

Consultation results summarised by issues raised

During the formal consultation, a total of 45 responses were received, comprising of seven comments in support, one of mixed opinion and 37 comments in objection. All comments were analysed for negative opinion towards the proposals, through which 146 of negative opinion towards the proposals were identified. The negative opinion was then classified into issue categories, of which 24 were identified. These issue categories are ordered below by frequency of appearance within all received comments. The top ten categories account for 78% of all negative sentiment raised, at 114 instances. Issues that Mr L. Hadji-Nikolaou CC or Mountsorrel Parish Council raised have been noted, and fall under issues 4, 11, and 15.

Issue Category	Officer's Comments
<p>Issue 1 Damage caused to vehicles by vertical traffic calming features</p> <p>Times raised: 23</p>	<p>The size and design of the proposed speed cushions are to a national standard and have been used extensively to help control vehicle speeds throughout Leicestershire and England. Research carried out by the Department for Transport has concluded that vertical traffic calming features, such as speed cushions and tables, do not cause damage to vehicles when negotiated at appropriate speeds.</p> <p>As the speed cushions are designed to national standards, they should therefore be able to be traversed by all vehicles which conform to manufacturer's specifications and there should be no discomfort for drivers or passengers when cushions are negotiated at an appropriate speed.</p>
<p>Issue 2 No speeding/accident issue to address</p> <p>Times raised:13</p>	<p>Speed surveys previously undertaken on Walton Way indicate average 85 percentile speeds (the speed at which 85% of vehicles are travelling at or below) of 36mph, exceeding the 30mph speed limit. The proposed speed cushions should reduce speeds to below the speed limit, particularly in the vicinity of where they will be sited. This should be a big improvement in road safety for all road users.</p>
<p>Issue 3 The proposals will generate noise pollution and vibrations</p>	<p>The speed cushions should encourage motorists that drive at excessive speeds to travel at a lower speed which will mitigate any increase in noise levels. Whilst heavy goods vehicles can cause the</p>

<p>Times raised: 13</p>	<p>occasional sharper noise when negotiating vertical features, they will be able to straddle the cushions.</p> <p>The properties along Walton Way are well set back from the carriageway.</p>
<p>Issue 4 Expressed a preference for vehicle activated signs (VAS) in lieu of the proposals</p> <p>Times raised: 13, including by the Local Member and the Mountsorrel Parish Council</p>	<p>Speed cushions are considered to be the most effective solution in controlling traffic speeds. Although VAS are an effective tool, they do not guarantee a speed reduction. A VAS is likely to reduce average traffic speeds by 2-3mph; speed cushions are likely to reduce average speeds to between 25mph and 30mph which is considered more advantageous at this location.</p>
<p>Issue 5 Displacement of vehicles to other routes to avoid the vertical traffic calming features</p> <p>Times raised: 12</p>	<p>Due to Walton Way serving as a distributor road, the expected displacement of vehicles is expected to be minimal. If further concerns were raised following the installation of the proposals, surveys could be conducted to establish whether further action was warranted.</p>
<p>Issue 6 Increased vehicle emissions from braking/accelerating to negotiate the vertical traffic calming features</p> <p>Times raised: 12</p>	<p>The speed table and cushions have been spaced to encourage motorists to travel at an appropriate consistent speed which would help to minimise any potential negative impacts associated with braking/accelerating driver behaviour causing increased emissions.</p>
<p>Issue 7 The proposal is not an appropriate use of public funds</p> <p>Times raised: 10</p>	<p>A Section 106 agreement is in place that has obliged the developer to fund these proposals as part of planning approval. There is potentially a slight shortfall in budget that is being met by the Road Safety Fund. However, this may not be required if works are completed within budget.</p>
<p>Issue 8 The proposals are ineffective as speed cushions only affect smaller vehicles</p>	<p>Speed cushions can affect the speed of vehicles in different ways, depending upon the vehicle size; however, they do reduce the speed of most vehicles. The size and design of the proposed vertical</p>

Times raised: 7	features are to a national standard and have been used extensively to help control vehicle speeds throughout Leicestershire and England.
Issue 9 The proposals would reduce the visual aesthetic of the area Times raised: 6	The reduction in vehicle speeds and improvement in road safety is considered a greater benefit.
Issue 10 Expressed a preference for a speed camera in lieu of proposals Times raised: 5	Safety cameras are intended for use at sites with recurring accidents; and where there is no other more appropriate cost-effective engineering solution. Guidance used to assess the need for cameras states that they should be considered at sites where there have been several serious personal injury accidents involving at least one fatal or serious injury per kilometre in the previous three years. Walton Road does not meet this criterion.
Issue 11 The removal of a pedestrian refuge on West Cross Lane, at the junction of Walton Way and West Cross Lane Times raised: 5, including by the Local Member and Mountsorrel Parish Council	The pedestrian refuge will now be retained with construction of the speed table.
Issue 12 Expressed a preference for horizontal traffic calming features in lieu of the proposals Times raised: 3	Build outs to reduce lane widths were considered at the design stage, however, this was not desired due to the reduced lane widths affecting access by larger vehicles. Vertical traffic calming features were deemed more appropriate to achieve the traffic calming obligation from the Section 106 agreement.

<p>Issue 13 The proposals would interfere with the response of emergency service vehicles</p> <p>Times raised: 3</p>	<p>Speed cushions are designed to be straddled more easily by wider vehicles to minimise their impact on emergency service response times. Emergency services were also consulted as part of these proposals and did not raise any objections</p>
<p>Issue 14 Preference expressed for speed tables in lieu of speed cushions</p> <p>Times raised: 3</p>	<p>An early draft proposal for the scheme included three speed tables. The estimate for this draft proposal was prohibitively expensive. To introduce a scheme with the available funding speed cushions were the most cost effective and would have the most impact for their cost.</p>
<p>Issue 15 Preference expressed for alternative location of traffic calming or alternative usage of Section 106 contribution</p> <p>Times raised: 3, including by the Local Member and Mountsorrel Parish Council</p>	<p>The funding available via the Section 106 agreement precludes the expenditure towards other purposes/locations.</p>
<p>Issue 16 Too many vertical features within the proposals</p> <p>Times raised: 2</p>	<p>The current spacing of the vertical measures are at the maximum permitted under guidelines, therefore a reduction in number of features, is not possible. In reducing the number of speed cushions there is the potential for an increase in both speeds and noise pollution.</p>
<p>Issue 17 Expressed a concern with the precise situating of specific speed cushions</p> <p>Times raised: 2</p>	<p>One objector states the speed cushion in the vicinity of their property would be better suited approximately 55 metres further west than is currently situated. This would leave the separation to the preceding speed table too short and the following separation to the next speed cushions too large. The current separation of the speed cushions is approaching the maximum separation advised under guidance.</p> <p>The other objector states that the speed cushion in the vicinity of their property is located at the entrance to a potential new property. The Council cannot make changes to the scheme in consideration of</p>

	potential changes to properties. The Council is not in receipt of any planning application in respect of this new property.
<p>Issue 18 Expressed concern with the ongoing maintenance costs of the proposals</p> <p>Times raised: 2</p>	During the planning permission process, it was determined that traffic calming was desirable to make the development acceptable in accordance with the planning conditions. Improving road safety is considered a greater benefit.
<p>Issue 19 Expressed a preference for signage indicating 30mph limit</p> <p>Times raised: 2</p>	Drivers are expected to be aware of the applicable 30mph due to the street lighting and built-up nature of the area. 30mph roundels are not permitted on restricted roads where the street lighting is less than 200 yards apart.
<p>Issue 20 Concerns that vehicles parked on or near speed cushions will present an obstacle to other vehicles</p> <p>Times raised: 2</p>	Drivers need to take account of surroundings and only overtake parked cars when it is safe. The proposed cushions will benefit drivers as they will be making their decision to overtake parked vehicles within a safer environment where all vehicle manoeuvres are being undertaken at a slower speed than usual.
<p>Issue 21 Proposals are ineffective as vehicles would sharply accelerate between vertical features</p> <p>Times raised: 2</p>	The design and spacing of the vertical features are intended for vehicles to travel through at the appropriate and consistent speed. However, it is drivers' choice as to how speed cushions are negotiated. The design of the proposed vertical features is to a national standard and have been used extensively to help control vehicle speeds throughout Leicestershire and England. The speed cushions are likely to result in a decrease in average speeds.
<p>Issue 22 Expressed concern over oncoming vehicles being dazzled by headlights of vehicles negotiating the vertical traffic calming feature</p> <p>Times raised: 1</p>	The design and size of the vertical features are to a national standard. The possibility of dazzling by oncoming vehicles is not substantially different from normal driving conditions.

<p>Issue 23 Speed cushions endanger cyclists through forcing vehicles onto the left-side of the carriageway</p> <p>Times raised: 1</p>	<p>Vehicles must leave 1.5 metres separation when overtaking cyclists. Drivers should consider their surroundings and act accordingly. The proposed cushions will benefit cyclists as vehicles will be making their decision to overtake within a safer environment where all vehicle speeds will be lower.</p>
<p>Issue 24 Expressed concern that the speed cushions are a hazard to cyclists and pedestrians</p> <p>Times raised: 1</p>	<p>There is no expectation that speed cushions would be on any pedestrian desire lines.</p> <p>Cyclists would be able to avoid the speed cushions by negotiating a route either side, but cyclists should consider their surroundings and ride appropriately.</p> <p>The proposals would reduce the average road speed, therefore increasing road safety for pedestrians and cyclists.</p>