

The Glebe - proposed Traffic Calming – Objections received & Council's response

Objection 1

[REDACTED]

Sent: 28 April 2023 14:41

To: HTD <HTD@stockton.gov.uk>

Subject: Glebe "traffic cushions"

I have just received a letter stating that the proposed traffic cushion scheme for the Glebe in Norton is in the formal consultation period.

I'd wish to strongly object to these schemes been taken any further, I understand that some drivers treat these "smaller" roads as a race track and don't stick to the 30mph speed limit through the Glebe. 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.

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.

Kind regards
Jonathan

Objection 2

From: I wish to object to speed bumps along The Glebe as I know they damage my vehicle

[REDACTED]

Sent: 30 April 2023 20:09

To: HTD <HTD@stockton.gov.uk>

Subject: Glebe speed bumps

I wish to object to speed bumps on The Glebe as I know it damages my vehicle.

Objection 3

From: David Cooper [REDACTED]

Sent: 07 May 2023 16:48

To: HTD <HTD@stockton.gov.uk>

Subject: OBJECTION - Glebe Road Speed Bumps

To whomever it may concern,

I am a resident of The Glebe Estate and would like to make my objection to the proposed speed bumps on Glebe Road known.

This document was classified as: OFFICIAL

My name is David Cooper and I live at number [REDACTED] I use Glebe Road numerous times a day and 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.

Personally 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.

Please can you confirm that my objection has been noted?

Many Thanks
David Cooper

Objection 4

From: Sheila Ross [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 May 2023 16:22
To: HTD <HTD@stockton.gov.uk>
Subject: Objection to The Glebe Traffic Calming Measures

Dear Transport Strategy and Road Safety Manager,

I am writing to you to lodge my objection to the proposed traffic calming measures, "traffic cushions", on The Glebe, Norton.

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.

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 icy weather attempting to negotiate the incline and I believe the traffic cushions will make this almost impossible.

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.

Hoping we will be traffic cushion free,
Yours sincerely,

Mrs Sheila Ross
[REDACTED]
Norton
[REDACTED]

Objection 5

From: michael jones [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 April 2023 17:44
To: HTD <HTD@stockton.gov.uk>
Subject: Proposal of the installations of several speed humps throughout the Glebe road, Glebe estate, Stockton.

Dear Stockton Council,

Regarding the proposal of the installations of several speed humps throughout the Glebe road, Glebe Estate, Stockton.

Please take this letter as formal response that I oppose the idea and do not support this.

Please can you let me know via email that you have received this formal response.

Thank you
M Jones

Objection 6

From: Robert Holloway [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 April 2023 15:25
To: HTD <HTD@stockton.gov.uk>
Subject: Proposed Traffic Cushions on The Glebe

Hello,

I have lived on [REDACTED] for almost 7 years and I would like to express my strong opposition to the proposed plans for traffic cushions on The Glebe.

Traffic cushions are not needed.

Traffic cushions are not a deterrent to determined speeders.

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.

Having lived on The Glebe for several years I have not witnessed / heard any nuisance road users / persistent speeders.

Traffic cushions will be a detriment to the local area.

Vehicles will be forced to brake and accelerate over the traffic cushions, which will increase noise levels in the area.

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.

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?

I sincerely hope that these plans are scrapped and the council can find more productive ways of spending tax payers hard earned money.

Regards
Robert Holloway

Objection 7

From: hello [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 May 2023 21:49
To: HTD <HTD@stockton.gov.uk>
Subject: RE- speed humps

Hello, just reading and viewing the proposed action for speed humps on the Glebe estate 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 on coming traffic, near missis a lot of the time I think you need to sort this problem of where resident are parking there cars and the danger they are putting people in before anything to do with speed humps
Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

Objection 8

From: Paul Hadlet [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 May 2023 13:11
To: HTD <HTD@stockton.gov.uk>
Subject: Speed Hump Objection

To whom it may concern,

I wish to express my strong opposition to the planned proposals of speed humps on the Glebe road. Please see the attached letter detailing my concerns. I believe this is an incredibly bad decision that will negatively impact Glebe residents and I beg you to reconsider.

Regards,
Paul Hadlet
Glebe Resident

Attachment:

Paul Hadlet
[REDACTED]
Glebe Estate
Stockton-on-Tees

To whom it may concern,

I strongly oppose to the installation of speed humps on the Glebe for the following reasons. This is something I feel incredibly strongly about, and I do hope my concerns are taken seriously.

1. **Damage to car** - Research by comparison website Confused.com claims 22 per cent of car owners have had their motors damaged going over humps. Of those, half suffered tyre trouble; a third said driving over humps had resulted in suspension problems. On a personal level, I can agree with these findings. Having been a resident of Rochester Road, Roseworth for several years where there are 6 speed humps, I frequently had to attend the garage with suspension problems at a cost of around £60 pounds each time. Since moving to the Glebe

and not having to drive over so many speed humps so frequently I have not had anywhere near as many issues. (Although I fear the aggressive speed bumps already installed at Tesco are not going to help here, I would hate for there to be even more I now need to contend with)

2. **Noise pollution** - Noise is quite a factor for the residents in a neighbourhood. This can be an even bigger problem for the residents if the traffic volume is larger and the street is busier. The noise also depends on the type of vehicles, as heavy traffic, such as buses (this is a bus route) and trucks, tend to make more noise while crossing a hump. 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.
3. **Fuel consumption** - In January 2008, research commissioned by the AA showed that speed humps cause fuel consumption to rise substantially. Researchers at the Millbrook Proving Ground found that while a car capable of over 58 mpg when driven at a steady 30 mph, delivered only 31 mpg when it had to slow down to negotiate speed humps and then speed up again. Carbon dioxide emissions changed similarly in proportion. 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.
4. **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 (and obviously this could be even more). Again, 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.
5. **Justification?** – I have been a Glebe resident for the majority of my life. From birth to around 25 years, then moved to Roseworth for around 10 years, then moved back to the Glebe around 2 years ago. My parents and many of my family and friends have always lived in Glebe. In all of that time I am unaware of any significant accidents that have occurred on this stretch of road. I understand I may not be aware of everything, however anything significant that may have resulted in loss of life, I think would have heard of. Therefore, I am struggling to see the justification for this decision. In my experience of regularly using this road I have not witnessed any dangerous driving or speeding. This decision would unfairly negatively impact the vast majority of sensible road users who frequently use this road.

Objection 9

From: Elaine Briscoe [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 May 2023 14:58
To: HTD <HTD@stockton.gov.uk>
Subject: Speed humps Glebe

I have recently moved into the area and use the roads into and out of the estate at both ends regularly. 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 therefore it would be difficult for people to "speed". There are numerous buses and therefore stops along the route as well as parked cars outside peoples 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 therefore 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 Glebe then in the long run it will only be detrimental to current residents not a help to them

Objection 10

From: Ntl World [REDACTED]
Sent: 09 May 2023 19:06
To: HTD <HTD@stockton.gov.uk>
Subject: Traffic calming measures The Glebe Norton

As residents of [REDACTED] 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. It would be easier for cars to avoid The Glebe by coming along Heworth Drive and then down Toddington drive to access Ashton Road, Kinderton Grove and Weaverham Road. We all know how speed humps etc damage the suspension and steering components of our vehicles. We hope that the rest of the estate does not become a rat run for drivers trying to avoid the speed bumps.

Eric and Susan Talbot.

Objection 11

From: Margaret Maynard [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 May 2023 23:17
To: HTD <HTD@stockton.gov.uk>
Subject: Traffic Calming on The Glebe

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.

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!

This document was classified as: OFFICIAL

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!

Margaret Maynard

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Objection 12

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 April 2023 22:25
To: HTD <HTD@stockton.gov.uk>
Subject: Traffic Calming Scheme - The Glebe Norton

Dear Officer

I write to object to the planned introduction of speed humps on the "The Glebe" which I am informed Stockton Borough Council intend to introduce (although no notification has been received at my mothers property to this effect).

I enter and exit the Glebe at least twice daily to visit my mother on the estate and have long noted the excess speed a relatively large minority of motorists exhibit on both heading to and from the Nuffield Hospital on Junction Road.

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.

On a separate but related point, traffic flow is regularly disrupted on the "The Glebe" road by one/two cars whose owners park their cars outside of their houses fully on the road, rather than using parking spaces which exist behind their properties. This causes cars to either back up until traffic heading towards the Nuffield Hospital has passed or increasingly for cars to try to pass two abreast alongside the stationary vehicles which is dangerous. I would request the application of double yellow lines on the dozen or so houses which are situated on the right of the road (immediately after the turning to the shops and the Centenary pub) as this will significantly improve traffic flow and the risk of a collision.

Finally and returning to the issue of speeds cameras, some motorists traveling on the "Ring Road" towards the St Mary Roundabout and from the "Blue Bridge" Ragworth, regularly run red lights at the Junction to the Glebe Estate. This is dangerous to motorists, such as myself, seeking to turn right from the ring road onto the estate. In addition, it also causes traffic flow disruption as vehicles waiting to turn right can be delayed in making the turn and can come into close proximity with vehicles seeking to exit The Glebe and making a right turn towards the Blue Bridge, Ragworth.

As you are not doubt aware the Ring Road is a exceptionally busy road throughout the day and particularly at peak hours. Again, I request implementation of one operational speed camera at the lights at the junction to the Glebe Estate. This will deter most motorists and improve safety/traffic flow. I have requested a speed camera at this site previously but heard nothing back. It is only a matter of time before there is a serious collision caused by running a red light here (if indeed not already). It is my believe installation of a speed camera here is as important at installation of cameras on The Glebe Road itself.

Thank You
Mr Cleary

Objection 13

From: G Hodgson [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 April 2023 16:12
To: HTD <HTD@stockton.gov.uk>
Cc: Alex Cunningham MP <alex.cunningham.mp@parliament.uk>
Subject: Traffic Cushions.. Glebe Est.

Hello,

We have received a letter from Alex Cunningham explaining the future "traffic cushions" proposed for the Glebe Estate.

It is very surprising that Weaverham Road has not been included in the plans.

We have lived in [REDACTED] 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.

Looking at the first and second phase, Weaverham is not considered, why?

Weaverham, must be the longest straight road on the estate and there are at least three boy 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.

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?

We await your reply to why Weaverham Road is not included.

Thanks
Geoff Hodgson.

Objection 14

From: Michael Grange [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 April 2023 14:02
To: HTD <HTD@stockton.gov.uk>
Subject: Glebe speed bumps

Hello

I would like to object against the. Speed bumps been installed on the glebe at Norton I live on [REDACTED] and have done for over 40 years and the increase in traffic on The glebe and speeding is people cutting through from junction road onto A1027 and visa 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 goi g to spend on. Speed bumps in fixing pot holes on the glebe and re tarmacking all The roads on the glebe as they are atrocious and having more parking enforcement officers round the school on The glebe as the traffic and parking is awful when the kids are going to and from school.

Mike Grange

Objection 15

Date 29th April 2023

Dear Stockton Council,

Regarding the proposal of the installations of several speed humps throughout Glebe Road, Glebe estate, Stockton.

Please take this letter as formal response that I oppose the idea and do not support this.

Please can you let me know via writing that you have received this formal response.

Thank you

Michael Jones

[REDACTED]

Norton

Stockton

[REDACTED]

Objection 16

[REDACTED]
Norton.
STOCKTON ON TEES.
[REDACTED]

Transport Strategy and Road Safety Manager.
Stockton on Tees Borough Council.
Community Services.
Environment and Culture,
Municipal Buildings,
Church Road.
Stockton on Tees.
TS18 1LD.

3rd. May 2023

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE. Stockton on Tees Borough Council. The Glebe, Norton Traffic Calming Scheme

I am a resident of The Glebe and have lived on the estate in excess of 40 years. I was employed for the majority of my working life in the road transport industry with all classes of road vehicles. My particular skill was the investigation of road traffic collisions involving all classes of vehicles. I was recognised by the judiciary as being an expert in Collision Investigation.

I fully endorse any viable scheme offered and implemented that would promote road safety which could contribute to the reduction of deaths and injuries on our roads.

It is with interest I read the proposals relating to The Glebe Traffic Calming Scheme. Over the time I have lived on The Glebe I am not aware of any fatal/serious road traffic collisions occurring on this road.

I am aware that a fatal road traffic did occur at the junction of The Glebe and A1027 a number of years ago. Prior to the introduction of the automatic traffic signals. The main contributory factor to this collision was due directly to the extremely high speed of a vehicle travelling north on the A1027. Yes, there have been both injury and damage only collisions on The Glebe. Each one of which I acknowledge is unacceptable. I do not have access to the actual figures in relation to the numbers involved.

Consider Junction Road, a similar two lane single carriageway road subject to a 30 mph speed limit. A two vehicle fatal road traffic occurred in July 2022. A main factor being excessive speed. A single vehicle high speed collision occurred where Junction Road

joins Station Road, Norton in early 2023. The main factor again being high speed. Historically a fatal road traffic collision involving a HGV and saloon car at the junction of North Albert Road, Fife Road, and Junction Road. Causation was the manner of driving. A damage only collision occurred at the junction of Milner Road and Junction Road. Causation again being excessive speed. I genuinely believe that numerous other collision have occurred along the length of Junction Road over the years. Again I do not have access to any accident statistics.

I would appreciate you revealing the accident statistics for both roads over at least a ten year period to further my observations.

For an informative comparison The Glebe from the A1027 to Junction Road (the actual junction) is approximately 0.64 miles/1030 metres long. Junction Road from the junction of The Glebe to Station Road 0.69 miles/1110 metres is approximately long.

Both roads are boarded by numerous domestic residences. I believe that the daily traffic flow along Junction Road is greater than that along The Glebe. This factor alone increases the risk of traffic collisions on Junction Road itself. Why then are you considering the placement of traffic calming devices on The Glebe when Junction Road is obviously a greater danger?

I note that the order is being made under the Highways (Road Humps) regulations 1999. Namely the construction of speed cushions.

There are numerous methods of traffic calming devices available:

- Road humps.
- Rumble Devices and Overrun Areas.
- Narrowing and chicanes.
- Gateways and entry treatments.
- Roundabouts.
- Vehicle activated devices.

An obvious question. Which of the above listed have been considered and what was the rational in deciding that road humps was the preferred choice?

From my experience of the above 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 in vehicles. They are also a causation to a marked increase in air pollution and engine noise in the immediate vicinity of speed humps. I acknowledge these adverse factors occur with any device which causes a motor vehicle to slow and accelerate to negotiate any hazard/obstruction. The fact that speed humps necessitate the motor vehicle ascending an uphill gradient requires a degree of acceleration thus

emitting more exhaust fumes. Ideally if all vehicles were electric powered the problem would be eliminated. Unfortunately it appears that this will be a number of years before this utopia is achieved I believe.

I am led to believe that building construction surveys have been carried out on The Glebe along the route of the proposed scheme. Is this an indication that the scheme has been approved?

I am aware that Stockton on Tees Borough Council have a number of traffic calming schemes installed across the borough that have been operating for numerous years. Some of these are road narrowing and chicanes. I acknowledge that there has to be an increase in pollution at these sites. I do not believe it is at the same level that speed humps promote. Due purely to the fact that road surface remains relatively flat. There is also a facility at some of these sites to provide a channel adjacent to the kerb edges to facilitate safer pedal cycle travel. This is not available with speed humps. There is little or no physical discomfort to passengers in vehicles as they negotiate the device. Mechanical component wear on all classes of motor vehicles is virtually eliminated as a direct consequence of negotiating this form of calming device.

I have deliberately tried not to have a negative approach to the calming scheme. I am of the opinion that if the drivers/riders of motor vehicles behaved in a considerate manner to all classes of other road users these devices/schemes would not be required. My main objection is on the type of calming device fitted.

I remain of the opinion that Junction Road is a far greater hazard for road safety to that of The Glebe. This is reinforced by the recent incidents on this road supported by historical information. Therefore I feel that consideration and prioritisation should be given to this section of road.

I have expressed my personal opinion and would be grateful if you would be kind enough to keep me informed of the developing situation.

Yours sincerely



John E Morton

Objection 17

[REDACTED]
Norton
Stockton on Tees
[REDACTED]

Dear Transport Strategy & Road Safety Manager

I am writing to express my opposition to the installation of speed bumps outside my house. I understand that the intention of these measures is to reduce the speed of vehicles and promote safety, but I believe that the negative impact they will have on our community outweighs any potential benefits.

Firstly, the installation of speed bumps will cause significant noise pollution, especially for residents living close to them. This can have a detrimental effect on our quality of life, making it difficult to sleep, concentrate, or simply enjoy our homes. In addition, the noise generated by vehicles traversing the speed bumps can be particularly disturbing during the night when traffic is lighter. Secondly, speed bumps can damage cars, causing wear and tear on tires, suspension, and other components. This could result in additional costs for motorists, especially those who use the road regularly, such as delivery drivers or emergency services.

Finally, the installation of speed bumps could lead to traffic congestion and longer journey times, as drivers slow down and speed up repeatedly. This would not only be frustrating for motorists but could also lead to increased pollution and a negative impact on the environment. Parking outside my property would also become a problem. In light of these concerns, I respectfully request that you reconsider the installation of speed bumps outside my house. I understand that safety is a priority, but there are other measures that could be considered, such as reducing the speed limit or increasing enforcement of existing traffic laws.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my views on this matter.

Sincerely,
Lynn & Gary Walsh

Objection 18

From: Stewart Milne [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 May 2023 16:56
To: HTD <HTD@stockton.gov.uk>
Subject: Proposed Glebe Traffic Measures

FAO Transport and Road safety Manager

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed installation of speed bumps on Glebe Road. While I understand that the council's intention is to improve road safety, I believe that speed bumps are not the solution and will cause more harm than good. This proposal seems to be initiated based on the complaints of a small but vocal minority.

Firstly, speed bumps are known to cause inconvenience and discomfort to drivers, passengers, and pedestrians. They can damage vehicles, cause wear and tear to vehicles and due to increased acceleration and braking cause increased running costs and maintenance. There is the problem of noise pollution, especially for those living near the speed bumps, from revving engines and suspension. In addition, speed bumps may cause delays for emergency vehicles, which can have serious consequences in cases of medical emergencies or fires.

Secondly, speed bumps do not address the root cause of the problem, which is reckless driving. Speed bumps may slow down traffic, but they do not prevent drivers from speeding or driving recklessly. In fact, some drivers may accelerate between speed bumps, which can be even more dangerous than continuous speeding. As was noted at the previous consultation, there have been no real reported incidents due to speed on this road.

Thirdly, the installation of speed bumps on Glebe Road will have a negative impact on the environment. The construction of speed bumps requires the use of materials such as concrete or asphalt, which contribute to carbon emissions. Furthermore, the maintenance and replacement of speed bumps will incur additional costs and use up valuable resources.

Instead of installing speed bumps, I suggest that the council consider alternative measures to improve road safety or target other areas with higher speeds or more reported incidents.

In conclusion, I urge you to reconsider the installation of speed bumps on Glebe Road. I believe that the negative impacts of speed bumps outweigh their supposed benefits and that alternative measures should be explored instead. Thank you for considering my views.

Best Regards

Stewart Milne [REDACTED]

Objection 19

From: antony Steinberg [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 May 2023 19:46
To: HTD <HTD@stockton.gov.uk>
Subject: Proposed traffic calming measures at The Glebe

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

I am writing to strongly object to the proposed installation of speed bumps on The Glebe. As a resident of the Glebe for the past 14 years I feel strongly about this. My reasons are as follows:

1. Do we really have an issue with speeders? If so what are the police doing about this?
2. How many accidents/incidents have been reported to the police?
3. How many accidents have there been over the last 14years. I don't remember many over the last 14 years.
4. What are the costs of these installations? Could this money be best spent elsewhere?
5. This is a major bus route. What effect will this have on passengers falling (the elderly especially) and congestion.
6. Will there be compensation to drivers whose cars (not everyone drives a 4 x 4) are damaged by these humps and what about the extra cost to drivers driving in lower gears?

These speed humps will have massive consequences for those of us who live on the Glebe.

Yours
Mr Antony Steinberg

[REDACTED]

Council's response

Dear

STOCKTON-ON-TEES BOROUGH COUNCIL THE GLEBE, NORTON - PROPOSED TRAFFIC CALMING SCHEME

Further to your email/letter which has been received as a formal objection to the proposed traffic calming measures on The Glebe, I will take this opportunity to give you the background in respect of this scheme and respond to concerns highlighted by residents.

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.

An automatic speed survey was 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.

The following information is in response to concerns raised by residents:

- 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. Each 1mph reduction in average vehicle speed as a result of traffic calming has been found to reduce accidents by around 5%. The

Government's traffic calming policies are evidence based and thereby undergo extensive tests and trials before they are introduced nationally. The proposed speed cushions are designed to allow larger vehicles such as buses and emergency vehicles to align and straddle the cushions and minimise any impact on passengers. The Bus Operators and emergency services have been consulted on the proposals and have raised no objections. Speed hump dimensions must comply with national standards adhered to by all local authorities and should not cause damage to vehicles if negotiated at an appropriate speed. The Council, as the Highway Authority, would not be liable for any damage caused to vehicles.

- The traffic volume on The Glebe is low and it is not considered that the introduction of speed cushions would cause traffic congestion. Similar schemes in the borough where traffic calming features have been introduced have not resulted in traffic congestion.
- There have been two road traffic accidents within the last 3 years on The Glebe, both of which 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.
- 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.
- 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 an estimated reduction in the maximum noise emission levels from cars due to the speed reductions at cushions. 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 speed control cushions, reduction in traffic noise levels would be about 5dB(A).
- It is acknowledged that some drivers may use alternative routes to avoid traffic calming features on The Glebe, however, this is not expected to be a significant number.
- The provision of speed cameras has been raised as an alternative option to speed cushions. There are large costs and ongoing resource issues associated with the provision of speed cameras, they are therefore not considered to be an option on The Glebe. Funding from speed camera's go to the Treasury not the local authority or police force where they are located.
- Speed cushions are effective at reducing motor vehicle speeds and do not require a specific forward visibility distance, whilst they obviously must be visible, they are not designed to stop vehicles, they are designed to slow them down, the associated road humps warning signs warn drivers of their existence and the need to reduce their speed to negotiate the feature. 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. This flexibility allows the designer to fit them into the streetscape.
- It has been suggested that chicanes should be considered as an alternative option to speed cushions. Single lane chicanes are a horizontal deflection treatment that requires one direction of traffic to give way to oncoming vehicles. The chicane normally consists of a raised kerb and bollard in one half of the road, with a sign to explain the vehicle traffic

priority. For the lane without traffic priority, there are Give Way sign and markings and hatching on approach to the chicane. A length of 20 metres is required to accommodate a chicane feature including give way markings. The forward visibility required for such features is 90m on a 30mph road and they are therefore more suitable for long straight roads and are difficult to fit into a residential streetscape where fronting properties have a large number of driveways such as The Glebe. The provision of chicanes is therefore not a feasible option.

- Road humps are not suitable for roads that are part of a bus route.
- The implementation of a 20mph speed limit without physical traffic calming features is only appropriate on those roads that already have an average speed limit of 24mph or less. Therefore, given the higher speeds on The Glebe, the implementation of a 20mph speed limit without physical traffic calming features is not a viable option.
- 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.
- The issues raised in regard to obstructive parking, Weaverham Road, Junction Road, A1027/The Glebe junction and A1027/Norton Avenue junction all sit outside the scope of this scheme.
- Restricting access to The Glebe to prevent people cutting through from Junction Road to A1027 and vice versa is not a possible option. The implementation of such a restriction is not feasible and would be unenforceable.

As your e-mail has been received as an objection the next stage is to ask you to please consider your objection. If you wish to uphold your objection the item will be referred to the Council's Appeals and Complaints Committee. The Committee is independent to the traffic Order process, as an objector you would be invited to attend and given every opportunity to address the Committee if you wish. I must make you aware that your correspondence will form part of the Appeals and Complaints Committee papers and it will therefore become a public document at that stage. Taking into consideration the information provided, the alternative is to withdraw your objection. I would be grateful if you would indicate your intentions by Friday 16th June 2023, by return of e-mail to HTD@stockton.gov.uk

Regards