Decision Session – Executive Member for Economy & Transport **11 July 2023**

Report of the Director of Environment, Transport and Planning

New Lane, Acomb - Review of existing 20mph limit

Summary

1. The report details the results of a consultation exercise with regard speed management proposals for New Lane, Acomb following on from the completion of a feasibility study and the receipt of a 124-signature petition.

2. The Executive Member is asked to decide how to proceed with speed management features on New Lane, Acomb.

Recommendations

3. The Executive Member is asked to:

    i. Approve Option 3: Improved Signage Only. Eight additional repeater signs to be provided along the full length of New Lane to support the existing signage.

    Reason: Following consultation with residents of the street there is no clear desire for the introduction of vertical traffic calming, despite the previous petition request. The measures do not offer value for money and when considered alongside the potential detrimental effects of such features on residents' quality of life the negative effects are considered to outweigh the positive impact in this case.

Background

4. A speeding complaint made by a local resident in 2019 led to New Lane being fed into the 95 Alive Speed Management process for investigation. The initial 95 Alive review highlighted that speeds in New Lane were

higher for southbound traffic, particularly the 85th percentile figure, and as such the recommended action was to consider an engineering solution to reduce traffic speeds.

5. The 2020/21 Speed Management Scheme programme identified New Lane, Acomb for a feasibility study.

6. The report looked at existing traffic speeds on New Lane, and proposed measures to improve compliance with the signed 20mph speed limit.

7. The report also considered opportunities a speed management scheme might present for improving facilities for pedestrians wanting to cross New Lane near the entrance to West Bank Park.

8. The feasibility report is attached as **Annex 1**. The report recommended that additional speed limit repeater signs were installed. The report was considered at Transport Board in July 2022 and approval was given to progress to design stage for the recommended option.

9. However, a petition requesting “speed calming measures” on New Lane had been submitted at the full council meeting in April 2022. As this was within the scope of the portfolio of the Executive Member of Transport it was formally acknowledged in a report to an Executive Member decision session meeting on 28 September 2022. Given the strength of feeling expressed in the petition, it was agreed that, as the work progresses through design (including consultation), a number of options would be presented to residents for comment. The results of the consultation would then be brought back to Executive Member Decision Session for decision.

Associated projects

10. Work is ongoing for the following associated projects in the area:

- A full review of the Our Lady Queen of Martyrs school safety zone including consideration of a request to join the two 20mph Zones which are currently in place on Hamilton Drive.
- A speed limit review of Acomb Road in the vicinity of crossing points used to access Acomb Primary School and West Bank Park.
- A feasibility study of crossing improvements on Acomb Road.
- A review of road markings on West Bank as part of the 23/24 annual review of parking restrictions.

Options

11. Three options were presented for consideration at consultation stage:

12. **Option 1: Traffic Calming. Estimated cost £32,000**
    A series of three speed humps on the southern half of the street along with the relevant signing. Plan provided as **Annex 2**.

13. **Option 2: Traffic Calming and crossing point improvement. Estimated cost £46,000**
    A series of three speed humps on the southern half of the street along with the relevant signing. In addition, a localised narrowing of the carriageway to a single lane, this creates an opportunity to provide a better crossing point in the vicinity of the access to West Bank Park. A section of guardrail to slow pedestrians as they approach the carriageway is also proposed. Plan provided as **Annex 3**.

14. **Option 3: Signs only. Estimated cost £2,000**
    Eight additional repeater signs to be provided the full length of New Lane to support the existing signage. Plan provided as **Annex 4**.

Consultation

15. A Consultation exercise was carried out via email with relevant officers within CYC. This was followed by emails to external statutory consultees and a letter drop to 63 properties which front onto New Lane or have direct vehicular access to the street.

16. A copy of the consultation documents issued to residents is provided as **Annex 5**.

17. A plan showing the consultation area is shown on **Annex 6**.

Internal consultation feedback

18. Four responses were received from internal officers and are outlined below

Comment	Response
• Not sure additional signs alone will work. • Asked if consideration had been given to using planters as a traffic calming method. • Agreed that a crossing point near the park access would be useful.	Planters had not been considered for three reasons. 1. Visibility from driveways must be maintained so all planters would be on the park side, creating a straight run for southbound traffic potentially increasing speeds at quiet times. 2. Creating several chicanes requires more signage and could lead to vehicles accelerating to get past features. 3. Maintenance of planters needs to be taken on by residents or they become unsightly. Width of road may make maintenance of planters by residents unworkable due to H&S concerns.
Noted that a petition for a one-way on Lindley and Murray Street had been received and that the request didn't specify a direction.	The schemes are not interdependent. No intention to combine.
1 - Are residents not concerned about northern section? 2 - Give way markings too close to the proposed build-out. Could we have an additional option - build outs only no humps? 3 - If drivers are already ignoring the signs, I can't see how installing even more will make any difference. 4- Disability issue on Hill Street just north of scheme proposals. Wheelchair users must cross New Lane twice to access.	1. Speed data illustrates there is no issue with vehicle speeds over the northern section. 2. Agreed. The give-way marking will be relocated before the options are presented to residents. The proposed build-out could be provided independently of the vertical measures. 3. Due to the low level of speeding vehicles, it is likely that some drivers are just not aware of the posted speed limit, more frequent reminders could help reduce the average speeds. 4. Changes to the Hill Street radii and footway are outside the scope of this scheme.

Can we tighten Hill Street with a proper buildout on both sides? Not keen on crossing as a narrowing - concerned cyclists will be put at risk. Suggested speed table as an alternative. Can we move guardrail back to park access?	Changes to the Hill Street radii and footway are outside the scope of this scheme. All other feedback will be considered if the scheme moves to detailed design.

External Consultation

19. In total, 7 households responded. Of these, 4 expressed a clear preference for signing improvements only, whilst 1 favoured traffic calming only. Two respondents were less clear with their preference with one happy with Option 1 or 2 and the final respondent was happy with Option 1 or Option 3. The comments are outlined below.

Comment	Officer Response
I have received your letter in relation to the proposed speed management on New Lane. I understand people's concerns regarding speeding on the road as we do hear people going by on a night-time, however I don't think speed bumps, or a carriageway narrowing are the answer. Hamilton drive has speed bumps and that does not stop people speeding on that road, my partner was even overtaken whilst doing the speed limit on the road. Also, the current surface of the road is concrete and already a bumpy surface that discourages speeding. The narrowing of the road would also not work for me as there are already a lot of cars that park on both sides of the road, so it is relatively impossible to speed during busy times at the park. However, at a night-time when it is less busy, I doubt the narrowing of the road would make any difference as the driver can see no oncoming traffic. As New Lane is a through road, I think the narrowing of the road will increase the traffic waiting on the road and make it more difficult for residents to get out of their driveways. Finally, regarding the addition of signage, this would make sense as I am aware that visitors to our house are sometimes unsure of the speed limit and therefore additional signage would benefit those who do not intend to speed.	Thanked resident for feedback. No further comments.
I'm emailing regarding the consultation regarding speed management on New Lane. I am a current resident on the road. I strongly oppose option 1 of traffic calming by using speed humps. I believe speed humps are ineffective, around the corner on Hamilton drive are speed bumps outside the primary school and they appear to make no difference to prevent speeding. I also find them visually unappealing.	Thanked resident for feedback. No further comments.

Option 2 of traffic calming and crossing points. Again, I feel speed bumps are ineffective. The suggestion of narrowing the carriageway along the road would be a waste of public funds. Cars are consistently parked on the road already creating several single lanes along the road. Option 3 of signs only would be my preference. I do not feel it is clear that the street is 20mph so additional signage could be beneficial. This also seems to be a more appropriate use of public funds.	
My husband and I think option 1 and 2 are the better options.	Thanked resident for feedback. No further comments.
I vote for Option 1. Option 2 isn't really viable as narrowing of the street will cause more problems than it's worth, many parents use this street to park in when dropping their children off and picking them up from the school in Hamilton Drive plus the Methodist chapel goers also use it as a means of parking!! There's hardly any room left for residents!!! Option 3 would be a total waste of taxpayers money as people don't adhere to the existing signage, I really don't think they would take notice of anymore!	Thanked resident for feedback. No further comments.
We have lived on New Lane for 49 years, since 1974, and as far as we are concerned there isn't an issue with excessive speed in New Lane that would warrant the installation of physical traffic calming measures. The vast majority of the traffic travels at a sensible speed and there is no guarantee that the occasional idiot that doesn't, would be deterred by speed humps etc. In the 49 years that we've lived here we can't recall any traffic accidents at all and certainly none that have been caused by excessive speed. Traffic humps cause vibrations to nearby properties and increased pollution because of vehicles slowing down and speeding up again. Large vehicles come along New Lane and sometimes have difficulty getting past parked cars. To reduce the width of the road near the Hill Street junction would only make the situation worse.	Thanked resident for feedback. No further comments.

We are agreeable to Option 3, signs only, but are strongly opposed to Options 1 & 2 which in our opinion are totally unnecessary.	

My concerns focus on my house being at a pinch point in the road where cars parked on the carriageway switch sides. South of my house cars park on the east side of the road, north of my house there is 100m of parking on west before reverting to east. There are visibility issues. It may help with speed, though. With the speed recommendations 1. Option 3 more signs 2. Do nothing 3. Option 1 traffic calming. There is effectively one lane and consequently you drive to manage the likelihood of oncoming traffic, with due consideration. 4. Option 2 not convinced a good use of funding; parked cars achieve this already. You give way to cars coming from the south already. Slowing traffic down is good, but road doesn't need any more weaving and darting for gaps. Thank-you for the opportunity to comment	Thanked resident for feedback. No further comments.
OPTION 1. Cheapest option – OK! OPTION 2. OK Three speed bumps! + signs. OPTION 3. Single Lane – NEVER! The lane plus Hamilton drive is already "crammed" at 'drop off' and 'collect' times i.e. school times. The drivers of cars and vans already take chances so a serious accident is only a matter of time. A section of guardrail – agreed but where would these be located. May I suggest that the "Council decision makers" plus the engineers visit the school "drop off & collect times" if they haven't already done so!	A CYC engineer has visited the site at school pick- up / drop off.

20. Consultation was undertaken prior to the election. Cllr Kallum Taylor made representations separately to officers for option 2 (traffic calming and crossing point improvement). Referencing that pedestrian safety and speed when crossing East to West towards the park is frequently raised with him as an issue. This reflects the petition that was organised and submitted by Cllr Taylor.

21. North Yorkshire Police – Raised concerns with regard the potential for noise generation by vertical traffic calming measures and loss of on street parking with the proposed buildout. Supported the introduction of additional signage to reduce speeds on the southern section of the street.

22. North Yorkshire Fire Service - No response

23. Ambulance Service – No response

Analysis

Option 1 – Traffic Calming.

24. Vertical traffic calming measures would help to enforce the 20mph speed limit, however the mean speeds through the southern section of New Lane are only 2 to 3mph higher than the signed speed limit. Vertical measures are expensive and do not offer value for money when the required speed reduction is so low.

25. Full width vertical measures can also create vibration and noise issues, negatively impact air quality in the local area, and most importantly as illustrated by the consultation responses are not supported by the residents of the street despite the views from the petition. For these reasons this option is not recommended.

Option 2 – Traffic Calming plus road narrowing for crossing point.

26. All the comments raised in relation to Option 1 apply to Option 2. The addition of the proposed localised narrowing to improve the crossing point to the park does offer an additional improvement over Option 1.

27. The use of a buildout to create a priority give way arrangement requires a steady flow of traffic in both directions or vehicles are not slowed sufficiently and could race to beat an opposing vehicle. The traffic flows reported in the Feasibility Report (**Annex 1**) are higher northbound and

are so infrequent (averaging one vehicle every 30 seconds) that the priority working is likely to be ineffective. So, whilst this option provides an improvement to crossing facilities, it may not provide worthwhile benefits for the significantly increased cost.

28. Both CYC officers and residents raised safety concerns in relation to the buildout's location, close to Hill Street, and the possible risks for cyclists at carriageway narrowings. These issues have been considered and whilst the scheme is not the recommended option it is considered suitable for implementation.

Option 3 – Additional signing.

29. The signing-only option offers an inexpensive and less intrusive scheme that can be achieved quickly and based on the result of the consultation exercise is supported by the local residents.

30. Whilst it may not provide the traffic calming intervention that the petition requested, it is considered adequate to make drivers more aware of the speed limit, something which was noted in the resident responses. Officers are aware that this may not provide the same reduction in traffic speeds as vertical measures but based on the original speed surveys it should help bring speeds down by 1-2 mph making them much more in line with the posted 20mph limit.

31. It should be noted that any option taken forward would be subject to the road safety audit process before the scheme progresses to construction. This is in line with City of York Council Policy for any scheme which changes the use of the highway.

Council Plan

32. The three options provided for consideration to the residents of New Lane all meet the following priorities from the Council plan.

33. *Getting around sustainably*: By reducing vehicle speeds on local roads the community can feel safer using sustainable transport methods including cycling and walking.

34. *Safe communities and culture for all:* Lower vehicles speeds can assist in vulnerable road users feeling safer when travelling.

35. *An open and effective council:* The original feasibility study was undertaken in response to concerns being raised by residents and following a subsequent recommendation from North Yorkshire Police. This report has been developed and progressed as a direct result of a petition. Both activities demonstrate that the council considers community requests in an open and effective manner.

Implications

36. **Financial –**
The cost of the proposed option can be met within existing budgets.

37. **Human Resources (HR) –**
There are no Human Resources implications around the decisions in this report.

38. ***Equalities*** –
The Council recognises its Public Sector Equality Duty under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 (to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other prohibited conduct; advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it and foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it in the exercise of a public authority's functions.

An Equalities Impact Assessment has been carried out. There are no equality implications as a result of the proposal. The assessment is attached as **Annex 7**.

39. **Legal –** All speed limits, other than those on restricted roads, should be made by order under Section 84 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. Any speed limits below 30 mph, other than 20 mph limits or 20 mph zones, require individual consent from the Secretary of State. Traffic authorities have a duty to erect and maintain prescribed speed limit signs on their roads in accordance with the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002 (TSRGD 2002).

40. **Crime and Disorder** –
There are no crime and disorder implications around the decisions in this report.

Information Technology (IT) –
There are no Information Technology implications around the decisions in this report.

41. **Property –**
There are no Property implications around the decisions in this report.

42. **Highways –**
The installation of any of the options may have an impact on the use of the highway in the short term during the construction period. Providing traffic calming on the street could relocate some of the existing traffic to other streets if they choose to avoid the measures. This may have implications for the wider highway network.

Risk Management

43. The following risks are associated with the recommendation of the report:

The wider community may be disappointed with the recommended option which could affect the authority's reputation. Using the CYC risk scoring matrix this risk is rated as 9. No further action is considered necessary because of this risk being identified.

Contact Details

Author:

Ben Potter,
Engineer
Highways Engineering Design
Tel No. 01904 553496

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

James Gilchrist
Title: Director of Environment, Transport and Planning

Report Approved ✓ **Date** 04/07/2023

Specialist Implications Officer(s)

Financial:
Patrick looker
Finance Manager
01904 51633

Legal:
Cathryn Moore
Legal Business Partner (Corporate)
01904 552487

Wards Affected: Holgate **All** ☐

For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers:

Decision Session – Executive Member for Transport – Wednesday, 28 September 2022. Agenda Item 5 – Acknowledgement of Petitions.

Annexes

Annex 1 – Feasibility Report – Speed Management Programme 2020/21 New Lane (Acomb) Review of existing 20mph limit

Annex 2 – Option 1 Outline Scheme Drawing

Annex 3 – Option 2 Outline Scheme Drawing

Annex 4 – Option 3 Outline Scheme Drawing

Annex 5 – Consultation Documentation Pack

Annex 6 – Consultation Area Plan

Annex 7 – Equalities Impact Assessment

List of Abbreviations Used in this Report

CYC – City of York Council