ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

1.	Meeting:	Cabinet Member and Advisers for Regeneration and Development
2.	Date:	Monday 4 th March 2013
3.	Title:	B6089, Nether Haugh Village. Petition / report requesting road safety improvements within village (Ward 7 Hoober)
4.	Directorate:	Environment and Development Services

5. Summary

To report the receipt of and investigation into the issues in a report submitted by the Nether Haugh Action Group requesting road safety improvement including traffic calming, a controlled crossing and improved footways in the village of Nether Haugh.

6. Recommendations

Cabinet Member resolve that:-

- a) The report requesting improved road safety facilities within Nether Haugh be noted.
- b) The report author be informed of the decision not to provide traffic calming or improved footways and the reasons why
- c) Ward Members are informed accordingly.

7. Proposals and Details

A report regarding road safety issues in Nether Haugh was presented by the Nether Haugh Action Group to the Wentworth North Area Assembly in late 2012 and subsequently reported as a petition at the Council meeting held on 12th December 2012. Whilst there are no signatures within the report, the detail of the report suggests that it has been put together following a community meeting at which the action group was formed.

The B6089 is one of the main routes between Rotherham Town Centre and the Dearne Valley. The village of Nether Haugh lies approximately 2 miles north of the town centre with approximately 40 residential properties. The action group feels that there is a high number of vehicles using the road through the village and that speeds of these vehicles are inappropriate, that there are inadequate pedestrian crossing facilities along the road and that the footways have a substandard width.

With regard to the issue of volume of traffic travelling through the village, the B6089 is a classified road and provides one of the two main routes between Rotherham and the Dearne Valley (the other being the A633). The B6089 is free from any low bridges, weak structures or width restrictions and as such the road is considered suitable as a B classified road to accommodate the type and mix of traffic expected to use a road of this nature.

With regard to vehicle speeds, South Yorkshire Police use the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) guidelines for enforcement of local speed limits. The current guidance triggers enforcement when the 85%ile (the speed at which 85 out of every 100 vehicles is travelling at or below) is the speed limit + 10% plus 2mph. In the case of Nether Haugh where the speed limit is 30mph, the trigger speed would be an 85%ile of 35mph. Three locations were chosen within the village to undertake a speed survey. None of the locations met the ACPO guidelines where speed enforcement could be considered as the recorded speeds were 33.4 / 33.3mph, 34.1 / 33.3mph and 33.4 / 33.3mph, however The Safer Neighbourhood Team have undertaken some speed enforcement along this route and have committed to return to this location within the near future.

In order to establish whether the request for a controlled crossing on the B6089 meets the Councils criteria for implementing controlled crossings a formal survey has to be undertaken. A request was been made to the action group to identify where they feel the greatest number of pedestrians cross the road. Following this request it was confirmed at a meeting with the Groups Chairman that they did not wish to pursue the option of a controlled crossing as they appreciated that there is a cost associated with collecting this data which they did not wish to burden the Council with.

The report makes reference to the number of injury accidents that have occurred within the village and how by targeting areas with a history of injury accidents the Council can concentrate on achieving a greater rate of return for the money that is invested. Our annual investigation of the three previous years worth of injury accident data does not demonstrate that Nether Haugh is a location that we

would consider as a site of concern. As such we could not justify the use of funding reserved for treating accident hotspots to provide a traffic calming scheme at this location.

Any potential widening of the footways within the village would reduce the existing carriageway width which in places is already relatively narrow. This would bring passing vehicles closer consequently increasing the potential for a head on collision. The existing footway widths are a minimum 1.2m wide which is sufficiently wide to accommodate a pedestrian pushing a pram. The useable footway width is reduced in places by overhanging vegetation from private properties and therefore the owners of these properties will be contacted and asked to cut back any vegetation that overhangs the public highway in order to maximise the footway width.

8. Finance

If no action is taken there are no financial implications associated with this report.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

None

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

Any proposed scheme would need to be in line with objectives set out in the Sheffield City Region Transport Strategy, and the associated road safety and casualty reduction strategy for improving road safety. In this instance it is not felt that any scheme contributes significantly to justify investment.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

Ward Members have been consulted with regard to the petition, with no comments received.

A copy of the report is attached as Appendix A. Location map attached as Appendix B

Contact Name: Nigel Davey, Engineer, Ext. 22380,

nigel.davey@rotherham.gov.uk