

# KINGS ROAD

## Briefing Report



### 1. INTRODUCTION

This report seeks delegated authority to implement new Humped Zebra Crossings and Speed Humps on Kings Road Plymouth.

### 2. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS REQUIRED

2.1 There are no Traffic Regulation Orders associated with this work; however, the proposal is to install 2 Humped Zebra Crossings and 9 Road Humps along Kings Road.

### 3. CONSULTATION PROPOSALS

The scheme has arisen from a planning requirement to consider improvement to pedestrian access across Kings Road from both the City College Site and Stonehouse Creek Car Park which are allocated as remote parking sites for Foulston Park which is being constructed at the former Brickfields site to the west of Kings Road.

At the same time, Plymouth Highways were investigating the Casualty Record along Kings Rd. There have been 9 injury collisions on the road between Stonehouse Bridge and Devonport Rd in the previous 5-year period, 5 of which involved inappropriate speed. These included 4 Slight Injuries, 3 Serious and 2 Fatal. Of note are that 2 children were injured, three of the collisions involved motorcycles and that both fatalities were motorcyclists. Two of the serious collisions also involved inappropriate speed resulting in collisions with roadside trees. (See Appendix K for Collision Plot)

An agreement was reached with the developer of Foulston Park to jointly fund the scheme, with Plymouth Highways funding the costs of the road humps up to a value of £50,000 as a casualty reduction intervention.

#### Initial Crossing Design

The design of the scheme took into account the existing and proposed pedestrian desire lines in the area with a new access into Foulston Park close to City College proposed some 20 metres southwest of the existing pedestrian refuge outside City College.

The position of the proposed crossing was therefore moved to the south of the existing crossing point to align more closely with the proposed new access and further away from the nearby bend. An initial assessment of Street Lighting in the area recommended that 4 trees would need to be felled in order to ensure that the crossings are adequately illuminated. Three Lime Trees close to the Northern Crossing and one London Plane adjacent to the Southern Crossing. In mitigation for the loss of the 4 trees a scheme involving the planting of 19 trees within the public area of the adjacent park has been prepared.

#### Road Hump Design

In order to address the number of casualties that have been seen along the road it is proposed that the Zebra Crossings would incorporate Speed Tables and that these would be supplemented by full width

sinusoidal road humps spaced appropriately. (Details available in Appendixes C, D and E). Kings Road has a relatively high-quality road surface and a 300m long straight section with good visibility which is attractive for motorcyclists particularly as the road is seen as an alternative to other more congested routes in this area of the City. Factors affecting the choice of Humps rather than Speed Cushions or Enforcement Cameras are :-

- Full width speed humps cannot be avoided by motorcyclists and cars with wider wheelbases as is the case with Speed Cushions
- There are no residences directly fronting the road. Noise and ground born vibrations from humps often make them unpopular with residents. Legitimate objections from Residents would not be an issue in this case.
- Although Buses use the road for School Transport there are no scheduled services routed along it. The choice of 75mm high Sinusoidal Humps allows buses to negotiate the humps at low speed without causing an uncomfortable ride, are more easily negotiated by cyclists than convex road humps but will act as calming features for both Motorcycles and Cars. (See Appendix C D & E)
- The use of enforcement cameras was discounted due to the tree lined nature of the road which would interfere with operation and an estimated cost at least twice that of the road humps scheme

#### **4. STATUTORY CONSULTATION**

The scheme required consultation under requirements set out in The Highways Act 1980 section 90C (Road Humps) and section 96A (Tree Removal). Further under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 section 23 (the establishment of a Pedestrian Crossing) notice was required to be given.

The original proposals were initially advertised on 26<sup>th</sup> November 2025 subject to the above legislation with a closing date of 24<sup>th</sup> December 2025. Notices were placed on street, in the Herald and on the Plymouth City Council website. Details of the proposals were sent to the Councillors representing the affected wards and statutory consultees on 20<sup>th</sup> November 2025.

During the advertisement period the Council were questioned about the positioning of the notices. DEFRA Guidance relating to S96A of the Highways Act sets out the process for consultation for the felling of street trees. It was noted that the Guidance advises that Notices should be placed on any trees affected rather than on a Lamp Column next to the tree which is the usual practice with consultation under different legislation. This point was fully accepted by the Council and therefore to fully comply with the Defra guidance a decision was made to restart the consultation on Friday 19<sup>th</sup> December and extend the consultation period until Friday 23<sup>rd</sup> January with an additional week added in view of the Christmas Break. Notices were added to each of the trees proposed for removal on 19<sup>th</sup> December.

##### **4.1 CONSULTATION SUMMARY**

A summary of the responses received along with Officer comments is shown below.

The Consultation followed the statutory processes set out in the above legislation and Defra Guidance giving advice on consultation when removal of trees is proposed. All residents of the nearby Rectory Road/Corea Terrace estate were contacted by letter along with the additional consultees listed below.

Shekinah – Kings Rd

Plymouth Petanque – Kings Rd

City College – Kings Rd

Plymouth Albion RFC

Devonport Services Rugby Football Club – Rectory Road

Devonport Community Leisure Ltd - Kings Road

Plymouth University Hospital Trust (Dental school/ Cumberland)

As the consultation dealt with 3 separate but interlinked proposals, the responses have been analysed initially to provide an in favour or against number. However, many of the comments received do refer to a perception that the proposals have been developed because the City Council believes that trees have been responsible for collisions on the road and in particular the 2 fatalities. This is not something that the City Council have ever stated in relation to this proposal.

Plymouth Highways have undertaken a visibility survey at the junction of Rectory Rd and established that there is adequate visibility from the junction to the right (north). There has never been a proposal from Plymouth Highways to remove the trees to the right of the junction to improve visibility.

A total of 52 responses have been received to the consultation of which 21 were residents of either Stoke or Devonport. Eight were in favour and 43 against and one neutral. 42 of those against the proposals cited removal of the trees as their main reason for objection.

Recurring themes were to introduce a 20mph Speed Limit (14/52), Move the Zebra Crossing so trees would not be required to be felled (8/52), the consultation is flawed (5/52) and that trees are not responsible for accidents (13/52).

<b>Comments Received</b>	<b>Officer Comments</b>
The northern Zebra Crossing does not give access to the site	This is incorrect, the route from City College to Foulson Park will be via a new gate to be constructed immediately adjacent to the proposed Zebra Crossing (See Appendix L)
Site the Crossing in a different location	A redesign has taken place which has moved the northern crossing some 20m to the north. This removes the need to fell any of the trees in this location
Other Lighting Solutions have been ignored	Professional advice has been sought regarding the required lighting. A reassessment has indicated that sensitive maintenance of the London Plane adjacent to the Southern proposed crossing will enable it to be sustainably retained.
Impose a 20mph Speed Limit	This is a wide tree lined road with no building frontages. 20mph under these circumstances would not be successful unless heavily traffic calmed or Camera Enforcement was introduced. The effects of the traffic calming

Will the Orchard Trees be accessible to the public	will be monitored after introduction. A lower speed limit may then be appropriate.
Objects to the scheme because of tree removal	As there is no longer a requirement to remove any trees the proposal to plant the community orchard in mitigation has now been dropped. Planting of the additional 5 trees also proposed in mitigation is still proposed.
Install Speed Cameras instead of Traffic Calming	Noted. No trees will now be removed.
Trees are not responsible for traffic accidents	Cameras would cost at least twice the budget available for the road safety intervention and are difficult to operate on heavily tree lined roads
PCC never listen to consultation responses	Agreed
Objection to road humps because they are ineffective, cause vehicle damage and are difficult for Cyclists	Noted
Parking narrows the road and makes it dangerous	The profile of road hump chosen is designed to provide an easier ride for buses and cyclists but will still be successful in reducing the speed of other vehicles. Speed Cushions are often used but can easily be avoided by Motorcyclists and vehicles with larger wheelbases.
Only willing to support the proposals if mature trees are not removed	Kings Road is wide enough to accommodate 2 way traffic and allow for parking on one side. Parking does narrow the road which tends to slow traffic. Its removal would potentially see an increase in speed
Waste of Public Money	Noted
The collision rate is vanishingly small.	Noted
None of the trees and in the U Category	Disagree. 2 Fatal Collisions and 3 Serious on a 0.5km section of road makes it one of the poorest performing roads in the City and region.
Don't agree to removal of a tree to install a speed hump	Agreed
	No trees will be removed to install speed humps

<p>Pavement on the eastern side of the road is unusable because of trees</p> <p>Build an alternative route for pedestrians</p> <p>Mitigation does not make up for the loss of mature trees</p> <p>Install additional Speed Humps</p> <p>Removal of the trees will speed up traffic.</p> <p>Object because Traffic Calming should be extended to all of the roads around the college</p> <p>Would prefer Camera Enforcement to Traffic calming</p> <p>Safety First</p> <p>Millbridge Scheme did not require removal of Trees.</p> <p>Extend Millbridge Scheme to cover this area</p> <p>The scheme is the bare minimum which should be considered</p>	<p>Noted although there is an alternative route available for pedestrians on Richmond Walk in the Stonehouse Creek Car Park area.</p> <p>The level differences do make this a challenging and potentially expensive project but the idea will be assessed.</p> <p>Noted. No trees will be removed</p> <p>The scheme will be evaluated when introduced. If further features are required these will be considered.</p> <p>Noted. No trees will be removed.</p> <p>Plymouth Highways do not have budgets to treat all areas it might wish and must prioritise its limited resources in areas where they will be most effective.</p> <p>Already addressed in the report.</p> <p>Agreed safety is a priority when reviewing our Highways.</p> <p>The Millbridge Scheme was fortunate in that adequate lighting was available without the need to remove any trees. The vast majority of Pedestrian Crossing Schemes are introduced without the need to remove trees because it is one of the first site issues a designer will look at.</p> <p>The boundaries of the Millbridge Scheme were expanded significantly for the original proposal centred on the crossing point. Funding did not allow for it to be extended beyond its current limits. Whilst this could be considered in future, the logistics involved in extending the Zone toward City College would bring in a large area of streets which would require both signs and Camera Enforcement and costs would far exceed the budgets currently available.</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	--

<p>Trees protect pedestrians</p> <p>Supports removal of tree T2.</p> <p>Reduce Speed Limit to 25mph.</p> <p>Remove more trees between Rectory Rd and the college entrance but keep T2.</p> <p>The consultation is flawed in process and not enough information was given. Some people might not have known about the consultation and unable to take part</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>No trees will be removed.</p> <p>There is no legal 25mph Speed Limit on public roads in the UK</p> <p>Plymouth Highways has no intention of removing these trees.</p> <p>Relevant legislation has been followed along with regulatory advice regarding consultation on tree removal. However, a review of the process followed has identified areas where the information provided could have been clearer. There have been 52 responses to the consultation and changes to the scheme have now been made and no trees will now need to be removed.</p>
---	---

**5. REVISED PROPOSAL**

During the consultation period it was established that the new gate into Foulston Park, close to City College, was intended to be an additional access adjacent to the pedestrian Refuge rather than the existing gate to the south as previously thought. This enabled a redesign to be undertaken which has moved the crossing to location of the existing pedestrian refuge.

It also became clear during the consultation that the loss of the trees was not regarded favourably by a large number of respondents and a design review was undertaken resulting in a number of changes.

The revised proposals remove the need fell to any of the trees associated with the scheme with the required visibility to the new Zebra Crossing position from the south achieved through sensitive maintenance of the Lime Tree listed as T2 in Appendix F if required.

In making this assessment, consideration was given to the excellent safety record of the existing uncontrolled pedestrian crossing point with no pedestrian injury collisions reported by the Police associated with the crossing point in the last 10 years, with the tree in situ. It is considered that, with a widened footway, visibility will be improved and that the associated traffic calming on both approaches to the crossing point will mean that approach speeds will be significantly slower than at present.

An additional review into the lighting requirements at the crossing site adjacent to the Stonehouse Creek Car Park has proposed that instead of removal of the London Plane Tree as advertised, the lighting requirement could again be achieved by sensitive maintenance of the tree which could be sustainably continued.

The retention of 4 trees, which were originally proposed to be removed, is as a result design and mitigation proposals that have been incorporated into the scheme design that meet safety requirements but also retain the trees.

Although the scheme will no longer remove any of the trees, the proposed mitigation will not be completely removed with 5 new trees to be planted close to the western side of the road in the publicly accessible area of Foulston Park. The Community Orchard will no longer be planted in association with the scheme.

Plans of amended proposals can be viewed in Appendixes C, D & E to this report and the original proposals in Appendixes H, I and J along with Appendix G, an overall plan showing the proposed locations of the trees to be planted in mitigation although the Community Orchard is no longer proposed.

## **6. LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

The lawful implications and consequences of the proposal have been considered and taken into account in the preparation of this report. This includes taking into account the relevant requirements for consultation pursuant to the provisions previously mentioned in this report.

When considering whether to make a traffic order it is the Council's responsibility to ensure that all relevant legislation is complied with. This includes Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) that sets out that it is the duty of a local authority, so far as practicable subject to certain matters, to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. It is considered that the proposals comply with Section 122 of the Act as they practically secure the safe and expeditious movement of traffic in and around Plymouth and provide for suitable and adequate associated parking facilities.

## **7. RECOMMENDATIONS**

Following consultation, it is proposed that :-

**RECOMMENDATION** - The crossing nearest to the college be relocated further north to align with the position of the proposed pedestrian access into Foulston Park. This recommendation no longer results in the loss of any trees.

**REASON** - The crossing point aligns better with the expected pedestrian flow from City College and Foulston Park entrance on King's Road.

This adjustment in the design also responds to a large number of the consultation responses regarding tree removal.

**RECOMMENDATION** - The crossing near to Stonehouse Bridge will proceed as originally planned.

**REASON** – An additional review into lighting requirements at the crossing has resulted in a revised proposal which removes the need for the felling of the London Plane Tree, as advertised. The lighting requirement can be achieved by sensitive maintenance of the tree which could then be sustainably continued. This adjustment in the design responds to a large number of the consultation responses regarding tree removal.

**RECOMMENDATION** - The Road Humps are constructed as advertised subject to minor amendments associated with the new Zebra Crossing location

**REASON** – This is the best design solution to achieve the scheme benefits.