

## **Report of the Strategic Director Place to the meeting of Bradford South Area Committee to be held on 28<sup>th</sup> June 2018.**

**A**

---

**Subject:**

**SPENCER ROAD, BRADFORD, TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT MEASURES - OBJECTIONS**

**Summary statement:**

**This report considers objections received to recently advertised proposals for a Traffic Regulation Order and Traffic Calming Measures on Spencer Road, Bradford.**

Ward: Great Horton

---

Steve Hartley  
Strategic Director Place

**Portfolio:**

**Regeneration, Planning and Transport**

Report Contact: Andrew Smith  
Phone: (01274) 434674  
E-mail: [andrew.smith@bradford.gov.uk](mailto:andrew.smith@bradford.gov.uk)

**Overview & Scrutiny Area:**

**Regeneration and Environment**

## Report to the Bradford South Area Committee

### 1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report considers objections to recently advertised proposals for a Traffic Regulation Order and Traffic Calming measures on Spencer Road, Bradford between the junctions with Clayton Road and Becksid Road.

### 2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 At its meeting of 29<sup>th</sup> June 2017 the Bradford South Area Committee approved funding as part of its Safer Roads schemes programme to introduce traffic management measures on Spencer Road between Clayton Road and Becksid Road junctions.
- 2.2 Concerns have been raised by local residents about traffic speed and parked vehicles causing sight lines obstruction at junctions on Spencer Road. Ward Councillors were approached by locals in the area and a site visit was arranged with the Senior Traffic Engineer to discuss their concerns.
- 2.3 Accidents records show that 6 collisions, resulting in 7 casualties, have occurred in the previous 5 years on the length of Spencer Road junctions between Clayton Road and Becksid Road. 1 of the collisions was fatal, 2 serious and 1 involved a child pedestrian.
- 2.4 The location of the proposed calming measures, refuge island and footway buildouts and the extent of the proposed waiting restrictions is shown on drawing no. HS/TRSS/103767/CON-2A attached as Appendix 1.
- 2.5 The Traffic Regulation Order and proposed traffic calming measures were advertised between 2<sup>nd</sup> March and 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2018. At the same time consultation letters and plans were delivered to residents and businesses affected by the proposals (approximately 55 letters were delivered). This resulted in 5 objections and one representation letter regarding the proposals.
- 2.6 One letter (by email) has been received in support of the scheme proposal from a resident of Spencer Road during initial consultation through ward member.
- 2.6 A summary of the valid points of objections and corresponding officer comments is tabulated below: (Full objections wording is attached in Appendix 2)

<b>Objectors Concerns</b>	<b>Officers Comments</b>
<b><u>Objector No 1</u></b> Not happy with the proposed road cushions features between Clayton Road and Brackenbeck Road. Objector claims that road cushions can cause more damage to cars than compared to speed plateaus features proposed between Brackenbeck Road and Becksid Road.	Vehicles travelling over road cushions at appropriate speeds should not suffer damage.  All traffic calming features are built to national guidelines.

Report to the Bradford South Area Committee

<p>Objector requested to modify proposed road cushions to speed plateaus calming measures.</p>	
<p><b><u>Objector No 2</u></b>          Not happy with the proposed road cushions features between Clayton Road and Brackenbeck Road. Claims that road cushions can cause more damage to cars than compared to speed plateaus features proposed between Brackenbeck Road and Becksid Road.</p> <p>Objector requested to modify road cushions to speed plateaus calming measures.</p>	<p>Vehicles travelling over road cushions at appropriate speeds should not suffer damage.</p> <p>All traffic calming features are built to national guidelines.</p>
<p><b><u>Objector No 3</u></b>          The business owner has concerns about the loss of on-street parking by the introduction of the double yellow lines on the Spencer Road. The objector feels that the proposed restrictions will have a detrimental impact on their business. There needs to be accessible on street parking to help maintain the passing trade in the area. Further restrictions will create more parking problems as it is already difficult to find space due to untaxed vehicles parked for long periods on Spencer Road.</p> <p>The objector feels that too many traffic calming features will deter traffic from using Spencer Road and will have a detrimental impact on their businesses.</p>	<p>It is intended to introduce restrictions only in areas where parked vehicles can create problems of obstruction. The restrictions are to protect the junctions and several businesses's accesses. The loss of parking space has been kept to the absolute minimum to improve visibility and sight lines at all junctions on Spencer Road.</p> <p>The objector's concern about untaxed vehicles will be investigated and any untaxed / obstructive parking will be dealt with by the police and/or the Council's civil enforcement officers.</p> <p>There is provision for off road parking at the objector's business.</p> <p>Whilst there may be a slight impact on through traffic volumes, the main purpose of the scheme is to reduce vehicle speeds and thereby improve road safety.</p>
<p><b><u>Objector No 4</u></b>          The objector concerns about the loss of on-street parking by the introduction of the double yellow lines restrictions on side road junctions with Spencer Road. Objectors claims that parking restrictions will reduce parking</p>	<p>Vehicles should not be parked near the junctions as this causes visibility problems. It is intended to introduce restrictions only in areas where parked vehicles can create problems of obstruction. The proposal shows the minimum length needed to improve</p>

Report to the Bradford South Area Committee

<p>provisions for residents. There is already a shortage of parking spaces on street and therefore, visitors to businesses will end up parking outside their homes. Adding restrictions will exacerbate the problem.</p> <p>The objector claims that there is no need of the introduction of the pedestrian refuge and objected to the proposed footway buildout on either side of refuge.</p> <p>The objector wants to modify road cushions to round top humps calming measures. Objector claims that Road cushions cause more damage to cars than compared to round top humps.</p>	<p>visibility and sight lines at all junctions with Spencer Road.</p> <p>It is accepted that some of the parking that currently takes place is associated with the visitors of the local Businesses.</p> <p>The narrowed road with the island will make it easier for pedestrians to cross Spencer Road and therefore improve road safety for all road users. Sufficient carriageway width will be maintained for the passage of traffic past the refuge island. Waiting restrictions are required in the vicinity of the pedestrian island to prevent on-street parking at this location.</p> <p>Properly designed road cushions which are traversed within the speed limit do not affect vehicles or their occupants.</p> <p>All traffic calming features are built to national guidelines.</p>
<p><b><u>Objector No 5</u></b></p> <p>The objector against the installation of any type of traffic calming measures in the form of speed ramps on Spencer Road.</p> <p>Claims that speed humps are detrimental to cars and occupants. Unnecessary wear and tear on vehicle due to constant negotiation of the humps.</p> <p>Increase in noise and vehicle emissions as a result of vehicles slowing and acceleration.</p> <p>Other methods of traffic control should be installed. The problems would be solved by better enforcement rather than physical measures. Speed cameras would be the preferred means of control.</p> <p>The road is a main through fare for emergency vehicles and buses and speed humps would affect them using the road.</p>	<p>The road injury record indicates that significant measures are required for the safety of people in the local community and all the road users on Spencer Road.</p> <p>Drivers travelling at an appropriate speed should not suffer any discomfort or damage to their vehicles. All traffic calming features are built to national guidelines.</p> <p>The scheme should have a neutral impact on noise and pollution.</p> <p>The police do not have sufficient resources to enforce speed limits on all roads in the District. Self enforcing schemes as proposed are therefore preferred.</p> <p>The measures proposed are commensurate with the need to reduce traffic speeds and increase safety for local people and for all road users. This road does not meet the criteria for the installation of safety cameras.</p> <p>Spencer road is not a bus route. The features proposed have been designed to minimise</p>

## Report to the Bradford South Area Committee

	<p>the effects while still achieving a traffic calming effect. The design is in accordance with standards accepted by ambulance authorities regionally and nationally. The standards used have been agreed with Metro and are supported by WY Fire and Rescue. The ambulance service has been consulted and no concerns have been raised about the scheme proposal.</p>
--	---

- 2.7 A further letter received from a resident has no concerns with the traffic calming measures and waiting restrictions proposals. The only concern this raises is that access to the property is often blocked by parked vehicles by visitors to business premises. The resident has requested parking restrictions outside their driveway access.

Officer comment: It is recommended that a keep clear bar marking be installed to maintain driveway access at all times.

### **3. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

- 3.1 Local ward members and the emergency services have been consulted on the proposals. Ward member comments were received and incorporated as part of the scheme. No adverse comments have been received from emergency services.

### **4. FINANCIAL & RESOURCE APPRAISAL**

- 4.1 The estimated cost of the proposals is £31,000.00. This can be met from the Safer Roads Budget approved by this committee.

### **5. RISK MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE ISSUES**

- 5.1 A failure to implement highway safety improvements would result in ongoing concerns about the road collision rate on the section of Spencer Road .

### **6. LEGAL APPRAISAL**

- 6.1 There are no specific issues arising from this report. The course of action proposed is in general accordance with the Councils power as Highway Authority and Traffic Regulation Authority.

**7. OTHER IMPLICATIONS**

**7.1 EQUALITY & DIVERSITY**

Due regard has been given to Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 when determining the proposals in this report.

**7.2 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS**

There are no Sustainability implications arising from this report.

**7.3 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS IMPACTS**

There is no impact on the Council's own and the wider District's carbon footprint and emissions from other greenhouse gases arising from this report.

**7.4 COMMUNITY SAFETY IMPLICATIONS**

The implementation of traffic calming measures should lead to a reduction in vehicles speeds and help to improve road safety and reduce casualty levels on Spencer Road. The introduction of a new pedestrian refuge, footway buildouts and Traffic Regulation Order would also be beneficial in terms of road safety.

**7.5 HUMAN RIGHTS ACT**

None

**7.6 TRADE UNION**

None

**7.7 WARD IMPLICATIONS**

Ward members have been consulted on the proposals.

**7.8 AREA COMMITTEE ACTION PLAN IMPLICATIONS  
(for reports to Area Committees only)**

None

**7.9 IMPLICATIONS FOR CORPORATE PARENTING**

None.

**7.10 ISSUES ARISING FROM PRIVACY IMPACT ASSESMENT**

None

**8. NOT FOR PUBLICATION DOCUMENTS**

None

**9. OPTIONS**

9.1 That the objections be overruled and the proposal be implemented as advertised.

9.2 That the objections be upheld and the proposal be abandoned.

9.3 Councillors may propose an alternative course of action from that recommended on which they will receive appropriate officer advice.

**10. RECOMMENDATIONS**

10.1 That the objections be overruled and the proposed traffic calming measures, pedestrian refuge island and the footway buildouts be constructed and the associated Traffic Regulation Order be sealed and implemented as advertised.

10.2 That the objector be informed accordingly.

**11. APPENDICES**

Appendix 1 Drawing HS/TRSS/103767/CON-2A

Appendix 2 Objectors comments

**12. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

12.1 City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council File Ref: HS/TRSS/103767



**Objector No 1**

I am writing with regards to your letter dated 27/2/2018. You propose measures which will reduce traffic speed and improve road safety for all road users on Spencer Road.

I have lived in my street for over 21 years and I am glad to read your proposed measures with traffic and road safety issues we are faced with.

I do have concerns with your measures and hope these can be addressed.

I object to the proposed plans on the grounds of the following :

Starting from Clayton Road please look at Spencer Road here I see four sets of PROPOSED ROAD CUSHIONS which finish before Brackenbeck Road.

THREE SPEED PLATEAUS are proposed from Beckside Lane up to the already existing pedestrian refuge near the Beckside Road Roundabout.

I strongly disagree with PROPOSED ROAD CUSHIONS on Spencer Road and request these to be amended to SPEED PLATEAUS which are better than ROAD CUSHIONS. ROAD CUSHIONS can cause more damage to vehicles accessing them compared to SPEED PLATEAUS. As a car driver and road user I will appreciate the continuous SPEED PLATEAUS as a road traffic measure.

**Objector No 2**

I am writing with regards to your letter dated 27/2/2018. You propose measures which will reduce traffic speed and improve road safety for all road users on Spencer Road.

I have lived in my street for over 9 years and I am glad to read your proposed measures with traffic and road safety issues we are faced with.

I do have concerns with your measures and hope these can be addressed.

I object to the proposed plans on the grounds of the following :

Starting from Clayton Road please look at Spencer Road here I see four sets of PROPOSED ROAD CUSHIONS which finish before Brackenbeck Road.

THREE SPEED PLATEAUS are proposed from Beckside Lane up to the already existing pedestrian refuge near the Beckside Road Roundabout.

I strongly disagree with PROPOSED ROAD CUSHIONS on Spencer Road and request these to be amended to SPEED PLATEAUS which are better than ROAD CUSHIONS. ROAD CUSHIONS can cause more damage to vehicles accessing them compared to SPEED PLATEAUS. As a car driver and road user I will appreciate the continuous SPEED PLATEAUS as a road traffic measure.

I agree with the measures to be in place at the junctions of entrances and exits as it is very difficult to see past parked vehicles when exiting junctions.

**Objector No 3**

I have business on Spencer road which would suffer loss of business with some of the proposals you have made. Time restriction would help but only in certain places as my business often needs on road parking as an overflow measure as I do a lot of the business on this road.

I have also noticed there are often untaxed vehicles without MOTs parked for long periods especially in the area between 77 Spencer road and 150 Spencer road.

Unfortunately enforcement do not take much notice in this area which would free up a lot more needed car parking spaces.

As to your proposal for speed reduction in my opinion the amount of speed ramps, cushions, plateau ect are way too many this would put drivers/passing traffic off from using this road which is going to impact our business.

Please consider our views before you make any final decision.

**Objector No 4**

I have spoke to you over the phone however you suggested to email.

I was initially the first one to complain that humps were needed on this road for traffic calming.

I have seen the proposed plan and I object to many measures you are planning to do.

1) on the junctions the yellow lines are not required as they will reduce car parking which we struggle with anyway and ultimately the garages will end up parking outside our homes.

2) if you want to put an island in the middle of the road even though people don't cross here then fair enough however I don't see why you have to narrow the road.

3) we would prefer the humps that go straight across the road as they cause less damage to cars.

I have also spoke with other residents and they also agree with the above.

**Objector No 5**

I wish to voice my strong objections to the proposed installation of speed ramps, or "Traffic Calming Measures" in the form of speed ramps on Spencer Lane/Road in the Lidget Green area of Bradford.

As a long suffering motorist who's sick and tired of these unnecessary obstructions in the road my feeling is, is that there should be a programme of REMOVAL of these things, not further placement of them.

My objections are based on several aspects of their use to slow down traffic, the main one being of the damage they cause to vehicles, especially those who use routes regularly where they are present. What makes this worse is the fact that the poorer, less well off motorist in the long run is saddled with repair bills as a result of them being present in road. Over time the gradual wear and constant driving over them damages the suspension on vehicles, and as I say, this affects the less well off motorist in terms of hefty repair bills to their cars, or having to purchase new ones. I have often noted also that drivers of bigger cars such as 4x4s, or "flying elephants" as I refer to them just drive over these obstructions without slowing down, thus defeating the object of the cause of the ramps being present in the first place. Drivers of these type of vehicles of course can afford the constant maintenance required as a result of body work damage speed ramps cause so it is of no deterrent to these people. Yet those such as myself on modest incomes on smaller, more delicate vehicles end up having to pay more in terms of repairs and maintenance. Even slowing down to a near stop to negotiate these nuisances still, over a period of time causes damage to the suspension work of the average car. Also in addition to this there is the question of them being placed on main roads where public transport every day several times of day are driving over them. The bus companies must have to spend considerable sums of money to maintain their vehicles and taking into account buses are driving over them several times a day EVERY day, then the damage to them must be a result of the speed ramps, and again, it's people from poorer incomes who suffer because they are the people who rely on buses and public transport to get about. Consequently the bus companies over time will pass on the cost of repair to damage to their vehicles to passengers in terms of higher fares.

There is too the question of damage to the environment. A recent government report indicated that where speed ramps have been installed levels of traffic pollution have risen as a result of cars slowing right down, and then expelling larger amounts of exhaust fumes when changing gear, and revving up again. There is much talk these days of vehicular pollution and the environment and I think the planning committee/council officers should take this into account also

I express my concern and objection regarding the cost of installing the speed ramps also. I have just received my council tax bill for 2018/19 and with it came a letter from the council leader informing us of the

## OBJECTORS COMMENTS

## APPENDIX 2

reduction in the government general grant which is going to be reduced to zero by 2022. With the state of the roads in the district with the ever expanding numbers of pot holes my feeling is, is that the council should be allocating their resources and priorities in repairing the roads, as they are a danger not just to motorists but cyclists who must also negotiate these hazards. I don't want to see Bradford Council spending increased council tax money on placing speed ramps in the roads causing vehicle damage when the roads are in urgent need of repair.

I question the actual need for speed ramps as all around the city there is ever increasing traffic congestion. How can traffic be speeding when for the most part of the day, seven days a week there are constant lengthy tailbacks where ever you go?! I also believe that these speed ramps cause avoidable traffic hold ups because of vehicles slowing down to a near stop, it has a dominoe effect.

As regards the aspect of pedestrian safety I understand there have been a couple of accidents on the stretch of road in question. This of course is unfortunate but the ultimate question that is constantly failed to be addressed is why are pedestrians not crossing the road safely and sensibly? It's all well and good blaming the motorist for everything but an equal responsibility lies with adults to ensure they look and listen for traffic before crossing, and also to teach their offspring about crossing the road safely. When I was growing up in the 1970s we were regularly told in class about the Green Cross Code, told at home by our parents about basic rules of crossing the road, and on TV there was the Green Cross Code adverts warning us of the dangers of crossing the road. My belief is that rather than finger pointing at the motorist efforts should be made to ensure children are given, and learn the lessons of road safety, and that less bright adults start to learn to gauge traffic and when it is safe and when it is not to step into the road to cross. Damage to my vehicle due to speed ramp installation because of a failure to undertake these measures is to my mind grossly unfair on the motorist.

If there truly is an urgent need to slow traffic down then there are other alternatives that I propose. The first being that there should be speed cameras built in areas where there is an alleged issue with speeding motorists. The revenue collected from these installations would pay for itself within months, and then there is of course the simple solution of if you don't want to pay-don't speed. I think this would be a much fairer method of speed control enforcement because the only people who pay are those who break the speed limit, rather than the entire motorists who pay to repair the damage to their vehicle body work because of ramps. The flying elephant brigade who disregard the speed enforcement would then be compelled to pay and with the build up of points on their licence would be an effective deterrent. Another possibility would be to the similar on in Wakefield where their speed ramps have a two tyre flat thread. This means the speed ramps have parts on both sides which are flat and this enables the motorist to negotiate the ramps by slowing down, but it means the suspension does not get damaged or worn because the two tyer threads are flat. Thus having the desired effect of slowing traffic (the driver must slow down in order to accurately gauge where to drive through the flat threads) while at the same time meaning the cars do not acquire suspension damage.

Another speed deterrent would be the measures that have been introduced in Frizinghall, and Parkwood lane in Keighley. This is where the road at certain locations the road goes into one lane with one side giving priority to oncoming traffic. Although this in itself can be quite annoying I would much prefer this to the damage speed ramps cause, or potentially cause to my vehicle, and again I would urge the powers that be to look at this as a sensible and viable alternative. I would like also to propose that the council gradually and eventually remove all of these vehicle damaging monstrosities in the interests of the environment if nothing else when finances will permit.