

## Delegated Officer Decision

---

### Summary Sheet

#### Report Title

TRO Consultation Update: Proposed implementation of road humps at Racecourse Road, Swinton.

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

No, but it has been included on the Forward Plan

#### Officer Approving Submission of the Report

Simon Moss, Assistant Director, Regeneration and Environment

#### Report Author

Ian Shelton, Road Safety Engineer  
01709 254404 or [ian.shelton@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:ian.shelton@rotherham.gov.uk)

#### Ward(s) Affected

Swinton Rockingham

#### Report Summary

To provide an update on the consultations regarding the implementation of traffic calming (road humps) at Racecourse Road, Swinton. This location was suggested as part of the Local Neighbourhood and Road Safety Scheme programme. Formal consultation and press advertisement took place from the 7<sup>th</sup> August and concluded on the 15<sup>th</sup> September 2023.

#### Recommendations

That the Assistant Director of Regeneration & Environment exercises his delegated powers and approves in principle the proposals shown on drawing number 122/21640/HT/02 and gives authority that:

1. The objections received are not supported.
2. The existing scheme is confirmed as shown on drawing numbered: 122/21640/HT/02 attached as Appendix 1 are implemented.
3. Residents are informed of the decision to implement the road humps as advertised.

## **List of Appendices Included**

Appendix 1 Drawing No. 122/21640/HT/02  
Appendix 2 Residents Consultation Letter  
Appendix 3 Carbon Impact Assessment  
Appendix 4 Part A Initial Equality Screening Assessment

## **Background Papers**

The scheme was reported to Cabinet Members on 19<sup>th</sup> December 2022, and delegated approval was given to enter Local Neighbourhood & Road Safety Schemes into the Capital Programme Transportation Capital Investment Programme (11<sup>th</sup> May 2023)

## **Consideration by any other Council Committee, Scrutiny or Advisory Panel**

Cabinet – 19 December 2022

## **Council Approval Required**

No

## **Exempt from the Press and Public**

No

**Title:** TRO Consultation Update: Proposed implementation of road humps at Racecourse Road, Swinton.

**TRO Consultation Update:** Proposed implementation of road humps at Racecourse Road, Swinton.

<b>1.</b>	<b>Background</b>								
1.1	<p>The scheme has been developed following a suggestion made to the Local Neighbourhood and Road Safety Scheme fund to reduce the speed of traffic travelling along Racecourse Road, Swinton. It proposes a series of road humps (8 in total) along the full length of Racecourse Road.</p> <p>The indicative positions of the road humps are indicated on the location plan Drawing Number: 122/21640/HT/02.</p> <p><b><u>Information</u></b></p> <p>A traffic speed survey was undertaken to establish speeds of vehicles travelling on Racecourse Road. The results can be summarised as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="375 887 1294 1146"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="375 887 592 1048"><i>Location</i></th> <th data-bbox="592 887 767 1048"><i>Mean Speed</i></th> <th data-bbox="767 887 963 1048"><i>85%ile</i></th> <th data-bbox="963 887 1294 1048"><i>Traffic Volume (7x day average/both directions)</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 1048 592 1146">Racecourse Road</td> <td data-bbox="592 1048 767 1146">31.1mph</td> <td data-bbox="767 1048 963 1146">36.7mph</td> <td data-bbox="963 1048 1294 1146">3,313</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>In the previous three years two injury collisions have been recorded by the police within the scheme area. Both resulted in slight injury, one of which involved speed as a contributory factor.</p> <p><b>Benefits of traffic calming</b></p> <p>There is clear evidence of the effect of reducing traffic speeds on the reduction of collisions and casualties, as collision frequency is less at lower speeds, and where collisions do occur, there is a reduced risk of fatal and serious injury. Research shows that generally for every 1 mph reduction in average speed, collision frequency reduces by as much as 5% (Taylor, Lynam and Baruya, 2000). It is anticipated that the installation of road humps here will significantly reduce overall speeds and therefore reduce the likelihood of collisions and any collisions that do occur are expected to have a lower injury severity. Typical collision reduction levels for the introduction of flat top road humps are reported at 66% over a range of similar schemes (TMS, Practical Road Safety Auditing 2001).</p>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Mean Speed</i>	<i>85%ile</i>	<i>Traffic Volume (7x day average/both directions)</i>	Racecourse Road	31.1mph	36.7mph	3,313
<i>Location</i>	<i>Mean Speed</i>	<i>85%ile</i>	<i>Traffic Volume (7x day average/both directions)</i>						
Racecourse Road	31.1mph	36.7mph	3,313						
<b>2.</b>	<b>Key Issues</b>								

2.1	Several comments, observations and objections to the proposed road humps were received following both informal and formal consultations with 413 households in the area. Details of these are contained in <b>Section 4.2</b> and includes responses received at both the formal and informal consultation stages.					
2.2	Initially an informal consultation took place with 145 households in the vicinity of the road humps. The formal consultation followed on and was expanded to include households on adjoining roads in the immediate vicinity.					
2.3	Lower speeds are shown to either; lower the number of collisions or injury severity and, reduce the likelihood further of injury collisions occurring.					
3.	<b>Options considered and recommended proposal</b>					
3.1	Following the receipt of a submission to the Local Neighbourhood and Road Safety Schemes programme by Elected Members, to provide measures to reduce traffic speeds and improve road safety at Racecourse Road.					
3.2	Traffic and speed surveys have been undertaken and revealed that the speed which 85% of traffic was travelling along Racecourse Road was in excess of police prosecution limits and unacceptably high in a residential area.					
3.3	Alternative traffic calming interventions such as priority working, and kerb build outs were considered. However, these are limited in their effectiveness at reducing traffic speeds at all times of the day. At quieter times vehicles can 'race' to get through the features rather than give way reducing any safety benefits. Additionally, the instances of queuing can cause unnecessary vehicle emissions because of repeated vehicle stop/starts. The road does not meet the criteria for a permanent safety camera site to be installed.					
4.	<b>Consultation on proposal</b>					
4.1	<p>Formal consultations commenced on the 7<sup>th</sup> August 2023, with a copy of the road hump notice placed in the Advertiser and on street. Additionally, 413 letters were distributed to Racecourse Road residents and those in the wider vicinity. In total thirty responses from both consultations were received. Twenty responses supported the proposal and there were seven objections. Three were duplications of comments made at the informal consultation and reiterated at the formal stage.</p> <p>A summary of the seven objections received (from the informal and formal consultation) are included in <b>Section 4.2</b>.</p>					
4.2	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Objection Details</th> <th>Response</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> <p>1. Objection from a resident of Racecourse Road:</p> <p><i>To whom it may concern,</i></p> </td> <td> <p>The situation regarding parking is not changed because of the installation of road</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Objection Details	Response	<p>1. Objection from a resident of Racecourse Road:</p> <p><i>To whom it may concern,</i></p>	<p>The situation regarding parking is not changed because of the installation of road</p>	
Objection Details	Response					
<p>1. Objection from a resident of Racecourse Road:</p> <p><i>To whom it may concern,</i></p>	<p>The situation regarding parking is not changed because of the installation of road</p>					

<p><i>I received the letter regarding the proposed humps on Racecourse Road Swinton on Saturday 17th June and would like to raise my objections.</i></p> <p><i>First of all, the installation of these humps will mean that there will be a build up of traffic outside my property as they will be slowing down and taking in turns to pass over the hump due to park cars on the road. The street is already bad for parked cars and adding humps to the road will make it mayhem for the residents.</i></p> <p><i>Furthermore, the build-up in traffic will make it extremely hard for us residents to get off our driveways.</i></p> <p><i>In addition to a build up of traffic this will increase the noise pollution outside my property as well as a build-up of car emissions. This is something that myself and neighbours do not want.</i></p> <p><i>This is also a waste of tax-payers money as the road has not had any accidents for as far as I can remember. There are plenty of other streets such as Sandygate where there's a higher number of incidents. Speed humps also are in inconvenience to the residents as they damage vehicles meaning that residents may take alternative routes down Romwood Avenue to get to either Swinton or Wath.</i></p> <p><i>Speed humps are also outdated and not aesthetically pleasing which could be a problem for this beautiful street.</i></p> <p><i>Further to this, the speed humps could cause distress to grieving families as they will need to go over the humps to get to the local church.</i></p> <p><i>Can you answer me the following;</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. How much is this project costing the tax-payer?</i></li> <li><i>2. Have other avenues being looked into? (for example; looking at painting the road to make it look narrower).</i></li> <li><i>3. When is the last date to raise objections?</i></li> <li><i>4. Is the Council going to actually consider the objections?</i></li> <li><i>5. If we are still in the objection stage then why are there yellow do not park cones on the street? (where they have not managed to lay them all down due to parked cars so it has gaps).</i></li> <li><i>6. Will this be going to a planning meeting and will residents be informed?</i></li> </ol> <p><i>Please can you listen to the residents as you are not the ones that have to live on the street.</i></p> <p><i>Please come out and speak with us and observe the parking issue not in working hours.</i></p> <p><i>Please see the attached images outside my house where the proposed humps will be going.</i></p> <p><i>You will be able to see parked cars that will continue to park there making it difficult for traffic to pass. (Pictures taken on different days).</i></p>	<p>humps, with give and take only necessary if there is insufficient space for opposing traffic to pass. The seven-day average of traffic volumes is 3,313 vehicles, (at the time of the survey in May 2022).</p> <p>At the busiest period 304 vehicles were recorded in a one-hour period, which is around one vehicle every 12 seconds. The traffic levels here are not exceptional compared to some other residential roads. There should be ample opportunity for drivers to emerge from driveways. Additionally, the slower speed of traffic using the road rather than create 'mayhem' will make the road safer for all users.</p> <p>The consultation also included a nearby funeral directors following the comment that road humps could cause distress to grieving families as they will need to go over the road humps to get to the local church. No response from them to the proposal was received.</p> <p>The objector has been contacted to answer the questions posed in their objection.</p> <p>Officers have observed parking outside normal working hours on the road and no obstruction of the carriageway was observed although several vehicles were parked partially on the footways, these appeared to be residents' vehicles and</p>
--	--



present on more than one occasion.

**2. Objection from a resident of Racecourse Road:**

Dear Sir,

Just to confirm, we are not in favour of the proposed road humps. A few years ago there did seem to be a problem with speeding cars, particularly late at night, but, it doesn't seem to be as regular now. (Maybe they have 'grown up' & moved on.)

We are not in favour of the road humps as we feel that all that live on the road will have the 'inconvenience' of these humps every trip, every day of the week, every month, every year and any speeding motorist will just move on to just another road. The drivers are the problem - not the road.

Could we not have more signs that light up & show the speed instead.

We feel the proposed number of humps is excessive & must be very costly, where money could be spent better elsewhere.

Also, thinking of air quality, this will drop, due to vehicles slowing down to the speedbumps then speeding up between each bump 8 times just on our road alone. We hope you take these points into consideration.

In respect of vehicle activated signs these have been deployed on the road previously and had limited effect. The speeds are such that the only effective treatment would be physical traffic calming measures. The air quality issue is commented upon below.

**3. Objection from a resident of Racecourse Road:**

*I Wish to raise a formal objection to the above proposed Road humps which will be adjacent to our property. You state in your letter that the proposed humps will not be obstructing drive ways, or access. But I would like to bring to your attention that we have a full property width access to our property. These humps would make it extremely difficult manoeuvring on and off*

The humps proposed are 75mm height with long lead in tapers to provide a 1:15 gradient and would not create problems accessing the driveway in any

	<p><i>our drive, more so in treacherous weather conditions ie snow and ice. Our concerns that these humps will decrease our property value and create noise pollution, due to vehicles accelerating from the humps in the road, especially with vehicles that have modified exhaust systems., particularly in the evenings, through the night and early morning. Our other concerns are that during bad weather the gritter will have difficulty and will not be as effective therefore having difficulty leaving our drive. We also have concerns with the parking, as it will create a funnel neck near the humps for passing vehicles. This in turn could cause more accidents with vehicles having less space and being impatient due to having to do this multiple times along Racecourse Road.</i></p> <p>Further from resident in response to formal consultation:</p> <p><i>With response to your correspondence dated 7th August 2023, regrading the formal consultation of the traffic calming features of proposed road humps.</i></p> <p><i>We are formally objecting to these road humps because it will increase the noise pollution to our property, as vehicles negotiating these proposed restrictions will be breaking and accelerating from the humps on the road outside our property. Especially with vehicles that have modified exhausts, particularly in the evenings, through the night and early mornings. This noise pollution will particularly affect our house hold as we all work multiple shift patterns. This will continue throughout the course of the length of Racecourse Road of the 8 proposed hump restrictions, making this noise relentless.</i></p> <p><i>Would it be more affective that a permanent speed camera system situated at the top of Racecourse Road, would eliminate speeding on this stretch of road, and bring a source of income to RMBC, rather than spending a vast amount of Council Tax Funds, in a challenging financial climate.</i></p>	<p>weather conditions. There should be no increase in acceleration or noise pollution from vehicles traversing them. Vehicle speeds will be lower generally coupled with a decrease in the likelihood of collisions should be a positive feature. Gritting operations will not be adversely affected by these features. Parking will not be 'funnelled' because of the installation and the likelihood of collisions should be reduced, not increased (1mph speed limit reduction equates to around a 5% decrease in collisions). The road does not meet the criteria for deployment of a permanent speed camera, and in any case, this would not prevent speeding on the full length of the road in both directions.</p>
	<p>4. Objection received with no address details:</p> <p><i>I am writing to object to the proposed humps on Racecourse Road, Rotherham. 1. How can anyone get speed up on that road, it's like driving up and down a slalom with all the cars parked on the road, it's not only Racecourse Road, just look at Darwynn Avenue, Romwood Avenue and Rig Drive, if there was a house fire, the property would be gutted before the Fire Engine could get to it. 2. If the humps are put on Racecourse Road where will all these cars go that can no longer get parked up? Outside other people's houses causing even more chaos, obstructing driveways, or parking on other roads nearby. Darwynn Avenue has its own problems with road parking which has not been addressed, the residents at No 4. park their cars so close to the junction of Darwynn Avenue and Romwood Avenue, it's a wonder that an accident hasn't happened, as you turn onto Darwynn Avenue you have to immediately go onto the wrong side of the road along a mini van thats parked on the drive and over half of the pavement. 3. The Road bumps don't always slow down the larger vehicles 4. The humps knock out the alignment of wheels and tracking. 5 They cause more pollutants with the cars slowing down to negotiate the bumps and more noise as the cars rev the engine to get over the</i></p>	<p>Comments on points raised: 1. Speed survey show mean = 31.1mph 85%ile =36.4mph at Racecourse Road. We have not received any complaint from the fire service regarding obstruction but they have been consulted and raised no objection. 2. Parking restrictions are not included in the proposal so parking would not be affected. 3. Road humps proposed all full width with tapered sides and would slow the speed of all traffic types. 4. The hump dimensions are 75mm high with a ramp lead in on approach</p>

	<p><i>bumps. 6. Large vehicles going over the bumps, Racecourse Road is on a bus route, can destroy the substructure of the road and damage walls and buildings. 7. Drivers currently park, half on the road half on the pavement, making it difficult for PushChairs and Mobility Scooters to get past and having to go on the Road to pass, if they park against the bumps, will make it even harder to pass.</i></p>	<p>that gives a 1:15 gradient which is not severe and would only potentially damage vehicles if they travelled over the measures at speeds well over the posted limit. 5. The proposed humps would slow traffic and steady traverse of the humps is unlikely to create additional pollution, no revving will be required to get over the humps. 6. The construction of road humps will look at the existing road structure to ensure it is sufficiently sound and make any identified repairs required. Properties on the road are set well back from the carriageway and no structural damage is likely as a result of the addition of road humps. 7. Reports of unnecessary obstructions and driving on the footway are matters for police enforcement. This proposal would not make the situation worse for mobility impaired and those pedestrians with pushchairs.</p>
	<p>5. Objection received from a resident of Darwynn Avenue:</p> <p><i>The caller has found out that there are planned works to install speed pumps on Racecourse Road but she says that only the properties along that road have been written to, the neighbouring streets (hers runs parallel) have not been contacted. she is unhappy that there has been no consultation and feels that the speed bumps may have implications as this is on an 'ambulance run'. she is not happy that she has not received a letter and possibly unhappy with regard to the speed bumps.</i></p>	<p>Informal consultation undertaken with frontages on Racecourse Road only. This address is a parallel side road and was included in the formal consultation process. The ambulance service was consulted on the proposal to install road humps and no objections were received.</p>
	<p>6. Objection received from a resident of Wath Wood Road:</p>	



	<p><i>I am aware you are now formally consulting on the proposed speed bumps for Racecourse Road.</i></p> <p><i>We live close to the top of Racecourse Road, on Wath Wood Road, use Racecourse Road daily to access activities, visit friends living on the road and travel away via Golden Smithies Road and have some observations to add to your deliberations.</i></p> <p><i>Please put double yellow parking restrictions at the top of Racecourse Road for some distance, on both sides and at each speed bump on the road. In term time many parents park very close to the top of Racecourse Rd awaiting collection of children from St Pius school. At this time of day the junction is very busy and, with added speed bumps, driving it will become really difficult.</i></p> <p><i>If you allow parking on the speed bumps - and many will rather than walk a few yards to a property! - then it becomes really difficult to drive over them safely, especially if people park on both sides which is likely to happen as Racecourse is a wider road. Perhaps prevent parking on at least one side of each bump, alternating up/down the road?</i></p> <p><i>On a wider matter of traffic speeds, while Racecourse Rd is to get traffic calming measures, when will the Council again address the repeated breaches of the 30mph limit on Wath Wood Road, by bikes, cars and lorries?! Traffic calming measures such as speed bumps are not appropriate on that road, so what other measures - speed cameras, regular police enforcement campaigns, 30mph stickers for our refuse bins....ANYTHING! - can the Council consider and implement to reduce the speeds, especially at night please? I fully understand the Council does not consider the road poses a significant risk of accidents, but prevention is better than the alternative and there is also the aspect of noise and disturbance from increasing numbers of unsilenced bikes at speed, roughly tuned cars and many large lorries, all exceeding speed limits, increasingly at night.</i></p>	<p>Requests that waiting restrictions are included in the proposal. These are not considered necessary to implement the scheme and would create additional problems for resident parking. In respect of the other matters raised, the resident has been advised separately on reporting these issues.</p>
	<p>7. Objection received from a resident of Romwood Avenue.</p> <p><i>I would like to object to the proposal because I live on Romwood Avenue and frequently drive along Racecourse Road. For people with chronic pain issues, driving over repeated speed humps is excruciatingly painful and I'm sure that people not affected will be unaware just how painful it is, however slowly they are driven over. It is already torture driving to Cottonwood Retail Park from Swinton, without humps on Racecourse road as well.</i></p> <p><i>The answer to this in my view is speed cameras that work at all times and issue a fine to every selfish driver each time they break the speed limit and put the local community at risk. I assume this would bring in a reasonable sum of money over time and cameras might cost less than speed humps to install. I really would prefer my council tax not to be used incurring costs for speed humps as a deterrent to speeding drivers.</i></p>	<p>The proposed road humps are relatively mild in nature, with dimensions as previously stated, to minimise discomfort to vehicle occupants whilst still effectively reducing speed. The road does not meet the criteria for deployment of a permanent speed camera, and in any case, this would not prevent speeding on the full length of the road in both directions.</p>

	<p>Several consultation responses commented on increased vehicle emissions and air quality. Recent research on this subject is included for information:</p> <p><u><i>Living streets.org:</i></u></p> <p><i>Air pollution hotspots arise from high volumes of traffic on major routes, not traffic-calmed neighbourhoods.</i></p> <p><i>The evidence that removing speed bumps will reduce air pollution is very weak. In fact, guidelines from NICE – the National Institute For Health and Clinical Excellence – released in June this year says the evidence does not back up removing speed bumps to lower air pollution.</i></p> <p><i>Removing speed bumps would at best do little or nothing to improve air quality.</i></p> <p><i>At worst it would endanger lives.</i></p> <p><u><i>Transport Research Laboratory Report 307: Traffic calming and Vehicle emissions:</i></u></p> <p><i>A review of previous case studies led to the conclusion that there is only limited agreement on the effects of traffic calming on vehicle emissions. The area-wide studies reviewed showed a decrease in NOx emissions as a result of calming. However, these studies were less conclusive in terms of the changes in emissions of CO and HC.</i></p>
4.3	Ward Councillors for Swinton Rockingham, including the Cabinet Member for Transport & Environment were consulted, and have no objections to the proposal.
4.4	South Yorkshire Police have been formally consulted and raised no objections.
4.5	The usual statutory consultations have been undertaken. No adverse comments were received.
5.	<b>Timetable and Accountability for Implementing this Decision</b>
5.1	If the recommendations are endorsed, then the scheme will be continued as per the drawing contained in <b>Appendix 1</b> ; with the traffic calming improvements implemented.
6.	<b>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)</b>
6.1	It is intended that the costs for drawing up relevant notices and consultation arrangements and the cost of providing the road humps, road markings and associated signing will be met from the Council's Transport Capital Programme (reported to Cabinet on the 24th April 2023, item 157 refers) The estimated total cost for the project is £75,000 which is within the available budget.

6.2	There are no direct procurement implications associated with this recommendation, however, if implemented, the engagement of external contractors to undertake the purchase and installation of the road humps, markings and signage, must be procured in compliance with the Council's Financial and Procurement Procedure Rules.
7.	<b>Legal Advice and Implications (to be written by Legal Officer on behalf of Assistant Director Legal Services)</b>
7.1	The procedure outlined in: The Highways (Road Humps) Regulations 1999 was followed, and road hump notices advertised in both the press and on street as required.
8.	<b>Human Resources Advice and Implications</b>
8.1	There are no direct human resources implications arising from the recommendations in this report.
9.	<b>Implications for Children and Young People and Vulnerable Adults</b>
9.1	Lower vehicle speeds should reduce the potential for collisions involving children, young people and vulnerable adults by shortening overall braking and stopping distances by vehicles. This in turn will reduce the likelihood of reported personal injury collisions on the highway for people within these groups.
10.	<b>Equalities and Human Rights Advice and Implications</b>
10.1	Reducing speeds in neighbourhoods 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 speed limits 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.	<b>Implications for Ward Priorities</b>
11.1	This proposal has been developed through engagement with Ward Members to address local ward priorities. Elected Members were asked for proposals in order to develop schemes for assessment.
12.	<b>Implications for Partners</b>
12.1	A reduction in the number of road traffic collisions will reduce pressure on the Emergency Service and Health Services, together with reducing the trauma on responders attending serious road traffic collisions.
13.	<b>Risks and Mitigation</b>

13.1.	There is a risk that residents on adjoining roads may consider that traffic will migrate to other unclassified roads adjoining Racecourse Road. This is unlikely, and it is expected that traffic will choose to use the A633 Wath Wood Road/Warren Vale Road and A6022 Rockingham Road. This would form part of the normal road safety monitoring process and be subject to available funds should any additional work be identified as necessary.
<b>14.</b>	<b>Accountable Officers</b>
	Ian Shelton, Road Safety Engineer
	Andrew Lee, Group Lead, Local Traffic and Road Safety Schemes

Approvals obtained on behalf of Statutory Officers:-

	<b>Named Officer</b>	<b>Date</b>
Chief Executive	Sharon Kemp	Click here to enter a date.
Strategic Director of Finance & Customer Services (S.151 Officer)	Judith Badger	Click here to enter a date.
Head of Legal Services (Monitoring Officer)	Bal Nahal	Click here to enter a date.

*Report Author: Ian Shelton, Road Safety Engineer  
01709 254404 or [ian.shelton@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:ian.shelton@rotherham.gov.uk)*