

WIRRAL COUNCIL

HIGHWAYS AND TRAFFIC REPRESENTATION PANEL

23 OCTOBER 2015

SUBJECT:	ANNESLEY ROAD AREA, WALLASEY
WARD/S AFFECTED:	SEACOMBE WARD
REPORT OF:	MARK SMITH, HEAD OF ENVIRONMENT AND REGULATION
RESPONSIBLE PORTFOLIO HOLDER:	COUNCILLOR STUART WHITTINGHAM
KEY DECISION?	NO

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 This report considers objections received to proposals to introduce traffic calming features and 20mph speed limit order within the Annesley Road area, Seacombe Ward as shown on drawing no. DC/0113/100.

2.0 BACKGROUND AND KEY ISSUES

2.1 On 21st November 2014, the Liverpool City Region Combined Authority awarded £1,058,000 of Integrated Transport Block funding to Wirral Council.

2.2 The proposed scheme forms part of the 2015/16 Integrated Transport Block (ITB) Capital Programme of works subsequently agreed by Cabinet at its meeting of 20th July 2015 [Minute 36 refers].

3.0 OBJECTIONS

3.1 During the consultation period 3 objections were received from residents before the deadline of 4th September 2015. As a result of further officer discussions with residents regarding the proposals, 2 objections were subsequently withdrawn.

An objection to the scheme has been received from the resident of 23 Pendennis Road and the points raised are detailed in sections 3.2 to 3.10 of this report.

3.2 The objector complains that no matter what the opposition or objections are, the Council intends to force this scheme of works through, no matter what. In addition, the Objector questions what increase in funding has been made to in-school education programmes in light of the advances in technology and audio equipment the average children now has, and how has this funding been increased to target children at risk in the last 5 years, and asks for details of those road safety programmes and their year on year increases in light of risk development over the

same period of time. The objector believes that other methods such as raised and coloured surfaces could have been used, as well as flashing speed repeater signing.

The objector also believes that 40 per cent of adult pedestrians killed are over the legal alcohol limits for drivers, and that the training of pedestrians has a role to play.

In response; Analysis of Wirral's recorded casualty information provided by the police for pedestrian death shows that of a total 4 pedestrian deaths in the last 5 years. Of these 1 (25%) involved the pedestrian under the influence of alcohol.

No additional funding has been made available for educating children, however we continue to provide road safety education lessons to more than 8,700 children annually. Over the last 10 years our statistics show that our overall approach to improving road safety (including the introduction of physical measures as well as education initiatives) has assisted the reduction of child pedestrians being injured by just over 51% from 78 in 2004 to 38 in 2014.

Within the 'Annesley Road Area' there were 3 recorded personal injury crashes All 3 involved child pedestrians and in two of these crashes two children suffered serious injuries. Based on experience, Officers consider that the proposed measures could assist in making this area safer for pedestrians.

3.3 The objector states that the erection of additional traffic signs and laying 20mph roundels will create a visual distraction. The objector also questions how many 20mph traffic signs have been erected and roundel carriageway marking laid within Wirral.

Wirral Council does not have detail records of the numbers of 20mph traffic signs and roundel carriageway markings already implemented in schemes across the borough.

The Government has encouraged Local Authorities to consider, amongst other measures, lower speed limits to assist communities and improve road safety where appropriate. As part of the proposals to introduce road humps and lower speed limit, the Council must comply with the national regulations regarding signage:

Two 'Gateway' traffic signs will be erected at the junction of Poulton Road/Canterbury Road.

As part of the scheme to reinforce the lower speed limit sixteen 20 mph roundel road markings will be introduced within the area. The Council has not received any other objection to the introduction of signs/markings.

3.4 The objector states that the introduction of traffic calming features will increase harmful vehicle emissions.

In response; Low speeds are generally associated with high rates of exhaust emission because they usually involve a high proportion of acceleration and deceleration. However, smooth, low speed driving, in as high a gear as possible, can result in relatively low emissions.

Officers consider that there is a balance between the low level of vehicular use within this area and the potential to improve safety for residents in this area.

3.5 The objector states that the introduction of traffic calming features will increase fuel consumption.

In response; it is envisaged that any potential increase in fuel use by vehicles within a comparatively small area would be negligible. The aim of this scheme is to encourage motorists to drive at appropriate speeds to the environment that they are negotiating.

3.6 The objector states that the introduction of traffic calming features will create increased engine noise.

In response; the introduction of a speed-controlling measure such as a road hump can influence traffic noise levels in a number of ways. For example, lowering the speed of vehicles may mean that vehicle noise emission levels are reduced.

Vehicle noise emissions may also depend upon the way vehicles are driven: a passive style of driving, at a lower but constant speed could contribute to lower noise levels; an aggressive style, with excessive braking and acceleration between speed control devices, gives rise to a highly fluctuating noise level, which could, in turn, contribute to noise disturbance to residents.

3.7 The objector states that traffic calming features cause damage to vehicles and could potentially cause water damage to properties (citing a case in a village in North Wales).

In response; Where motorists drive with due care and consideration vehicles travelling over road humps at appropriate speeds should not suffer damage, provided the humps conform to the national hump regulations set out by the Department for Transport.

The roads encompassed within Annesley Road area are cleansed on a 4 week rota.

Correctly designed, there should be no additional risk to properties from water damage directly relating to the proposed scheme.

3.8 The objector suggests that the proposed traffic calming features will slow down the response times for the Emergency Services.

In response; The Authority is not responsible for undertaking additional specific risk assessments on behalf of the emergency services. However, as part of the consultation exercise for this scheme the emergency services have been consulted regarding the proposals.

Merseyside Police have stated that the zone would have little effect in responding to an emergency call and confirmed that they would support the measures.

North West Ambulance Service have stated that they do not foresee any issues that will slow down their response times to this area as the area in question is quite

condensed and fast speed is not possible, the traffic calming measures will not see a reduced response time.

Merseyside Fire & Rescue Service have commented that vehicles are consistently double parked in this area, which could increase the likelihood of collisions at low speed due to the lateral movement a fire appliance when proceeding over speed control humps/bumps. However the Council are unaware of any individual instances of vehicle damage as a direct result of fire appliances traversing traffic calming features.

3.9 The objector questions how the maintenance of the proposed road humps will be funded. The objector also suggests that existing road humps in Parkside, Liscard are in a poor condition.

In response; Residential roads similar to the ones encompassed within Annesley Road Area are inspected for defects annually as part of the Highway Maintenance Policy. An assessment of the existing road humps in Parkside, Liscard has been undertaken with no actionable defects found. Revenue funding would be allocated should there be a requirement to undertake maintenance works in the future.

3.10 The objector states that they have a right to a quality of life and refers to the Human Rights Act and the protection of property, together with cases of law involving compulsory purchase of private land. The objector also suggests that the proposed road humps will cause problems for persons with existing back conditions.

In response; There are no proposals to compulsorily purchase any private property to facilitate the introduction of this project. The extent of the scheme will be constructed within the limits of the adopted highway. It is not considered that this scheme breaches the Objector's rights.

This scheme was prioritised within the 2015/16 Integrated Transport Block by following analysis of the accident records for the Wirral area.

The scheme has been designed in accordance with the standards set by the Department for Transport for the introduction of road humps. The round topped road humps will be constructed at the recommended height of 75mm +/- 5mm tolerance.

The Department for Transport states that road humps are effective because they cause discomfort to the driver when they are crossed at high speeds. Unfortunately for some vehicle occupants, for example those with back injuries, road humps cause discomfort even at low speeds. It is important that humps are carefully designed and built to minimise discomfort for those travelling at appropriate speeds. The first consideration must be to ensure the hump dimensions are within those specified in the road hump regulations. A hump specification should not be for the maximum (100 mm) height, as this would not allow for any construction tolerance. Generally humps of 75 mm in height are recommended, as these minimise discomfort whilst maintaining effectiveness. The proposed measures are to be constructed using current national design standards issued by the Department for Transport.

3.11 A second objection to the scheme was received from the resident of 2 Raymond Road however this was after the deadline for objections. The objector does not want the speed humps outside their property as it will conflict with the position of

their vehicle access. In addition, the objector is concerned about damage to their vehicle and the noise that will be generated by vehicles travelling over the hump.

In response; It is considered that the proposed position of the road hump fronting 2 Raymond Road would not conflict with the position of the vehicle access or restrict movements onto/off the adjacent off-street parking.

Vehicles travelling over road humps at appropriate speeds should not suffer damage, provided the humps conform to the hump regulations (also refer to the response contained in para 3.7 above).

The introduction of a speed-controlling measure such as a road hump or cushion can influence traffic noise levels in a number of ways. For example, lowering the speed of vehicles may mean that vehicle noise emission levels are reduced. Vehicle noise emissions may also depend upon the way vehicles are driven: a passive style of driving, at a lower but constant speed, contributes to lower noise levels; an aggressive style, with excessive braking and acceleration between speed control devices, gives rise to a highly fluctuating noise level, which can in turn contribute to noise disturbance.

4.0 RELEVANT RISKS

4.1 Failure to undertake the proposed scheme would result in a failure to support the priorities of the Liverpool City Region Transport Plan for Growth and the Council's existing Corporate Goals and Objectives.

5.0 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

5.1 No other options are considered suitable to meet the needs of this location.

6.0 CONSULTATION

6.1 As part of the consultation exercise for this scheme, letters were delivered to local residents in the vicinity of the scheme, informing them of the proposals. Consultation was also undertaken with Party Spokespersons, Ward Members, Cycle Forum, Pedestrian Forum, Emergency Services, Freight Transport Association, Road Haulage Association and Merseytravel.

7.0 OUTSTANDING PREVIOUSLY APPROVED ACTIONS

7.1 None.

8.0 IMPLICATIONS FOR VOLUNTARY, COMMUNITY AND FAITH GROUPS

8.1 All groups will benefit from improved road safety.

9.0 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS: FINANCIAL; IT; STAFFING; AND ASSETS

9.1 The cost of implementing these works is in the region of £55,000 which is funded from the 2015/2016 Integrated Transport Block (ITB) Capital Programme of works. Existing staff will be used to undertake the design of the scheme.

10.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

10.1 The Council follows statutory processes to implement this type of proposal.

11.0 EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

11.1 The Equality Impact Assessment demonstrating a potential negative implication associated with the implementation of these proposals on the 'protected characteristics', may be accessed via the following link;

<https://www.wirral.gov.uk/communities-and-neighbourhoods/equality-impact-assessments/equality-impact-assessments-2014-0#wgSM-0>

12.0 CARBON REDUCTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

12.1 Low speeds are generally associated with high rates of exhaust emission because they usually involve a high proportion of acceleration and deceleration. However, smooth, low speed driving, in a high gear as possible, will result in relatively low emissions. The effect on emissions, therefore, of any traffic calming scheme will depend on how the scheme influences both the average speed of traffic and the amount of speed variation.

13.0 PLANNING AND COMMUNITY SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

13.1 The implementation of this proposal will have a positive impact on road safety and result in fewer road casualties.

14.0 RECOMMENDATION/S

14.1 Panel is requested to:

- a) Note the objections received and the Officers' responses; and
- b) Recommend to the Regeneration and Environment Policy and Performance Committee that the proposal as shown on attached drawing no. DC/0113/100 is approved for implementation.

15.0 REASON/S FOR RECOMMENDATION/S

15.1 To support the priorities of the Liverpool City Region Transport Plan for Growth and the Council's existing Corporate Goals and Objectives.

REPORT AUTHOR: Graham Roe
 telephone (0151) 606 2134
 email grahamroe@wirral.gov.uk

APPENDICES: DC/0113/100

BACKGROUND PAPERS/REFERENCE MATERIAL

Liverpool City Region Combined Authority - 'A Transport Plan for Growth'

<http://councillors.knowsley.gov.uk/documents/g6257/Public%20reports%20pack%2006th-Mar-2015%2011.30%20Liverpool%20City%20Region%20Combined%20Authority.pdf?T=10&StyleType=standard&StyleSize=none>

<http://www.merseytravel.gov.uk/about-us/local-transportdelivery/Documents/8375%20Plan%20for%20growth%20WEB%20FINAL.pdf>

BRIEFING NOTES HISTORY

Briefing Note	Date
None	

SUBJECT HISTORY (last 3 years)

Council Meeting	Date
Cabinet - TRANSPORT PLAN FOR GROWTH PROGRAMME 2015/16	20th July 2015