



Report of Corporate Management Team

Terry Collins, Corporate Director Neighbourhood Services

Councillor Bob Young, Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Strategic Environment and Leisure

Purpose of the Report

- 1 To advise Committee of a representations received to the proposed traffic calming measures for the C10a St Ives Road, Leadgate.
- 2 It is recommended that the Committee endorse the proposal having considered the representations and proceed with the implementation of the advertised traffic calming cushions along the C10a St Ives Road, Leadgate as per the plans in Appendix 2

Background

- 3 Following a number of ongoing complaints from local residents and an accident in April 2010 involving a motor vehicle being driven at excessive speed where the driver lost control and caused considerable damage to a property on St Ives Road funding was identified for a possible traffic calming scheme.
- 4 Further investigations showed that the stretch of road does have an ongoing speed complaint profile and an accident profile which would benefit from the implementation of traffic calming measures. Community Speed Watch is also active at various locations and Durham Constabulary Road Policing Unit has undertaken specific enforcement. The last speed survey undertaken in the vicinity of the school showed only 35% of vehicles travelling below the posted 30 mph speed limit. This equating to approximately 1600 vehicles of the 4500 average daily flow Monday to Friday. The pattern is also the same on a weekend; 1250 vehicles of the 3700 on a Saturday and 1060 vehicles of the 3040 on a Sunday. The mean speed Monday to Friday is 33 mph. The mean speed on a Saturday and Sunday is 32.7 mph.
- 5 A review of the accidents between the 1st January 2007 and 31st October 2010 showed 6 number accidents. 5 of these were damage only and one was a slight injury. Three of these when investigated by Durham Constabulary showed speed as a contributory factor to the accident.

#

Proposals

- 6 The proposed scheme includes for the provision of 8 sets of triple cushions and 1 set of quadruple cushions as per the plans in Appendix 2.
- 7 The scheme also includes a reduction of the sign clutter at the eastern end of the scheme. This being designed to re-iterate to motorists that they are entering a built up area.

Consultation

- 8 Informal consultation occurred with the affected residents, businesses and statutory consultees from the 22nd September 2010 to the 21st October 2010.
- 9 Out of the 98 letters sent to affected residents and businesses 36 responses were received. 28 were in favour of the proposals and 8 were against. Durham Constabulary and the North East Ambulance Service responded to the informal consultation. Both were in full support of the proposals.
- 10 The Statutory Notice for the implementation of the road cushions was advertised between the 2nd June 2011 and the 23 June 2011. During this period one further letter of objection was received. However we must advise that this letter was from a person who objected at the informal stage also.

Representation and responses

- 11 Representation 1

“Speed cushions cause damage to vehicles / suspension”

One resident stated this reason

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 cushions are negotiated at a reasonable speed, then they will not cause discomfort, damage or constitute a danger to any road user. The proposals are based upon national guidance for traffic calming measures and these take into account all types of vehicles likely to encounter these features.

- 12 Representation 2

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

One resident stated this reason.

Response: Before and after studies published by government organisations show that traffic cushions are an effective means of reducing vehicle speeds on roads.

Durham County Council have implemented similar schemes such as these proposals throughout the county and have found that by undertaking before

and after speed surveys these types of schemes do have a positive effect on reducing vehicle speeds.

13 Representation 3

“Implement a 20 mph speed limit”

Two residents stated this reason

“To Expensive; implement a 20 mph speed limit

One resident stated this reason

Response: Research undertaken by the Transport Research Laboratory and following implementation within the County has shown that implementation of a speed limit using signs alone only reduces the mean speed by approx 1 mph.

The principle provided by current relevant legislation states that 20mph zones/limits should be self enforcing using suitable traffic calming methods. Therefore we would have to provide even more measures which would be even more expensive. The County Council Policy for 20 mph Zones states that zones should be self enforcing using traffic calming measures. It also provides that they may be introduced in areas around schools and areas with above average number of accidents, particularly where child accidents are involved or in areas adjacent to facilities for vulnerable road users where demand is significant enough to justify such measures. Although this location has a history of accidents they do not involve vulnerable road users therefore this is not a location where we would consider such implementation.

14 Representation 4

“Hazard especially in winter weather”

Two residents stated this reason

Response: The C10a forms part of Durham County Council’s Priority 1 salting routes and therefore this would still be undertaken. To date we have received no other issues from the drivers who undertake such work that traffic calming measures prevent them from undertaking this duty.

We also have many other locations throughout the county where traffic calming measures such as these are provided and we are not aware of them being any more a hazard in the winter periods.

15 Representation 5

“Increase in noise by wagons / in general”

Four residents stated this reason

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; however it is noted that there is a flow of HGVs' along the C10a. It is hoped that these proposals will assist in persuading these types of vehicles to use the by-pass rather than use the C10a as a quicker route therefore reducing the volume of HGVs' using the C10a.

16 Representation 6

One resident stated this reason

“Prevent the bad parking outside of the school”

Response: This is not an issue which will be affected by the proposals and will be investigated separately.

17 Representation 7

One resident stated this reason

“Concerned about a possible increase in congestion”

Response: It is acknowledged that due to a reduction in speed there may be a possible increase in traffic congestion especially at peak times; However this may be counterbalanced by the possibility that a number of the HGVs' and other vehicles once these measures are implemented may chose to use the alternative route of the by-pass therefore actually reducing the number of vehicles using the C10a.

18 Representation 8

This is in reference to the letter received at the legal stage. The correspondent raised the issue of noise as the main point which has been answered in representation 5. He then requested that we implement the scheme for a trial period of weeks to allow him to monitor the consequences and then review the situation.

Response: Unfortunately we are unable to accede to this request for the implementation of the traffic calming humps for a short period of time. The cushions will be constructed by keying in to the existing highway which would make this suggestion highly expensive.

Recommendations and reasons

- 19 It is **RECOMMENDED** that the Committee endorse the proposal having considered the objections and proceed with the implementation of the (traffic calming cushions) on (C10a St Ives Road, Leadgate) as per the plan in Appendix 2

Background papers

Contact: [David Battensby] Tel: 0191 332 4435

Appendix 1: Implications

Finance – Local Elected Members Neighbourhood Budget

Staffing - None

Risk - None

Equality and Diversity / Public Sector Equality Duty – Not applicable

Accommodation - None

Crime and Disorder - None

Human Rights - None

Consultation – Both informal and legal as described in report above

Procurement - None

Disability Issues - None

Legal Implications - None