

Report to: Cabinet

Date: 2 April 2009

Subject: Objections to the proposed traffic calming, Ravenswood Drive Development, Hindley

Report of: Executive Director of Environmental Services

Contact officer: Heather Mulliner Telephone: 01942 404692

Purpose/summary: To advise Cabinet of objections received to the proposed traffic calming scheme in the vicinity of the Ravenswood Drive Development.

Alternative options considered and reason for selecting the one recommended:

- 1) Progress the proposed traffic calming as advertised.
- 2) Abandon the proposed traffic calming and amend the existing traffic calming features on Ward Street to comply with current legislation.

Recommendation/decision: Option 1 recommended, to progress the proposed traffic calming as advertised.

Key Decision: This report does not involve a key decision.

Risks/Implications:

Financial:	Developer funded.
Staffing:	Within existing resources.
Policy:	Road Safety Strategy.
Equal Opportunities - has a Diversity Impact Assessment been conducted?	N/A
Wards affected:	N/A
	Hindley.

Property – Does the proposal involve a reduction, addition or change to the Council’s asset base or its occupation?

No

Does this proposal have significant implications for the Council and the local population?

A diversity impact assessment is not necessary at this stage, however, equality and diversity implications have been considered when producing this report.

Does this proposal involve a new policy or procedure or significant changes to an existing policy or procedure?

No

Has the Director of Legal and Property Services confirmed that the recommendations within this report are lawful and comply with the Council’s Constitution? **Yes**

Has the Director of Finance and IT confirmed that any expenditure referred to within this report is consistent with the Council’s budget? **Yes**

Are any of the recommendations within this report contrary to the Policy Framework of the Council? **No**

For Cabinet reports only:

Categorisation of the report:			
Discussion leading to a decision		Discussion	
Monitoring		Decision	X
Sharing for corporate understanding		Information	

Tracking/Process:

	Consultation	Ward Members	Partners
Panel	Overview and Scrutiny	Cabinet	Council
		2 April 2009	

List of Background Papers in accordance with Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972:

Document	Date	File Reference	Place of Inspection
Planning Application	23 July 2001	A/01/54492	Civic Buildings, New Market Street
TMU Report	6 June 2005	19.2i	Civic Buildings, New Market Street
TMU Report	23 January 2007	19.2i	Civic Buildings, New Market Street

Proper Officer Martin Kimber

Date 17 March 2009

1 Background

- 1.1 On 23 July 2001 a planning application was submitted to develop a new housing site off Ravenswood Drive, Hindley. Residents of Elliot Drive were concerned about safety aspects of the development and sent in petitions. As a result of this a planning condition was issued on 25 January 2002 requiring the introduction of traffic calming features on the roads leading to the new development.
- 1.2 Highway Engineers and the Planning officers in discussion with the Developer agreed to consider introducing 75mm road humps on streets affected by the development and replacing the existing 50mm traffic calming features on Ward Street.
- 1.3 A report was taken to the Wigan Traffic Management Unit on 6 June 2005 (see Appendix A in Members Room) to seek approval for the introduction of traffic calming on Ward Street, Elliot Drive, Sunleigh Road, Hill Street and Ravenswood Drive, Hindley. The report recommended that:
 - The unit approve the proposals
 - A public consultation be carried out to determine public opinion of the proposals and
 - A 20mph speed limit be introduced if the speed reducing features were approved.The report was approved at the meeting and it was agreed to progress to public consultation.
- 1.4 Consultation with the residents was carried out in September 2005. 227 questionnaires were sent out and 95 responses were received, giving a 42% response rate. 56 (59%) respondents were in favour of the proposals and 36 (38%) did not support the proposals. 3 (3%) of responses were void. The residents that had voted no to the proposals were given a further choice of introducing rumble strips or red bar markings. These measures have very little traffic calming effect therefore it was decided to not to progress this option. As the majority of residents were in favour of introducing traffic calming it was decided to proceed with this option.
- 1.5 Speed surveys were carried out on Elliot Drive which indicate an average speed of 20.4mph in the westbound direction and an 85%ile speed of 25.0mph and 20.5mph in the eastbound direction. These results show that at present there is not a problem with speeding vehicles on Elliot Drive.

2 Proposals

- 2.1 On 23 January 2007 a report was taken to the Wigan Traffic Management Unit (see Appendix A in Members room) to consider the results of consultation with residents and seek approval for the introduction of traffic calming measures on Ward Street, Ravenswood Drive, Elliot Drive, Sunleigh Road and Hill Street. At the TMU it was agreed that the proposal, detailed on the plan in Appendix B, be progressed.

3 Objections received

3.1 During the objection period ten letters of objection and one letter of support have been received by the Director of Legal and Property Services, and these are contained in Appendix C.

3.2 Letters of objections have been received from the following people.

- | | | |
|-----|-------------------------|---------------------|
| 1. | Mr D Round | 5 Linden Road |
| 2. | Ms K Lowerson | 14 Ravenswood Drive |
| 3. | Mr S Dowd | 21 Ward Street |
| 4. | Councillor James Talbot | Hindley Ward |
| 5. | Mr D Ratilge | 16 Sunleigh Road |
| 6. | Mr and Mrs T O'Neill | 12 Ravenswood Drive |
| 7. | Mr G Bray | 25 Elliot Drive |
| 8. | Mrs H Mitchell | 8 Elliot Drive |
| 9. | Mrs A Woods | 1 Linden Road |
| 10. | Mr S Clarke | 17 Ward Street |

3.3 Many of the objectors feel that the noise vehicles will make when travelling over the humps will disturb those residents whose properties will be in the vicinity of a speed hump.

3.4 A number of objectors referred to traffic calming schemes that have recently been removed in the Hindley area on Hall Lane / Ladies Lane and Sandy Lane. The objectors feel that the schemes that were removed caused problems to residents and drivers, and do not wish the same problems to occur in the Ravenswood Drive area.

3.5 Some of the objectors feel that vehicles driving over speed humps will cause vibrations, which in turn over a long duration may cause structural damage to their properties.

3.6 A number of residents stated in their letters that they did not think there was an accident or speeding problem in the Ravenswood Drive area to justify introducing speed humps. Some of the objectors felt that speed humps were an ineffective way of reducing vehicle speeds.

3.7 Two of the objectors did not object to the use of speed humps within the estate but did not want a speed hump to be situated in the vicinity of their property.

3.8 Some objectors felt that the proposed humps would cause damage to their vehicles when driving over them. Other objectors were also concerned that there would be an increase in pollution in the area from vehicle emissions caused by vehicles manoeuvring over the humps.

3.9.1 Other general comments made by the objectors included claims that road humps cause accidents, slow down response times for ambulances, fire engines etc., cause pain and difficulties for elderly or disabled people as they drive over the humps, and look unsightly.

- 3.10 A letter of support for the scheme has been received from Mr F Walder of 24 Sunleigh Road as he believes it will reduce traffic speeds and make the area safer.

4 Comments of the Executive Director of Environmental Services

- 4.1 Although there have been ten objections to the proposals, the remainder of the residents in the Ravenswood Drive area did not object to the proposals. 227 notices of proposals were sent out to residents in the affected area and the local ward members. 95.59% of residents did not send in letters of objection which clearly shows they do not object to the introduction of speed humps in the area.
- 4.2 The proposed traffic calming is to be funded by the developer and addresses some of the safety concerns raised by residents following the initial planning application.
- 4.3 If the proposals were not approved any future requests for traffic calming from the residents would be subject to assessment as other streets in the borough are, and as such may not be treated as a priority site for funding.
- 4.4 The traffic calming schemes that were removed on Hall Lane / Ladies Lane and Sandy Lane, Hindley were replaced with other alternative methods of traffic calming. The Hall Lane / Ladies Lane scheme was replaced with a series of vehicle activated signs. The road hump that was removed on Sandy Lane was replaced with pairs of speed cushions at revised locations.

5 Ward Members comments

- 5.1 Councillor Talbot has formally objected to the proposals. He feels that the proposed speed humps will have an unhealthy effect on the environment due to the increase in vehicle emissions. He is also concerned about the noise vehicles will make when travelling over the humps and the aggravation this may cause to an elderly resident and her husband who live on the estate. He also comments on the possible damage to vehicles when travelling over the speed humps.

6 Recommendations

- 6.1 Although there have been ten objections to the scheme, this is a very small number compared to the overall number of residents affected by the proposals. It is therefore recommended that the traffic calming scheme be introduced as originally advertised.

Martin Kimber
Executive Director of Environmental Services