

---

**Decision Session - Cabinet Member for  
Transport**

**21 November 2014**

Report of the Director of City and Environmental Services

**HUNTINGTON ROAD TRAFFIC CALMING (NEAR THE FORMER  
SESSIONS SITE)**

**Summary**

1. This report provides feedback on a recent consultation exercise undertaken in relation to restoring the chicanes on Huntington Road near the new housing development on the former Session site.

**Recommendation**

2. That the Cabinet Member agrees to reinstall chicanes in this area, as proposed in Annex D.

**Background**

3. Ben Bailey Homes Ltd is developing the former Sessions site off Huntington Road. As part of the development work, there was a requirement to remove the existing priority give-way measures (chicanes) as they would cause problems for construction traffic and would conflict with the position of new driveway accesses onto Huntington Road as proposed as part of the new housing development.
4. The planning conditions stipulated that, as a temporary measure, speed cushions should be introduced on to Huntington Road in place of the chicanes to continue to control vehicular speeds. The temporary cushions were installed prior to the development work commencing, as required under the planning conditions, as shown in Annex A. However, in the long term it was always understood that the chicanes would be restored when most of the construction work was completed and suitable new positions had been agreed.

5. Ben Bailey Homes Ltd has a commitment to fund the introduction of the temporary and replacement permanent traffic calming measures.

### **Outline Proposals**

6. To help identify where the replacement chicanes would be best positioned, the new street layout was assessed and the proposals shown in Annex B were developed for local consultation.

### **Consultation**

7. Consultation was undertaken in February 2014 with a letter (see Annex C) and plan being sent to local residents and businesses. The consultation also included Huntington Parish Council, the Ward Members, party group representatives and relevant road user organisations. The results of the consultation are outlined below.

### **Ward Member Views**

8. Councillors Hyman, Runciman and Orrell requested that the consultation letter be sent out to a much wider area than just those properties adjacent to the scheme.

*Officer Response - After internal consultation with City of York Council's planners, it was agreed that there was no additional requirement under the planning consent for the developer of the Sessions site to do a wide scale consultation. The original traffic calming scheme had been consulted upon quite some time ago, and as the proposals are to replace the original chicanes, just in a more appropriate location, all that was considered necessary at this stage was consultation of these changes locally.*

### **Political Party Views**

9. Councillors D'Agorne, Reid and Steward offered no response to the consultation.

### **Parish Council Views**

10. Huntington Parish Council offered no response to the consultation.

## **Local Business Views**

11. Local businesses offered no response to the consultation.

## **User Group Views**

12. None have offered any response to the consultation (but it is understood that North Yorkshire Police intends to respond and this feedback will be added to the report later or given at the meeting).

## **Residents**

13. Two residential households responded to the consultation. The views were divided, with one supporting the removal of the cushions, and the other supporting their retention in place of the chicanes. More detail is given below:
  - A resident of Fern Close stated that the new rubber speed cushions caused grounding problems for drivers on low sports cars. The resident also considered that lorries and vans are able to straddle them too easily, and so feels the cushions do not work in traffic calming terms.

*Officer response: The proposed removal of the cushions should resolve the problem for low cars, and chicanes are effective at slowing vehicles of all sizes.*
  - A resident of Huntington Road stated that the previous chicanes caused noise pollution regularly night and day along Huntington Road, as motorists were frustrated by being held up by the chicanes, resulting in frequent use of horns to vent their frustrations.

*Officer response: This is not thought to be a significant problem, and at night the traffic flows are much less making instances of conflict and horn blowing much less likely. It is not a complaint that has regularly been made about the former layout in this area, or indeed over the rest of the scheme.*

## Safety Audit

14. A safety audit appraisal of the proposal was recently carried out and highlighted the following points:-

- The proposed layout of the chicanes in Annex B places them in an arrangement which is different to the rest of the scheme (they would be on the opposite side of the road if the arrangement was the same). The layout in Annex B has the advantage of keeping traffic on the normal (left) side of Huntington Road as it passes the new site access, which is less likely to cause any confusion for drivers exiting the side road. However, there is a concern that queuing back from either of the chicanes could make entry or exit from the side road very difficult and lead to driver frustration and possible some hazardous manoeuvres. There is also a concern that if this queuing developed at both chicanes simultaneously a grid-lock situation would occur, which again could result in some hazardous manoeuvres.
- Given these concerns the audit team looked at the option of locating the chicanes in the same locations, but on the opposite side of the road, to create a consistency with how the rest of the scheme works. The main drawback identified is that as traffic goes around the chicanes it would be on the “wrong” side of the road, and this could be potentially confusing for drivers exiting the new side road. However, drivers should be emerging from this side road with caution, and providing they take the normal precaution in looking left and right there should not be a significant problem.
- The safety audit team feedback goes on to say that retention of speed cushions could avoid the potential problems highlighted with chicanes. However if retained permanently, the cushions would need to be carefully placed within the available road space to ensure drivers cannot avoid the measure and stray into opposing traffic or close to the kerb where they may come into conflict with a cyclist. Adequate space should also be provided between the kerb and outside edge of the cushion to allow cyclists to avoid the measure.

## Options & Analysis

15. There are three options available:
  - (a) Implement the chicane scheme as originally proposed in Annex B
  - (b) Implement the revised chicane scheme as proposed in Annex C in response to the safety audit comments;
  - (c) Leave a speed cushion scheme in place permanently.

## Analysis

16. The consultation exercise produced very little feedback, other than one expression of dislike of the existing cushions, and one view that the chicanes have some associated noise problems. This tends to imply that most people are happy to see chicanes restored in this area.
17. The chicane layout shown in Annex B has some potential problems as highlighted by the safety audit appraisal. Positioning the chicanes on the opposite side of the road, as shown in Annex D, would have less potential problems. Hence this would be the recommend option (option b)
18. The option of retaining speed cushions would be a significant change to the proposals and so would require additional consultation. It would create a permanent inconsistency in the scheme, and would probably be opposed by those not supporting more permanent vertical traffic calming measures. Also, under this option, the existing cushions would need to be replaced with ones meeting the council's recently adopted standard dimensional specifications.

## Council Plan

19. The potential implications for the priorities in the Council Plan are:
  - i. **Get York Moving** - the proposals offer a suitable and recognised method of controlling vehicle speeds, making it safer for road users, whilst still allowing unrestricted movement and access in this area.
  - ii. **Protect vulnerable people** – the proposed scheme would maintain a safer highway environment, which would benefit the local community

## Implications

20. This report has the following implications:

- **Human Resources** – None.
- **Financial** – The cost of installing the permanent traffic calming measures will be met by the developer. In addition it is proposed to carry out some local road re-surfacing which would be funded through the highways maintenance budget. The surfacing will be undertaken concurrent to the s278 works to reduce disruption to residents and to reduce the overall expenditure in providing the required work.
- **Equalities** – This highway project should not adversely affect specific groups of people.
- **Legal** – The City of York Council, as Highways Authority, has powers under the Highways Act 1980 and associated Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984, and the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 to implement the measures proposed.
- **Crime and Disorder** – None
- **Information Technology** - None.
- **Land** – None
- **Other** – None.

## Risk Management

21. In compliance with the Council's risk management strategy, the following risks associated with the recommendations in this report have been identified and described in the following points and set out in the table below:
22. Health and safety – the risk associated with this is in connection road safety implications of the final layout, and has been assessed at 6.

23. Authority reputation – this risk is in connection with public perception of the Council not undertaking a project that has been consulted upon, and is assessed at 2.

Risk Category	Impact	Likelihood	Score
Health and safety	Moderate	Remote	6
Organisation/ Reputation	Minor	Remote	2

Together these produce a risk score of 8, which being in the 6-10 category means that the risks have been assessed as being “Low”. This level of risk requires regular monitoring.

#### **Contact Details:**

##### **Report Author:**

Mark Reade  
Engineer  
Transport Projects  
Highways  
Tel: (01904) 553519

##### **Chief Officer Responsible for the Report:**

Neil Ferris  
Assistant Director  
Transport, Highways and Waste

Report approved:  Date 24<sup>th</sup> October 2014

##### **Specialist Implications Officer(s)**

There are no specialist implications.

**Wards Affected:** Huntington and New Earswick

##### **Background Papers**

None

## **Annexes**

Annex A Position of temporary speed cushions.

Annex B Proposed chicane layout, as consulted on.

Annex C Consultation document distributed from February 2014

Annex D Proposed alternative chicane layout.