

## Highways Committee

09 November 2012

### Unc.27.1 Tail Upon End Lane (Henry Avenue), Bowburn Proposed Traffic Calming Scheme



---

#### Report of Terry Collins, Corporate Director of Neighbourhood Services

#### Councillor Bob Young, Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Strategic Environment

---

##### Purpose of the Report

- 1 To advise Committee of the representations received with regard to the proposed traffic calming scheme for Unc.27.1 Tail Upon End Lane, Bowburn
- 2 It is recommended that the Committee endorse the proposal having considered the objections and proceed with the implementation of the advertised traffic calming scheme.

##### Background

- 3 Reason for traffic calming scheme is that a number of issues have been raised by the local residents & Councillors regarding speeding and road safety along Tail Upon End Lane. There have been a number of incidents where vehicles have left the road on a tight bend and complaints regarding inappropriate speed of vehicles negotiating the bend.

##### Proposal

- 4 A number of options have been considered however the best solution to the issues raised was decided to be three sets of two speed cushions and a chicane in the area between 32 and 34 Henry Avenue.

##### Consultation

- 5 A consultation was undertaken with 52 Residents between the 25th April 2012 and the 18<sup>th</sup> May.

Out of 37 letters sent out only 13 responses were received. Out of these 13 replies 3 were against the proposed restrictions. The remaining consultees who did not respond are deemed to have no preference. Each of these comments were carefully considered with regards to our proposals but it was ultimately decided that the scheme should proceed to statutory consultation.

- 6 The proposals were formally advertised from 9 August 2012 to 30 August 2012 and no objections were received.

## Public Representations

- 7 One representation was that traffic calming is unnecessary.

*Response: The necessity or otherwise of a traffic calming scheme is somewhat subjective although those who have raised concerns regarding vehicle speed would probably welcome such measures. 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*

- 8 Two representations were the scheme is a waste of money

*Response: The national average cost of an accident is over £70k and a fatal accident can be £1.8 million. 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. The £15k scheme is being funded by the local County Councillors from their local area budget.*

- 9 One representation was that speed cameras would be more of a deterrent

*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 safe location being available. In addition speed cameras are only effective for a very short distance.*

- 10 One representation were the proposals are in the wrong place

*Response: The speed cushions were positioned in the most appropriate places that also took account of the many constraints along the road, such as driveways, junctions, visibility and bends. The spacing of the cushions is also within the tolerances permitted within the relevant legislation to best accommodate the locality and maintain reduced vehicle speeds. The chicane is placed to provide the necessary visibility whilst acting as a speed reducing feature.*

## Statutory Representations

- 11 From the statutory consultees list, responses of support were received from the North East Ambulance Service and Durham Constabulary

## Local Member Consultation

- 12 The County Council Members, Councillor Mac Williams and Councillor Jan Blakey have been consulted and are minded to support the proposal.

## **Recommendations and reasons**

- 13 It is recommended that the Committee endorse the proposal having considered the representation and proceed with the implementation of the Traffic Calming Scheme.

## **Background Papers**

- 14 Correspondence on Office File

---

**Contact: [David Battensby] Tel: 03000 263681**

---

---

**Appendix 1: Implications**

---

**Finance – Local elected Member’s Neighbourhoods Budget**

**Staffing – None**

**Risk – None**

**Equality and Diversity / Public Sector Equality Duty – None**

**Accommodation – None**

**Crime and Disorder – Reduction in excessive speed**

**Human Rights – None**

**Consultation – As described in the report**

**Procurement – Works to be delivered by Highway Operations**

**Disability Issues – A reduction in vehicle speeds will assist those with disabilities**

**Legal Implications – The measures are being introduced in accordance with the current legislation**