

# North Tyneside Council Report to Cabinet Member for Environment Date: 07 July 2023

**Title:** Road humps – Whitley Road, Holystone

---

<b>Portfolio(s):</b> Environment	<b>Cabinet Member(s):</b> Councillor H Johnson
----------------------------------	--

---

**Report from Service Area:** Regeneration and Economic Development

**Responsible Officer:** John Sparkes, Director of Regeneration and Economic Development (Tel: 0191 643 7295)

**Wards affected:** Killingworth

---

## **PART 1**

### **1.1 Executive Summary:**

This report seeks the approval of the Cabinet Member for Environment to introduce road humps (speed cushions) on Whitley Road, Holystone and to set aside seven objections received to the proposal.

### **1.2 Recommendation(s):**

It is recommended that the Cabinet Member for Environment:

- (1) considers the objections;
- (2) sets aside the objections in the interests of increasing safety for all road users and contributing to ensuring that highway conditions are conducive to support greater usage of cycling, walking and wheeling; and
- (3) determines that road humps should be installed in accordance with the proposal.

### **1.3 Forward Plan:**

Considering any representations received in relation to the proposed construction of road humps, and thereafter determining if road humps should be installed, is a standing item on the Forward Plan.

## 1.4 Council Plan and Policy Framework

The proposals in this report relate to the following priority in Our North Tyneside, the Council Plan 2021 to 2025:

- A green North Tyneside
  - We will increase opportunities for safe walking and cycling, including providing a segregated cycleway at the coast
  - We will publish an action plan of the steps we will take and the national investment we will seek to make North Tyneside carbon net-zero by 2030
- A secure North Tyneside
  - We will continue to invest £2m per year in fixing our roads and pavements.

## 1.5 Information:

### 1.5.1 Background

In accordance with the Authority's aims to improve road safety, it is proposed to install traffic calming measures (speed cushions) on Whitley Road, Holystone in the vicinity of Bede Close. A plan showing the scheme is included at Appendix 3.

A 'give and take' priority traffic calming measure was previously in place at this location. However, following reports from residents that this measure had led to confusion and queries around road safety, it was removed in 2021 prior to carriageway resurfacing works being carried out on Whitley Road.

The results of a traffic speed survey (included at Appendix 4) carried out after the removal indicated that an alternative traffic calming measure would be required in order for traffic speeds to remain compliant with the existing 20mph speed limit. Given the regular use of Whitley Road by buses and HGVs, speed cushions were identified as the most appropriate form of traffic calming. The use of cushions rather than full width road humps will minimise any discomfort to bus users and also reduce noise and vibrations owing to the smaller dimensions of these features.

Ward Members and key stakeholders were informed of the proposal by email. Residents living in the immediate vicinity of the proposed traffic calming features were contacted by letter. No concerns about the proposal were raised with officers at this stage.

Whitley Road Action Group (WRAG), a local residents' group whose focus is traffic and road safety issues in the Holystone area, have also been consulted about the proposed traffic calming measures. Discussions around reducing the volume and speed of vehicles using Whitley Road have taken place during 2022 between WRAG and officers of the Authority, including the Director of Regeneration and Economic Development. Different options for addressing the concerns raised by WRAG continue to be explored by the Authority.

The proposals were advertised in accordance with the Authority's usual procedure as set out in section 2.2 and seven formal objections to the proposal were received.

### 1.5.2 Proposal in relation to road humps

It is proposed to construct three sets of speed cushions on Whitley Road adjacent to its junction with Bede Close. These are intended to reduce average traffic speeds to a level

consistent with national guidance for an area with a 20mph speed limit (i.e. 24mph or less).

The proposed introduction of speed humps will contribute to reducing motorised traffic speeds in the area, thereby increasing safety for all road users, and will contribute to ensuring that highway conditions are conducive to support greater usage of cycling, walking and wheeling. There will be a 1.3 metre gap between the kerb and the outer edges of the speed cushions to allow people cycling to bypass these features. This is in accordance with guidance set out in the North Tyneside Cycling Design Guide.

### 1.5.3 Statutory Consultation

Proposals to construct road humps are subject to statutory legal process as described in section 2.2: this includes the Authority giving public notice of the proposals and taking such other steps as it may consider appropriate for ensuring adequate publicity. In North Tyneside, this includes notices advertising proposals being displayed on affected streets and on the Authority's website. This enables members of the public or businesses to object to the proposal. Any objectors are sent a response and invited to reconsider their objection. Any objections not withdrawn are referred to the Cabinet Member for Environment for consideration in accordance with the Mayor's Scheme of Delegation.

### 1.5.4 Summary of Objections

#### Objection 1

**Mr W** submitted an objection to the scheme in which he stated that the consultation exercise undertaken with residents was in his view insufficient and suggested that the proposals did not demonstrate good street design.

A response was provided outlining the reasons behind the scheme and why speed cushions were proposed. The objector was invited to withdraw his objection and advised that the objection, if not withdrawn, would be included in a report for consideration by the Cabinet Member for Environment. The objector responded to make further comments and confirm that he wished for his objection to remain.

#### Objection 2

**Mr H** submitted an objection to the scheme stating that emergency vehicles, buses and heavy goods vehicles would in his view have difficulty negotiating the proposed traffic calming features. He suggested the installation of speed cameras and more stringent enforcement of the 20mph restriction.

An officer wrote to the objector to clarify that the proposed features would be constructed to ensure minimal discomfort to public transport and emergency vehicle passengers. The objector was invited to withdraw his objection and was advised that the objection, if not withdrawn, would be included in a report for consideration by the Cabinet Member for Environment. The objector confirmed that he wished for his objection to remain.

#### Objection 3

**Mrs WL** submitted an objection to the scheme and stated that as a local resident she had not received a letter to her home address. She further stated that the proposed speed cushions would in her view not be effective in reducing speeding.

A response was provided stating that letters had been delivered to properties directly affected by the installation of the proposed traffic calming features and outlining the reasons for the scheme and for speed cushions being proposed. The objector was invited to withdraw her objection and advised that the objection, if not withdrawn, would be included in a report for consideration by the Cabinet Member for Environment. The objector confirmed that she wished for her objection to remain.

#### Objection 4

**Mr WT** submitted an objection to the scheme stating that the proposals were in his view not an appropriate use of public funds and that the proposed speed cushions would in his view not be effective in reducing speeding. He also requested a copy of the data from a previous speed survey.

A response was sent providing the requested information and outlining the reasons for speed cushions being proposed. The objector was invited to withdraw his objection and advised that the objection, if not withdrawn, would be included in a report for consideration by the Cabinet Member for Environment. The objector confirmed that he wished for his objection to remain.

#### Objection 5

**Mrs K** submitted an objection to the scheme and stated that as a local resident she had not received a letter to her home address. She further stated that the proposed speed cushions would in her view not be effective in reducing speeding.

A response was provided stating that letters had been delivered to properties directly affected by the installation of the proposed traffic calming features and outlining the reasons for the scheme and for speed cushions being proposed. The objector was invited to withdraw her objection and advised that the objection, if not withdrawn, would be included in a report for consideration by the Cabinet Member for Environment. The objector responded to make further comments and confirm that she wished for her objection to remain.

#### Objection 6

**Mrs R** submitted an objection to the scheme and stated that as a local resident she had not been notified of the proposals. She further stated that the proposed speed cushions would in her view not be effective in reducing speeding and requested the installation of a raised pedestrian crossing.

A response was provided stating that letters had been delivered to properties directly affected by the installation of the proposed traffic calming features and outlining the reasons for the scheme and for speed cushions being proposed. The objector was invited to withdraw her objection and advised that the objection, if not withdrawn, would be included in a report for consideration by the Cabinet Member for Environment. The objector confirmed that she wished for her objection to remain.

#### Objection 7

**Mrs A** submitted an objection to the scheme in which she stated that the proposed speed cushions would in her view not be effective in reducing speeding and requested the installation of a pedestrian crossing.

A response was provided outlining the reasons for the scheme and for speed cushions being proposed. The objector was invited to withdraw her objection and advised that the objection, if not withdrawn, would be included in a report for consideration by the Cabinet Member for Environment. The objector that she wished for her objection to remain.

Details of the objections and associated correspondence are included at Appendix 1 of this report.

## 1.6 Decision options:

The following decision options are available for consideration by the Cabinet Member for Environment:

### Option 1

Approve the recommendations set out in section 1.2.

### Option 2

Not approve the recommendations set out in section 1.2.

Option 1 is the recommended option.

## 1.7 Reasons for recommended option:

Option 1 is recommended in the interests of increasing safety for all road users and contributing to ensuring that highway conditions are conducive to support greater usage of cycling, walking and wheeling.

## 1.8 Appendices:

Appendix 1 Details of objection and associated correspondence

Appendix 2 Notice advertised on site



Notice of Intent -  
(Whitley Rd Holystone)

Appendix 3 Copy of Proposed Plan



Whitley Road  
Cushions GA.pdf

Appendix 4 Speed Survey



Whitley Road ATC  
march 2022.pdf

Appendix 5 Equality Impact Assessment



Whitley Road  
EqIA.pdf

## **1.9 Contact officers:**

Nick Saunders, Senior Traffic Engineer, Capita, 0191 643 6598  
Andrew Flynn, Integrated Transport Manager, 0191 643 6083  
Amar Hassan, Principal Accountant Investment (Capital) and Revenue, 0191 643 5747

## **1.10 Background information:**

- (1) [North Tyneside Transport Strategy](#)
- (2) [Highways Act 1980](#)
- (3) [Highways \(Road Humps\) Regulations 1999](#)

## **PART 2 – COMPLIANCE WITH PRINCIPLES OF DECISION MAKING**

### **2.1 Finance and other resources**

Funding to advertise and implement the proposals is available from the 2022/23 (Road Safety) Local Transport Plan capital budget.

### **2.2 Legal**

Proposals that involve revocations or amendments to the provision of road humps and the installation of any new road humps are subject to statutory legal process set out in the Highways Act 1980 and the Regulations that flow from that Act, namely, the Highways (Road Humps) Regulations 1999. The Authority is required to publish at least one notice detailing the proposal in a local newspaper stating the proposed nature and dimensions of the proposed humps and the address to which objections should be sent no less than 21 days from the date of the notice first appearing. The Authority is obliged to consult with Chief Officer of Police under the 1980 Act and the Fire and Rescue Authority, the body providing ambulance services and organisations appearing to the Authority to represent persons who use the highway or represent such persons who are likely to be affected by the road humps under the 1999 Regulations.

In addition to being advertised in a local newspaper, notices advertising the proposal for road humps were displayed on the Authority's website and on roads affected by the order. Documents relating to the proposal were also available for public inspection at the Authority's offices at Quadrant.

In accordance with the Mayor's Scheme of Delegation, if any objections cannot be resolved, then the Cabinet Member for Environment is asked to consider those objections made and not withdrawn and to determine if road humps should be installed.

### **2.3 Consultation/community engagement**

#### **2.3.1 Internal consultation**

Internal consultation has involved the Cabinet Member for Environment. Ward members' views on the proposal were sought as described in section 1.5.1.

### **2.3.2 Community engagement**

Views on the proposal were sought as described in section 1.5.1. The proposal was advertised in line with statutory process as described in section 1.5.3.

### **2.4 Human rights**

Any human rights implications must be balanced against the duty that the Authority has to provide a safe highway for people to use. It is not considered that the proposed restrictions will have a negative impact on individuals' human rights.

### **2.5 Equalities and diversity**

An Equality Impact Assessment for the scheme has been undertaken and is attached as Appendix 5 to this report. This notes that most of the identified potential impacts are positive; these related to improved accessibility for people who currently experience difficulty crossing the road. Actions are specified to reduce the identified potential negative impact relating to access arrangements during construction work.

### **2.6 Risk management**

There are no risk management implications directly arising from this report. Strategic and operational risks associated with transport matters are assessed via the established corporate process.

### **2.7 Crime and disorder**

There are no crime and disorder implications directly arising from this report.

### **2.8 Environment and sustainability**

There are potential positive environment and sustainability implications in that the proposals support the use of more sustainable modes of transport in preference to car use. By reducing the speed of motorised traffic, and potentially discouraging some through traffic, the proposed traffic calming will create a safer environment more conducive for cycling, walking and wheeling. Whilst some studies have suggested that vertical traffic calming measures may result in a small amount of highly localised air pollution, the health impacts are likely to be negligible and outweighed by the health benefits of slowed traffic and shift to cycling, walking and wheeling with likely lower overall pollution levels. In addition, it is anticipated that any localised air pollution associated with vertical traffic calming measures will reduce as the use of electric vehicles becomes more widespread.

### **PART 3 - SIGN OFF**

- Chief Executive  X
- Director of Service  X
- Mayor/Cabinet Member  X
- Chief Finance Officer  X
- Monitoring Officer  X
- Assistant Chief Executive  X



---

## Details of Objection [No 1] – Mr W (6 January 2023)

It is good to see the authority striving to deliver exceptional customer service and value for money, if you can call delivering the minimum possible, i.e. statutory requirements, as exceptional customer service.

Your professional traffic team will be well aware of LTN 01/07, in particular the paragraph below.

*"It is also recommended that the consultation process does not just cover the statutory duties requirements, but that authorities should open up a dialogue with all interested parties (including pedestrians, disabled people, cyclists' groups and, where appropriate, equestrians) to try to ensure that there is a consensus in favour of the scheme".*

Interesting, as you have formally closed down your dialogue with the Whitley Road Action Group, which had a mandate to represent residents on the issue of excessive speeds and rat run traffic. Which seems to hint that engagement by the authority is just a token gesture, a decision already has been made. This email and comments are from myself, they do not represent WRAG's position.

The document "Delegated Decision Record" adds no value, it is just part of your internal process.

The second document, which is an internal report seeking approval to proceed, is not completely honest about the facts.

- Quoting very high level council policies seems to be a very lazy way to justify a scheme
- **A green North Tyneside** - Not sure of how that impacts this scheme?
- **We will increase opportunities for safe walking and cycling, including providing a segregated cycleway at the coast** - A fairly bland comment
- **We will publish an action plan of the steps we will take and the national investment we will seek to make North Tyneside carbon net-zero by 2030** - A strange comment, not the carbon net zero ambition, more that you are acknowledging that vehicle speeds have a direct impact on emissions, this scheme will have a very minimal impact, now if you would consider dropping a number of 40 mph speed limits to 30 mph across the entire Borough that would have a very significant impact. Whatever you may say in reply, the authority still has a car focused perspective. followed very closely by cyclists, and lastly pedestrians.
- **A 'give and take' traffic calming measure was previously in place at this location. However, following reports from residents that this measure had led to confusion and queries around road safety, it was removed in 2021 prior to carriageway resurfacing works being carried out on Whitley Road.** The authority placed this particular measure in an inappropriate location, at a "T" junction to an estate road, this confused residents trying to leave the estate, they had no clue who had the right of way. The same measure at a suitable location would have worked.
- **The results of a traffic speed survey carried out after the removal indicated that an alternative traffic calming measure would be required in order for traffic speeds to remain compliant with the existing 20mph speed limit.** - Confusing, you decided that a "give and take" traffic calming measure was appropriate, you removed this as the location was not suitable, having already decided a chicane would work, instead of just

moving it to a more suitable location, you now decide that speed cushions are the answer, not a very consistent approach, which seems to be a common theme.

The comment on the speed survey, showing that alternative speed calming measures were required in order for traffic speeds to remain compliant with the existing 20 mph limit, is yet another example of what I see as an inconsistent approach by the authority. You have stated that this speed survey and several others, provided data that the speed profile is within acceptable limits (85th percentile etc), documentary evidence is in the public realm confirming this. Is there any reason or background to the change in standards, a speed survey either shows compliance or not, the whole background to the 20 mph limit is based on accident data which shows that at speeds above 20 mph fatalities and injuries in all categories increase exponentially, particularly for pedestrians in the high risk groups such as children, elderly and disabled.

Nothing in this scheme addresses the issues of Rat Run traffic, this seems to show a failure in the planning and design of the Holystone Bypass, this should have been addressed as part of that major scheme, funded by the developer as part of the local impact assessment, all we have now is band aids being applied, not a real solution.

I am not, and have never purported to be a traffic engineer, but you cannot just write off residents' comments if they do not fit your internal plans. The scheme completed at Forest Hall was very successful, is it beyond the authority to use something like Whitley road to show good street design and showcase the Borough, the Manual for Streets 2 has some excellent examples on how to do this, make the motorist feel that they have no priority or right, change the highway texture or colour, remove road markings, put a cycleway down either side, create a place for people and not the car, the list is endless and I am sure the professional highways team could produce some innovative solutions with residents fully engaged at the start. You have carried out similar schemes in other parts of the Borough, they work, it would be nice to see some investment outside of the town centres and the coast. Funding will be an issue, balancing that against wasting money on installing speed cushions which do not work, so a challenge for you.

The Highways team seem to have a very good track record of successful bids for central government funds for cycling improvements, such as the Rake Lane roundabout, could this funding source be a future bid for cycleways and road surface treatments on Whitley Road, the funding criteria seems to have some flexibility and cycling ticks all the boxes.

I realise I am wasting my time on this, true engagement is the last thing the authority really wants.

### **Officer Response (9 February 2023)**

Thank you for your recent correspondence in which you made a formal objection to the proposed speed cushions on Whitley Road.

In response to your comments querying the type of speed reduction features that are proposed for Whitley Road, investigations in other areas have proven speed cushions/humps are the most effective form of reducing vehicle speeds. Furthermore, it would not be appropriate to install cycle lanes on Whitley Road as the speed restriction is 20mph; features such as cycle lanes are implemented where speed restrictions are 30mph or above.

In relation to the speed reduction features that were installed on Percy Park Road; this location is within a conservation area and so it was necessary to use alternative measures that were in keeping with its conservation status.

With regards to your comments relating to the dimensions of the speed cushions, as this is a bus route it is standard practice and agreed with Nexus that these are the type to be used to reduce passenger discomfort to public transport users whilst also ensuring the reduction to the average speed of overall traffic.

The installation of the traffic calming is recommended as vehicle speeds have increased following the removal of the pinch point priority system and to ensure the 20mph restriction is self-enforcing.

In response to your comments relating to the perceived rat running issue through Whitley Road, following the construction of the Holystone Bypass I can confirm a scheme was carried out on Whitley Road to help address these concerns from residents which included the reduction of the speed restriction to 20mph as well as installing traffic calming measures.

The primary purpose of the scheme was to encourage motorists to use the bypass and prior to the introduction of these measures Whitley Road had a daily volume of approximately 12,000 vehicles.

It is worth noting that there is an additional road safety scheme proposed for Whitley Road to address the perceived rat running problem through Holystone and several options are being considered as part of this project. The proposed speed cushions as part of this proposal are unrelated to this additional road safety scheme, and so that project is ongoing.

I do hope this response addresses any concerns you may have and we request that you withdraw your objection in light of this information. If you would like to withdraw your objection, please notify ourselves in writing by 2 March. If we do not hear from you, your objection will be referred to the Cabinet Member for consideration. You will of course be informed of the decision in due course.

### **Mr W further response (10 February 2023)**

Thank you for your comprehensive reply to my objection. Some of your points I agree with, we have, and still are, attempting to engage with the council itself over a number of issues in the Holystone area, this being a mature way to get out of a pointless loop, with the authority proposing solutions without really having any engagement with residents. We do seek real engagement, having met with the authorities Engagement Officer who can act as a facilitator. That is why I can say I agree with some of your points, you have given reasons and explained the logic behind ideas such as a cycle lane.

Overall the Authority (not Capita) has been very dismissive of our suggestions, going as far as to say that we are not qualified highways engineers, thus our suggestions do not even merit consideration, the fact that you have not been briefed on any of this seems proof that the authority is happy to carry out the statutory consultations, but not go beyond that, even though central government advice on Highways suggests that real consultation provides benefits to all parties involved. Statutory consultation is the minimum level, not a very challenging attitude for a "Good rated authority".

My comments:

**Cycle Lane** - Is the decision to only provide a dedicated cycle lane on the carriageway only on roads with a 30 mph limit or higher a local decision, as it seems to go against national guidance.

*Tables 5.2 and 5.3 in the Design Manual for Bicycle Traffic, CROW Record 28, 2016; London Cycling Design Standards, Chapter 2, TfL 2016 and the Urban Bikeway Design Guide, NACTO, 2012.*

Reading through some of the design guides it would seem that the section of the A191 Murton / New York, which has had the speed limit reduced to 40 mph and the provision of only light protection of the cycle lanes (plastic bollards) is not acceptable, given the high traffic volume and the number of HGV's, so the authority is not applying what seems to be a consistent design policy for cycleways.

**Percy Park Road** - We are talking about the design of the speed cushions on Percy Park Road, not the cosmetic impact of a conservation area, what stops the same size cushion being used elsewhere, in a cheaper material.

**Speed cushion design sizes** - The majority of residents see the use of the smaller cushions as window dressing which gives an illusion of safety, a large percentage of modern cars have a far wider wheelbase and can straddle these cushions without reducing speed. You have some leeway in the design sizes to adopt the design to accommodate the wheelbase of a PSV or emergency vehicle, while still impacting on the speed of cars.

**The installation of the traffic calming** - *"It is recommended as vehicle speeds have increased following the removal of the pinch point priority system and to ensure the 20mph restriction is self-enforcing"*

The chicane which was removed had been located in the wrong location, adjacent to a side road, this confused residents trying to enter Whitley Road as to who had priority. Putting the chicane back at a more appropriate point away from the side street would have removed the cause of the confusion, the chicane did work as self enforcing the 20 mph limit.

A considerable length of time has passed since the authority removed the chicane, so it is difficult to see what difference a short delay will make, otherwise the work would have been given a much higher priority under road safety. Pushing ahead with this single feature whilst the residents are trying to get the authority to engage them to discuss the bigger picture is bluntly just putting a bandaid on the problem. It would be more realistic to pause this speed cushion scheme until the final options for Whitley Road are agreed and announced.

On a previous speed survey on Whitley Road, the senior traffic engineer stated that the recorded speeds were within acceptable limits (85th percentile), do we know what has changed to make the road noncompliant on the speed survey you are using.

**Whitley Road Rat Running** - The Holystone Bypass works as designed, I suggest that the later works to Whitley Road to discourage Rat Running were an afterthought, it had not been considered in the original bypass design, or if so was assessed as having no impact.

The authority knows well from its traffic studies on the A191 West Allotment Bypass, that rat runners only need to have a perceived benefit of saving time, from a Whitley Road residents study we saw that the time taken is almost identical as to using the Bypass, if cars exceed the 20 mph limit, given there is a school on Whitley Road this excessive speed is not acceptable, your own traffic speed surveys show this.

The separate scheme being delivered by others is the victim of a lack of engagement and communication with residents, it has one element, which is to close Whitley Road to through traffic, this will be a 100% fix for the rat running issues, what I have not seen is any direct communication with individual residents, explaining the proposal and running through the impacts, then they can make an informed decision.

### **Summary -**

The authorities stance on this issue and the complete lack of any engagement with residents is the problem behind all of this, speak to people, hear their views, then explain the legislation and design constraints, if they are given the full facts, most people will accept the solutions, they do not need any formal qualifications in highways design to do that.

Given the current financial climate and the authority having to raise council tax and reduce some services, it would be criminal to waste money (no matter how little) on window dressing.

From my comments you will see why I will not withdraw my objection.

### **Details of Objection [No 2] – Mr H (7 January 2023)**

With regards to the above proposed traffic measures can I strongly object to the above measures for the following reasons.

- 1) The previous radical calming and idiotic chicane which was previously introduced and subsequently rightly removed after numerous objections just did not work outside of Bede close. Numerous traffic incidents occurred and I personally witnessed many instances of road rage and very nearly fights in the highway between drivers' whilst this being a total waste of tax payers' money was in place and then removed at a high cost no doubt.
- 2) Emergency vehicles and buses or indeed heavy vehicles' will no doubt have difficulty negotiating these speed humps measures.
- 3) By far the best solution would be to introduce speed cameras to eliminate the speed of vehicles on Whitley Road as well as introduce speed signals/signage/VMS to clearly indicate contraventions on the full length of Whitley Road.
- 4) Additionally, more presence/ visibility by police patrols would be an added benefit also as well as providing a reinforcing deterrent to speeding motorists and careless drivers.

### **Officer Response (7 February 2023)**

Thank you for your recent correspondence in which you made a formal objection to the proposed speed cushions on Whitley Road.

In response to your comments querying the type of speed reduction features that are proposed for Whitley Road, investigations have proven speed cushions/humps are the most effective form of reducing vehicle speeds and as this is a bus route it is standard practice and agreed with Nexus that these are the type to be used to reduce passenger discomfort to public transport users and ambulance patients whilst also ensuring the reduction to the average speed of overall traffic.

The installation of the traffic calming is recommended as vehicle speeds have increased following the removal of the pinch point priority system and to ensure the 20mph restriction is self enforcing.

In relation to your request for the installation of speed cameras on Whitley Road, this would fall under the responsibility of Northumbria Safer Roads Initiative however their deployment is usually reserved for highways with a 30mph speed restriction or above.

With regards to your request for the erection of variable message signs, I can confirm this location does form part of our rotating programme for the VMS units and they are routinely erected on Whitley Road for a temporary period.

Our investigations have shown these units are most effective when used on a short term basis and with this in mind we generally only erect them on sites for a maximum 2 weeks. When left in place for longer periods of time, motorists tend to become familiar with their presence and the average speeds gradually return to their previous levels.

In relation to your final comment, we will contact Northumbria Police making them aware of your concerns and ask they undertake any action they feel is required.

I do hope this response addresses any concerns you may have and we request that you withdraw your objection in light of this information. However, if you would still like to proceed with the objection, please notify ourselves in writing by 28 February at which time the matter will be referred to the Cabinet Member for consideration.

You will of course be informed of the decision in due course

### **Details of Objection [No 3] – Mrs WL (7 January 2023)**

I would like to object to the above proposal posted publicly on lampposts on Whitley Road recently and comment that this basic form of consultation is far from that as required by LTN 01/07. Although, I have previously been in discussions with highways on this matter as a member of WRAG, as a local resident I have not received a letter to my home address as stated in section 1.5.2 of the report Road Humps Whitley Road, Holystone and as far as I can ascertain no other affected resident has either. This is symptomatic of the type of faux engagement practices employed by highways and falls far short of actually opening up meaningful dialogues with interested parties to gain a true consensus. The speed cushions will do nothing to assist in cutting down the speeding, or rat running on this road. WRAG have advised highways of this and advised this proposal is a waste of council tax money. It requires a full analysis and real solutions to long standing issues, such as those employed elsewhere in the borough., for instance, Forest Hall. It requires some of the original S106 money to be spent addressing the real problems on this road that were not addressed by the building of the bypass. It requires a willingness on behalf of highways to actually engage properly with residents to find a workable solution.

### **Officer Response (1 February 2023)**

Thank you for your recent correspondence in which you made a formal objection to the proposed speed cushions on Whitley Road.

In relation to the extents of the public consultation exercise, I can confirm a letter was delivered to those properties on Whitley Road that are located around the proposed traffic calming features and will be directly affected by their installation. I can confirm we also liaised with the local residents group making them aware of the proposals and invited comments on them. As well as this, A4 sized legal notices were posted on site and advertised in the local press and also on the council's website.

The installation of the traffic calming is necessary following the removal of the pinch point give and take system and to ensure the 20mph restriction is self enforcing.

However, consultation is still ongoing with regards to another wider road safety scheme for Holystone Village and a number of options are still being considered as part of this project and I understand you have been involved in this consultation process.

I do hope this response addresses any concerns you may have and we request that you withdraw your objection in light of this information. However, if you would still like to proceed with the objection, please notify our legal and democratic services team in writing by 17 February at which time the matter will be referred to the Cabinet Member for consideration. You will of course be informed of the decision in due course

In the meantime if you need any further information please do not hesitate to contact ourselves at [traffic@northtyneside.gov.uk](mailto:traffic@northtyneside.gov.uk)

### **Details of Objection [No 4] – Mr WT (9 January 2023)**

With regard to the proposed siting of the speed cushions, I recollect that a speed survey was undertaken at that site last year. Would it be possible for you to provide me with a copy of the outputs of that data please? In the meantime, I wish to object to the proposed construction of the speed cushions on the basis that they are a waste of public funds. As we all know, speed cushions do not have any impact on the speed of vehicles as drivers merely position their wheels either side of them so that they don't have to slow down. If the Council is proposing measures to reduce the speed of vehicles travelling along Whitley Road then it is in everyone's interest that they introduce something that is effective and cost efficient. A box ticking exercise (we know it won't work but at least it looks like we're doing something) is neither of those

### **Officer Response (1 February 2023)**

Thank you for your recent correspondence in which you made a formal objection to the proposed speed cushions on Whitley Road.

Attached is a copy of the 5-day summary of the traffic survey which was carried out on Whitley Road where the pinch point priority system was previously located as requested.

With regards to your comments relating to the dimensions of the speed cushions, as this is a bus route it is standard practice and agreed with Nexus that these are the type to be used to reduce passenger discomfort to public transport users whilst also ensuring the reduction to the average speed of overall traffic.

The installation of the traffic calming is necessary following the removal of the pinch point give and take system and to ensure the 20mph restriction is self enforcing.

However, consultation is still ongoing with regards to another wider road safety scheme for Holystone Village and a number of options are being considered as part of this project to reduce the levels of through traffic on Whitley Road

I do hope this response addresses any concerns you may have and we request that you withdraw your objection in light of this information. However, if you would still like to proceed with the objection, please notify our legal and democratic services team in writing by 17

February at which time the matter will be referred to the Cabinet Member for consideration. You will of course be informed of the decision in due course.

### **Details of Objection [No 5] – Mrs K (20 January 2023)**

I wish to strongly register my opposition to these and the way NTC has handled the whole issue of speeding on Whitley Road. I will firstly say that you have apparently advised that residents to have received letters regarding these. I have checked with 5 neighbours including myself making 6 NO ONE has received a letter. The feeble attempt at notices are ridiculous an A5 sheet of paper on two posts one of which is ripped to shreds. My husband and myself are both disabled and we never walk past this pole as we use a mobility car and scooters. I read this poster I had to park on Bede Close hobble along a frozen pavement and onto frozen lumpy grass. Not a good health and safety advertisement for the council. All of us are willing to confirm you have not issued any letters. Speed cushions are not an option as people drive over on one wheel and the SUVs just drive over them as the wheelbase is so high. It would need a full raised crossing as demonstrated elsewhere in the Borough to slow them. Only this week at the chicanes I had right of way I was driving through and 3, yes 3, cars ran past me when I was driving through no give way at all. The 3rd ran onto the pavement around me with a fingers sign. I am currently attempting to download from the dashcam to refer to the police.

### **Officer response – (1 February 2023)**

Thank you for your recent correspondence in which you made a formal objection to the proposed speed cushions on Whitley Road.

In relation to the extents of the public consultation exercise, I can confirm a letter was delivered to those properties on Whitley Road that are located around the proposed traffic calming features and will be directly affected by their installation. As well as this, A4 sized legal notices were posted on site and advertised in the local press and also on the council's website

With regards to your comments relating to the dimensions of the speed cushions, as this is a bus route it is standard practice and agreed with Nexus that these are the type to be used to reduce passenger discomfort to public transport users whilst also ensuring the reduction to the average speed of overall traffic.

The installation of the traffic calming is necessary following the removal of the pinch point give and take system and to ensure the 20mph restriction is self enforcing.

However, consultation is still ongoing with regards to another wider road safety scheme for Holystone Village and a number of options are being considered as part of this, one of which is the installation of a raised zebra crossing.

I do hope this response addresses any concerns you may have and we request that you withdraw your objection in light of this information. However, if you would still like to proceed with the objection, please notify our legal and democratic services team in writing by 17 February at which time the matter will be referred to the Cabinet Member for consideration. You will of course be informed of the decision in due course



### **Mrs K further response – (1 February 2023)**

I will not withdraw the objection as the residents in Bede Close whose gardens directly abut the proposed speed cushions have NOT been advised by letter. WE, will have the impact of the cars going over these cushions, we are the ones that will have the increased emissions of cars slowing and zooming back to speeding after they have been over them. In the same way we, were directly impacted by the pinch point. It would appear that you may have circulated residents on Whitley Road considerably further down from the proposed installation which defeats the whole concept of consultation.

As i have said your notices were displayed on 3 posts inaccessible to those with disabilities, many of whom live in the affected area. Many people do not take local newspapers especially in the current financial scenario and certainly would not think to look at the public notices.

It would be more appropriate to hold a public meeting regarding the all issues relating to Whitley Road. Correctly circulated this would ensure a clear, transparent process where ALL residents affected by the issues on Whitley Road have a chance to voice their concerns and opinions, rather than the rather clandestine process being adopted at present.

In regard to the cushions being preferable for buses, full width cushions exist in other parts of the Borough on bus routes. I would also raise that it has recently been announced a number of the bus services passing through Whitley Road are being reduced or even axed due to low take up.

I find it contrary to transparency and due process that you have requested an objection to be withdrawn.

### **Details of Objection [No 6] – Mrs R (25 January 2023)**

I wish to object to the proposed speed humps on Whitley road. May I firstly point out that I am a resident of Whitley road and received no notice of this proposal from NTC. I have only just heard from a neighbour hence the last minute email. Everyday I see vans and large vehicles (who should be using the bypass) speeding along our road and the proposed additional humps will do nothing to stop such vehicles due to wheel May I suggest you change plans and add a raised zebra crossing like the new addition on the B1322 towards Backworth? This not only slows ALL traffic but allows pedestrians to cross safely. I appreciate Whitley rd is a bus route (with services now cut back to hourly in last few months) but B1322 is also bus route so I see no reason as to why this would be a problem. Interestingly, after some research online I found estimated cost of 4 speed cushions to be £13000-19000 whereas raised crossing is £5208. As a pedestrian with a pram I often struggle to cross Whitley road due to speeding vehicles and the volume of traffic. Many children in Holystone walk to school and I am sure you agree it is important they are able to make a safe journey on foot. The existing zebra crossing by school involves children having to cross two junctions by St Bede's Walk which is very busy with poor visibility amongst parked cars. An additional crossing would be welcomed Please may I be updated on the outcome of this proposal

### **Officer response – (1 February 2023)**

Thank you for your recent correspondence in which you made a formal objection to the proposed speed cushions on Whitley Road.

In relation to the extents of the public consultation exercise, I can confirm a letter was delivered to those properties on Whitley Road that are located around the proposed traffic calming

features and will be directly affected by their installation. As well as this, legal notices were posted on site and advertised in the local press and also on the council's website

With regards to your comments relating to the dimensions of the speed cushions, as this is a bus route it is standard practice and agreed with Nexus that these are the type to be used to reduce passenger discomfort to public transport users whilst also ensuring the reduction to the average speed of overall traffic.

The installation of the traffic calming is necessary following the removal of the pinch point give and take system and to ensure the 20mph restriction is self enforcing.

However, consultation is still ongoing with regards to another wider road safety scheme for Holystone Village and a number of options are being considered as part of this, one of which is the installation of a raised zebra crossing.

I do hope this response addresses any concerns you may have and we request that you withdraw your objection in light of this information. However, if you would still like to proceed with the objection, please notify our legal and democratic services team in writing by 17 February at which time the matter will be referred to the Cabinet Member for consideration. You will of course be informed of the decision in due course

In the meantime, if you need any further information please do not hesitate to contact ourselves at [traffic@northtyneside.gov.uk](mailto:traffic@northtyneside.gov.uk)

### **Details of Objection [No 7] – Mrs A (24 January 2023)**

I am writing today to express my opposition to a further 3 speed cushions to be installed on Whitley Road, proposed by NTC. It is clear to me that the current 3 speed cushions (already installed) at the other end of Whitley Road, in the village of Holystone, have done nothing to actually lower the speed of commuters nor has it had any significant/noticeable impact on cutting down the number of cars using this portion of Whitley Road as a cut through (instead of using the bypass road). It is my belief that due to the small size of speed humps and the ability of vehicles to drive over them at speed, with little to no impact on the car/driver, that these are a waste of the council's money. Instead, I feel as though this money would be far better spent installing another zebra crossing at this end of Whitley Road. The village of Holystone (and this section of Whitley Road) is a very active area for pedestrians, cyclists, school children, shoppers, and metro users. It is my belief that a zebra crossing in this areas would make a huge difference in the lives and safety of these local citizens.

### **Officer response – (1 February 2023)**

Thank you for your recent correspondence in which you made a formal objection to the proposed speed cushions on Whitley Road.

Investigations have proven speed cushions/humps are the most effective form of reducing vehicle speeds. The existing traffic calming which you refer to within Holystone was installed many years ago to complement the reduction of the speed limit from 30mph to 20mph.

That scheme was carried out following the opening of the Holystone Bypass and was intended to encourage motorists to use the bypass and prior to the introduction of all of these measures Whitley Road had a daily volume of approximately 12,000 vehicles.

With regards to your comments relating to the dimensions of the speed cushions, as this is a bus route it is standard practice and agreed with Nexus that these are the type to be used to reduce passenger discomfort to public transport users whilst also ensuring the reduction to the average speed of overall traffic.

The installation of the traffic calming is necessary following the removal of the pinch point give and take system to ensure the 20mph restriction is self enforcing. However, consultation is still ongoing with regards to another wider road safety scheme for Holystone Village and a number of options are being considered as part of this, one of which is the installation of a raised zebra crossing.

I do hope this response addresses any concerns you may have and we request that you withdraw your objection in light of this information. However, if you would still like to proceed with the objection, please notify our legal and democratic services team in writing by 17 February at which time the matter will be referred to the Cabinet Member for consideration. You will of course be informed of the decision in due course

In the meantime if you need any further information please do not hesitate to contact ourselves at [traffic@northtyneside.gov.uk](mailto:traffic@northtyneside.gov.uk)