

**REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN OF TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS  
COMMITTEE****RESPONSE TO PETITIONS PRESENTED TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE  
COUNTY COUNCIL ON 27<sup>TH</sup> FEBRUARY 2014****Purpose of the Report**

The purpose of this report is to inform Council of the decisions of the Transport and Highways Committee on the issues raised in petitions presented to the Chairman of the County Council at the Council meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> February 2014. The petitions were considered and agreed by Transport and Highways Committee at their meeting on 24 April 2014.

- A. Petition regarding street lighting at Kegworth (Ref:2014/059)
- B. Petition regarding flooding on Far Lane, Normanton on Soar (Ref: 2014/060)
- C. Petition regarding resurfacing of Pye Hill Road, Jacksdale (Ref:2014/061)
- D. Petition regarding A60 crossroads on Loughborough Road, Costock (Ref:2014/063)
- E. Petition regarding the resurfacing of Upton Mount Road, Mansfield (Ref:2014/065)

**A. Petition regarding street lighting at Kegworth (Ref:2014/059)**

- 1. At the County Council meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> February 2014 a petition of 1,547 signatures was presented to the Chairman by County Councillor Andrew Brown. The purpose of the petition is to request the installation of street lighting on Station Road between the University of Nottingham, Sutton Bonnington and Kegworth Village. This facility would be aimed at improving safety for both pedestrians and cyclists.
- 2. A representative from the County Council met four of the student representatives on Monday 24<sup>th</sup> February (prior to the petition being handed to Councillor Brown). The students stated that their concerns mainly related to pedestrian visibility and personal safety. They also asked that as well as street lighting other measures could be considered. These included the renewal of road markings (which has been actioned) and the review of the existing speed limit from 60mph to 40mph.

**Speed Limit reduction**

- 3. The speed limit request does not meet the DfT guidance regarding 40mph speed limits as the road is not built up. Also only 1 or 2 schemes a year from the Speed Limit

Review Programme are being implemented, therefore it is not likely to be considered for some time unless additional funding can be secured.

### **White Lining maintenance**

4. The lining request has been actioned. The lining will probably need a road closure and bus operators will require 14 weeks' notice.

### **Street Lighting installation**

5. The lighting provision requested would extend from the last existing lamp column west of the bridge up to the County Boundary, a distance of some 900 metres. Any new scheme would need to conform to the current standards for street lighting which dictates that columns are generally required at a spacing of around 35-40 metres. This would mean a scheme would be likely to require 22-25 columns at a cost of around £100,000.

### **Funding Options**

6. County Council highway budgets provide for such projects in the following ways:

#### Crash reduction

7. Accident remedial funding is justified on the basis that there are a number of reported accidents resulting in personal injury and indicate a pattern which may be addressed in order to reduce the accident rate. The prospective number of accidents which it is estimated would be saved contributes to a calculation of the amount of funding which would be justified to address the problem. This type of cost-benefit analysis is used nationally and forms the primary basis of accident reduction in this country.
8. In terms of the accident history at this site, there has been one reported injury accident in the period 1.1.10 – 31.10.13. This was slight and did not involve a pedestrian or cyclist. Historically the junction of Station Road/College Road/Melton Road has been subject to new signing and lining to address an overshoot problem. However there is currently not a reported injury accident pattern on the length of Station Road in question (and nothing to support an accident remedial scheme for street lighting).
9. Ironically, pedestrians feeling unsafe and drivers/riders feeling anxiety often means they are all recognising a need for additional caution, for example in circumstances such as darkness or a narrow road/footway width. This can result in their taking additional care to avoid accidents and can often result in the phenomenon of a good accident record existing along a length of road which people regard as being dangerous.

#### Local Transport Plan

10. It is recognised that pedestrian and cyclist anxiety can suppress cycle use and walking as chosen modes of transport. Our Local Transport Plan (LTP) Team promotes schemes to encourage and assist the use of sustainable forms of transport and could support the installation of lighting. This needs to be evidenced and justified as well though and lighting is an unusual form for an LTP Scheme to take as they are more commonly installed are pedestrian crossings, cycle lanes, bus priority measures and suchlike. Fuller results of the survey carried out would be needed as we need to know how many of the 1,034 respondents using Station Road currently drive, take a bus, cycle or walk to the university and how many of this number would be likely to change their mode of transport to cycling and walking if the route were lit. This would be

evidence of a suppressed demand for this type of sustainable transport which we could use towards a bid for a lighting scheme.

#### External funding

11. Nottingham University have made a commitment to fund up to £50,000 of the works costs to make Station Road more comfortable for pedestrians and cyclists to use. In the current economic climate this generous contribution is very welcome. It is understood that this will be a one-off payment, so it is important that the full and ongoing costs of any potential schemes are recognised and discussed with the University representatives.

#### **Other considerations**

12. There has been an ongoing project for the last few years to reduce lighting costs in terms of annual maintenance and the cost of electricity. To install additional new lighting at a time when the aim is to reduce overall lighting costs will need careful consideration.

It was agreed that

13. A detailed design and costing is prepared of a new lighting scheme for Station Road. This will need to include the ongoing energy and maintenance costs, as well as the initial installation costs. Alternative lighting solutions will also be considered.
14. The request to reduce the speed limit is investigated and costed.
15. A working group is convened, involving representatives of the University, to establish the most beneficial remedial measures within the available resources.
16. Once the scheme is agreed it will be completed without delay and funded from within the 2014/15 highways capital programme.

#### **B. Petition regarding flooding on Far Lane, Normanton on Soar (Ref: 2014/060)**

17. A petition of 205 signatures was presented to County Council by Councillor Andrew Brown on 27<sup>th</sup> February requesting urgent drainage improvement works to alleviate ongoing flooding issues at the Main Street, Far Lane and Moor Lane junction in Normanton-on-Soar.
18. The flooding problem at this location is well known and there have been a high number of complaints received over the years. However, the problem appears to mainly involve Severn Trent Water's drainage system, the Environment Agency's pumping station or private drainage ditches rather than our own gully connections into the drains.
19. In 2010, it was reported that much of the works that were needed to improve the land drainage system serving the area had been completed by various private land owners. Severn Trent Water had removed the silt from their system on Main Street and the Environment Agency had cleared reeds and silt from their section of a watercourse. However, as the gradients achievable for land drainage in this area are very nearly flat, it could not be guaranteed that these works would prevent the flooding on Main Street/Moor Lane/Far Lane from recurring, only that it might be reduced and the water should drain away more quickly. We also have cleaned our gully connections several times since then on request, but there have still been further complaints regarding flooding at this location.

20. In late 2013, we also installed a number of bollards and marker posts on the verges to prevent vehicles overriding verges and footways as this was occurring when water flooded the road and was raised as a safety issue by the Parish Council and Councillor Andrew Brown.
21. At this time, the Council has undertaken what works are within its power to undertake or enforce with private parties, but the overall problem that remains seems to be the capacity of Severn Trent Water's drainage system. This matter is being discussed with them by the Council's Flood Risk Manager, but there is no timescale as to when an improvement scheme might be undertaken by the company.

**C. Petition regarding resurfacing of Pye Hill Road, Jacksdale (Ref:2014/061)**

22. A petition containing 159 signatures was presented to the 27<sup>th</sup> February 2014 meeting of the County Council by Councillor Gail Turner. The petition requests the introduction of traffic calming and the resurfacing of the carriageway on Pye Hill Road, Jacksdale.
23. The environmental impact and noise created by traffic calming measures as well as limited support has led to traffic calming measures being introduced only where there has been an identified injury accident problem involving vulnerable road users.
24. On Pye Hill Road itself there were 5 collisions between the 1<sup>st</sup> February 2010 and the 30<sup>th</sup> September 2013 with one resulting in a serious injury.
25. However, the carriageway is in the resurfacing programme for 2014/15 and has been provisionally programmed to be undertaken in July.

**D. Petition regarding A60 crossroads on Loughborough Road, Costock (Ref:2014/063)**

26. A petition of 334 signatures was presented to County Council by Councillor Reg Adair on 27<sup>th</sup> February requesting traffic signals be installed at the junction of the A60 Loughborough Rd with Main St in Costock on safety grounds. The petition was initiated by Costock Parish Council and states that this request also has the support of the neighbouring parish councils in East Leake, Bunny, Bradmore, Wysall and Rempstone.
27. An evaluation of this junction has been carried out in conjunction with the Police following a recent fatal accident. The findings were that traffic signals are probably the only other possible improvement that remains as a future option given that refuge islands and central hatching markings have already been introduced. Traffic Signals would cost approximately £300,000.
28. Installing traffic signals does not necessarily mean there will be a marked reduction in accidents as traffic signals at crossroads junctions in Nottinghamshire have an average rate of 1.3 injury accidents a year. This is due to simply the nature of such junctions as even under signal control there would still be some residual accidents caused by red light violations and driver errors as well as other factors such as mechanical failures, physical/mental impairment, etc. which signals would be less likely to prevent. In the last 10 years there have been 12 accidents at this location, meaning that the junction's accident rate is 1.2 injury accidents a year, less than the countywide average for a similar signalled junction.

29. However, traffic signals may reduce the severity of the injuries which would occur. Based on that, some of the funding required may be justified on accident remedial grounds but further funding would be needed from other funding streams such as Section 106 Agreements from nearby developers. Consequently, the accident situation at the junction will be closely monitored and the request noted in case other funding streams become available in future.

**E Petition regarding the resurfacing of Upton Mount, Mansfield (Ref:2014/065)**

30. A petition of 110 signatures was presented to County Council by Councillor Darren Langton on 27th February requesting Upton Mount, Colwick Close and Blythe Close in Mansfield be resurfaced.
31. These roads have been identified previously as being in need of carriageway resurfacing. The last annual detailed inspection identified a number of actionable defects totalling approximately 10 square metres of repairs. Also, previous reactive inspections have brought similar results over a number of years.
32. These roads have not been selected for inclusion in the 2014/2015 Capital Resurfacing Programme as there were other roads judged to be in greater need. However, they will be considered again for the 2015/2016 Capital Resurfacing Programme and inspected in the meantime to ensure that any urgent defects are made safe. The future assessment will also take into account the number of signatures on this petition which indicates the roads' importance to the community.
33. The additional issues of through traffic and specific difficulties faced by elderly pedestrians subsequently raised by the petition organiser will be considered and responded to separately by the Highways Area Office.

**Reason for Recommendation**

34. To inform County Council of responses to issues raised in petitions presented to the County Council on 27<sup>th</sup> February 2014.

**Statutory and Policy Implications**

35. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of crime and disorder, finance, human resources, human rights, the NHS Constitution (Public Health only), the public sector equality duty, safeguarding of children and vulnerable adults, service users, sustainability and the environment and ways of working and where such implications are material they are described below. Appropriate consultation has been undertaken and advice sought on these issues as required.

**RECOMMENDATION/S**

It is RECOMMENDED that the contents and actions be noted.

**Report of the Chairman of the Transport & Highways Committee**

**For any enquiries about this report please contact:  
Peter Barker, Senior Administration Officer**

**Background Papers**

None

**Electoral Division(s)**

Soar Valley, Selston, Ruddington, Mansfield West.