

## Highways Committee

18 January 2008



### Unclassified Bellerby Drive Ouston Traffic Calming

---

#### Report of John Richardson, Corporate Director, Environment

---

#### 1.0 Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To advise Members of objections to a Traffic Calming scheme at Bellerby Drive, Ouston (see attached plan).
- 1.2 This report requests that Members consider the objections of the residents of Bellerby Drive, Ouston and endorse the recommendations.

#### 2.0 Background

- 2.1 Concerns regarding the speed of vehicles using the estate road of Bellerby Drive were raised by residents through the Local Member. As a result of a meeting with the Local Member and a community representative in July 2007, it was decided to proceed with the usual consultation exercise for schemes of this nature. Members are advised that this is the second of two reports being presented for neighbouring streets (see item no 2).
- 2.2 Speed surveys were undertaken to determine the nature of the problem and these demonstrated that although there wasn't a problem with drivers breaking the 30mph speed limit, a large majority were well above the speed expected for a residential area, e.g. 66% exceeded 20mph.
- 2.3 A draft scheme, comprising 2 speed humps was prepared.  
  
Each of the 84 properties received a letter, a plan of the scheme and a pre-paid reply card inviting them to inform us of their comments. The letter also stated that if the pre-paid reply card was not returned then the resident would deem to be in favour of the scheme.
- 2.4 A total of 36 (43%) cards were returned. Of these, 24 (29%) indicated support for the scheme and 12 (14%) raised at least one point of issue and the remainder who did not respond (57%) were deemed to be in support of the scheme. One email of support was also received. The majority of positive responses raised concerns over the safety of children and pedestrians and the speed of vehicles on the estate.

- 2.5 The formal advertisement of the proposal, in the press and on-site, started on 29 November 2007 and ended on 24 December 2007. This formal consultation resulted in two letters being received from the Fire Service and the Ambulance Service providing their usual general response.
- 2.6 The Police have indicated their support for the proposals.

### **3.0 Representations**

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

#### 3.2 Representation 1

**“Never had a problem with speeding traffic”.**  
**“It is not necessary”.**  
**“Not justified”.**  
**“Speed of cars never exceed 20mph”.**

These and similar points were raised by eight respondents.

*Response: The necessity or otherwise of a traffic calming scheme is somewhat subjective depending upon one's viewpoint. However, the County Council is confident that, if it is implemented, vehicle speeds will be reduced which will be an improvement in road safety terms, especially for pedestrians and other vulnerable road users.*

*With regard to statistics, the motivation for this type of scheme is not solely the accident record of, or conviction rate on the road in question. The speed survey of vehicles on the estate show that 66% of vehicles to be driving at speeds above 20mph which is considered an appropriate speed threshold within residential roads. Traffic calming is provided as a measure to address the concerns of residents who have complained about the speed of traffic. It is also provided as an integral feature on new estates as a preventative measure.*

#### 3.3 Representation 2

**“A waste of money” or “money could be better spent”.**

This point was raised by four respondents.

*Response: The scheme is being funded from the Local Member's Allowance and is considered to be a cost effective means of responding to the issues raised by residents. The national average cost of an accident is over £65k. If one accident is prevented, or the severity reduced as a result of the installation of this scheme, then it can easily be established as having been cost effective.*

3.4 Representation 3

**“Speed humps don’t work” or “do nothing to reduce speed”.**

This point was raised by three respondents.

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

3.5 Representation 4

**“Speed humps cause damage to cars”.**

This point was raised by one respondent.

*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. The principle applies that if the speed humps are negotiated at a reasonable speed, then they will not cause discomfort or constitute a danger to any road user or damage vehicles*

3.6 Representation 5

**“The proposals are in the wrong place”.**

This point was raised by one respondent.

*Response: The proposed speed humps were positioned in the most appropriate places that also took account of the many constraints along the road, such as driveways, junctions and bends.*

3.7 Representation 6

**“I am in favour of any speed reduction schemes – but not this one”.**

**“It would be outside my house and cause noise and nuisance – I am a light sleeper”.**

*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. Most traffic calming schemes are requested by residents who are concerned about the safety of pedestrians and children due to inappropriate vehicle speed. It is unfortunate that features have to be located outside a resident’s house but this is often unavoidable.*

**4.0 Local Member consultation**

4.1 The Local Member, Councillor Colin Carr has been consulted and fully supports the proposal.

## **5.0 Recommendations and Reasons**

- 5.1 Members are recommended to endorse the proposal to set aside the objections and proceed with the scheme as proposed.

### **Background Papers**

Scheme File

Copies of responses and correspondence

Copies of correspondence have been placed in the Members' Resource Centre.

---

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

---

---

## **Appendix 1: Implications**

---

### **Local Government Reorganisation**

**(Does the decision impact upon a future Unitary Council?)**

None

### **Finance**

To be funded by the Local Member from the Local Area Measures Allowance.

### **Staffing**

None

### **Equality and Diversity**

None

### **Accommodation**

None

### **Crime and Disorder**

The measures will reduce the problem of inappropriate driving within Bellerby Drive.

### **Sustainability**

Possible improvements in the residential amenity.

### **Human Rights**

None

### **Localities and Rurality**

As detailed in the report.

### **Young People**

Possible safer highway environment due to reduction in traffic speeds.

### **Consultation**

Consultation on the proposed measures was undertaken.

### **Health**

None