

The Glebe - proposed traffic calming scheme - Summary of objections/support

Total objections received – 24

Total objections withdrawn - 5

Total support received – 2

Ref.	Support	
1	<p>I fully welcome the proposed work that is to be carried out on our estate. While walking my dog I've noticed the number of cars that seem to speed along Glebe Road.</p> <p>May I also suggest, if funding allows, erect two no through road signs. One to be placed at junction road end of the Glebe Road end and the other just past the Glebe shops junction. I believe this might deter non-resident traffic using the Glebe Road as a short cut from Junction Road to the A177 and vice versa.</p>	
2	<p>We are in support of traffic calming measures and agree this should be done first in The Glebe road.</p>	

Ref.	Objection	Response
1	<p>These speed bump/cushions are completely useless, they only speed up between them and I have seen some drivers just carry on over them at normal speed. They are uneconomical as you use more fuel slowing down and then getting back up to 30mph and they increase wear and tear on your car even when going slowly over them. Especially in the current economic situation the honest drive doesn't need increased costs on what is already an expensive "privilege" to be on the road. Surely, they are other ways of dealing with these things, perhaps lowering the limit to 20mph or designing other traffic calming settings like priority lanes where you give way to the other side and vice versa as other areas around Stockton have.</p> <p>I find it very comical that money can be found for those "traffic" measures but the average roads around the Stockton/Norton borough are diabolical and are desperately in need of pothole fixing or a full resurface.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that fuel consumption may increase slightly when adjusting speeds to negotiate speed cushions. However, speed is the main cause of premature deaths and injuries in road casualties with older people and children being most vulnerable. Speed cushions are one of the most effective means of reducing traffic speed, which can in turn reduce the number and severity of road accidents.</p> <p>20mph speed limits should be self enforceable and are only appropriate for roads that have an average speed limit of 24mph or less. Roads such as The Glebe with higher average speeds would require traffic calming features to achieve a 20mph speed limit.</p> <p>Stockton Borough Council actively respond to and repair any potholes classed as actionable defect as and when required and have done many and continue to do so in the Norton and Stockton area. We have also carried out programmed patching in some areas with our Highways</p>

		team along with continued carriageway resurfacing schemes.
2	It damages vehicles	<p>If you go over a speed bump too fast then you could potentially cause damage to your vehicle. An appropriate speed for driving over speed cushions is less than 20mph, Transport Research Laboratory studies have shown that the speeds vehicles travel over speed cushions are around 14mph. Speed cushions are thereby one of the most effective traffic calming measures available to local authorities.</p> <p>The Council, as the Highway Authority, would not be liable for any damage caused to vehicles.</p>
3	<p>I believe that speed bumps are not needed and will if anything add to the congestion by slowing traffic to speeds lower than the speed limit.</p> <p>I believe this money would be better spent by repairing the various Pot Holes on the estate correctly rather than the useless filling of the holes that has been carried out so far (many many times) especially at the top of Weaverham Road.</p>	<p>The traffic volume on The Glebe is low and it is not considered that the introduction of speed cushions would cause traffic congestion. Similar roads in the borough where traffic calming features have been introduced has not caused traffic congestion.</p> <p>Stockton Borough Council actively respond to and repair any potholes classed as actionable defect as and when required and have done many and continue to do so in the Norton and Stockton area. We have also carried out programmed patching in some areas with our Highways team along with continued carriageway resurfacing schemes.</p>
4	<p>I have lived on The Glebe for over 35 years and I have never had a problem with speeding traffic. I am not aware of any serious accident on The Glebe road and cannot understand the need for "traffic cushions". I believe these measures will be more of a hindrance to the traffic than a solution to any complaints about speeding traffic. I am concerned that residents such as myself with their driveways close to the road will have great problems entering and exiting their driveways.</p> <p>Winter weather causes a great problem with traffic attempting to go up the hill towards Junction Road and traffic cushions will cause a complete stoppage. I have witnessed and experienced the difficulties faced by drivers in</p>	<p>An automatic speed survey has been carried out on The Glebe to establish prevailing vehicle speeds, the results of which confirmed that the 85th%ile speed at 36mph (the speed at or below which 85% of vehicles are travelling) are above police enforcement levels, specifically for vehicles travelling in a southbound direction. The aim of the scheme is therefore to reduce vehicle speeds. Speed cushions are generally effective at reducing motor vehicle speeds and in turn increase road safety.</p> <p>There have been two road traffic accidents within the last 3 years which both resulted in slight injuries. This is a proposed</p>

	<p>icy weather attempting to negotiate the incline and I believe the traffic cushions will make this almost impossible.</p> <p>I find it very difficult to believe that any car driver living on The Glebe would agree to traffic cushions. We already have the two speed monitors on The Glebe which I feel encourages drivers to check their speed and comply with the road's speed limit and no further measures should be necessary.</p>	<p>environmental traffic calming scheme to address concerns relating to speeding issues raised by local residents and has not been developed based on road traffic accidents.</p> <p>The proposed cushion locations have been designed to avoid driveways.</p> <p>The traffic volume on The Glebe is low and it is not considered that the introduction of speed cushions would cause traffic congestion. Similar roads in the borough where traffic calming features have been introduced has not caused traffic congestion.</p>
6	<p>As a resident of Glebe Estate and a car driver I see no need for these. I regularly drive along the Glebe Road and do not see any speeding drivers.</p> <p>Is there documented evidence, to show the number of speeding drivers against the number of car journeys taken over a given period, along with the number of speed related accidents along the Glebe Road as this would be the basis for the speed humps.</p>	<p>An automatic speed survey has been carried out over a 7 day period on The Glebe to establish prevailing vehicle speeds, the results of which confirmed that the 85th%ile speed at 36mph (the speed at or below which 85% of vehicles are travelling) are above police enforcement levels, specifically for vehicles travelling in a southbound direction. The aim of the scheme is therefore to reduce vehicle speeds. Speed cushions are generally effective at reducing motor vehicle speeds and in turn increase road safety.</p> <p>There have been two road traffic accidents within the last 3 years which both resulted in slight injuries. This is a proposed environmental traffic calming scheme to address concerns relating to speeding issues raised by local residents and has not been developed based on road traffic accidents.</p>
7	<p>Traffic cushions are not needed. Traffic cushions are not a deterrent to determined speeders.</p> <p>I have done my own research and found only a single slight accident in the last 10 years of available data, see attached. As you can see many of the recorded incidents have occurred in surrounding areas not on The Glebe.</p> <p>Having lived on The Glebe for several years I have not witnessed / heard any nuisance road users / persistent speeders.</p> <p>Traffic cushions will be a detriment to the local area.</p>	<p>An automatic speed survey has been carried out on The Glebe to establish prevailing vehicle speeds, the results of which confirmed that the 85th%ile speed at 36mph (the speed at or below which 85% of vehicles are travelling) are above police enforcement levels, specifically for vehicles travelling in a southbound direction. The aim of the scheme is therefore to reduce vehicle speeds. Speed cushions are generally effective at reducing motor vehicle speeds and in turn increase road safety.</p>

	<p>Vehicles will be forced to brake and accelerate over the traffic cushions, which will increase noise levels in the area.</p> <p>In a cost of living crisis, traffic cushions will increase wear and tear and fuel usage for all vehicles, adding to the maintenance costs of all local drivers.</p> <p>In addition, the general annoyance of having to drive over the proposed traffic cushions several times per day would put many people off living in the area. Would you like them outside your home?</p> <p>I sincerely hope that these plans are scrapped and the council can find more productive ways of spending taxpayers hard earned money.</p>	<p>The humps tend to produce around 85-90 decibels in the 15-20 mph range of vehicles. In comparison, speed cushions are the least noisy, according to the Local Transport Note 1/07. Most of the speed humps in the UK conform to these sound levels.</p>
8	<p>I do think there is a need for some kind of action on the Glebe road I don't think there is a need for 7 speed humps on this short stretch of road I think this is being over the top my concern as a resident of 25 years on this estate has been as turning left or right out of Ashton road you cannot see if there is anything coming from the top of the bank because of cars parked on the pavement obstructing the oncoming traffic, near missis a lot of the time I think you need to sort this problem of where resident are parking their cars and the danger they are putting people in before anything to do with speed humps</p>	<p>The number of speed cushion proposed follows the Department for Transport guidance on the distance suggested between the features, which should be no more than 100-150 metres apart, with the optimum spacing of 75m to avoid drivers adopting an aggressive style of driving, with heavy braking and acceleration between humps.</p> <p>The issue of obstructive parking sits outside the scope of this scheme.</p>
9	<p>In my opinion these are not required as we have not had any accidents due to speeding on this road.</p> <p>Install speed humps is an unnecessary waste of public funds which could be better spent installing a right turn traffic light on to the estate at the shops end and also lights or a roundabout at the top of Leven road next to Aldi assisting traffic to get onto the 1027, currently it is very difficult to get out as traffic turning left blocks access.</p> <p>Installing speed humps will cause a lot of pain and inconvenience to the elderly on the Estate and the Emergency services.</p> <p>I have spoken to a lot of elderly residents who use the buses and live on the Glebe, they have pointed out that this will cause delays with the</p>	<p>There have been two road traffic accidents within the last 3 years which both resulted in slight injuries. This is a proposed environmental traffic calming scheme to address concerns relating to speeding issues raised by local residents and has not been developed based on road traffic accidents.</p> <p>The proposed speed cushions are designed to allow buses and larger emergency vehicles to straddle the cushions and minimise any impact on passengers. The issues raised at A1027/The Glebe junction and A1027/Norton Avenue junction sit outside the scope of this scheme.</p>

	<p>bus service and make travelling on the buses painful for those with joint and back problems.</p>	
<p>10</p>	<p>Damage to car - Research by comparison website Confused.com claims 22 per cent of car owners have had their motors damaged going over humps</p> <p>Noise pollution - Noise is quite a factor for the residents in a neighbourhood. The result is that most speed humps and undulation produce noise up to certain levels. Humps tend to produce around 85-90 decibels in the 15-20 mph range of vehicles.</p> <p>Fuel consumption - In January 2008, research commissioned by the AA showed that speed humps cause fuel consumption to rise substantially. Fuel costs are already incredibly high and is of significant concern to many drivers. Being efficient with fuel consumption is very important to help drivers reduce the burden on our already very tight purse strings. There is also the environmental impact of using greater fuel to consider.</p> <p>Physical discomfort - AA president Edmund King once said "Humps are a crude, uncomfortable and noisy way of slowing people down". Anyone who needs to use this stretch of road will now have to cross over speed bumps 14 times in one singular return journey. In 2-3 journeys, which is not at all unreasonable, this would be as many as 42 times in a single day. speaking from experience, I can confirm speed humps do cause genuine painful discomfort, as well as having a significant negative impact on my mental health. I used to dread having to drive on that stretch of road in Roseworth, which was something I had no choice but to do every single day in order to get to work. It caused me a significant amount of anxiety, upset and anger and I fear these feelings would resurface should these speed humps be installed. It was a genuine contributing factor on my decision to move home. I implore you to please not go ahead with these plans.</p> <p>Justification? –I have been a Glebe resident for the majority of my life. In all of that time I am unaware of any significant accidents that have occurred on this stretch of road. . In my experience of regularly using this road I have not witnessed any dangerous driving or</p>	<p>A study on vehicle noise emissions alongside speed cushions and humps was carried out by The Transport Research Laboratory (TRL Report 180). The conclusions of which shows estimated a reduction in the maximum noise emission levels from cars due to the speed reductions at narrow cushions (width less than 1700mm) was 6.6dB. These estimates compare well with results from surveys of vehicle noise emissions carried out alongside speed control cushions (width of 1700nm) in York, where reductions of 8.4dB(A) in the noise from cars were achieved after the cushions were installed. Where the traffic stream consists entirely of cars, the prediction model estimates that for both humps and cushions, traffic noise levels, dB(A), would reduce following installation. For humps the reduction in traffic noise levels would be about 7dB(A), whilst for speed control cushions, reduction in traffic noise levels would be about 5dB(A).</p> <p>Speed cushions are designed to cause less interference than humps to large vehicles, such as buses and emergency vehicles, but still slow down small vehicles, such as cars. Negotiating a speed cushion at an appropriate slow speed should reduce any physical discomfort. Speed cushions are one of the most effective means of reducing traffic speed, which can in turn reduce the number and severity of road accidents.</p> <p>There have been two road traffic accidents within the last 3 years which both resulted in slight injuries. This is a proposed environmental traffic calming scheme to address concerns relating to speeding issues raised by local residents and has not been developed based on road traffic accidents.</p>

	<p>speeding. This decision would unfairly negatively impact the vast majority of sensible road users who frequently use this road.</p>	
<p>11</p>	<p>I have looked at proposed situation of speed humps and find them excessive in amount unusual in their proposed situation and overall not needed. The road is curved and therefor it would be difficult for people to “speed”. There are numerous buses and therefore stops along the route as well as parked cars outside people’s residences. Putting speed humps into the mix would just make the road a deadlocked area and dangerous. Humps look to be situated close together in places and at the entrance egress of minor roads thus gridlocking those areas and therefor backing up those minor roads. It is not a straight road and therefore would just be a hindrance rather than a help. It would be interesting to know what if any speed study has shown or statistics relating to accidents on the road thus warranting such drastic measures. The majority of users in the estate are elderly careful drivers anyway or bus users. So, what really is the benefit and to whom. As if I was living along that stretch I would certainly not want standing traffic backing up outside my house waiting to negotiate such as well as damage to cars suspension, braking and speeding up engine noises and emissions. I myself have health issues which are exacerbated when I have to encounter these on my journeys and try to avoid areas with them thus taking a longer route adding to traffic there. If this is an attempt to get people to circumvent The Glebe then in the long run it will only be detrimental to current residents not a help to them</p>	<p>Air pollution hotspots arise from high volumes of traffic on major routes, not traffic-calmed neighbourhoods. It is important to remember that reducing speed saves lives and speed cushions are often used in residential areas with low traffic flows. Such areas don’t normally have air quality problems, so speed cushions do not significantly contribute to the total amount of harmful vehicle pollutants that are created. The number of speed cushion proposed follows the Department for Transport guidance on the distance suggested between the features, which should be no more than 100-150 metres apart, with the optimum spacing of 75m to avoid drivers adopting an aggressive style of driving, with heavy braking and acceleration between humps. There have been two road traffic accidents within the last 3 years which both resulted in slight injuries. This is a proposed environmental traffic calming scheme to address concerns relating to speeding issues raised by local residents and has not been developed based on road traffic accidents. An automatic speed survey has been carried out on The Glebe to establish prevailing vehicle speeds, the results of which confirmed that the 85th%ile speed at 36mph (the speed at or below which 85% of vehicles are travelling) are above police enforcement levels, specifically for vehicles travelling in a southbound direction. The aim of the scheme is therefore to reduce vehicle speeds. Speed cushions are generally effective at reducing motor vehicle speeds and in turn increase road safety.</p>
<p>12</p>	<p>As residents of Toddington Drive we wish to object about the proposed traffic calming measures on The Glebe Road. We believe that this could impact on increased traffic cutting round the estate to avoid these humps. We all</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that some drivers may use alternative routes to avoid traffic calming features on The Glebe.</p>

	<p>know how speed humps etc damage the suspension and steering components of our vehicles.</p> <p>We hope that the rest of the estate does not become a rat run for drivers trying to avoid the speed bumps.</p>	<p>If driven over at an appropriate slow speed, speed cushions should not cause damage to vehicles.</p>
13	<p>As a resident of the Glebe Estate for many years I wish to voice my concerns at the short sightedness and lack of thought given to the Council's plans for speed humps on The Glebe. We do have problems with speeding traffic and we now have a mixture of both elderly and young on the estate, who are perhaps not as nimble or aware on the roads.</p> <p>The proposal to install speed humps on The Glebe will only result in the traffic diverting round the estate and using both Ashton Road and Weaverham Road. Both have long straight stretches of road which are perfect for speeding vehicles!</p> <p>Why does the council not install speed cameras at various points? And actually utilise them to issue fines and penalty points, this will provide a bigger deterrent and also help to pay for itself, instead of coming out of our pockets!</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that some drivers may use alternative routes to avoid traffic calming features on The Glebe. Speed camera not appropriate for The Glebe. Funding from speed camera's go to the Treasury not the local authority or police force where they are located.</p>
14	<p>Rather than impose the misery of an extensive speed hump system on this road I request the installation of two or three speed cameras at strategic points to enforce speed limits. I would expect installation & maintenance of these cameras will substantially exceed the cost of simply laying down speed bumps and would therefore expect this request, along with that made by others to no doubt be dismissed. Nevertheless, installation would avoid the imposition of this misery upon the majority of us who do abide by the speed limit.</p>	<p>Speed cameras are not an option for The Glebe. It is extremely costly to install speed cameras and would require additional resources. Funding from speed camera's go to the Treasury not the local authority or police force where they are located.</p>
15	<p>It is very surprising that Weaverham Road has not been included in the plans.</p> <p>We have lived in Weaverham for 42 years and have seen a great increase in traffic over the years. This has been largely due to parents of children who take them to the Glebe School. So Weaverham is very busy, twice per day.</p> <p>Looking at the first and second phase, Weaverham is not considered, why?</p> <p>Weaverham, must be the longest straight road on the estate and there are at least three boy</p>	<p>The proposed traffic calming scheme on The Glebe was identified as a priority by the Norton West Ward Councillors to address concerns relating to speeding issues raised by local residents. The scheme is to be funded through the Norton West Ward allocation of the Ward Transport Budget; this budget is provided to spend on transport priorities within the ward that would not be eligible for funding from the core road safety budget. The</p>

	<p>racers, who emerge from Ashton, who use the stretch to see if they can achieve 60 mph, before they hit the Glebe Rd. This becomes very dangerous, as there are young children playing on the footpaths and particularly at school times.</p> <p>So, why has Weaverham been left out of the plans, as with the Glebe Road they are the two roads where many motorists exceed the speed limits?</p> <p>We await your reply to why Weaverham Road is not included.</p>	<p>Norton West Ward Councillors have therefore been active members in the scheme's development.</p> <p>Weaverham Road sits outside the scope of this scheme.</p>
16	<p>The increase in traffic on The Glebe and speeding is people cutting through from junction road onto A1027 and vice versa the speed bumps will severely impact the people living on the glebe the easiest solution is make cutting through the glebe illegal !! and spend the money you were going to spend on. Speed bumps in fixing potholes on the glebe and re tarmacking all the roads on the glebe as they are atrocious.</p>	<p>Restricting access to The Glebe is not a possible option.</p> <p>Stockton Borough Council actively respond to and repair any potholes classed as actionable defect as and when required and have done many and continue to do so in the Norton and Stockton area. We have also carried out programmed patching in some areas with our Highways team along with continued carriageway resurfacing schemes.</p>
18	<p>I am an elderly resident with health problems and need my car. I am not happy about speed humps.</p>	
19	<p>Why are you considering the placement of traffic calming devices on The Glebe when Junction Road is obviously a greater danger and has more accidents. There are numerous methods of traffic calming devices available: road humps, rumble devices and overrun areas, narrowing and chicanes, gateway and entry treatments, roundabouts, vehicle activated signs. Which of these have been considered and what was the rationale in deciding that road humps were the preferred choice?</p> <p>From my experience of the listed devices road humps are the most damaging to all classes of vehicles. They are also acknowledged as a potential hazard contributing to physical injuries to passenger vehicles. They are also a causation to a marked increase in air pollution and engine noise in the immediate vicinity of speed humps. My main objection is on the type of calming device proposed, chicanes would be a more environmentally friendly option.</p>	<p>The proposed traffic calming scheme on The Glebe was identified as a priority by the Norton West Ward Councillors to address concerns relating to speeding issues raised by local residents. The scheme is to be funded through the Norton West Ward allocation of the Ward Transport Budget; this budget is provided to spend on transport priorities within the ward that would not be eligible for funding from the core road safety budget. The Norton West Ward Councillors have therefore been active members in the scheme's development.</p> <p>Junction Road sits outside the scope of this scheme.</p> <p>Chicanes require good forward visibility and are difficult to fit into a residential streetscape where fronting properties have many driveways such as The Glebe; they are therefore more suitable for long straight roads. The provision of chicanes is therefore not a feasible option.</p>

		<p>Road humps are not suitable for roads that is part of a bus route.</p> <p>Gateway and entry treatments are used to signify the approach into a village, or into a traffic-calmed area such as a 20 mph zone. The traffic calming proposed is for a single road and not a zone, therefore it is not an appropriate option.</p> <p>Air pollution hotspots arise from high volumes of traffic on major routes, not traffic-calmed neighbourhoods.</p> <p>The evidence that removing speed bumps will reduce air pollution is very weak. In fact, guidelines from NICE – the National Institute For Health and Clinical Excellence – says the evidence does not back up removing speed bumps to lower air pollution.</p> <p>Removing speed bumps would at best do little or nothing to improve air quality.</p>
--	--	--