

OFFICER DECISION REPORT - RAISED TABLE SPEED HUMP
(Traffic Regulation Order 'Notice') TRO

5a

OUTCOME OF TRO PROCESS – DECISION (following objections)

PREPARED BY: Traffic Management Team, Highways and Traffic Group

TITLE OF REPORT: Farrington Gurney Mobility Hub CRSTS Scheme

PROPOSAL: Raised Table Speed Humps

SCHEME REF No: 26-034C

REPORT AUTHOR: Sadie Cox-Alcuaz

1. DELEGATION

The delegation to be exercised in this report is contained within **Part 2 Section 2.35** of the Constitution under the **Delegations of Functions to Officers**, as follows:

Section A	The Chief Executive, Executive Director - Chief Operating Officer, Directors and Heads of Service have delegated power to take any decision falling within their area of responsibility....”
Section B	Without prejudice to the generality of this, Officers are authorised to: serve any notices and make, amend or revoke any orders falling within their area of responsibility.
Section D	An Officer to whom a power, duty or function is delegated may nominate or authorise another Officer to exercise that power, duty or function, provided that Officer reports to or is responsible to the delegator.

For the purposes of this report, the Director of Place Management and the Head of Highways Delivery hold the delegated power to make, amend or revoke any Orders.

2. LEGAL AUTHORITY

This proposal is made in accordance with The Highways Act 1980 Section 90A which permits a highway authority to both construct and remove road humps in a public road, for which they are the highway authority, if the highway is subject to a legal speed limit for motor vehicles of 30 miles per hour or less or the road humps are specially authorised by the Secretary of State.

3. PROPOSAL

To introduce a Raised Table Speed Hump on Church Lane and Ham Lane, Farrington Gurney.

The proposals are shown in Appendix 1.

4. REASON

Please refer to the Statement of Reasons.

The Council has had in mind and discharged the duty (as set out in section 122(1) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984) to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) so far as practicable. It has also had regard to the factors which point in favour of imposing the new raised table speed humps. It has balanced the various considerations and concluded that it is appropriate to promote the proposals. The Council has also considered and discharged its network management duty under section 16 of the Traffic Management Act 2004. It has concluded that the proposed raised table speed humps are consistent with that duty, having regard to its other policies and objectives.

5. IMPACT ON EQUALITIES

An Equality Impact Assessment has been undertaken in relation to the introduction of traffic management measures, which is available upon request. The Council has had due regard to the needs set out in section 149(1) of the Equality Act 2010. It considers that the proposal is consistent with the section 149 public sector equality duty, which it has discharged.

6. IMPACT ON HUMAN RIGHTS

The proposals are considered to have a minimal impact on human rights (such as the right to respect for private and family life and the right to peaceful enjoyment of property). However, the Council is entitled to affect these rights where it is in accordance with the law, necessary (in the interests of public safety or economic well-being, to prevent disorder and crime, to protect health, or to protect the rights and freedoms of others), in pursuit of a legitimate aim and proportionate to do so. The proposal(s) within this report are considered to be in accordance with the law, necessary, in pursuit of a legitimate aim and proportionate.

7. SOURCE OF FINANCE

This proposal is being funded through cost code: TCSVL004S

8. CONSULTATION REQUIREMENT

The proposal requires consultation with the Chief Constable, Emergency Services, Road Haulage Association, Freight Transport Association (Logistics UK), Parking Services, Waste Services, Ward Members and the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Transport Delivery.

The responses to the informal consultation can be found in TRO report number 3.

9. OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS RECEIVED (following the public advertisement of the proposal(s))

Two responses expressing partial support have been received and are shown below.

- I live at Farrington Way. I support the calming measures proposed to the A37 but what about the A362 - it would surely make sense for the central village roads to all be calm - prioritizing the lives of residents over passing traffic as seen elsewhere. The A362 has got substantially noisier and busier over the last 15 years making it difficult to feel happy at home and it's been difficult to sleep this summer (as we can't open our windows in this heat). It's harder to pull out from Farrington Way as the road is busy with oncoming speeding traffic and the PRow can't be safely accessed as the road is difficult to cross. The section of A362 we pull out onto is a 40mph speed limit area (but people generally exceed this) and is sandwiched between two 30mph areas. It's only 200m long so this change of speed limit is pointless - it should simply all be 30mph and to make this change means simply replacing the number 4 on the sign with a 3 (very cheap indeed). This will also make the whole village speed limit consistent on all the main roads so people don't accelerate and then brake (we are in an air quality management area so this would assist reduce pollution). Speeds humps would also work on the A362 as this road seems to attract amateur racing drivers and crazed motorbikes at all times of the day and night (pls note many fatalities occur on Rush Hill so that must evidence the reckless driving stats).

We have a very costly digital traffic sign on Rush Hill that generally informs drivers that the Cleveland Bridge is closed in Bath (15 miles away) or not to drink - drive. How about saying something more relevant such as 'you are entering a residential area, please respect the speed limit' or Mr Cassidy at no. 21 has just bought a stinger and is not afraid to use it on anyone exceeding 30mph?

I hope you can see that a reduction in speed here will complement calming on the A37 and calming on-coming traffic speeding towards the cycle crossing to main street (farm shop junction). This is an absolute no-brainer, I've spent good time writing a response for you but am sure it will not be listened to and used as a sweetener when banes put 500 new houses in the fields opposite - brilliant!

- I have lived at Farrington Way for 15 years, my house is near the very small length of 40mph road (trapped between 2 areas of 30mph road) on the A362 (I

have labelled it 'santa pod racetrack' on the enclosed plan). This section of road, whilst short in length, is quite wide and straight and attracts those of a need to make up a few wasted seconds to race at terrific speeds

It is my firm belief that drivers, frustrated at having to wait in congested traffic, stop to allow people to cross or simply conform to a 30mph speed limit to react (let off steam) and race away (even overtake) in anger.

I see the proposals seek to add crossings etc to the A37 (slowing people down and adding to some people frustration) and add a cycle lane and crossing point into Main Street (Farm Shop junction) from A362. With the speeds that people accelerate towards that crossing/junction I can foresee someone running over a cyclist on what is quite a blind junction (well it is if the car is doing 60-70mph which I see regularly).

I support the proposal but feel there is one very obvious (and cost effective) oversight. I mean for Christ's sake why can't you just do away with the ridiculous section of 40mph road and make it 30mph (it's 200yds long with a 30mph section either side) which makes the main roads a consistent speed and making it easier for villagers to get out onto the A362 from Farrington Way junction.

Officer Response:

Farrington Way and A367 are not within the scope of these proposals.

A separate scheme is in development on that section and will be brought to consultation in due course – these comments are noted.

10. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM WARD MEMBERS AND CABINET MEMBER FOR SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT DELIVERY (in response to the above)

Councillor Ann Morgan - I agree with the raised humps on Ham Lane and Church Lane.

Cabinet Member for Sustainable Transport Delivery

Councillor Lucy Hodge

I have reviewed the consultation comments and am supportive of the proposal for raised table speed humps as part of the Farrington Gurney Mobility hub scheme to calm traffic speeds and enable active travel.

11. RECOMMENDATION

That the proposal as advertised is implemented.

Paul Garrod
Head of Highways Delivery

Date:

12. DECISION

As the Officer holding the above delegation, I have decided that the objections / comments be

not acceded to and the proposal as advertised be implemented.

Or

acceded to in full and the proposal(s) withdrawn.

Or

acceded to in part and the following adjustments, being of minor significance; be included in the proposal to be implemented.

specify minor amendment to Order here:

The Council's policy framework has been used as the basis to develop the scheme with full engagement with stakeholders across the area.

I further note that the issue of deciding whether to implement any scheme is a matter of broad judgement, taking into account the wider transport and climate aims of the Council rather than a purely mathematical analysis on the numbers of positive or negative responses.

The arguments both for and against the scheme were clearly identified and were considered fully as part of the decision-making process before I made the final decision as set out above.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Chris Major', is positioned above the printed name.

Chris Major
Director for Place Management

Date: