

09 January 2020**Agenda item:12****REPORT OF CORPORATE DIRECTOR, PLACE****THE NOTTINGHAMSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (SHERBROOK ROAD,
DAYBROOK) TRAFFIC CALMING SCHEME****CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS****Purpose of the Report**

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

Information

2. Sherbrook Road is a link between two main distributors, the A60 Mansfield Road and the B6004 Oxclose Lane. There are several properties, some local shops, including a post office, a secondary school and three business centres. The speed limit is 30mph along the whole length of the road. At both ends of the road there are traffic restrictions: a 'No Entry' at the western end and a 'Turn Left' at the eastern end. The section between the junction with Sherbrook Terrace and Prior Road is currently a bus route. The Arnold Fire Station is less than 200m away from Sherbrook Road. Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust and the Oxclose Lane Police Station are within 1km distance. Both sides of the carriageway are used for on-road parking, significantly reducing the road width and causing 'give and take' situations at some points.
3. Given its location, Sherbrook Road provides a convenient shortcut to avoid congestion on Mansfield Road. This causes an increase in the volume of traffic on Sherbrook Road to a level that is considered unsuitable for this type of road.
4. Sherbrook Road has been subject to an accident investigation by Via East Midlands and the result was that during the period between 1/1/13 and 31/10/17 a total of 4 road injury accidents were recorded by the police. All the collisions were classified as serious and involved vulnerable road users. In particular, three of them involved powered two-wheeler vehicles and the other involved a child pedestrian. Three of the collisions occurred near the shops opposite Prior Road. The accident investigation report recommended the installation of road humps on Sherbrook Road.
5. As a result of the accident investigation report's recommendation, it is proposed to introduce 6 No. modified round top (sinusoidal) road humps on Sherbrook Road. These would be 75mm high and 4m long and their sinusoidal profile would make them suitable for buses and large vehicles. The proposals are detailed on the attached drawing EMD/HW30042/01.

Responses Received

6. In order to achieve prompt implementation, the two phases of the standard consultation process, as defined by the Nottinghamshire County Council Traffic Calming Design Guide, have been merged together to a single-phase consultation including both the “initial consultation” with affected frontages and the “formal consultation” with the public and external organisations. All the local residents and businesses on Sherbrook Road received a questionnaire requesting their views on the proposals, together with an explanatory letter, a plan showing the proposed locations of the humps, and a notice. At the same time, all statutory consultees were consulted, notices were posted in the area, the proposals were advertised on the internet, and a notice was placed in the local press, in accordance with the Highways Act 1980. The consultation took place from 05/08/19 to 27/08/19.
7. A total of 255 questionnaires were delivered to the local residents and businesses. The number of questionnaires returned was 71 (27.8 %), of which:
 - In favour: 56 (78.9%)
 - Not in favour: 13 (18.3%)
 - Indifferent: 2 (2.8%)In addition to that, we received 2 comments by email from residents concerned about the proposals. No responses were received from the other statutory consultees.
8. This consultation response did not meet the threshold of 35% returned questionnaires set by the Nottinghamshire County Council Traffic Calming Design Guide for schemes to be implemented on environmental grounds. However, given that the scheme is being promoted on accident reduction grounds, it is considered appropriate to progress further with the proposals, hence this report.

Comments

9. The objecting comments received during the consultation can be grouped in relation to:
 - Damage to vehicles
 - Irresponsible road use
 - Environmental impact
 - Noise
 - Effectiveness in reducing accidents
 - Evidence of accidents
 - Impact on large vehicles
 - Preferred alternatives
 - Cost-effectiveness
 - Motorbikes
10. Damage to vehicles – Four residents are concerned that the road humps will cause damage to vehicles.
11. Irresponsible road use – Three residents suggested that the road humps would encourage fast drivers to drive irresponsibly. Another resident stated that road humps would only affect responsible drivers and would not slow fast drivers down.
12. Environmental impact – One resident objected to the proposals saying that the road humps would increase pollution due to slowing and accelerating of vehicles.

13. Noise – Three residents raised concerns relating to noise caused by vehicles driving over the road humps, especially HGVs. One of them was concerned particularly about the road hump close to the entrance to the business unit, saying that this would cause a high increase of noise levels due to the frequent transit of HGVs in and out the business unit. They added also that it is not necessary to have a road hump at that location because the majority of the accidents occurred in other locations.
14. Effectiveness in reducing accidents – Two residents stated there is no evidence that road humps reduce the number of accidents. One of them suggested that the accidents occurred on Sherbrook Road were caused by the inconsiderate parking around the post office, which will not improve after the installation of the road humps.
15. Evidence of accidents – Three residents stated that they consider there was insufficient evidence of accidents along the road to justify road humps.
16. Impact on large vehicles – Three residents raised the potential negative impact on buses, emergency vehicles and HGVs driving along the road.
17. Preferred alternatives – Three residents suggested the need to consider the introduction of a 20mph speed limit as a more effective and less disruptive alternative solution, one of them also suggesting the installation of an interactive speed sign.
18. Cost-effectiveness – One resident considers road humps to be not worth as they cause more problems than benefits. Another resident suggested that the money to build the road humps would be better spent for maintaining the road.
19. Motorbikes – One resident stated that the road humps would not slow motorbikes down as they can easily drive around them

Responses

20. Damage to vehicles – The nature, dimensions and location of the proposed road humps is in accordance with the national specifications set out in the Highways (Road Humps) Regulations 1999 (SI 1999/1025). As such, the proposed humps should present no greater risk of damage to vehicles than other road humps nationally.
21. Irresponsible road use – The impact of the road humps is anticipated to discourage irresponsible road use by reducing vehicle speeds.
22. Environmental impacts – The number of humps, their visibility and the 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.
23. Noise – The profile of the humps is designed to minimise the effect of the ride over the hump. These design measures seek to minimise noise and vibration impacts associated with a humped crossing.
24. Effectiveness in reducing accidents – Traffic calming is a proven technique for effecting road accident casualty reduction and to alleviate problems caused by excessive speed. The Nottinghamshire County Council has had wide experience with traffic calming by vertical

deflection, since the early 1990s. These road hump schemes were monitored over the years and have been found to be successful in reducing casualties.

25. Evidence of accidents – During the period between 1/1/13 and 31/10/17 a total of 4 road injury accidents were recorded by the police. Each of them were classified as serious and involved vulnerable road users.
26. Impact on large vehicles – Emergency services, bus operators and local businesses were included in the consultation process. No objection or comment relating to impact on access has been received from those organisations.
27. 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 Sherbrook Road. Whilst road humps have a physical influence on drivers, interactive speed signs and 20mph speed limit rely only on driver compliance and have proven to be less effective than road humps in casualty reduction situations such as this.
28. Cost-effectiveness – From the collision monitoring carried out by Via East Midlands, road humps have been found to be effective in reducing casualties and have been proven to be one of the best all-round casualty reduction treatments. This scheme achieves a significant anticipated cost benefit.
29. Motorbikes – Sinusoidal profile humps are as wide as the carriageway, apart for 200mm gap at each side to not affect the surface water drainage of the road. Vehicles would not be able to by-pass them.

Other Options Considered

30. The following options have been considered:
 - a. The use of speed cushions was considered but it was discounted as these do not affect the travel speed of powered two-wheeler vehicles.
 - b. The use of standard round top road humps was considered but it was discounted as these are not suitable for bus routes.
 - c. The use of horizontal traffic calming, i.e. chicanes and central refuges, was considered but it was discounted as they are not as effective as road humps and they have a negative impact on parking.
 - d. The utilisation of speed cameras was considered but it was discounted as it does not meet the required criteria set by Government guidelines.
 - e. The use of a 20mph speed limit was considered but was discounted as it would be unlikely to achieve an appropriate level of compliance without physical measures (such as road humps) being installed anyway.

Comments from Local Members

31. County Councillors John Clarke and Muriel Weisz, Members for Arnold South, were informed about the proposal at feasibility stage and were subsequently consulted. Cllr John Clarke did

not provide any comment. Cllr Muriel Weisz responded with a resident's view, but she has no specific view on this scheme.

Reasons for Recommendations

32. The proposed scheme is considered the most appropriate means of reducing traffic speed and therefore reducing road traffic collisions and corresponding injuries occurring along the route.

Statutory and Policy Implications

33. 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

34. Nottinghamshire Police raised no objections to the proposals.

Financial Implications

35. The Scheme is funded from the 2019/20 Safety Improvements (Integrated Transport Measures) at an anticipated cost of £45,000.

Human Rights Implications

36. 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

38. 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.

39. 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.

40. 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

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

Implications for Sustainability and the Environment

42. 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 traffic calming measures proposed for Sherbrook Road, Daybrook be implemented as proposed.

Adrian Smith
Corporate Director – Place

Name and Title of Report Author
Cathy Gillespie – Team Manager (Environmental Management and Design)

For any enquiries about this report please contact:
Dave Collins – Principal Project Engineer – Tel 0115 9774460

Constitutional Comments (SJE 04/12/2019)

43. This decision falls within the Terms of Reference of the Communities & Place Committee to whom responsibility for the exercise of the Authority's functions relating to the planning, management and maintenance of highways (including traffic management) has been delegated.

Financial Comments (GB 2/12/2019)

44. The estimated cost to implement the works outlined in this report is £45,000. This will be funded from the 2019/20 Integrated Transport Measures capital budget which totals £7.1m and is already approved as part of the Communities and Place capital budget.

Background Papers and Published Documents

- 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.
- A drawing of the proposed traffic calming scheme is attached to the report.
- Equality Impact Assessment of Sherbrook Road, Arnold – Traffic Calming scheme is attached to the report.

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

Arnold South	Councillor John Clarke
Arnold South	Councillor Muriel Weisz