

Crawley County Local Committee	Ref No: (C02(19/20))
Date : 21st November 2019	Key Decision: No
Matthews Drive Removal of chicanes and replacement with speed reduction cushions: objections arising from advertisement of the traffic regulation order (TRO)	Part I
Report by Executive Director for Place and Director of Highways, Transport and Planning	Electoral Division(s): Maidenbower

Summary

The system of chicanes along Matthews Drive dates from traffic management thinking at the time of the Maidenbower development being considered, i.e. late 1980's and early 1990's. Traffic volumes continue to increase resulting in reports of build-ups and queues especially at peak times. There is also a concern about safety arising from the desire of some drivers to 'rush the chicanes', as well as the pollution associated with idling engines in a queue. It is recognised that some form of traffic management / speed control is essential in this part of Maidenbower. This proposal aims to address the issues and to serve the interests of all road users and to seek to mitigate the issues referred to above.

This proposal is similar to the works carried out at Station Hill and Billinton Drive several years ago.

Comments received during the formal advertisement period resulted in 14 objections. It is considered that there are benefits to introducing the traffic calming and that these outweigh the concerns expressed by the objections.

Recommendation

That the County Council Members of Crawley CLC, having considered the responses to the formal consultation, authorises the Director of Law and Assurance to make the order as advertised and the Director of Highways, Transport and Planning to install the scheme.

Proposal

1. Background and Context

1.1 The system of chicanes along Mathews Drive dates from the early days of urban traffic management thinking in the 1980's and early 1990's.

1.2 Since then traffic volumes have continued to increase resulting in reports of major build-ups and queues especially at peak times.

- 1.3 There are also concerns about safety associated with the desire of some drivers to 'rush the chicanes', as well as the pollution associated with idling engines in a queue.

2. Proposal

- 2.1 The existing chicanes are intended to control the traffic speeds between Maidenbower Drive and the Lucas Close area.
- 2.2 To achieve the same effect five sets of raised cushions will be required
- 2.3 Also included are some repairs to service covers and road surfaces where potholes are starting to form.

3. Resources

- 3.1 The Traffic Regulation Order is being progressed using internal resource and does not require funding. It is estimated that the cost of implementation will be £80,000 and is funded from the capital allocation for 2020/21.
- 3.2 The works will be undertaken by the County Council's highways framework contractor.

Factors taken into account

4. Consultation

- 4.1 Formal advertisement of the speed cushions commenced on the 4th September and lasted for the statutory 21 days.
- 4.2 The County Councillor Bob Lanzer supports the proposal. Sussex Police have not raised any objection.
- 4.3 Public notices were erected on site, and an advertisement made in the local press. Online consultation was also undertaken on the WSCC website. This resulted in the following representations received:
 - 14 objections from members of the public
- 4.4 The responses are summarised in Appendix B, along with officer comments.

5. Risk Management Implications

There is a risk that the removal of the chicanes and replacement with pairs of cushions may result in higher traffic speeds; however this scenario has not been seen in other roads where similar work has been carried out.

6. Other Options Considered

- 6.1 It is not possible to install a traffic speed camera as requested as the site does not meet the criterion for their installation by Sussex Police.
- 6.2 There is concern that extensive use of traffic calming features could have a negative impact on public transport and emergency services therefore speed cushions are being proposed (which have a lesser effect on such vehicles than other types of traffic calming) and are to be used over a relatively limited length of road.

7. Equality Duty

- 7.1 The Equality Act 2010 bans unfair treatment and seeks equal opportunities in the workplace and in wider society. It also imposes a Public Sector Equality Duty. The protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage/civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.
- 7.2 The protected characteristics have been duly considered and assessed in the course of the consideration of this proposal. No relevant or disproportionate impact upon any of the protected characteristics in the Equality Act 2010 has been identified in the consideration of the proposals detailed in this report.

8. Social Value

The proposals align with the County Council's policy on Social Value insofar as they aim to improve the local road environment for existing users and existing and future residents.

9. Crime and Disorder Act Implications

Sussex Police were formally consulted on this scheme and raised no concerns regarding implications on Crime and Disorder. Officers have also considered WSCC obligations under the Act and no issues have been identified.

10. Human Rights Implications

It is unlawful for a public authority to act in a way that is incompatible with a convention right. Officers have considered the scheme proposals and implications it may have on Human Rights and are satisfied the proposals will not have a negative impact. It is believed that the introduction of this order is justified.

Lee Harris

Matt Davey

Executive Director for Place

Director of Highways, Transport
and Planning

Contact: Peter Bradley, 03302222104

Appendices

Appendix A – plan of proposals

Appendix B – summary of responses