

11 January 2018**REPORT OF CORPORATE DIRECTOR (PLACE)****ITEM: 8****THE NOTTINGHAMSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (STANDHILL ROAD,
CARLTON - TRAFFIC CALMING)****CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS****Purpose of the Report**

1. To consider objections received in respect of the above Traffic Calming and if it should be implemented as advertised.

Information and Advice

2. Standhill Road is a mainly residential street, with a small number of shops located primarily at the southern extent. There are two schools along the road; Standhill Infant School and Porchester Junior School, at the southern and northern ends respectively. St John's Methodist Church and King George V Recreation Ground are located off the road. Properties largely consist of detached and semi-detached houses. The properties to the north generally have off-road parking, with more on street parking at the southern end of the road. The road terminates at its southern end with Carlton Hill (B686). At the northern end, at its junction with Morley Road/Prospect Road, there is a No Entry restriction. Along the whole road there are 8 junctions, including the one with Carlton Hill.
3. Following concerns raised by local residents and investigation of accidents along the route including vulnerable road users, it is proposed to introduce 11 round top road humps on Standhill Road, from the junction with Carlton Hill to the junction with Morley Road/Prospect Road. The proposals are detailed on the attached drawings EMD_HW10215_006A, EMD_HW10215_006B, EMD_HW10215_006C,

Responses received

4. An initial consultation was carried out in June 2016 with 197 questionnaires delivered to local residents. The number of responses received was 106 (53.8%), of which 83 (78.3%) were in favour of the introduction of the road humps. This is in keeping with the required criteria to progress with the scheme proposal.
5. In accordance with the Highways Act 1980, a formal consultation took place between 23rd October and 19th November 2017. Notices and plans showing the proposals were posted on site and a notice placed in the local press. Comments were invited from statutory consultees including police, fire and ambulance services and Gedling Borough Council. All 193 residents, businesses and organisations on the road were consulted. Ten written responses were received during the consultation; six of these are supportive of the proposals; four responses are considered to be objections to all or part of the proposals.

6. Objecting comments relate to the following issues:

- Lack of evidence to support the proposals
 - Negative environmental effects of humps
 - The proposals will encourage irresponsible road use
 - Negative impacts on residents
 - Negative impact on other road users
 - Preferred alternatives
7. Lack of evidence - One resident considered the representation of statistics from the initial consultation had been misleadingly represented and there was insufficient demonstration of support from the first consultation. Further, they considered the detail provided should have given size and construction of the proposed bollards and traffic signs.
8. Negative environmental impacts - Three residents raised concerns about increased pollution due to slowing and accelerating of vehicles caused by the road humps. There was one concern expressed about noise generated by vehicles travelling over the humps.
9. The proposals will encourage irresponsible road use - One resident suggested that the humps would attract younger drivers to drive irresponsibly.
10. Negative impacts on residents' road use - Three residents raised concerns relating to parking and one resident on access to their driveway
11. Negative impact on wider road users – One resident raised the potential negative impact on emergency vehicles passage along the road.
12. Preferred alternatives - one resident suggested the need to consider use of speed cameras as a less disruptive alternative solution.

Responses

13. Lack of evidence to support the proposals - In the initial consultation letter it was stated that 78% of respondents were in favour of the traffic calming measures. The exact percentage of votes received after initial consultation is 53.8%, of which 78.3% of the votes received were in favour of the introduction of the road humps. Public consultation exercises often experience poor response rates. A response of over 50% on this occasion with over 75% of respondents in favour, indicates strong support for the proposals and is in keeping with criteria to progress with the proposal.
14. Over the last 5.5 years (1/1/12 to 31/7/17) on Standhill Road there have been 11 reported injury accidents, 6 of which involved vulnerable road users, i.e. pedestrians, cyclists and motor-cyclists; 2 out of those 6 were serious injuries. Having reviewed the circumstances of these accidents, it is considered that the round top road humps offer the most appropriate solution to reduce accidents.
15. Negative Environmental Impacts - The number of humps and intervening distances are designed to allow drivers to maintain an acceptable speed, without the need for a sudden change of speed just before/after humps, so should not have an unacceptable environmental impact.
16. The impact of the road humps is anticipated to discourage irresponsible road use by reducing vehicle speeds.

17. Negative impacts on residents' road use - There will be no loss of on street parking. The location of humps and associated bollards and signage has been carefully considered to meet the aims of the scheme but manage impact on residents. Where possible, bollards and humps have been located adjacent to property boundaries to reduce impact on parking practice and negative visual impact. No access to driveways has been compromised.
18. Negative impact on wider road users - Emergency Services were included in the consultation process. No objection or comment relating to impact on access for emergency vehicles services has been received from those organisations. Standhill road is not a classified road, strategic fire route or bus route
19. Preferred alternatives- Government guidelines state that fixed cameras should only be used where there have been at least three fatal or serious collisions per kilometre in the last three calendar years and where the majority of drivers are exceeding the speed limit. This is not the case for Standhill Road.
20. Traffic calming by vertical deflection has been demonstrated to be successful in reducing casualties and Nottinghamshire County Council has had wide experience with these schemes since the early 1990s.

Other Options Considered

21. The following options have been considered:
 - a. The option to provide parking bays on alternate sides of the road and define formal passing places; this was discounted due to concern over lack of effectiveness in reducing vehicle speeds and anticipated lack of popularity with residents, who generally prefer to park vehicles close to their property.
 - b. The utilisation of Speed Cameras was discounted as it does not meet the required criteria as defined in para 19 above.
 - c. The use of speed cushions was discounted as these are generally required on roads which are classified road, strategic fire route or bus route.

Comments from Local Members

22. County Councillors Jim Creamer and Errol Henry, Members for Carlton West are supportive of the scheme.

Reasons for Recommendations

23. The proposed scheme is considered the most appropriate means of reducing road accidents occurring along the route.

Statutory and Policy Implications

24. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of crime and disorder, data protection and information governance finance, human resources, human rights, the public-sector equality duty, safeguarding of children and vulnerable adults, service users, smarter working, sustainability and the environment and where such implications are

material they are described below. Appropriate consultation has been undertaken and advice sought on these issues as required.

Crime and Disorder Implications

25. Nottinghamshire Police raised no objections to the proposals.

Financial Implications

26. The Scheme is funded from the 2017/18 Safety Improvements (Integrated Transport Measures) at a cost of £40,000.

Human Rights Implications

27. The implementation of the proposals within this report might be considered to have a minimal impact on human rights (such as the right to respect for private and family life and the right to peaceful enjoyment of property, for example). However, the Authority is entitled to affect these rights where it is in accordance with the law and is both necessary and proportionate to do so, in the interests of public safety, to prevent disorder and crime, to protect health, and to protect the rights and freedoms of others. The proposals within this report are considered to be within the scope of such legitimate aims.

Public Sector Equality Duty implications

28. As part of the process of making decisions and changing policy, the Council has a duty 'to advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not' by thinking about the need to:

- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation.
- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share protected characteristics (as defined by equalities legislation) and those who don't.
- Foster good relations between people who share protected characteristics and those who don't.

29. Disability is a protected characteristic and the Council therefore has a duty to make reasonable adjustments to proposals to ensure that disabled people are not treated unfairly. Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) are a means by which a public authority can assess the potential impact that proposed decisions / changes to policy could have on the community and those with protected characteristics as a means of ensuring this. An EIA may also identify potential ways to reduce any impact that a decision / policy change could have, and if it is not possible to reduce the impact, the EIA can explain why. Decision makers must understand the potential implications of their decisions on people with protected characteristics.

30. An EIA has been undertaken to assess the potential impact of the proposal, the results of the consultation and any appropriate mitigation. This EIA is included as a background paper to this committee report. Decision makers must give due regard to the implications for protected groups the potential implications of their decisions on people with protected characteristics.

Safeguarding of Children and Adults at Risk Implications

32. The proposals are intended to have a positive impact on all highway users. Being in close proximity to two schools, they should also help to safeguard and promote the welfare of children.

Implications for Sustainability and the Environment

33. By creating a safer walk to school environment, the proposals may help to promote sustainable transport choices for staff and pupils accessing the school, and may thereby reduce travelling by private transport.

RECOMMENDATION/S

It is **recommended** that:

- 1) The Nottinghamshire County Council (Standhill Road, Carlton) Traffic Calming goes ahead as proposed.

Adrian Smith
Corporate Director – Place

Name and Title of Report Author

Cathy Gillespie - Team Manager Environmental Management and Design (Via East Midlands Ltd)

For any enquiries about this report please contact:

Steve Marston - Project Engineer (Environmental Management and Design) (Via East Midlands Ltd) 0115 9772154

Constitutional Comments (SLB 06/12/2017)

34. Communities and Place Committee is the appropriate body to consider the content of this report.

Financial Comments (SES 29/11/2017)

35. The financial implications are set out in the report.

Background Papers

All relevant documents for the proposed scheme are contained within the scheme file which can be found in the Environmental Management and Design section at Trent Bridge House, Fox Road, West Bridgford, Nottingham, NG2 6BJ.

- Drawings of the proposed traffic calming scheme are attached to the report.
- Equality Impact Assessment Standhill Road Traffic Calming Scheme

Except for previously published documents, which will be available elsewhere, the documents listed here will be available for inspection in accordance with Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972.

Electoral Division(s) and Member(s) Affected

Carlton West	Councillor Jim Creamer
Carlton West	Councillor Errol Henry