

## Highways Committee

29 June 2010

### Proposed Traffic Calming Various Streets, Pittington, Durham.



---

### Report of Terry Collins, Director of Neighbourhood Services Cabinet Portfolio Member Councillor Bob Young.

---

#### 1.0 Purpose of the report

- 1.1 To advise Members of the representations received with regard to a traffic calming scheme recently proposed for streets in Pittington, Durham (see attached plan).
- 1.2 This report requests that Members consider the representations to the proposals.

#### 2.0 Background

- 2.1 Representations have been made by the Parish Council, County Ward Members and members of the public from the largely residential area of Pittington (including Low Pittington and High Pittington) with regard to the issue of vehicle speed on Front Street, Hallgarth View, Coalford Lane and Hallgarth Lane.
- 2.2 Following these concerns, a traffic calming scheme was entered onto the Local Member's Pool List of schemes for future consideration. The scheme will involve installation of a Speed Visor (vehicle activated speed indicator device) at a point on Front Street, Low Pittington, a chicane and series of 12 sets of speed cushions (1 x triple cushions and 11 x cushion pairs) in High Pittington, supplemented by necessary signs and road markings.
- 2.3 Public concern was further heightened by a recent traffic accident in the area, resulting in fatal injuries. A County Council Traffic Officer also attended the subsequent public meeting chaired by the Parish Council.
- 2.4 The speed surveys showed that in January 2009 there were 47% of vehicles travelling up to 30mph and 53% of vehicles exceeding 30mph along C13 Front Street, Low Pittington. The average speed of traffic at this location is 31.6mph.

- 2.5 Additional speed survey information taken in June 2008 indicated that there were 41% of vehicles travelling up to 30mph and 59% of vehicles exceeding 30mph along C60, Graham Terrace, High Pittington. The average speed of traffic at this location is 28.9mph. A further speed survey taken at the same time (June 2008) showed that there were 38% of vehicles travelling up to 30mph and 62% of vehicles exceeding 30mph along C60, Coalford Lane, High Pittington. The average speed of traffic at this location is 32.2mph.
- 2.6 A consultation was undertaken with residents of Low Pittington and High Pittington, where all properties, a total of 611, were issued with details of the proposed scheme and invited to make comment. In addition, the statutory consultees including the emergency services were also consulted with regard to the proposals and inviting their comments.
- 2.7 Out of 611 letters sent out to residents, a total of 215 replies were received from individual properties; an additional two letters were received from properties undecided about the proposals. Of the 215 replies, 170 are in favour, 43 are against, 2 undecided and the remaining 396 are deemed to have no preference.
- 2.8 With regard to the statutory consultees, responses of support were received from the North East Ambulance Service, Royal Mail and Durham Constabulary. There are no objections received from the statutory consultees.
- 2.9 During the formal advertisement period two enquires were lodged. These were minor concerns with respect to the locations of traffic calming measures. These residents were contacted individually and the details discussed. These concerns were not treated as objections.

### **3.0 Public Representations**

- 3.1 Since the number of respondents is high and some raised several different representations to the scheme, each topic will be reported together with the number of respondents who raised the particular issue and the County Council's response.

#### **3.2 Representation 1**

##### **“Speed cushions cause damage to vehicles”**

This point was raised by four respondents.

*Response: The Highway Code advises in Rule 153 that motorists should reduce their speed when approaching traffic calming features that are intended to slow them down. Therefore the principle applies that if the speed humps are negotiated at a reasonable speed they will not cause discomfort or constitute a danger to any road user or*

*damage vehicles. Also, a gap is left between the kerb and the hump which allows two wheeled vehicles to manoeuvre around the humps but not at speed.*

3.3 Representation 2

**Speed humps have no effect, don't stop 'boy racers' or vehicles speeding**

Four respondents raised this issue.

*Response: Before and After studies show that speed humps are an effective means of reducing vehicle speeds on residential roads.*

3.4 Representation 3

**"The installation of speed humps will result in increased noise"**

Six respondents raised this point

*Response: Research has shown that overall traffic noise is actually reduced when traffic calming is implemented on roads where the traffic flow consists mainly of light vehicles.*

3.5 Representation 4

**"Waste of tax payer's money"**

This point was raised by one respondent.

*Response: The scheme is being funded from Local Member's Allowance with contributions from local businesses and the Local Area Programme. It is considered to be a cost effective means of responding to the issues raised by residents. The national average cost of a traffic accident is over £70k. If one accident is prevented, or the severity reduced as a result of the installation of this scheme, then it can be deemed cost effective.*

3.6 Representation 5

**"Speed Humps slow down emergency vehicles"**

This point was raised by one respondent.

*Response: It is well known that both the Fire and Ambulance Services have reservations about road humps. These two organisations were consulted concerning this scheme along with the Police. Durham Ambulance Service has expressed their usual concern regarding traffic calming but has indicated their support due to the potential road safety improvement. The Fire and Rescue Service did not respond to the*

*consultation but generally offer their support for traffic calming as a means to improve road safety and accident prevention.*

3.7 Representation 6

**“The speed humps will reduce parking capacity”**

This point was raised by two respondents.

*Response: There is nothing to stop a motorist from parking a vehicle on a speed hump.*

3.8 Representation 7

**“Wouldn’t speed cameras be better?”**

This point was raised by one respondent.

*Response: It is not Durham Constabulary’s’ policy to use fixed speed cameras – the mobile safety camera is used where there is a history of a large number speed related accidents or where speed enforcement campaigns are carried out, subject to a safe location being available.*

3.9 Representation 8

**“Traffic Calming measures will increase emission and / or vibration from vehicles” and “Excessive noise from large wagons, particularly when empty”**

This point was raised by one respondent.

*Response: Research has shown that overall traffic noise is actually reduced when traffic calming is implemented on roads where the traffic flow consists mainly of cars and light vehicles, As a number of HGVs that do pass are likely to be empty when passing over the cushions, it is possible that there may be some noise generated as a consequence, although to some extent they will be able to straddle the cushions. The County Council and the Parish Council have been working closely with some of the HGV operators and secured agreements to avoid this area where possible or indeed proceed along the carriageway with due caution minimising disruption and disturbance to residents. Research has also shown that if motorists maintain a constant lower speed through a traffic calming scheme, then vehicle pollution will actually decrease.*

**4.0 Statutory Representations**

4.1 The Ambulance Service and Durham Constabulary both responded offering their support to the proposals.

4.2 An objection was lodged by Durham County Council's Passenger Transport Section on behalf of the local Public Transport Operators on 4 March 2010. This objection was retracted following a site visit with The Passenger Transport Section and the public transport operators on 16 March 2010.

**5.0 Local Member Consultation**

5.1 The Local Members, Councillors Carol Woods and Maureen Wood are minded to support the proposals.

**6.0 Recommendations and Reasons**

6.1.1 Members are recommended to endorse the proposal to set aside the representations and proceed with the scheme.

**7.0 Background Papers**

Correspondence on Office File  
Copies of correspondence have been placed in the Members'  
Resource Centre

---

**Contact: David Battensby Tel: 0191 332 4404**

---

---

**Appendix 1: Implications**

---

**Finance**

It is understood that £6,000 funding will be provided by the County Councillor Local Area Measures Allowance toward the scheme.

A further £12,000 will be provided through Local Area Programme monies.

A £10,000 contribution will be supplied by Taylormade Wood yard.

The cost of supply and implementation of a Speed Visor will be met by Sherburn Stone (£4872.08 anticipated).

**Staffing**

None

**Equality and diversity**

None

**Accommodation**

None

**Crime and disorder**

The proposal is likely to result in a reduction of some anti-social speed related offences

**Environment**

None

**Human rights**

None

**Localities and rurality**

As described in the Report

**Young people**

None.

**Consultation**

Consultation with affected residents in addition to statutory bodies.