

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Brar commented that some councils might take the view that it was right to mitigate the impact of dangerous driving with physical measures rather than a reminder of the speed limit which a driver who was impaired might well ignore. A refuge island would require the highway to be widened by around 4-5 feet. At the site discussed, there was 14 feet of verge on one side and 4 on the other, and the owner of the larger verge had told Councillor Brar he was open to the idea of cooperating with RBWM. She asked what discussion had been had with the landowners, and what was the outcome?

As Councillor Haseler was not present, the Mayor agreed that a written response would be provided

Written response:

*Dear Cllr Brar,*

*Thank you for your supplementary question and apologies for the delayed response.*

*The site has been assessed. A central traffic island is impractical to install as the current road width is too narrow. The installation of any island would require the acquisition of land and the road widened on both sides for some distance.*

*This would in effect remove the Eastern grass verge immediately alongside the road and a section of the existing footway and would bring traffic closer to pedestrians using the footway. This is not conducive to road safety and comfort of pedestrians.*

*Due to this assessment identifying that a central island is not a safe and viable option, private landowners have not been approached.*