
Meeting of Executive Members for City Strategy and Advisory Panel

29 October 2007

Report of the Director of City Strategy

RUFFORTH SCHOOL SAFETY ZONE AND ASSOCIATED SPEED MANAGEMENT MEASURES

Summary

1. Following monitoring and consultation, approval is requested to make permanent the two temporary chicanes on the B1224 Wetherby Road, which act as traffic calming measures to slow speeds in advance of the existing School Safety Zone. In addition, to further help reduce the speed of traffic approaching the school from the north-west, approval is sought to extend the existing 30mph speed limit on Wetherby Road.
2. The report also seeks authority to implement a number of other minor signing improvements in the vicinity of the School Safety Zone.

Background

3. In 1999/2000, a study of the traffic problems within the village of Rufforth highlighted concerns regarding traffic speeds. In response, the study report recommended improvements to the 30mph speed limit signing, and that a School Safety Zone should be installed outside the school.
4. In December 2000, the Planning and Transport (North-West Area) Sub-Committee approved a package of measures to improve road safety outside Rufforth Primary School. As part of this, a 20mph School Safety Zone was proposed, covering the section of the B1224 Wetherby Road outside the school. The measures sought to highlight the presence of the school, reduce vehicle speeds, and to make it easier for people to cross the road. The measures included a speed table crossing point directly outside the school's pedestrian entrance. The scheme was implemented in February 2001. Around this time, some minor improvements to the 30mph speed limit signing at the entry points to the village were also carried out.
5. Soon after the School Safety scheme was installed, residents adjacent to the speed table complained of excessive noise and vibration when large vehicles crossed over the table, affecting their quality of life and raising concern regarding damage to their properties. In response to these concerns, it was agreed that the speed table should be removed and replaced with two pairs of speed cushions, one at either side of a dropped crossing point. This work was carried out in June 2001.

6. Shortly after these amendments were made, a small amount of comment was received, which covered a mix of views. Some living near the scheme said that traffic speeds had increased, and that noise and vibration remained an issue if large vehicles did not straddle the cushions as intended. Other residents were in favour of additional traffic calming measures to reduce traffic speeds through the village. Most residents commented on the need to reduce the amount of heavy vehicles travelling through the village.
7. In response to these ongoing concerns, noise and vibration surveys were conducted, and a report on the findings was produced by the Council's Environmental Protection Unit in September 2003. The results showed that traffic noise was actually lower than at a control site in the village, away from the traffic calming scheme. They also showed that vibration was not at the high levels necessary to cause structural damage to nearby property. However, vibration did reach levels that are recognised to be perceptible by residents whilst in their properties. The problem is thought to be exacerbated in this particular location because of the relatively high percentage of heavy goods vehicles passing by, which cause the most noticeable effects, and the proximity of some buildings to the carriageway (some being as close as 1.5 metres from the road).
8. In November 2004, the Planning and Transport (West Area) Sub-Committee approved a revised School Safety Zone scheme that removed the speed cushions (as part of this, the removal of the speed cushions meant that the 20mph speed limit could no longer be retained – hence, the 30mph limit was reinstated), and alternative traffic calming measures in the form of chicanes to control traffic speeds entering the area outside the school were introduced. It was agreed that the chicanes should be constructed in a temporary manner and monitored for a period of six months. Additional measures also included improved 'gateways' at the three village boundaries, the introduction of Vehicle Activated Signing in the central part of the village, and a Zebra crossing adjacent to the school's pedestrian access with the associated anti-skid surfacing (it is worth noting at this stage, that the position of School Crossing Patrol Warden has been vacant at this location for some time, and remains so). The temporary chicanes were introduced in March 2006, along with the other speed management measures. The layout of these measures is shown in **Annexes A & B**.

Scheme Monitoring

9. During the six month trial period, traffic surveys and site observations were carried out in order to assess the effectiveness of the new measures. Analysis of the traffic data shows that the chicanes have been effective in maintaining low traffic speeds outside the school. The surveys show that average speeds outside the school were 26mph with the 20mph Zone and speed cushions in place, compared to 34mph when no form of traffic calming measures were in place. With the temporary chicanes in place, the current average speed is 28mph. This is close to the level achieved when the speed cushions were in place, and certainly much lower than when no traffic calming measures were present.

10. However, on the downside, Officers have observed some poor driver behaviour, such as:

- Some drivers speed up to get past the chicanes before the oncoming traffic arrives, so that they're not delayed by having to give way;
- A small minority of drivers disregard the requirement to give way under the current priority arrangements, sometimes causing 'near misses'. This situation can be exacerbated in adverse weather conditions, particularly in fog;
- The temporary chicanes have been hit by approaching/passing vehicles on a small number of occasions during the six month trial;
- Parents of children attending the school have reported that some drivers do not stop to allow them to cross the road on the Zebra crossing.

Proposals

11. In view of the positive speed survey results outside the school, and in consultation with the Ward Members in post at that time (i.e. prior to the May 2007 election), Officers developed proposals for making the chicanes permanent along with some additional measures to further enhance road safety in the area. The proposals are shown on the plans in **Annex C**, and are described below:

- Permanent chicanes with kerbed edges, illuminated bollards and chevron boards, and incorporating a cycle bypass lane. These features are proven in regulating traffic speed outside the primary school, and their increased conspicuity should reduce the chances of the chicanes being hit by approaching vehicles;
- Relocation of the existing 30mph speed limit boundary on the approach from Wetherby. This is intended to reduce the speed of traffic approaching the village from the north;
- The introduction of some 'five-bar' gate features, painted white, at both sides of the road on the Wetherby approach to the village to enhance the existing 30mph village 'gateways'. This is intended to highlight the start of the 30mph speed limit and encourage drivers to reduce traffic speeds as they enter into the village;
- Introduction of one additional Vehicle Activated Sign, on the approach to the northern-most chicane. This is intended to remind drivers who may not have slowed down sufficiently of the 30mph speed limit as they approach the school Safety Zone from the north.

Consultation

Consultation Process

12. An information leaflet on the proposals (see **Annex C**), which included a questionnaire on a separate sheet with a freepost return address, was distributed to all residential properties in the village on 22 December 2006. The primary school and the Parish Council were also included within this distribution. In total, approximately 235 leaflets were delivered, and a deadline of 16 January 2007 was given for the receipt of questionnaires and to forward any comments. This gave consultees approximately three and a half weeks to respond, and an opportunity to respond after attending the Parish Council's pre-scheduled meeting, which took place on 8 January 2007. A Council Officer was present at the meeting to explain the reasoning behind the proposals, and to field any questions that people might have about the proposals.
13. Consultation was also conducted with the previous Ward Members, and consultation letters were also sent to other interested parties, which included the emergency services.

Consultation Feedback

Residents

14. A total of 102 questionnaires were returned. The main results are shown in the table below:

Proposal	Percentage of Responses				
	Strongly	Slightly	No Opinion	Slightly	Strongly
	Agree			Disagree	
Retaining the Chicanes	34.3%	10.8%	2.0%	2.0%	51.0%
Extending 30mph Limit	64.7%	10.8%	3.9%	5.9%	14.7%
Additional VA Signs	71.6%	20.6%	4.9%	0.0%	2.9%

15. In summary, the results show that a slight majority oppose the retention of the chicanes. However, there is a large majority of support for the 30mph speed limit extension and the introduction of a Vehicle Activated Sign.
16. Below is a summary of reasons given for opposing the chicanes:

	Percentage of responses
Poor driving at chicanes	51.0%
Traffic/tailbacks at chicanes	22.5%
Deterioration in air quality	9.8%
Speed humps more effective	6.9%
Excessive traffic noise	4.9%

17. In addition to this feedback, a petition was received with 88 signatures in objection to the proposal to make the chicanes a permanent feature (see **Annex D** for the front page of the petition). The 88 signatures gathered represent 68 households in the village. Out of an approximate total of 235 households within the village, this represents 29% against the proposal

(assuming that all village residents were consulted by the person compiling the petition).

18. A more detailed summary of the comments received from residents is contained within **Annex E** along with Officer responses. The key issues resulting from this are discussed below:

- **Issue 1: Poor driving at chicanes.**

Officer comments – The nature of this type of traffic calming feature and how drivers conduct themselves when negotiating such measures has to be balanced against the positive benefits of speed reduction outside the school. Driving on the footway is obviously not acceptable, but this could be prevented by providing timber bollards where necessary. Officers consider that in their temporary format, the chicanes are rather like road works in appearance. However, Officers feel that the majority of drivers still comply with the priority arrangements, and if made into permanent features, drivers would be even more likely to respect the chicanes. In conjunction with improved advance signing, Officers also consider that drivers would be much less likely to collide with the chicanes than at present, although clearly, those few drivers that have done so in the past have either been driving without due care, or were driving at excessive speed.

In the main, our surveys have shown that drivers generally comply with the 30mph speed limit in the village. It is unfortunate, but there will always be a minority of drivers who display poor behaviour. However, without any form of traffic calming feature (as indicated by our speed surveys) average speeds outside the school would increase to approximately 34mph, whereas with the chicanes in place, it is more like 28mph.

- **Issue 2: Traffic/tailbacks at chicanes.**

Officer comments – Officers accept that traffic sometimes builds up through the village for the car boot and auto-jumble (which are particularly busy over the summer months), sometimes on race days, and occasionally when incidents occur on the A1 and A59. Officers looked at the situation on a car boot Sunday on 17 December 2006 and there were no problems. It appears that it is rare for the build up of traffic to cause major disruption or safety concerns, even at busier times of the year. The only consequences are of inconvenience to motorists when occasional delays can be experienced if traffic queues back from the chicanes as motorists give way to what can be a continuous flow of traffic leaving the School Safety Zone. Officers would expect that drivers' common sense would prevail under these circumstances and where queues do build up, some motorists may allow traffic to pass the chicanes when their own progress is impeded.

- **Issue 3: Speed humps more effective.**

Officer comments – Speed cushions, as a vertical traffic calming measure, are more effective in reducing traffic speeds than horizontal measures. However, this method of traffic calming has already been tried and subsequently rejected, due to the associated problems as outlined in the Background section of this

report. When the School Safety Zone was introduced in 2001, a 20mph speed limit and vertical traffic calming measures were introduced. Current legislation dictates that to introduce a 20mph speed limit, vertical traffic calming measures have to be included to self-enforce traffic speeds within the Zone. However, following complaints from residents about traffic noise and vibration caused by vehicles riding over the speed cushions, the Council had to remove the traffic calming measures. Consequently, the speed limit had to revert back to a 30mph limit. Current legislation does not allow the introduction of a 20mph speed limit without vertical traffic calming measures.

- **Issue 4: Excessive traffic noise.**

Officer comments – The issues now relate to increased braking and subsequent acceleration as drivers negotiate the chicanes. However, this is not considered to be a significant problem, and has certainly generated far less complaints than the noise and vibration issues linked to vehicles riding over the vertical traffic calming measures in the past. It is found that the overall noise level in areas where traffic calming is installed generally reduces as vehicles are travelling more slowly, but because of this, the peaks can become more noticeable. Therefore, even though this route is well used by heavy goods vehicles, Officers consider that any increases in traffic noise at the chicanes should be minimal. Officers' observations on-site have not given rise to concerns in this regard, despite the odd sounding of a vehicle's horn.

- **Issue 5: Deterioration in air quality.**

Officer comments – We have sought the views of the Council's Environmental Protection Service concerning this issue. Their advice was that since this area of the city is relatively open, emissions from vehicles are likely to be easily dispersed and thus unlikely to pose any potential health threat to local residents. It is generally acknowledged that emission concentrations generally return to background levels approximately 10-15m away from the carriageway. City of York Council currently undertakes monitoring of air quality at over 300 sites in the city and at present the only areas shown to have the potential to breach the current UK health based air quality objectives are areas on, or close to, the inner ring road in the city centre. Historical monitoring data from Rufforth has shown that levels of nitrogen dioxide in the village were well below the government's health based objective levels (i.e. levels of pollutant likely to have a negative impact upon health).

Organisations/other interested parties

19. **The Police** would have difficulty in supporting the proposed extension of the 30mph speed limit because it would start too far out of the village. They think that this could lead to poor driver compliance, and fear that the overall speed of vehicles could in fact rise due to the lack of any obvious need to reduce speed at this location. The Police are also opposed to the proposed use of a Vehicle Activated Sign within this context. They generally only favour the use of such signs as a last resort where there is a speed related accident problem, and it has been found that other measures have been unable to achieve the desired speed reductions. They are concerned that if the implementation of VAS is not

regulated by conducting such meaningful analysis, then the potential proliferation of inappropriate usage would be likely to dilute their overall effectiveness. To back this up, the Police referred to DTp guidance, which says that VAS should only be used where there is an existing speed related accident history, which cannot be solved through the introduction of standard signing or similar measures.

Officer response:

Officers met with the Police on-site, and having reviewed the situation, identified a more suitable position for the extension of the 30mph speed limit boundary, which the Police could support. This is close to the first house, and should give approaching motorists a stronger impression that they are entering a village environment. The start of the speed limit boundary would then be only about 190m away from the chicane, as compared to around 340m under the original proposal.

With regard to the proposed Vehicle Activated Sign, Officers consider that if the speed limit commences at the amended position, there would be a reduced need for such a sign in advance of the chicane. It is therefore proposed to remove this measure from the proposals. However, Officers consider that speed monitoring should be conducted following implementation of the other measures to assess the scheme's effectiveness before considering whether a Vehicle Activated Sign may still be required.

In addition, the warning signs for motorists approaching the chicanes were also reviewed on-site with the Police, and a slightly revised layout developed.

20. ***The Head Teacher at Rufforth Primary School*** is generally supportive of the proposals, and responded by agreeing that the chicanes do slow the majority of the traffic travelling through the village. However, his main concern relates to the minority of drivers who show little regard for the safety measures. Indeed, he is particularly concerned that some drivers are reluctant to stop at the Zebra crossing, which is frustrating and disconcerting for pedestrians when they are waiting to cross. Therefore, he thinks that a Pelican crossing would be a safer measure to assist the children to cross the road, as a red light means stop and is clear to all drivers.

Officer response:

Officers could not support a conversion of the existing Zebra to a Pelican crossing because of concerns over an increased risk of a serious accident occurring. Our main concern is that children will automatically cross as the 'green man' is displayed, and a driver could fail to observe the signals and stop. There is evidence that in situations where a crossing is rarely used (as is the case at this location), drivers who travel through the area regularly can become accustomed to the signals being at green, and are therefore less likely to observe the change to a red signal. This risk is highlighted in the DfT's Local Transport Note (LTN) 1/95: The Assessment of Pedestrian Crossings, which says "*In considering a signal-controlled crossing, caution should be exercised where pedestrian flows are generally light, or light for long periods of the day.*"

Drivers who become accustomed to not being stopped at the crossing may begin to ignore its existence, with potentially dangerous consequences."

An additional safety concern is linked to pedestrians becoming impatient when a red man is displayed, and traffic flows are low. This delay can lead them to cross against the red man. In turn, this can add to driver frustration if they have to stop for a red signal on an empty crossing, and may result in some red light violations.

Whilst we understand the concerns about the behaviour of a minority of drivers not stopping immediately for pedestrians waiting to use the Zebra crossing, this is not considered to be such a safety concern, provided that the crossing is used correctly. To help address this, we are already working with the school to help educate children and parents about how to use the crossing safely. A point worth noting, is that even where traffic does not stop immediately at the Zebra crossing, delays to pedestrians are still likely to be less than with a Pelican, as the traffic does eventually stop to allow pedestrians to cross.

21. **Rufforth & Knapton Parish Council** do not wish to see the chicanes retained, but support the proposed 30mph speed limit extension and additional Vehicle Activated Sign. In their comments, they have focused upon the associated problems with poor driver behaviour at the chicanes, and drivers disregarding the Zebra crossing outside the school. The Parish Council feels strongly that the current arrangement has raised the risk of an accident, particularly one involving pedestrians both on the crossing and on the footways adjacent to the chicanes. The Parish Council believes that removal of the chicanes and the introduction of a traffic light controlled crossing (a Pelican) would be a better solution. As part of this, they would want any noise nuisance from any audible alarm to be minimised, and that the crossing was supported by measures to control speed through the length of the village (as opposed to locally at the school) by the incorporation of additional and preferably larger Vehicle Activated Signs, regular speed camera checks (with prosecutions) and more dominant road markings adjacent to the crossing.

Officer response:

Officers attended the Parish Council meeting on Monday 8 January, and the previously mentioned comments concerning poor driver behaviour were discussed a length, as was the suggestion of a Pelican crossing. Reference should also be made to **Annex E** for further details on all of the concerns raised as part of the consultation exercise.

Revised Scheme Proposals

22. As a result of the consultation feedback, and following the meeting with the Police's Traffic Management Liaison Officer to discuss their concerns in more detail, a number of amendments to the proposals were made. These are shown in **Annex F**. In summary, the key elements of the revised layout are as follows:
 - Revised position for the 30mph speed limit boundary (closer to the village environ) on the northern approach to the village;

- No immediate provision of a Vehicle Activated Sign (to be reviewed following further monitoring);
- Improved signing arrangements, which should help to provide an improved warning for motorists on their approach to the chicanes, the School Safety Zone and the Zebra crossing;
- Timber bollards to prevent vehicles from overrunning the footways and verge areas adjacent to the chicanes.

Further Consultation

23. Following the election in May 2007, the newly elected Ward Members arranged for a public meeting to be held in early September to discuss the latest proposals. Prior to this, Officers sent out an update letter to all households in the village presenting the revised proposals and inviting residents to the public meeting.

Feedback from the Public Meeting

24. The issues raised at the public meeting were mostly the same as those already discussed (the key issues are covered in Para 18 above). A couple of new issues were raised, and these are summarised below:
- Using pinch points with priority working instead of chicanes would have the advantage of pulling cars into the middle of the road, rather than the wrong side of the road;
 - Speed activated traffic signals (similar to systems used in Portugal and Spain), which change to a red signal when approaching traffic is travelling in excess of the speed limit should be considered as an alternative to chicanes.

These suggestions are covered in more detail together with an Officer response in **Annex G**.

Ward Members' Views

25. Councillors Ben Hudson and Paul Healey support the revised proposals in principle, and have made the following statements:

Cllr Paul Healey: "The current situation with temporary chicanes on the approach to the Primary School is causing a substantial nuisance to nearby residents. However, this needs to be weighed against the speed reduction they impose. Given that the survival rate of a child involved in an accident is directly related to speed of impact I could not with a clear conscience support the removal of the chicanes and the subsequent speed increase. However, I do believe that Speed cameras would be more suitable for all concerned and would recommend, that if retained, the chicanes are replaced by cameras at the earliest opportunity."

Cllr Ben Hudson's full comments are attached as **Annex H** to this report, and the following is a summary of his comments:

Although the chicanes are not popular with some village residents, the City Council has a policy to provide Safety Zones outside schools, and I could not support a removal of the chicanes without providing alternative traffic calming measures to replace them. In addition, I do not support the conversion of the existing Zebra crossing to a Pelican because research has shown that where such facilities are not used frequently, a Pelican could be more dangerous than the existing Zebra crossing.

26. Councillor Ian Gillies, as the Chairperson for this Advisory Panel, has chosen not to comment in advance of the meeting.

Options

27. The following options are available for Members to consider:

Option One - Implement the original proposals, as identified in the consultation leaflet (see **Annex C**).

Option Two - Implement the revised proposals as shown on the drawing in **Annex F**, plus any other amendments that are considered necessary.

Option Three - Do not implement the proposals and remove the temporary chicanes, together with the associated signing and road markings.

Analysis

28. The arguments against the proposals have been considered, and although there are obviously strong feelings held by many village residents about the negative aspects of the chicanes, Officers consider that none raise serious safety concerns. Indeed, Officers would have more serious concerns over removing them completely, as without any measures in place, there would be the prospect of average speeds outside the school rising back to around 34mph. In addition, Officers are concerned that without any form of traffic calming, the highest recorded speeds (albeit by a minority of drivers) could also increase considerably. This conclusion has been drawn from a comparison of the top vehicle speeds recorded during a number of speed surveys conducted outside the school under varying road layouts, as indicated in the table below:

Speed Survey Details	Direction	Highest speed recorded
Pre SSZ with no traffic calming(March '99)	N-bound (out of village)	49mph
	S-bound (into village)	48mph
With 20mph SSZ in place (March 2005)	N-bound (out of village)	33mph
	S-bound (into village)	41mph
Temporary chicanes in place (Sept 2006)	N-bound (out of village)	34mph
	S-bound (into village)	40mph

29. As mentioned earlier, Officers do not support the suggestion to introduce a Pelican crossing, because Officers consider that in these circumstances, the Zebra crossing offers the safest, most practical and most convenient crossing

facility. Therefore, Officers consider that a revision of the proposals as outlined above offers the best overall solution, whilst recognising that this would be unpopular with many of the village residents and the Parish Council. If the proposals were implemented, further monitoring would need to be carried out in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the measures, and assess whether any additional measures were considered necessary.

30. Although not recommended within the revised proposals, it is thought prudent to have an option available for an additional Vehicle Activated Sign to be added to the scheme, should monitoring of the entry speed of vehicles approaching from the Wetherby end of the village indicate that one may be helpful. Officers suggest setting a target average speed of 34mph in advance, for the section between the proposed relocation of the 30mph speed limit boundary and the chicane. Consequently, Officers request that delegated authority is granted to install a Vehicle Activated Sign, should this target average speed be exceeded.
31. Officers consider that the proposed introduction of the 'five-bar' gate feature as part of the enhanced 'gateway' for the Wetherby approach would be effective at encouraging slower entry speeds into the village. If successful, such features could also be useful additions to the other entry 'gateways' into the village (from York and Askham Richard). Therefore, Officers request that delegated authority is granted to install additional 'five-bar' gates should they be considered appropriate. Under this delegation, Officers would review the impact of the enhanced 'gateway' on traffic speeds and local reaction to the 'five-bar' gate at the Wetherby approach to the village, before deciding whether this feature should be installed at the other entry points to the 30mph speed limit.

Corporate Priorities

32. Retaining and enhancing the existing measures that help to reduce the speed of traffic outside Rufforth Primary School, and through the village as a whole, would help meet the Council's Corporate Priorities. In particular, it should encourage local people to walk and cycle, which in turn, meets the priority of improving the health and lifestyles of the people who live in York. In addition, the extensive local consultation on these proposals meets the priority of focusing on the needs of customers and residents in designing and providing services.

Implications

Financial/Programme

33. Funding provision, including a provisional sum for a Vehicle Activated sign and 'five-bar' gates has been allocated within the current Capital Programme for 2007/08. Should approval be granted, it is hoped that the measures could be implemented within the current financial year. The total estimated cost of the works is £40k, broken down as follows:
 - £34k for measures associated with the School Safety Zone and 30mph speed limit relocation;

- £4k for Vehicle Activated Sign installation (if deemed necessary);
- £2k for 'five-bar' gates installation at two further sites (if deemed necessary).

Human Resources (HR)

34. There are no human resources implications.

Equalities

35. There are no equalities implications.

Legal

36. There are no legal implications.

Crime and Disorder

37. There are no crime and disorder implications.

Information Technology (IT)

38. There are no information technology implications.

Property

39. There are no property implications.

Risk Management

Risk Category	Impact	Likelihood	Score
Physical	Very High	Remote	5
Financial	Medium	Possible	9
Organisation/Reputation	Medium	Probable	12

40. In compliance with the Council's risk management strategy, the main risks that have been identified in this report are physical harm linked to road traffic accidents (Physical), higher than expected construction costs (Financial), or damage to the Council's image and reputation because the proposals may remain unpopular with many people (Governance). Measured in terms of impact and likelihood, the risk scores have all been assessed at less than 16. This means that at this point the risks need only to be monitored, as they do not provide a real threat to the achievement of the objectives of this report.

Recommendations

41. That the Advisory Panel advise the Executive Member to:
- a) Approve the revised proposals as shown in **Annex F** (in accordance with **Option Two** above) for implementation in the 2007/08 capital programme.

Reason: To retain a form of effective traffic calming outside the primary school in order to maintain low vehicle speeds, thereby creating a safer environment for school children and village residents.

- b) Request that Officers report back to an Officer In Consultation (OIC) meeting to authorise the installation of a Vehicle Activated Sign at the north-western entry point to the village (on the Wetherby side), should the monitoring of traffic speeds determine this to be necessary, following the introduction of measures in accordance with Recommendation a) above.

Reason: To enable further steps to be taken to reduce traffic speeds on the approach to the village from the Wetherby direction, should the speed monitoring exercise indicate that average approach speeds are excessive.

- c) Request that Officers report back to an OIC meeting to authorise the installation of 'five-bar' gate arrangements at the two other entry points to the village (on the York and Askham Richard sides), should this be considered appropriate after assessing the success of this measure on the Wetherby Road approach.

Reason: To enable further steps to be taken to reduce traffic speeds on the approaches to the village from the York and Askham Richard directions, should Officers consider that the 'five-bar' gate arrangement has had a positive effect at the Wetherby approach to the village.

Contact Details

Author

Jon Pickles
Senior Engineer
Transport & Safety
Tel No: 553462

Chief Officer Responsible for the report

Damon Copperthwaite
Assistant Director of City Strategy

Report Approved Date 17/10/07

Specialist Implications Officer(s)

Financial :
Tony Clarke
Capital Programme Manager

Wards Affected: Rural West York

All

For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers:

Rufforth School Safety Zone and Associated Speed Management Measures – Officer In Consultation report – presented 30 January 2007.

Annexes:

Annexes A, B, C, D, E, F, G and H.