

REPORT AUDIT TRAIL				
REPORT TITLE – REPORT OF OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED ADDITIONAL ROAD HUMPS ON WINNEY HILL, HARTHILL.				
CONSULTATION <i>This is important as it shows that consultation has been undertaken in the preparation of the report and provides a quick reference point for specific comments, whilst the report will not be publishable if these areas have not been completed by the named persons below. You must liaise with and receive sign off from the relevant Cabinet Member(s).</i>				
Name/Position	Portfolio/Ward/ Directorate	Date Sent	Date Received	Comments in para:
Councillor Emma Hoddinott	Cabinet Member for Waste, Roads and Community Safety	17/02/21	17/02/21	'I am happy for the wider scheme to go ahead so the primary objective of reducing the speed of traffic is achieved'.
<i>Paul Woodcock</i>	Assistant Chief Executive/ Strategic Director for Regeneration and Environment	Click here to enter a date.	Click here to enter a date.	
<i>Richard Young,</i> Finance	Finance and Customer Services	17/02/21	24/02/21	6.1
<i>Stuart Fletcher,</i> Legal Services	Finance and Customer Services	17/02/21	24/02/21	7.1
<i>John Crutchley,</i> Human Resources	Assistant Chief Executive's Office	17/02/21	17/02/21	8.1
<i>Jo Kirk,</i> Procurement	Finance and Customer Services	17/02/21	24/02/21	6.2
<i>Steve Eling,</i> Equalities	Assistant Chief Executive's Office	17/02/21	23/02/21	Acknowledged Receipt 23/2/21
Antony Ashton	South Yorkshire Police Traffic Liaison Officer	13/01/20	14/01/20	4.1

<u>REPORT APPROVAL TRACKING</u>			
Equalities Your report will not be authorised for submission to Cabinet by your Strategic Director if you have not undertaken and included an initial equalities screening. All equalities analysis documents should be included as appendices	Initial Screening completed and included with report	YES	29/01/2021
	Full Assessment completed and included with report	No	Insert date agreed
Background information MANDATORY: Insert headings for a few main public documents you have used or referenced to write this report. This is a legal requirement. For Cabinet reports, <u>insert hyperlinks</u> . Do not list private documents.	Planning Application – Jones Homes Limited: RB2016/1227 LINK: https://rotherham.planportal.co.uk/?id=RB2016/1227		
Appendices If appendices are essential to the understanding of the report, list titles here. Equality Analysis documents should be listed as Appendix 1 for all reports. Ensure that appendices have proper titles.	Appendix 1 <i>Part A Initial Equality Screening Assessment</i> Appendix 2 Drawing No. 126/17/TT484.1a – Road Hump Positions Appendix 3 Drawing No. 11017-100-001C – General Arrangement		
Cabinet Member Approval You should retain an email confirming the Cabinet Member approval for your records. Strategic Directors should not authorise reports unless Cabinet Members have given sign off	YES/NO (delete as appropriate)	Click here to enter a date.	
Report Authorised by Strategic Director	YES/NO (delete as appropriate)	Click here to enter a date.	
Report Authorised for publication by Chief Executive	YES/NO (delete as appropriate)	Click here to enter a date.	

Delegated Officer Decision

Summary Sheet

Strategic Director Report

Report Title

Report of objections to proposed additional road humps on Winney Hill, Harthill.

Is this a Key Decision and has it been included on the Forward Plan?

No

Strategic Director Approving Submission of the Report:

Paul Woodcock, Strategic Director, Regeneration and Environment.

Report Author

Ian Shelton, Road Safety Engineer
01709 254404 or ian.shelton@rotherham.gov.uk

Ward(s) Affected

Wales

Report Summary

To consider receipt of objections to a proposal to introduce four 60mm high 7 metre long full width road humps (with channelled sides) along Winney Hill, Harthill. These are proposed as part of the Jones Homes housing development at the south west of the route and will replicate the existing humps that commence north of the scheme, outside property number 5 Winney Hill. These measures and their proposed positions are intended to improve compliance of the existing 30mph speed limit.

Recommendations

That the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment exercises his delegated powers and resolves that:

- a. The standing objections are not supported;
- b. The existing scheme be confirmed as proposed in this report;
- c. The Director of Legal Services is authorised to make the Order;
- d. The objectors be informed of the decision made and the reasons for that decision.

List of Appendices Included

Appendix 1 Part A Initial Equality Screening Assessment
Appendix 2 Drawing Number: 126/17/TT484.1a
Appendix 3 Drawing Number: 11017-100-001C

Background Papers

Planning application: RB2016/1227 Jones Homes Limited application to build 24 dwellings. The subsequent consent required the introduction of measures at Winney Hill to mitigate and slow traffic on that road.

Consideration by any other Council Committee, Scrutiny or Advisory Panel

Planning Board – 08 November 2018

(Consent for Jones Homes to construct dwellings - included a requirement to introduce measures to mitigate and slow traffic)

Council Approval Required

No

Exempt from the Press and Public

No

Title : Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found.

1.	Background
1.1	On 8 th November 2018 Jones Homes Limited received consent to construct 24 houses at a site situated to the south west of Winney Hill approximately 100 metres south of the Firvale junction, (<i>Planning Application: RB2016/1227</i>).
1.2	As part of this planning consent the Developer entered into an agreement under section 278, Highways Act 1980 to introduce measures at Winney Hill to mitigate and slow traffic on that road.
1.3	The proposals put forward include the introduction of four 60mm high, 7 metre long, full width road humps (with channelled sides) as identified on drawing no: 126/17/TT484.1a, see appendix 2.
1.4	Additionally, the 30mph limit will be extended further south and complimented by ‘dragon teeth’ road markings, red surfacing and a 30mph roundel marking to form a gateway effect. Shown on drawing no: 11017-100-001C, see appendix 3
1.5	The initial consultation on the provision of road humps was carried out during January 2020 with formal consultation undertaken in June 2020 (which was delayed due to the Covid 19 lockdown).
1.6	Following the statutory consultation period six objections were received.
2.	Key Issues
2.1	The planning consent included a requirement to provide measures to mitigate and slow traffic on Winney Hill.
3.	Options considered and recommended proposal
3.1	Option one: ‘Do nothing’. This is not considered appropriate due to the nature of the road and previous complaints relating to excessive speed; it is felt that the proposed traffic calming affords the most effective option and complements existing measures to the north of the route.
3.2	Option two: Progress the scheme consulted upon. Following consideration of the objections received as outlined below, it is recommended that the scheme be progressed. These proposals are shown in drawing 126/17/TT484.1a. (See Appendix 2).

4.	Consultation on proposal
4.1	South Yorkshire Police were consulted on the proposal and did not object.
4.2	In accordance with the Road Hump Notice procedure, a letter and plan explaining the scheme was delivered by hand to all properties adjacent to the restrictions on 15th January 2020. A revised letter and plan was delivered to adjacent properties on the 25th February 2020 following an amendment to one of the road hump proposed positions.
4.3	Statutory notices advertising the proposal were placed on street and in the local press on the 12th June 2020.
4.4	Ward 18 Wales, Elected Members were consulted about the initial proposals and Councillor Beck responded expressing a wish that the Parish Council suggestion to introduce a chicane system was explored and assessed further.
4.5	The consultation period ended on the 10th July 2020 and six objections were received.
4.6	Five of the objections received include concerns over noise generation from vehicles (particularly commercial and agricultural) travelling over the humps and three include concerns over emission & pollution increases.
4.7	<p>Other concerns expressed as the basis for objection are summarised below with officer comments:</p> <p><i>a) Proximity of property to proposed road hump.</i></p> <p>This relates to property number 70, Winney Hill which is a bungalow approximately 15 metres from the edge of carriageway.</p> <p><i>b) Suggests re-siting hump from o/s no. 70 to o/s No.68 or either side of allotments.</i></p> <p>The objector suggests re-site of the feature to outside number 68, this property is around 1.8 metres from the edge of carriageway. If the hump was re-sited to the allotments it would result in irregular spacing from the previous feature (approximately 140 metres).</p> <p><i>c) Assumption that there will be a loss of parking.</i></p> <p>There is no intention to introduce parking restrictions alongside the road</p>

humps.

d) Additional trip generation (resulting from the new development).

This would have been considered as part of the planning application process; a total of 24 dwellings are proposed and unlikely to add significantly to traffic levels.

e) Road humps proposed are ineffective in reducing speeds.

Vertical traffic calming measures are recognised as an effective speed reduction measure. The proposal is for 60mm high humps which are below the maximum height allowed but will offer a reasonable speed reduction effect balanced against the potential noise created from vehicles passing over more severe measures.

f) Potential trip hazard the hump might create for a partially sighted relative.

The features will be ramped to a maximum 60mm height over a 7 metre length and not likely to create a trip hazard.

g) Objection to four humps on the grounds that it is excessive.

Four humps will provide regular spacing between each feature, this assists drivers in maintaining a steady speed over each and helps to prevent acceleration and braking between the humps which can create added noise and pollution.

h) Parish Council did not consider road humps to be very effective in the rest of the village.

As per (e) above.

i) Parish Council feel this is an opportunity to create a long-term solution for the issues along this stretch of road and outside the school, but strongly feel that road humps are not the answer.

It is considered that the proposal is a proportionate long term solution to the issue. The consultation did not include the section of Winney Hill outside the school and this is already traffic calmed and should be considered separately.

j) The Parish Council also noted that the markings rub off, reducing visibility. This adds to the existing tendency for drivers to brake late as they approach the humps and then accelerate away afterwards.

This appears to be a maintenance issue; instances of worn road markings can be reported through the established channels and remedial action will be undertaken.

	<p><i>k) Due to the downhill gradient on Winney Hill the Parish Council strongly believes traffic needs to be slowed before it enters the village and that creating a stop/start for vehicles entering the village is the only way to change the current behaviour of drivers and has the added advantage of moving the noise and pollution outside the village.</i></p> <p>To complement the road humps the 30 mph speed limit will be extended further south and a 'gateway' feature will be included with dragons teeth markings, 30mph roundels and warning signs. Introducing a 'stop/start' (priority give way system) upon entering the village, at the speed limit change, would be likely to introduce shunt type collisions.</p>
4.8	<p>Many of the objectors included suggestions for alternative measures within the correspondence. These are summarised below, with officer comment:</p> <p><i>a) Roundabout on entry to the village.</i></p> <p>A roundabout would not be a suitable intervention and likely to impact on safety leading to an increase in collisions due to the adjoining section of road being of a rural nature and subject to the National Speed limit.</p> <p><i>b) Introduce 40mph limit and rumble strips before the start of 30mph limit.</i></p> <p>This is not required because the 30mph is proposed to be extended south. Rumble strips would not be suitable due to the noise created however 'dragon teeth' markings will be deployed.</p> <p><i>c) Suggestion to introduce three way stop signs at the development access.</i></p> <p>This would not be permissible under current regulations</p> <p><i>d) Suggestion to introduce 'traffic gate' at entry to village with priority give way and narrowing.</i></p> <p>The proposal will form a 'village gateway' at entry to the 30mph speed limit with 'dragons teeth' markings and 30mph roundels. A priority give way is not recommended and is likely to introduce shunt type collisions.</p> <p><i>e) Suggest that a maximum number of 3 humps installed only – one at the top of Winney Hill – on the approach to Harthill from Barlborough / Clowne, one at Fir Hill, and one at Crescent.</i></p> <p>This would not provide sufficient calming features over the length of Winney Hill and will result in traffic using the route at inappropriate speed and accelerating and braking between the road humps.</p>

	<p><i>f) Rumble strips suggested in advance of the road hump at Fir Hill.</i></p> <p>Rumble strips cannot be used this close to residences due to the noise that they create. The Department for Transport recommend a minimum distance of 300 metres from residential properties but local experience has indicated that a minimum of 400 metres is more appropriate.</p> <p><i>g) Extend the 30mph area south, to encourage traffic to start to slow earlier.</i></p> <p>The 30mph speed limit will be extended further south as suggested.</p> <p><i>h) Traffic needs to be slowed before it enters the village.</i></p> <p>See (g) above.</p> <p><i>i) Introduce Carriageway Narrowing in conjunction with a pedestrian refuge to slow traffic at the wider parts on Winney Hill.</i></p> <p>Carriageway narrowing and a pedestrian refuge would require the introduction of significant lengths of parking restrictions. This type of measure would be unlikely to result in a significant reduction in traffic speed.</p> <p><i>j) Consider the use of chicanes;</i></p> <p>Introducing chicanes would remove significant amounts of parking and lead to vehicles having to stop/start, increasing emissions and noise.</p> <p><i>k) To install a Pedestrian Crossing outside the school. The Parish Council requests that the site is re-surveyed and that the Road Safety Officer visit the school at opening and closing times on three separate occasions before the possibility of a Pedestrian Crossing is dismissed as part of this proposal.</i></p> <p>This matter is separate to the road hump consultation. The site was surveyed as a result of a previous request and did not meet the criteria.</p> <p><i>l) Introduce various additional signing including Vehicle Activated Sign (VAS) speed signs.</i></p> <p>Some additional signing will be included as part of the road hump installation. A Vehicle Activated Sign has recently been installed on Winney Hill adjacent to the allotments.</p>
4.9	<p>All objectors have been informed that at the close of the consultation period their objections will be reported to Sanderson Associates who are proposing the works as part of the housing development, and the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment where a decision on how to proceed will be</p>

	made. On conclusion the objectors will be notified of the outcome of these considerations.
4.10	A site meeting between Parish Council representatives and officers from the Councils Road Safety Team took place on the 4th November 2020. This meeting enabled those present to walk the route, discuss the proposed measures thoroughly and overcome any concerns regarding the traffic calming. As a result, the Parish Council responded in an email dated 7th December 2020 that they are still not wholeheartedly on board with the proposal they accept that there would appear to be little alternative. Providing the scheme was enacted in its entirety, with the package of measures suggested, they would be supportive of the proposed scheme.
4.11	The Parish also indicated that a request for a gated feature for the speed sign would be requested to enhance the “welcome” signage for approaching road users and that request has been received and is supported by the service. Consideration will be given to the precise details of this additional item in liaison with the Parish Council on completion of the project and will be dependent on funds being made available.
5.	Timetable and Accountability for Implementing this Decision
5.1	If the recommendation is endorsed, then objectors and residents will be informed of the decision as soon as possible. The road humps will be installed in advance of the first property within the Jones Homes development being occupied as set out in the Planning Application.
6.	Financial and Procurement Advice and Implications (to be written by the relevant Head of Finance and the Head of Procurement on behalf of s151 Officer)
6.1	The proposal costs of the additional road humps will be met by Jones Homes Ltd within the provisions of Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980, the speed sign feature is consistent with similar small measures (© £2k) delivered from the approved Highways Budget.
6.2	There are no procurement implications.
7.	Legal Advice and Implications (to be written by Legal Officer on behalf of Assistant Director Legal Services)
7.1	No issues.
8.	Human Resources Advice and Implications
8.1	There are no human resource implications arising from this report.

9.	Implications for Children and Young People and Vulnerable Adults
9.1	Lower vehicle speeds reduce the potential for collisions involving children, young people and vulnerable adults by shortening overall braking and stopping distances by vehicles.
10.	Equalities and Human Rights Advice and Implications
10.1	Reducing speeds can improve Road Safety through a reduction in injury collisions but can also improve people's perception of safety, thus removing major barriers to people walking or cycling. Lower speeds can improve a community's health and wellbeing through more active living, resulting in environmental improvements such as less air and noise pollution and safer, healthier neighbourhoods.
11.	Implications for Ward Priorities
11.1	None
12.	Implications for Partners
12.1	None
13.	Risks and Mitigation
13.1.	If traffic calming measures are not implemented the current Planning Conditions associated with the Jones Homes development on Winney Hill will not be met
14.	Accountable Officers
	Ian Shelton, Road Safety Engineer
	Andrew Moss, Interim Head of Transport Infrastructure

Approvals obtained on behalf of Statutory Officers:-

	Named Officer	Date
Chief Executive	Sharon Kemp	Click here to enter a date.
Strategic Director of Finance & Customer Services (S.151 Officer)	Named officer	Click here to enter a date.
Head of Legal Services (Monitoring Officer)	Named officer	Click here to enter a date.

Report Author:

Ian Shelton, Road Safety Engineer

01709 254404 or ian.shelton@rotherham.gov.uk