

**ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS**

<b>1.</b>	<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Town Centres Economic Growth and Prosperity</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>6 February 2012</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Title:</b>	<b>Proposed Road Humps at Rother Crescent Treeton</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Directorate:</b>	<b>Environment and Development Services</b>

**5. Summary**

To inform Cabinet Member of an objection to the proposed scheme of road humps at Rother Crescent, Treeton

**6. Recommendations**

**Cabinet Member is asked to resolve that**

- i. the objection not be acceded to**
- ii. Jones Homes Ltd be authorised to install road humps on Rother Crescent, Treeton as shown on drawing No 126/17/TT162**
- iii. the correspondent be informed accordingly**

## **7. Proposals and Details**

As part of the Planning consent allowing Jones Homes to construct approximately 92 dwellings on land at the end of Rother Crescent, Treeton, Jones Homes Ltd were required to make various improvements to Rother Crescent to benefit existing residents, including the installation of road humps. The locations are shown on drawing No 126/17/TT162 attached as appendix A.

In accordance with statutory requirements for the installation of Road humps the proposals were advertised by notice on street and by letter to the affected premises.

One objection was received, a copy of which is attached as Appendix B. The objection refers to the hump located near 16 Rother Crescent. It questions the necessity of a hump in this location since there is another hump located further to the north near the junction with Wood Lane. The objection also raises issues relating to school run parking.

Rother Crescent splits into two near the location where the hump is proposed. Government guidance advises that where there is a system of humps in place, one hump should be situated near a junction with an adjoining road. In view of this a road hump is justified here.

Whilst we do have a programme to introduce no stopping restrictions onto zig-zag school keep clear markings, additional yellow line waiting restrictions in roads around schools are normally only introduced where parking would raise a road safety concern. The relatively low level of school related parking on Rother Crescent does not raise such a concern.

While concerns about inconsiderate parking during the school run are acknowledged, we would not usually consider introducing measures to control it such as waiting restrictions. Drivers are likely to ignore them when parking for short times particularly if they feel they are unlikely to be prosecuted. Furthermore they would have a detrimental affect on the on-street parking available to residents and their visitors outside school hours.

In view of this the objection should not be acceded to.

## **8. Finance**

The proposals will be fully financed and constructed by Jones Homes Ltd as part of an agreement entered in to under section 278 of the Highways Act 1980

## **9. Risks and Uncertainties**

None

## **10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications**

The proposals are in line with objectives set out in the South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan.

## **11. Background Papers and Consultation**

Appendix A – Drawing No 126/17/TT162

Appendix B – Copy of objection

**Contact Name :** *Simon Quarta, Assistant Engineer, Ext 54491*

[Simon.Quarta@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:Simon.Quarta@rotherham.gov.uk)