

## **Report to the Cabinet**

Meeting to be held on Thursday, 7 October 2021

### **Report of the Head of Service - Design & Construction**

#### **Part I**

Electoral Division affected:  
Preston North;

### **Proposed Traffic Calming Measures on Lightfoot Lane, Preston**

(Appendices 'A' and 'B' refer)

Contact for further information:

Callum Torrans, Tel: (01772) 537559, Assistant Highways Engineer,  
callum.torrans@lancashire.gov.uk

#### **Executive Summary**

It is proposed to install traffic calming measures consisting of 8 pairs of speed cushions and 1 junction table. This is proposed along Lightfoot Lane, from its junction with Eastway (B6241) to the west and its junction with Garstang Road (A6) to the east.

A public consultation was undertaken with several supporting responses and objections received.

#### **Recommendation**

Cabinet is asked to approve the installation of the speed cushions and junction table as shown at Appendices 'A' and 'B'.

#### **Background and Advice**

To guide long term development growth of the Fulwood area, Preston City Council, supported by Lancashire County Council, developed the North West Preston Masterplan. The Masterplan included a long-standing community aspiration to provide traffic calming along Lightfoot Lane, Fulwood. The traffic calming was identified to help improve highway safety, encourage better speed compliance, and make the residential street less attractive as a route for through traffic.

The B6241 Eastway forms part of the principal route connecting northwest Preston to the A6 Garstang Road and the motorway network. The introduction of Eastway is an attractive route and reduces the need for through traffic to use the residential section of Lightfoot Lane immediately west of Garstang Road. , Some vehicle drivers however continue to use Lightfoot Lane as part of a through route for the area.

As development has come forward in Fulwood, funding has been secured through the planning process for the implementation of traffic calming along Lightfoot Lane.

As a result, suitable measures have been designed, taking into consideration the nature of the route, drainage, vehicular driveways, the requirement to facilitate bus access and the level of funding available. These measures have subsequently been advertised and the feedback received is the subject of this report.

## **Consultations**

Formal consultation was undertaken during February and March 2021, with initial feedback resulting in a revision to the proposals. These revised proposals were advertised as a modification order during May and June 2021.

As part of the original proposals an existing bus stop would be relocated to accommodate a pair of speed cushions (pair 6). This relocation was objected to by a local resident. Savings from a related scheme were identified which resulted in additional funding being available to consider this objection. Subsequently a modified design enabled the introduction of a junction table which removed the need for a set of speed cushions (pair 6), which in turn negated the need to reposition the bus stop. This modification resulted in the resident's objection being withdrawn.

As the additional monies were identified and design modified after the initial consultation a proposed modification order was subsequently advertised.

## **Responses**

As part of the consultation process (original proposals and modifications), the proposals received; 16 supporting, 1 supporting with comments, 1 supporting the principle objecting to the detail and 21 objecting. From analysis of the objections, it was identified that numerous points were raised by each objector. Each specific point is discussed and addressed below, with a number next to each title to represent how many of the objectors raised each point.

### **Objection 1 – Speed cushions cause damage to vehicles [4 objectors]**

*Response:* The Department for Transport Local Transport Note 1/07 shows that vehicles travelling over speed cushions at appropriate speeds should not suffer damage, provided the cushions conform to Highways (Road Humps) Regulations.

### **Objection 2 – Increase in air and noise pollution [6 objectors]**

*Response:* Increases in emissions and noise levels are likely to be minimal when designed correctly. The spacing of measures are designed to keep vehicles at a low consistent speed thereby reducing deceleration and acceleration phases, it is very unlikely that the measures would result in poor local air quality and excessive local noise levels. Whilst the vehicle emissions and noise levels may rise slightly for each individual vehicle, by discouraging through usage overall emission and noise levels are expected to reduce. The reductions in speed and traffic volumes is also

anticipated to lead to an increase in safety. Hence, it is felt the benefits gained will offset any minor negative aspect.

**Objection 3 – Vibrations caused by speed cushions will cause discomfort and/or damage to properties [1 objector]**

*Response:* The Department for Transport Local Transport Note 1/07 brings together commissioned and independent research on the use of traffic calming. The document highlights that vibrations are very unlikely to pose a significant risk of even minor damage to properties. The most likely vehicles to cause significant vibrations are those with a gross vehicle weight above 7.5 tonnes, on Lightfoot Lane there is a weight restriction prohibiting vehicles above 7.5 tonnes. In addition, the note references that extensive research failed to find any conclusive evidence that traffic-induced vibrations can cause significant building damage.

**Objection 4 – Speed cushions are not an effective traffic calming measure [9 objectors] and lead to an increase safety risks [9 objectors]**

*Response:* The Department for Transport Local Transport Note 1/07 brings together commissioned and independent research on the use of traffic calming. The document highlights that speed cushions are effective at calming traffic and improve road safety.

**Objection 5 – The proposals will encourage through traffic to use adjacent roads to avoid speed cushions [9 Objectors]**

*Response:* If drivers were to use adjacent residential roads avoiding most of the traffic calming measures, this would lead to approximately a 40% increase in distance travelled. Due to the narrowness of the adjacent roads and the extra distance travelled, it is not anticipated that the adjacent roads will become alternative through routes.

**Objection 6 – Money should be spent on the existing highway network (road maintenance or improving highway network) [3 objectors]**

*Response:* The proposals are being funded via a specifically worded Section 106 agreement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The agreement stipulates that the monies must be spent on traffic calming measures along Lightfoot Lane.

**Objection 7 – Different traffic calming measures should be considered [3 objectors]**

*Response:* A number of traffic calming measures were considered. Speed cushions were chosen as they are deemed to be the most effective in terms of enforcing the existing 20mph speed limit and will make Lightfoot Lane less attractive as a through route. The measures proposed will not impact on existing driveway access and bus service requirements.

#### **Objection 8 – Impact on emergency and public transport vehicles [4 objectors]**

*Response:* Speed cushions have been chosen as the most appropriate traffic calming measures due to the ability of larger vehicles to straddle the cushions. It is therefore envisaged that the proposals will have a minimal impact on these vehicles whilst providing enhanced safety improvements along Lightfoot Lane.

#### **Objection 9 – Objection to speed cushions identified as pair 1 and 6 (safety concerns and existing bend acts as traffic calming) and 6 (original proposal) [4 objectors]**

*Response:* The speed cushions identified as pair 1 will slow vehicles entering Lightfoot Lane from Eastway (40mph to 20mph) and will help encourage drivers to take the bend at the Lansdown junction at an appropriate speed. As part of the modification order the speed cushions identified as pair 6 have been removed due to the introduction of the proposed junction table.

#### **Objection 10 – Objection to the statement of reasons and method of consultation [2 objectors]**

*Response:* The consultation was carried out under the normal procedure of posting site notices and via advertisement in a local newspaper. In addition to this, additional copies of the site notices were left at the local primary school and posted at the local Methodist church. The statement of reasons states that the proposals are "*proposed to complement the existing 20mph speed limit and enhance road safety by discouraging the route to through traffic.*" This is justified as its aim is to fulfil the existing planning conditions, which is to reduce the attractiveness of Lightfoot Lane as a through route.

#### **Objection 11 – Existing speed limit should be increased to 30mph on Lightfoot Lane [3 objectors]**

*Response:* The proposals are aimed at enforcing the existing 20mph and making Lightfoot Lane unattractive for through traffic. Increasing the speed limit would be counter to these aims and be in breach of the contractual Section 106 agreement that has been entered into to.

#### **Objection 12 – The existing 7.5 tonne weight restriction on Lightfoot Lane should be enforced instead of the proposals [1 objector]**

*Response:* Enforcement of the 7.5 tonne weight restriction is a matter for Lancashire Constabulary and therefore is outside the scope of the proposals.

#### **Objection 13 – Speed cushions will damage highway and increase maintenance requirements and costs [2 objectors]**

*Response:* There is no evidence to support that significant deterioration of the highway will result due to the installation of Speed cushions.

**Objection 14 – The existing speed limit should just be enforced instead of introducing the proposals [2 objectors]**

*Response:* Lancashire Constabulary has limited ability to enforce speed limits below 30mph. However, they support such limits that are self-enforcing in nature. Therefore, speed cushions have been identified as the most appropriate method to encourage compliance with the existing speed limit.

**Objection 15 – Similar measures have been introduced on Hoyles Lane which are unpopular [1 objector]**

*Response:* Most responses that have been received in relation to this scheme were positive and there was a large amount of community support for this scheme.

**Objection 16 – Speed cushions cause discomfort for sufferers of chronic pain/Musculoskeletal conditions [2 objectors]**

*Response:* Unfortunately, it is not possible to eliminate all discomfort to road users who suffer from such conditions. However, a large portion of discomfort can be regulated by the driver's approach speed. It is believed that any negative impacts are offset by the safety benefits gained by a reduction of through traffic and vehicle speed reductions.

**Objection 17 – Encourage use of SUVs [2 objectors]**

*Response:* There is no evidence to support the theory that traffic calming encourages a particular class of vehicle to utilise a calmed route. SUV type vehicles will still need to slow down to pass speed cushions or risk damaging their vehicles if passed at high speeds.

**Objection 18 – Drivers don't like speed cushions [2 objectors]**

*Response:* Whilst speed cushions can be unpopular with road users, they are proven to be effective at reducing vehicle speeds provided the maximum spacings are not exceeded.

**Objection 19 – Existing school crossing patrol [1 objector] and on street parking [1 objector] already act as traffic calming**

*Response:* The school crossing patrol and on street parking affect the highway temporarily and intermittently. The speed cushions will calm traffic regardless of time of day and also help to assist in the operation of the school crossing patrol.

**Objection 20 – Alternative methods should be considered i.e. educate drivers, introduce signing, make access only [13 objectors]**

*Response:* The proposals are being funded via a Section 106 agreement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The agreement stipulates that the monies must be spent on traffic calming measures along Lightfoot Lane, the exact nature of which is at the discretion of Lancashire County Council. As such the monies could

not be spent on non-traffic calming as this would breach the contractual obligations of the Section 106 agreement. Physical measures in the form of speed cushions are considered to be the most appropriate solution required to achieve the desired outcome of making the route less attractive to through traffic.

### **Recommendation**

It is considered that although various objections have been raised, they are addressed above and it is advised that traffic calming proposed is appropriate and of benefit on balance to the users of the highway network and local area. Therefore, the proposed traffic calming measures as re-advertised should be approved.

### **Implications:**

This item has the following implications, as indicated:

### **Risk management**

The speed cushions will improve safety on Lightfoot Lane. In addition, the scheme will help reduce the attractiveness of Lightfoot Lane as a through route, thus strengthening the places for people nature of the residential area.

If the speed cushions and junction table are not introduced, the S106 agreement stipulations will not be met. Less effective methods of traffic calming will then have to be considered, which will most likely result in higher overall speeds and the continuing use of Lightfoot Lane as a through route.

Should the funding not be utilised for traffic calming measures it is stipulated within the section 106 agreement that it will be returned to the developer along with any accrued interest.

### **Financial**

The estimated cost of the works is £68,859.39 and the secured S106 funding is £101,336 which has been received by Lancashire County Council.

The works will be programmed into the 2021/2022 capital programme, with the intention that the works will be completed before April 2022.

### **Legal**

The legal procedure to install road humps is under section 90(A) Highways Act 1980 and the Highways (Road Humps) Regulations 1999.

### **List of Background Papers**

Paper	Date	Contact/Tel
None		

Reason for inclusion in Part II, if appropriate

N/A