

Title of meeting: Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation

Date of meeting: 17 December 2020

Subject: Speed Reduction LTP 19/20 - Clive Road

Report by: Tristan Samuels, Director of Regeneration

Wards affected: Fratton Ward

Key decision: No

Full Council decision: No

1. Purpose of report

- 1.1 To consider the responses to the public consultation regarding the proposals to implement speed reduction infrastructure (speed cushions) on Clive Road.

2. Recommendations

It is recommended that:

- 2.1 **The Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation approves the implementation of speed cushions on Clive Road.**

3. Background

- 3.1 Clive Road is subject to a 20mph speed limit, but has a high level of historical and recent non-compliance, due to the road being long and straight with good visibility which enabling faster vehicle speeds. The proposed traffic calming features aim to improve road safety within the area, and increase active travel through improved pedestrian/cyclist confidence, which may in turn lead to improved air quality.
- 3.2 Previously recorded speeds show that 15% of drivers travel at speeds of 32mph or more, and average speeds recorded at 25mph.
- 3.3 During the five year period of March 2015 to February 2020, there have been five road traffic collisions recorded (one serious, four slight).
- 3.4 The implementation of the three proposed sets of speed cushions (see appendix 2 for specific locations) will reduce speeds and the risk of road traffic collisions



along Clive Road, and increase confidence in the infrastructure for active travel, potentially encouraging more walking and cycling, which may in turn lead to improved air quality in the city.

4. Reasons for recommendations

- 4.1** There is evidence of vehicles speeding along the section of Clive Road proposed for speed cushion implementation.
- 4.2** The proposed traffic calming features will reduce speed driven on Clive Road, and reduce the risk of road traffic collisions. The design of a speed cushion means that the driver of the vehicle should slow down to between 5-10mph when driving over them to minimise the risk of damage to their vehicle. This will reduce the speed of vehicles to below the 20mph limit.
- 4.3** This will improve road safety within the area, potentially increase active travel through improved pedestrian/cyclist confidence in using the route, which may also lead to improved air quality.
- 4.4** No parking space(s) will be permanently removed as a result of these speed cushions being implemented.

5. Integrated impact assessment

- 5.1** The proposed speed cushions would encourage safer driver behaviour, reducing the risk of road collisions and their associated economic costs, and offer greater protection and confidence in the road safety infrastructure for all drivers. Lower speeds could potentially encourage more people to walk and cycle along the route, which in turn could promote greater health benefits and improved air quality.
- 5.2** This recommendation does a negative impact on any of the protected characteristics as described in the Equality Act 2010. As a road safety scheme, this project aims to meet the requirements of Section 39 of the 1988 Road Traffic Act by seeking to reduce casualties. The scheme also seeks to improve the area for residents and local businesses. The scheme contributes to protecting and supporting our most vulnerable residents.
- 5.3** A full Integrated Impact Assessment accompanies this report.

6. Legal implications (draft comments below, tbc: currently being reviewed)

City Solicitor's comments



- 6.1 It is the duty of a local authority to manage their road network with a view to achieving, so far as may be reasonably practicable having regard to their other obligations, policies and objectives, the following objectives:
- (a) securing the expeditious movement of traffic on the authority's road network; and
- (b) facilitating the expeditious movement of traffic on road networks for which another authority is the traffic authority."
- 6.2 Local authorities have a duty to take account of the needs of all road users, take action to minimise, prevent or deal with congestion problems, and consider the implications of decisions for both their network and those of others.
- 6.3 Traffic regulation orders (TROs) can be made for a number of reasons, including avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or for preventing the likelihood of such danger arising, for preventing damage to the road or any building on or near the road, for facilitating the passage on the road of traffic (including pedestrians) or preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs.
- 6.4 A TRO may make provisions for identifying any part of the road to which any provision of the TRO is to apply by means of a traffic sign.
- 6.5 A proposed TRO must be advertised and the public given a 3 week consultation period where members of the public can register their support or objections. If objections are received to the proposed order the matter must go before the appropriate executive member for a decision whether or not to make the order, taking into account the comments received from the public during the consultation period. It should be noted, however, that the chosen contractor carrying out the works can potentially do so without the need for closing the road, rendering both a TRO or TTRO unnecessary.
- 6.7 The power to make traffic calming works is contained in the Highways (Traffic Calming) Regulations 1999. Where a local authority proposes to construct traffic calming works they shall consult the chief officer of polices and such persons or organisations representing persons who use the highway or who are otherwise likely to be affected by the proposed works. The proposed works can include build-outs, chicanes, gateways, islands, overrun area, pinch-points, or rumble devices. Regulations apply to specific traffic calming works and the display of appropriate signs.
- 7. Director of Finance's comments (draft comments below, tbc: currently being reviewed)**
- 7.1 The cost of this scheme is £35,000, this will be funded from the LTP Capital Budget as approved at Full Council on the 12th February 2019.

7.2 Ongoing costs of maintenance will be met by the Highways Maintenance contract and a commuted sum has been included within the scheme cost to maintain this site.

.....
Signed by:

Appendices:

Background list of documents: Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972

The following documents disclose facts or matters, which have been relied upon to a material extent by the author in preparing this report:

Title of document	Location

The recommendation(s) set out above were approved/ approved as amended/ deferred/ rejected by on

.....
Signed by:

Appendix 1:

Consultation

8.1 A letter was addressed to residents around Clive Road within the appropriate consultation area, on the 11 September 2020, along with a public notice detailing the proposed scheme was displayed on-street in Clive Road, uploaded to the City Council website, published in the Portsmouth news and sent to statutory consultees and ward councillors, inviting comments. The consultation period took place between 11 September and 18 October. Six responses were received, with four respondents in favour, one objection raised and one respondent suggested using alternative speed reduction infrastructure. Public responses and safer travel team comments have are below:

8.2 Consultation Responses & Safer Travel Team Responses:

<i>Resident</i>	<i>Objections and Comments</i>	<i>Safer Travel Team Comments</i>
Residents of Clive Road	<u>Support: Speeding Is An Issue On Clive Road</u>	



	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• I greatly support the installations of these, as the parent of 2 small children is can be quite a worry crossing Clive Road with my youngest child in a pram due to the speed of cars coming down my road. I am unable to allow my oldest child to play out the front of his house again due to the speed of the cars, I can reassure yourself that there are parents that are in a similar situation to myself further up the road and the roads opposite such as Adames and Samuel road.• Reference the speed cushion proposal for Clive Road; I and my family are in full support for this to happen. I would say 90% of drivers ignore the 20 mph limit hitting maybe 30 mph, and every day several drivers are at least driving over 40 mph. The sooner it is completed the better.• As residents [of this section of road], we fully support the introduction of speed bumps. There are far too many cars that use this road as a shortcut from the main road and that travel down it at excessive speeds.• Further to your recent notice I honestly don't believe that 'speed cushions' or any such would have any effect on the speed of traffic through this road. Given the mentality of the 'boy racers' that drive at speed around this area I would suggest that the only thing that would have any effect would be to hit them in their pocket i.e. speed cameras which I am sure would pay for themselves very quickly. Also I would like to go on record in saying that I am not happy about encouraging cyclists. From my observations as a	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The speed cushions will reduce speeds travelled along this section of Clive Road, which has shown historical and current excess speeding issues. Other roads are considered annually for speed reduction schemes.• The Safer Travel team agree that the speed cushions will reduce speeds travelled along Clive Road and make the environment safer for all road users.• The Safer Travel agree that there is clear evidence of speeding in this section of Clive Road and the speed cushions will reduce speeds travelled.• The council cannot implement speed cameras that lead to enforceable fines. Speed cushions are an evidence based, effective measure when looking to reduce speeds on roads. The council also is positive in supporting cycling as a healthy, sustainable activity, and improving road safety infrastructure is one of the
--	---	--



	<p>driver they don't use lights, dress in dark clothes and don't signal before doing all sorts of weird and wonderful manoeuvres in front of you. As a pedestrian they ride down pavements (very narrow in Fratton Road!) and round corners without looking. I have had at least half a dozen near misses this year alone if you insist on encouraging these people at least give them decent cycle lanes and enforce their use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please also consider the other end of Clive road for traffic calming, as this is used by speeding drivers as a short cut. Thank you 	<p>best ways to support active travel.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The safer travel team have a rolling program of speed surveys and site assessment for roads around the city.
<p>Resident of nearby Brookfield Road</p>	<p><u>Objection: there is no speeding on Clive Road</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am writing to object to the council's proposal for traffic calming on Clive Road, for the following reasons. I have lived in Brookfield Road since 1999, and have never seen any issues of speeding in Clive Road, other than an occasional idiot. I travel along Clive road many times a day. This for the above reason, would be a total waste of public money, as it is not needed. If anything, something should be done to stop people going the wrong way in the one way bit in Guildford Road between Clive Road and Brookfield Road. Since living in the area since 1999, I have not seen any call for speed humps. The only accidents I have witnessed, or been involved in, are at junctions where people don't look before pulling out... not speed related. I would also like to add that pollution is apparently 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recent speed survey data showed average speed to be 25mph, and the V85 to be 32mph (15% of drivers drive at speeds of 32mph and above). Compared to other speed surveys in the city, these levels are high. Historical speed data has also showed excess speed to be an issue on this section of Clive Road. <p>Improving road safety infrastructure is fundamental to encouraging active travel, especially cycling and walking over car use. Increased active travel can in turn lead to improved air quality across the city.</p>



increased where speed humps are put in place, due to the acceleration between the humps, and there is an increase in brake dust. In a city that is trying to reduce pollution, I believe this will not help. I also maintain it is a total waste of tax payers' money, especially when councils are claiming not to have any!

Speeding is one of the fatal four causes of accidents, as noted by police (speeding, mobile phone use, not wearing your seatbelt, and drink driving). Reducing speeding has significant potential in reducing accidents along Clive Road.

Historical accidents recorded show a wide range of contributory factors recorded by the police, including aggressive driving, reckless/in a hurry, loss of control, failure to judge another person's speed etc.

Appendix 2:

Drawing

