> <p>Inclusion of a weight limit in this area needs to be backed by evidence. There would not appear to be any survey data to suggest that a large amount of HCV movements are passing through the Cross that shouldn't be. Understandably implementing a weight limit in this area would afford greater pedestrian importance, and therefore Implement weight limit through the Cross has been added to the list of possible additional features for the brief in <u>paragraph 3.6</u>. However it will need to be the subject of further consultation with Hertfordshire Highways, the police , HGV representatives and other interested parties.</p>
---------------------------------	--	---	--

Keep	Option 1 - Development of a Building on Land to the North of the Cross.	Firstly I oppose the idea of a building on the Northern Open space. There is no need for more town centre building in Royston the current premises are under occupied and there is no shortage of Cafe.	<p>Noted. Although there might not currently be a need for additional retail at the moment. This project is looking to the medium / long term and in the future it is predicted that there will be the need for more retail floorspace and Royston is constrained as a result of its historic development.</p> <p>The option chosen incorporates primarily enhancement features in line with comments received to the consultation. There was a mixed level of support for built development in this area, as the need to maintain openness was viewed as important however a flexible approach to the future development of the Cross has been taken so that in the future, should any proposals come forward that do maintain the openness and provide an enhancement to the area come forward, it is considered in a fair and reasonable way.</p>
The Highways Authority	Option 1 - Development of a Building on Land to the North of the Cross.	Option 1 is proposed for a mixed use type of facility to include residential properties. It is unclear as to where these residents park and it does not address the issues highlighted in the UTP of making this area more pedestrian priority.	Noted, any provision for parking would be difficult to accommodate on site.

Slater	Option 1 - Development of a Building on Land to the North of the Cross.	<p>Lower King Street is already dangerous for pedestrians - traffic comes round the corner fast and very near the narrow pavement. The whole area is dirty has broken flag stones and should have been seen to years ago. Not necessarily either beautiful or worth keeping. There is no point in just "beautifying" the area of the Cross itself (which incidentally I think is a container for disinfecting plague money) without tackling the whole area, perhaps you still have the power of compulsory purchase and could alter one of the uglier buildings to give a bit more room?</p>	<p>Noted. The preferred option would control vehicles turning into Lower King Street by traffic signals affording pedestrians the greatest level of priority. Compulsory purchase is a very detailed and expensive process and unlikely to be achievable for this particular project.</p>
Royston Chamber of Commerce	Option 1 - Development of a Building on Land to the North of the Cross.	<p>Historically there have been buildings on both sides of the Cross. The Crown on the north side was demolished in late 1920's, and the south side had buildings demolished as far back as Natwest bank in the 1950's. These sites now provide the open spaces we recognise.</p> <p>The area to the north in front of the Coach and Horses public house could withstand some development within the constraints of maintaining and improving the open aspect of the area.</p> <p>The brief suggests a planning Class A usage on the ground floor (which covers shops, financial & professional services, restaurant/cafes, drinking establishments and hot-food takeaways) perhaps incorporating the existing public toilet provision.</p> <p>If the concept is properly thought through then this could be an opportunity to create a landmark building which, whilst sympathetic to the history of the area, reflects the modern age.</p> <p>There could be a competition for local architects to design a building for the area which satisfies the stated objectives of NHDC in the development brief.</p>	<p>The option chosen incorporates primarily enhancement features in line with comments received to the consultation.</p> <p>There was a mixed level of support for built development in this area, as the need to maintain openness was viewed as particularly important. A flexible approach to the future development of the Cross has been taken so that in the future, should any proposals come forward that do maintain openness and do enhance the area, they are considered in a fair and reasonable manner.</p>

Drake	Option 2a- Improvement of Open Space and Pedestrian Importance.	Deals with many of the problems, and can always be reviewed in the future. A building is not necessary at this time (option 1). If the stop line is moved back in Baldock Street then it would be possible to have a green cross light to give a safe crossing from the North Cross area to Baldock Street, currently very dangerous for pedestrians. Traffic speed need to be greatly reduced in Lower King Street, and narrow footway widened.	Noted. The preferred option incorporates features from option 2a.
Warburton	Option 2a- Improvement of Open Space and Pedestrian Importance.	<p>I don't want to see built development. I think there are plenty unused buildings at the moment in Royston and would like to see those filled first.;</p> <p>Also I think it's important to pedestrianise the area and keep it open as it improves the overall appearance of a town it there are plenty of open spaces.</p> <p>I think it would be helpful to the flow of pedestrian traffic to limit cars turning onto Lower King Street.</p>	Noted. The preferred option incorporates features from option 2a

<p>Keep</p>	<p>Option 2a- Improvement of Open Space and Pedestrian Importance.</p>	<p>In terms of the other improvements the document ignores the biggest problem of all which is the width of the pavement not on Kneesworth St but on the Lower Kings Street. The only pavement on Lower King Street (west side) gets far more narrow than it does on the Kneesworth Street side and this route is the direct route to the station not only for anyone living west of Lower Kings St, as I do, but also for anyone coming to or from the town centre and crossing to the central area. The buildings at 17 and 17a lower King Street appear to be currently vacant and so the council could purchase and reduce their encroachment onto the pavement line. To my surprise they are grade II listed on your drawing but this need not be insurmountable. The rear of the conservative club opposite is even less delightful so maybe a couple of metres could be cut off that to allow the road to move further East to widen that pavement. Even more radically Lower King Street could be closed to traffic and made pedestrian plus bikes and north bound traffic be required to use Tannery/Green drift. The implication of the word rat run in your document is that you think that people should use the Tannery/Green drift route. I don't think anyone thinks of this route even certainly no one is going to go to the bypass to get to the station as you seem to imply they should. This closure would enforce the green drift route, but I think I would be in a minority of supporting it.</p> <p>A consideration of the Lower King St pavement issue even if unaffordable should have been in this document.</p> <p>I do not like the idea of raising the cross area in the carriage way if Baldock Street is going to continue to be a through route, which it has to be. I regularly used the raised crossing between Kings Cross and St Pancreas and I think it is a very unsafe design as it lures the pedestrian into thinking that they have priority when they do not. By all means change the cycling of the crossing lights to favour pedestrians more and add a controlled crossing across Lower King Street and Baldock Street (at the risk of further congestion) but raising the carriage way is not a good idea. I do not understand why there is any need to slow vehicles down coming in to the junction by any other means than the traffic lights. If you are thinking of removing the traffic lights and replacing with just this raised</p>	<p>Widening the footpath on Lower King Street and maintaining the minimum carriageway width will be very difficult as where the buildings either side Lower King Street converge makes the space particularly narrow. The Lower Kings Street path will be incorporated as part of enhancement proposals for the areas of open space and improvement will be incorporated. Purchasing the buildings at 17 and 17a Lower King Street would will not be possible as this would be particularly expensive and beyond the requirements of this scheme.</p> <p>Raising the carriageway will provide a visible difference meaning that vehicles will slow down, although it will be the traffic lights that ultimately stop the vehicles passing through. Comments supporting movement of the stop line are noted.</p>
-------------	--	---	---

		<p>area then that would be incredibly dangerous.</p> <p>Widening the pathway on Kneesworth Street is a good idea although I almost never use that route.</p> <p>I strongly like the idea of moving the stop line west to include lower king St. This might send more cars up Tannery drift rather than lower King St. There should be a crossing from west side of lower King Street/north side of Baldock Street to the south side for people travelling from the North of the town/station to Morrisons. My normal route would probably continue to be crossing Baldock Street west of the roundabout on the traffic island to avoid princes mews but I do go to Morrisons on the way home sometimes.</p> <p>I don't feel strongly that there are significant problems with the current street furniture in the area.</p> <p>In summary I would like to see the pedestrian through routes improved particularly the pavement in Lower King Street and better crossing of Baldock Street and Lower King Street.</p>	
--	--	--	--

Keep	Option 2a- Improvement of Open Space and Pedestrian Importance.	<p>Option 2 a) i): I am concerned about the safety of raising the carriage way. My experience of this at Kings Cross St Pancreas and Bury St Edmunds is I am much less aware of the need to check for traffic when there is no change in level from pavement to road.</p> <p>Option 2 a) ii): Although I am in favour of widening the pavement on Kneesworth Street, I feel the pavement in Lower King Street is a higher priority for widening. This is the main pedestrian route between the station and the town centre. I use it most days. I find it particularly narrow at numbers 17 and 17A. I would like these properties compulsorily purchasing and partially demolishing to widen the pavement. I am particularly annoyed as they have both been unoccupied for some time and I dislike having to walk in the road whenever I meet a pedestrian in the opposite direction there. One of these properties has a defective gutter which drips water onto the pavement - a further hazard to pedestrians.</p> <p>Option 2 a) iii): I agree that moving the stop line for the traffic lights to Baldock Street is a good idea. I often cross Lower King Street to get to and from the post box and find it difficult to see traffic turning left into Lower King Street.</p>	<p>Widening the footpath on Lower King Street and maintaining the minimum carriageway width will be very difficult as where the buildings either side Lower King Street converge makes the space particularly narrow. The Lower Kings Street path will be incorporated as part of enhancement proposals for the areas of open space and improvement will be incorporated. Purchasing the buildings at 17 and 17a Lower King Street would will not be possible as this would be particularly expensive and beyond the requirements of this scheme.</p> <p>Raising the carriageway will provide a visible difference meaning that vehicles will slow down, although it will be the traffic lights that ultimately stop the vehicles passing through.</p> <p>Comments supporting movement of the stop line are noted.</p>
Royston Town council	Option 2a- Improvement of Open Space and Pedestrian Importance.	Members support this option but would like to see a more detailed study, they feel that benches and trees should be included and it should ensure that any public facilities are replaced i.e benches, toilets etc.	<p>Support is noted. A detailed scheme will be prepared as in advance of any enhancement / development onsite. Regularisation of street furniture will be included in any scheme.</p> <p>The future of the toilets is currently being debated by the Council and it is recognised that the retention/re-provision of the public toilets as part of any development/enhancement scheme on this site would need to be the subject of further discussion with the Council. <i>Para 1.22 in the Brief has been amended to reflect this.</i></p>

The Highways Authority	Option 2a- Improvement of Open Space and Pedestrian Importance.	<p>Option 2a (Improvement of Open Space and Pedestrian Importance) increases pedestrian priority and does make the road network more conducive to the pedestrian having access to cross where possible. The question is whether there is the scope to widen pathways particularly on Kneesworth Street and maintain the minimum carriageway width. Such measures have to be explored further. This option also addresses the issues raised within the UTP for improving this area and that of the Cave. The option of moving the stop line on Baldock Street west to behind Lower King Street, need be subject to a detailed scheme in order to ensure that such measures will not result in significant traffic volume diverting along Green Drift and Tannery Drift.</p> <p>Option 2a proposes to raise the carriageway area. We would prefer that different surfacing or other method were used rather than a vertically raised area as these would be more bus friendly. Buses are more adversely affected by such measures than smaller vehicles and raised junctions where buses turn across raised and unraised areas are not ideal.</p> <p>Option 2a_{ii} proposes widening the pathway on Kneesworth St but retaining two lane turning at the junction. It is not clear the extent of widening involved here. Depending on the existing and proposed lane widths, buses may have to straddle the lanes which would affect the operation of the junction and this will need to be modelled.</p> <p>Option 2a_{iii} proposes moving the stop line on Baldock St West to behind Lower King St. This would give more priority to pedestrians but would delay buses turning left into Lower King St. As outlined in paragraph 3.19, this option should be modelled to assess its effect. If new signals are installed it would be beneficial to have bus priority on this junction to minimise delays to buses.</p>	<p>There is the potential to increase the width of Kneesworth Street footpath, however it will mean incorporating the area used as an informal loading bay into the road to ensure 2 way turning is maintained. The need for loading to continue to the businesses in the Cross is a key consideration. With regards to Kneesworth Street and the extension of the pavement, loading could be restricted to times when buses are not passing down this route to prevent and issue, however, <i>an additional sentence has been added to Paragraph 3.11 which reads: Alternatively consideration could be given to including provision for a loading bay within the area of open space to maintain the existing situation.</i> This provides another potential option to enable businesses to function as normal with additional importance and protection afforded to pedestrians.</p> <p>As part of any detailed scheme a traffic assessment will be completed to ensure there is no significant negative impact on the Highway network. <i>This is specifically detailed in paragraphs 3.14 and 4.5 of the brief</i></p>
Butler Car Services	Option 2a- Improvement of Open Space and Pedestrian Importance.	Moving the lights back would open the area centrally.	Noted

<p>Letchworth Police Station</p>	<p>Option 2a- Improvement of Open Space and Pedestrian Importance.</p>	<p>I) Raise the Cross area in carriageway The HCC passenger transport unit preference is for no vertical features on bus routes.</p> <p>ii) Widen the pathway on Kneesworth Street but retain two lane Turing at junction Is there sufficient carriageway width to provide wider footways and maintain the minimum carriageway width? If not this should not be included in the range of options.</p> <p>iii) Move the stop line on Baldock Street west to behind Lower King Street In principle Police have no objection subject to consideration of a detailed and viable plan and confidence that the measures will not result in significant traffic volume diverting along Green Drift and Tannery Drift.</p> <p>iv) Expand width of pedestrian crossing areas In principle Police have no objection subject to consideration of a detailed and viable plan.</p> <p>v) Rationalise street furniture and make environmental improvements A proportion of street furniture includes signs that must be provided.</p>	<p>Noted. Raising the carriageway will be gentle to ensure that there are no issues with longer vehicles.</p> <p>There is the potential to increase the width of Kneesworth Street footpath, however it will mean incorporating the area used as an informal loading bay into the road to ensure 2 way turning is maintained. The need for loading to continue to the businesses in the Cross is a key consideration. With regards to Kneesworth Street and the extension of the pavement, loading could be restricted to times when buses are not passing down this route to prevent an issue, however, <i>an additional sentence has been added to Paragraph 3.11 which reads: Alternatively consideration could be given to including provision for a loading bay within the area of open space to maintain the existing situation.</i> This provides another potential option to enable businesses to function as normal with additional importance and protection afforded to pedestrians.</p> <p>As part of any detailed scheme a traffic assessment will be completed to ensure there is no significant negative impact on the Highway network. <i>This is specifically detailed in paragraphs 3.14 and 4.5 of the brief.</i></p> <p>Comments on signage are noted.</p>
--------------------------------------	--	---	---

Robinson	Option 2a- Improvement of Open Space and Pedestrian Importance.	<p>This appears to give the most emphasis to pedestrians.</p> <p>Other Comments</p> <p>From our point of view it is important that the Cave is protected. Ideally, the area should be restricted to avoid the passage of heavy lorries, parking of any kind or anything else that might cause harmful vibration to the carvings in the Cave. The area also needs good signage so that people can find the entrance to the Cave. If it is decided to erect any 'storyboards' or other 'Tourist Information' type signs then the text for these needs to be checked for factual accuracy by the Royston and District History Society. Ideally, an image (or images) from the Cave could be used to brighten the area. The Drugs Line building has already got a copy of the figure of St Katherine on it more would be better.</p>	<p>The preferred option incorporates the main features from option 2a. It does also include double yellow lines throughout the Cross.</p> <p>Inclusion of a weight limit in this area needs to be backed by evidence. There would not appear to be any survey data to suggest that a large amount of HCV movements are passing through the Cross that shouldn't be. Understandably implementing a weight limit in this area would afford greater pedestrian importance, and <i>therefore Implement weight limit through the Cross has been added to the list of possible additional features for the brief in paragraph 3.6.</i> However it will need to be the subject of further consultation with Hertfordshire Highways, the police , HGV representatives and other interested parties. <i>Within paragraph 3.20 an additional feature has been added incorporating the • Brighten the area using images that provide an historic element . This could incorporate images of the Cave.</i></p>
----------	---	--	--

Slater	Option 2a- Improvement of Open Space and Pedestrian Importance.	<p>Lower King Street is already dangerous for pedestrians - traffic comes round the corner fast and very near the narrow pavement. The whole area is dirty has broken flag stones and should have been seen to years ago. Not necessarily either beautiful or worth keeping. There is no point in just "beautifying" the area of the Cross itself (which incidentally I think is a container for disinfecting plague money) without tackling the whole area, perhaps you still have the power of compulsory purchase and could alter one of the uglier buildings to give a bit more room?</p>	<p>Noted. The preferred option would control vehicles turning into Lower King Street by traffic signals. Compulsory purchase is a very detailed and expensive process and unlikely to be achievable for this particular project.</p>
Slater	Option 2a- Improvement of Open Space and Pedestrian Importance.	<p>* Optimum ease of flow of pedestrians a priority. * Lower King Street is difficult and hazardous for pedestrians. * A much higher quality of build and appearance of the surroundings of the Cross area is needed.</p> <p>1. There is a general need to improve the ease of flow of pedestrians, especially North/South. 2. There is a specific need to remove the obstacles and hazards on the route from Morrison's store to Lower King Street and Kneesworth Street. Lower King Street itself would not have met Health and Safety regulations surely before the time of motorised vehicles. I write as a car driver of long standings.</p>	<p>Comments supporting Option 2a are noted.</p>
Royston Chamber of Commerce	Option 2a- Improvement of Open Space and Pedestrian Importance.	<p>There are five aspects to the proposed improvement of open space and pedestrian importance: raising the carriageway height to that of the paving by the Cross; widening the footpath along Kneesworth Street; moving the traffic light sign on Baldock Street westwards to include the turn down Lower King Street; expanding the width of the pedestrian crossing area, and rationalising the street furniture.</p> <p>Raising the carriageway height will illustrate that the status of the area is altered but will it be sufficient to ensure traffic slows down when crossing the area?</p>	<p>The traffic lights will ultimately stop the traffic, the raised carriageway will create an added feature to slow vehicles down in this area and give the feeling of being more pedestrianised.</p> <p>Widening of Kneesworth Street will be considered in combination with the requirements of the businesses for loading. The need for loading to continue to the businesses in the Cross is a key</p>

		<p>Widening the footpath along Kneesworth Street must be considered in light of the feasibility of alternative provision for deliveries to businesses in the Cross area, as the proposal would extend the existing road into the current loading bay. The businesses of the Cross area rely on access for delivery vehicles, provision for which is already far from ideal with large lorries often mounting the pavement on Melbourn Street over the area of Royston Cave.</p> <p>There are two motives behind the moving of the stop-sign westwards to control traffic turning left; enabling safer pedestrian movement across the Cross and reducing the volume of cars using Lower King Street as a 'rat run' towards the station.</p> <p>We doubt whether traffic will cease using Lower King Street as this is the most direct route North out of Royston via the Station. As such there is danger that the moving of the stop sign will simply increase traffic congestion in the area and cause gridlock at busy times.</p> <p>We support the motives behind the suggestion, though, and further investigation would be required as to the impact of this proposal along with the alternative (Option 2C) of restricting traffic to a single lane by providing for parking bays on the North of Baldock Street. This would naturally slow the procession of traffic turning left, and the additional parking would be of benefit to businesses in the area.</p>	<p>consideration. With regards to Kneesworth Street and the extension of the pavement, loading could be restricted to times when buses are not passing down this route to prevent and issue, however, <i>an additional sentence has been added to Paragraph 3.11 which reads: Alternatively consideration could be given to including provision for a loading bay within the area of open space to maintain the existing situation.</i> This provides another potential option to enable businesses to function as normal with additional importance and protection afforded to pedestrians.</p> <p>There is the school of thought that if the stop line was moved west behind Lower King Street, drivers would divert their journey earlier, probably along the A10 instead, but that will need to be determined by a traffic assessment and agreement would need to be sought from Hertfordshire Highways (as Highway authority)</p> <p>A fall back position of retaining traffic lights in their existing position would have to be taken if this feature is proved to have significant negative impacts on the local road network. But we would seek to introduce parking along the northern side of Baldock Street i.e. provisions of what was Option 2c in the draft as this would be affording greater freedom to pedestrians crossing Lower King Street and would be of benefit to businesses also.</p>
--	--	---	--

Franks	Option 2a- Improvement of Open Space and Pedestrian Importance.	<p>2C would be a disaster at night. The council recently spent alot of money providing posts to stop the louts in the pub randomly parking.</p> <p>3.9 from personal experience residential in this location would be a disaster (no dedicated parking) thus very difficult to let. Better to be upmarket office. Better still don't build anything. You don't seem to have done any thinking about the end of the Natwest Bank. Could you get some inspiration from structure within CORN EXCHANGE. People are forever collecting for charity in this area.</p> <p>We are all pleased that the area is being considered at all.</p>	Comments on potential development and option 2c are noted.
--------	---	--	--

Kennedy	Option 2a- Improvement of Open Space and Pedestrian Importance.	<p>3.12 The options would improve the environment but I do not agree that all the proposals should go forward, I have the following specific comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Agreed, the carriageway at the Cross should be raised with pedestrian priority. ii. The footpath in Kneesworth Street needs to be widened from where it narrows from the Old Palace south to the junction with Melbourn Street. This would require the carriageway to be narrowed with no parking at any time restrictions, allowing the clear flow of a single line of traffic. The two lane turning at the junction should e retained. iii. Moving the stop line would restrict the free flow of traffic into Lower King Street. The stop line could be moved in line with the Lower King Street junction if it only applied to traffic moving through the lights and a left filter lane was clearly marked. iv. Agreed, the area needs to be de-cluttered. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Raise Cross Area in Carriageway. <p>3.13 Traffic calming, a 20mph speed limit and pinch points should be used before the crossing point to clearly indicate to motorists that pedestrians have priority.</p> <p>3.14 With a ban on through HGVs their number should be limited to those servicing local businesses, low loaders should not have a problem with a raised area, with appropriate road engineering.</p> <p>3.15 The pavers in the crossing need to be different to clearly indicate that it is crossing point and not a meeting point, but the York pavers currently in the Cross area could be retained.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii) Widen pathway on Kneesworth Street but retain two lanes at junction. <p>3.16 The footpath needs to be widened from the Old Palace, south along the narrowest part of the road, although probably not to 2 metres, it could widen out as one approaches the junction with the road re-aligned using land from the central island. A 20mph speed limit on this length should also be considered and there must be a complete ban on all parking, although provision for off-loading for deliveries will be required and continued access to the drive-ways of the properties on the east of the road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii) Move stop line on Baldock Street west to behind Lower King Street. <p>3.18 I fail to understand the concern with "rat running" to the station, where is the evidence that this occurs or it is a problem? Where is the evidence</p>	<p>The preferred option incorporates the main features from option 2a.</p> <p>Inclusion of a weight limit in this area needs to be backed by evidence. There would not appear to be any survey data to suggest that a large amount of HCV movements are passing through the Cross that shouldn't be. Understandably implementing a weight limit in this area would afford greater pedestrian importance, and therefore <i>Implement weight limit through the Cross</i> has been added to the list of possible additional features for the brief in <u>paragraph 3.6</u>. However it will need to be the subject of further consultation with Hertfordshire Highways, the police , HGV representatives and other interested parties.</p> <p>A detailed traffic assessment is required to ensure that there is not significant negative impact on the road network from moving the stop line to behind Lower King Street.</p> <p>The word "rat-running" has been deleted from the brief, as by design vehicles are forced to u-turn around the Morrison's roundabout.</p> <p>With regard to a 20mph speed limit, it is our understanding that they need to be self - enforcing, which would not be the case in this area and so under Hertfordshire County Guidance (Speed Management Strategy) it would not be appropriate to implement it here.</p>
---------	---	--	--

		<p>that the existing left turn is dangerous? For residents who live on the west of the Town and off Briary Lane, are entering Royston from the west or returning from the Heath, the option is to rat-run down Tannery Drift/Green Drift or use the Cross junction. The turn into Lower King Street takes one to the north of the Town, not just the railway station. Residents who live in Kneesworth Street will also use this turn. A rat-run down Tannery/Green Drifts will be more dangerous as the primary school has to be passed. The stop line could be moved by an un-signalled filter lane should be provided.</p> <p>3.19 No modelling is required but the application of common-sense. If the turn into Lower King Street is restricted more traffic will use Tannery and Green Drifts and stationary traffic will at peak periods block the Morrison roundabout. This already occurs when inconsiderate motorists stopped at the traffic lights, or parked vehicles block the left turn. It must also be remembered that the Town bus service is centred around the Morrison bus stop.</p> <p>iv) Expand width of Pedestrian Crossing Area.</p> <p>3.20 This is surely one of the main objectives of the exercise?</p> <p>v) Rationalise Street Furniture and make environmental improvements.</p> <p>3.21 Another prime objective which I support and is very necessary. There also need to be a full risk assessment and the existing trip hazards removed. At present the raised edging blocks around the trees are a major hazard and have caused several trips and falls, particularly to elderly residents.</p>	
--	--	---	--

Anon 1	Option 2a- Improvement of Open Space and Pedestrian Importance.	<p>It has long been the case that pedestrians are the “poor relations” at Royston Cross, as compared to motor traffic. For example the block-paved are at the entrance to Lower King Street. Since this was put in under a previous refurbishment, some years ago, I have never understood its purpose. I always thought a block paved area meant pedestrian priority, but apparently most of the left turning drivers dont share this view to judge by the number of times I’ve nearly been bowled over at this point. In fact it seems to be the done thing to come round as fast as possible because it makes the tyres squeal. I don’t think you will ever stop the rat-running down Lower King Street , unless it is blocked off. However it could certainly do with some traffic calming, The usual practice seems to be for driver to enter this street and then accelerate as hard as possible all the way down, so that they emerge into Kneesworth Street at light speed. Also this forms part of the Royston banger boys favourite circuit from the north of the town to the town centre and back again, ad infinitum.</p> <p>Another pointless idea hitherto has been allowing parking in the narrowest part of Kneesworth Street, around the Conservative club. No wonder a bus route had to be re-directed (although it still has some trouble negotiating parked vehicles in Green Drift / Tannery Drift). Kneesworth Street at this point should have a reasonable width of footway on both sides with a reasonable width of carriageway between.</p> <p>Do away with the small layby beside the north area of open space (Eastern side). It is meant for lading . unloading? In any event it seems to be largely used by cars etc – people just nipping to the bank and so on.</p> <p>Don’t allow parking on the northern open space. Pleant of old photos of Royston Cross show that there used to be a large building on that spor, which made the whole are look over-developed. Keep the open space open. We need somewhere for the Christmas Tree</p>	<p>Comments on preference for Option 2a and need for signal control are noted.</p> <p>Comments against formal development in this area and the need for the area to be kept open are also noted.</p>
Kennedy	Option 2b - As option 2a, except no movement of Stop Line on	3.23 I support this option, but still do not understand where the rat-running comments have come from. The left turn lane should be clearly marked.	Comments noted. <i>The phrase “rat-running” has been deleted from the document as by design, vehicles are forced to u-turn around the Morrison’s roundabout.</i>

	Baldock Street		
The Highways Authority	Option 2b - As option 2a, except no movement of Stop Line on Baldock Street	Option 2b is as 2a but without moving the stop line. As mentioned above, modelling is needed to decide whether to move stop line or not.	<i>Noted, this is a requirement of any detailed scheme as set out in <u>paragraphs 3.14 and 4.5</u> of the development brief.</i>
Letchworth Police Station	Option 2b - As option 2a, except no movement of Stop Line on Baldock Street	In principle Police have no objection subject to consideration of a detailed and viable plan and confidence that the measures will not result in significant traffic volume diverting along Green Drift and Tannery Drift.	<i>Noted, this is a requirement of any detailed scheme as set out in <u>paragraphs 3.14 and 4.5</u> of the development brief</i>

Holgate	Option 2b - As option 2a, except no movement of Stop Line on Baldock Street	<p>In practice I doubt whether moving the stop line west would actually decrease the rat-run to the station. It will most likely cause traffic to back up round the roundabout thereby causing more traffic chaos.</p> <p>Option 1, building on the site would be a travesty. The site is not big enough and any building would significantly reduce the openness of this area, giving a claustrophobic feeling to the already narrow streets.</p> <p>Other Comments</p> <p>Any proposals should consider the entry to Princes Mews, and the Morrison's roundabout. This roundabout can be horrible at times, not helped by people parking on the double yellow lines immediately outside Morrison's entrance and the lack of enforcement from Traffic Wardens which consequently permits it. Any backed up traffic as a result of moving the stop sign would impact on this roundabout and therefore on residents of Princes Mews trying to enter and exit. Also, bear in mind that not everyone turning left onto Lower King Street is doing so as part of a rat run. Many people from that end of town, Princes Mews, Briary Lane etc use this route as a way to work, Tescos etc. If it becomes to inconvenient it will force people to look for different routes eg via Tannery Drift, an area with schools.</p>	<p>The preferred option incorporates the main features from option 2a, however <i>a detailed traffic assessment is required as set out in paragraphs 3.14 and 4.5 of the development brief</i> to ensure that there is no significant negative impact on the road network from moving the stop line to behind Lower King Street.</p> <p>Comments on Option 1 - the development option are noted.</p>
Kennedy	Option 2c - Parking along Baldock Street reducing left turning along Lower Kings Street	<p>3.24 I do not support this option as it would cause serious traffic congestion and block the Morrison roundabout. Some traffic which would have used Lower King Street would be diverted along Tannery/Green Drift, although many would still need to access Lower King Street. This option should be dismissed.</p>	<p>Comments on option 2C are noted.</p>

Keep	Option 2c - Parking along Baldock Street reducing left turning along Lower Kings Street	Option 2 c): I am not in favour of parking on the north side of Baldock Street. I think this will make it harder to see traffic when crossing Lower King Street or when crossing Baldock Street to get to Morrisons.	Comments on option 2C are noted.
The Highways Authority	Option 2c - Parking along Baldock Street reducing left turning along Lower Kings Street	Option 2c involves adding parking spaces on Baldock St to reduce left turning along Lower Kings St. This would also affect the operation of the junction, which may mean delays to buses and this will need to be modelled.	Comments on option 2C are noted.
Letchworth Police Station	Option 2c - Parking along Baldock Street reducing left turning along Lower Kings Street	Police have recently considered, together with Mr Simon Young NHDC and Mr Gary Henning Herts Highways, what additional on street parking provision may be practical in the town centre area. In Baldock Street some additional parking may potentially be available but not at the position shown in the diagram on page 14 of your consultation document. However this is likely to require the centre line being adjusted. We await more detailed plans before any decision can be made.	Comments on option 2C are noted. The diagram within the consultation document was designed to be illustrative.

Moschini	Option 2c - Parking along Baldock Street reducing left turning along Lower Kings Street	<p>The open space to the north should be enhanced for people - not buildings. I doubt that the size of building that could be put on the plot would be viable or in fact that there is any demand for it with units already sitting empty.</p> <p>Other Comments</p> <p>I believe that the brief to be flawed. The Baldock Street/Melbourn Street route should be considered entirely secondary for traffic and should primarily for only local traffic. Through traffic should use the bypass and suffer if the bypass has problems, the town shouldn't suffer. The two open spaces should therefore be joined with pedestrian priority at all times with local traffic waiting until the way is clear. The A10 is the north south route. Kneesworth Street and Lower Kings should be closed to traffic, fully pedestrianised with only small vehicle deliveries being permitted. A roundabout should be introduced at the north end of the buildings between these streets making Kneesworth Street and no through road running south. This area of the town was never designed for vehicles and will flourish without them.</p>	<p>Comments on Option 1 are noted.</p> <p>Although the area is used by mostly local traffic it does provide an east, west, north, south crossroad allowing local traffic to access different parts of the town. It also provides a location for businesses to be serviced by HCVs, which is an important consideration.</p> <p>Creating an appropriate balance between affording pedestrian priority and ensuring the junction is usable and fit for purpose is important.</p> <p>The features being taken forward offer most pedestrian importance, whilst allowing the junction to function appropriately.</p> <p>Understandably implementing a weight limit in this area would afford greater pedestrian importance, and therefore <i>Implement weight limit through the Cross</i> has been added to the list of possible additional features for the brief in <u>paragraph 3.6</u>. However it will need to be the subject of further consultation with Hertfordshire Highways, the police , HGV representatives and other interested parties</p>
----------	---	--	--

Rae	Option 2c - Parking along Baldock Street reducing left turning along Lower Kings Street	<p>1. Area does look quite ugly at present. 2. Don't see a problem with left turn into Lower King Street. Most of us are car drivers who use the town too. 3. Additional parking good for town centre. 4. Dislike the idea of another building to the north - think it will look very cramped.</p> <p>Other Comments</p> <p>1. Roys Stone is currently mounted in a very ugly and unnatural way - raised on a pebble plinth. I'd really like to see it in a more natural setting, so it looks like it's been there for 100's of years. 2. I like the trees - could have fewer but bigger. 3. Personally, I think allowing a right turn into Lower King Street. Would stop people going through the area twice as they turn at Morrison's roundabout. 4. Please try to keep in line with the red brick and tile heritage of the area.</p>	<p>Specific comments on the area and option 1 are noted.</p> <p>The additional features suggested for the area have been taken into account in the preferred option. Specifically • Fewer but more interesting trees and • Making the Royston Stone more prominent and making it more of a feature. Potentially restoring the "Cross" on top of the stone have been added to <u>paragraph 3.20</u>.</p> <p>Allowing the right turn, would again afford greater vehicle priority, in an area where we are trying to increase the importance of the pedestrian. Currently there is no signalised control meaning that cars have right of way into Lower King Street, which the preferred option is trying to prevent.</p> <p>Comments regarding additional parking are noted.</p>
Pyne	Option 3 - Do nothing	<p>The country is bankrupt - we shall never pay off the deficit so how can additional unnecessary expenditure be justified?</p> <p>Melbourn Street and Baldock Street are not a pedestrian level - it is easy to cross the road.</p>	<p>Currently no funding has been identified for this project. it is something to consider in the future. Investing in our town centres (the district's economic drivers) will help encourage greater economic vitality and improve the economy. This project is identified for medium to long term.</p> <p>Raising the carriageway will give the area a more pedestrian feel, slowing drivers that pass through.</p>

Royston Town council	Option 3 - Do nothing	Members of Royston Town Council do not agree that nothing should be done, they would like to see the area enhancement project take place.	Noted.
Kennedy	Option 3 - Do nothing	There is a need to improve this area, it should have been the top priority for improvements within the central area of Royston.	Noted.

<p>Zambonini</p>	<p>Option 3 - Do nothing</p>	<p>Insufficient information from consultation. Option 1 - No plan of building: how can we judge? Option 2a - Possibly favoured, depends on 1, the stop line may be an improvement. Option 2b - Depends if stop line in it can be justified - essentially no change. Option 2c - Possibly preferred - depends on the case for iii in 2a. Option 3 - Burying head in sand!</p> <p>Main criticism is of the presentation of the consultation - very disappointing. A shoe box in the library with a thin document containing errors and omissions. Compared with Fish Hill, poor. The Cross is of more significance to Royston Towns people.</p> <p>Other Comments</p> <p>The Building - A reasonable visualisation and explanation may have helped the case. How big is it? What types are being proposed? Is it 21st century? or in keeping with a conservation area?</p> <p>The Cross</p> <p>For a long time I have believed that hopes may be raised by having an actual Cross (Hardwood) raised on the stone. Can the feasibility be investigated? It may provide more of a focus (Á LA LADY ROYSIA) then a lump of millstone grit.</p>	<p>Comments on the consultation are noted - This was an options consultation rather than a detailed scheme.</p> <p>The detailed scheme will follow later to enable to the detailed features to be discussed in the same approach as Fish Hill was recently.</p> <p>Broad details of a potential building were included in the brief, i.e. 2 storey, potentially 21st century modern building, but fitting in with historic context. It was not the aim of the document to be prescriptive but to obtain consensus from a number of options.</p> <p>To accompany a detailed scheme a traffic assessment will be completed to ensure that movement of the stop line does not have any significant negative impacts on the highway network.</p> <p>The comments regarding the Cross have been taken into account in the preferred option scheme as <i>in paragraph 3.20 an additional objective has been added:</i> • <i>Making the Royston Stone more prominent and making it more of a feature. Potentially restoring the “Cross” on top of the stone .</i></p>
------------------	------------------------------	--	---

Royston Chamber of Commerce	Option 3 - Do nothing	If there is possible funding available then doing nothing does not seem the progressive option.	Noted. This is a medium to long term project, so funding may become available in the future.
Anon 2	Option 3 - Do nothing	Happy with how it is. No need to spend money for little benefit	Noted. Investing in our town centres (the district's economic drivers) will help encourage greater economic vitality and improve the economy. This project is identified for medium to long term.
Kennedy	4. Next steps/delivery	Why is the consultation process for the Cross less extensive than that for Fish Hill Square, the area is more significant to the central area of Royston than Fish Hill Square.	Comments on the consultation are noted. This was an options consultation rather than a detailed scheme. The detailed scheme will follow later to enable to the detailed features to be discussed.