

North Tyneside Council

Report to Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport

Date: 9 March 2021

Title: Proposed Speed Cushions – Red House Drive/Beaumont Drive, Whitley Bay

Portfolio(s): Environment and Transport	Cabinet Member(s): Councillor C Johnson
--	--

Report from Service Area: Environment, Housing and Leisure

Responsible Officer: Phil Scott, Head of Environment, Housing and Leisure (Tel: 0191 643 7295)

Wards affected: St Mary's

PART 1

1.1 Executive Summary:

This report seeks the approval of the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport to introduce four sets of speed cushions on Red House Drive and Beaumont Drive, Whitley Bay, and set aside nine objections received to the proposal.

1.2 Recommendation(s):

It is recommended that the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport:

- (1) considers the objections;
- (2) sets aside the objections in the interests of improving road safety; and
- (3) determines that the proposed speed cushions should be introduced.

1.3 Forward Plan:

Considering objections relating to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders and road humps and representations relating to proposed pedestrian crossings 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 2020 to 2024:

- Our places will:
 - have an effective transport and physical infrastructure

1.5 Information:

1.5.1 Background

The proposal to introduce speed cushions on Red House Drive and Beaumont Drive was developed as part of the Authority's efforts to improve road safety. Funding has been allocated from the 2020/21 Local Transport Plan capital budget to undertake this scheme to reduce vehicle speeds on Red House Drive and Beaumont Drive.

The proposal was developed following reports by residents of speeding traffic and subsequent investigations carried out by officers. The results of traffic speed surveys conducted at various locations on the Red House Drive/Beaumont Drive loop and data obtained from the Department for Transport (DfT) Trafficmaster system (which provides data on traffic speeds across the UK road network using vehicle GPS information) confirmed a speeding issue on the northern section of the loop near the junction of Red House Drive and Beaumont Drive. The data showed two-way 85th percentile vehicle speeds of between 35.5mph and 37mph which is above the acceptable threshold of 35mph as indicated in DfT guidance.

It is anticipated that the proposed traffic calming measures will reduce the 85th percentile speeds of vehicles using this section of carriageway to within the acceptable threshold and thus improve road safety on Red House Drive and Beaumont Drive.

The proposal consists of four sets of speed cushions which would be installed where the highest 85th percentile speeds were recorded adjacent to the junction of Red House Drive and Beaumont Drive.

In accordance with the statutory process, a Notice of intention for the proposal was displayed on site, in the local newspaper and on the Authority's website.

Officers also consulted the 'Friends of Red House Drive' group about the proposed speed cushions.

Nine objections were received in response to the statutory Notice of Intention. A summary of these objections is provided below.

1.5.2 Statutory Consultation

Before local authorities propose to construct a road hump, they must first consult the emergency services and any other relevant organisations likely to be affected by the proposal. Schemes must also be advertised on site and in the local press. In North Tyneside, schemes are also advertised on the Authority's website. This enables members of the public or businesses to make objections in respect of the proposal. Any objectors are first sent a detailed response and invited to reconsider. Any such objections

not withdrawn are referred to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport for consideration in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation for Cabinet Members.

1.5.3 Summary of Objections

Ms A wrote to the Authority and indicated that she wished to object to the implementation of the speed cushions on the grounds that the traffic calming measures were a waste of public funds which would be better spent in other areas such as footpath maintenance within the Red House Drive estate.

An officer contacted the respondent to inform her that the proposal was intended to improve road safety and address concerns amongst some residents about excessive traffic speeds. It was also explained that the results of the traffic surveys had demonstrated that the 85th percentile traffic speeds were above the acceptable threshold at the location in question. The respondent was also informed that the funding for maintenance schemes could not be taken from the same budget used for road safety schemes.

Ms A was given the opportunity to withdraw her objection in light of this information by responding to officers in writing by 11 December 2020. No response was received.

Ms T wrote to the Authority and indicated that she wished to object to the implementation of speed cushions on the grounds that there is no accident history to justify the installation of traffic calming measures. Ms T also stated that the funding being used for the traffic calming scheme would be better spent on footpaths in the area.

An officer contacted the respondent to inform her that the proposal was intended to improve road safety and address the speeding issues highlighted by the results of traffic surveys. The officer confirmed that there was no recorded accident history on the section of road where the traffic calming is proposed but it was clarified that this was not the only criterion used to justify the installation of traffic calming measures. The respondent was also informed that funding for maintenance schemes could not be taken from the same budget used for road safety schemes.

Ms T was given the opportunity to withdraw her objection in light of this information by responding to officers in writing by 11 December 2020. No response was received.

Mr T wrote to the Authority and indicated that he wished to object to the implementation of the speed cushions as he felt that they would cause an increase in carbon dioxide emissions owing to vehicles decelerating and then accelerating when negotiating the cushions. Mr T also expressed concerns relating to the potential increase in noise pollution if the proposal was taken forward.

An officer contacted the respondent to inform him that whilst there was evidence to suggest that traffic calming could lead to an increase in both carbon dioxide and noise pollution, this was not expected to reach a level which would cause any significant issues particularly given the lack of any existing air pollution problem in the area. It was explained that the anticipated road safety benefits of the scheme would outweigh any negative impact associated with noise pollution or air quality.

Mr T was given the opportunity to withdraw his objection in light of this information by responding to officers in writing by the 11 December 2020. Mr T responded to state that he still wished to object to the proposed scheme.

Mr W wrote to the Authority and indicated that he did not feel that traffic speeds within the estate warranted the installation of traffic calming measures. He also stated that the funding would be better spent repairing potholes.

An officer contacted the respondent to inform him that officers had conducted several surveys which demonstrated a speeding issue on the section of Red House Drive/Beaumont Drive where it was proposed the speed cushions would be installed. The respondent was also informed that the funding for maintenance schemes would not be taken from the same budget used for road safety schemes.

Mr W was given the opportunity to withdraw his objection in light of the information by responding to officers in writing by the 11 December 2020. No response was received.

Ms W wrote to the Authority and indicated that she did not feel that traffic speeds within the estate warranted the installation of traffic calming measures. She also stated that the funding would be better spent repairing potholes.

An officer contacted the respondent to inform her that officers had conducted several surveys which demonstrated a speeding issue on the section of Red House Drive/Beaumont Drive where it was proposed the speed cushions would be installed. The respondent was also informed that the funding for maintenance schemes would not be taken from the same budget used for road safety schemes.

Ms W was given the opportunity to withdraw her objection in light of the information by responding to officers in writing by 11 December 2020. No response was received.

Mr A wrote to the Authority and indicated that he wished to object to the implementation of the speed humps owing to the expected increase in carbon dioxide emissions associated with vehicles negotiating the speed cushions decelerating and then accelerating. In his opinion, this was a more significant issue than traffic speeds.

An officer contacted the respondent to inform him that whilst there was evidence to suggest that traffic calming could lead to an increase in both carbon dioxide and noise pollution, this was not expected to reach a level which would cause any significant issues particularly given the lack of any existing air pollution problem in the area. It was explained that the anticipated road safety benefits of the scheme would outweigh any negative impact associated with noise pollution or air quality.

Mr A was given the opportunity to withdraw his objection in light of the information by responding to officers in writing by 11 December 2020. No response was received.

Mr B wrote to the Authority and indicated that he felt that the implementation of traffic calming would negatively affect the response times of the emergency services. The resident also felt that there was no problem with speeding traffic in the estate and therefore installing traffic calming was not necessary.

An officer contacted the respondent to confirm that speed cushions were being proposed rather than full width road humps to allow larger vehicles to straddle them. It was also explained that the results of traffic surveys had demonstrated a speeding issue.

Mr B was given the opportunity to withdraw his objection in light of the information by responding to officers in writing by 11 December 2020. No response was received.

Ms C wrote to the Authority to express her view that the proposed scheme was not sufficiently extensive to resolve speeding issues in the estate. She felt that the scheme would need to be extended further along Red House Drive to its junction with Monkseaton Drive in order to be effective.

An officer contacted the respondent to explain that traffic calming measures are installed using an evidence-based approach. Speed cushions were being proposed for the location in question based on the results of surveys carried out throughout the estate to determine vehicle speeds. These identified a particular issue on the section of carriageway adjacent to the junction of Red House Drive and Beaumont Drive and the speed cushions were consequently proposed for that section only. It was also explained to the respondent that following the implementation of the speed cushions, vehicle speeds throughout the estate would be monitored to ensure the vehicle speeds in the surrounding area remain within acceptable thresholds going forward.

Ms C was given the opportunity to withdraw her objection in light of the information by responding to officers in writing by 11 December 2020. No response was received.

Ms A wrote to the Authority indicating that she felt that the proposed scheme was not extensive enough to resolve speeding issues in the estate and should be extended along Red House Drive and Beaumont Drive. Ms A also asked for a hedgehog pass to be created to protect the local wildlife.

An officer contacted the respondent to explain that traffic calming measures are installed using an evidence-based approach. Speed cushions were being proposed for the location in question based on the results of surveys carried out throughout the estate to determine vehicle speeds. These identified a particular issue on the section of carriageway adjacent to the junction of Red House Drive and Beaumont Drive and the speed cushions were consequently proposed for that section only. It was also explained to the respondent that following the implementation of the speed cushions, vehicle speeds throughout the estate would be monitored to ensure the vehicle speeds in the surrounding area remain within acceptable thresholds going forward.

The respondent was also informed that appropriate signage could be installed as part of the scheme to increase awareness of the presence of wildlife in the area.

Ms A was given the opportunity to withdraw her objection in light of the information by responding to officers in writing by 11 December 2020. No response was received.

1.6 Decision options:

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

Option 1

Approve the recommendation set out in section 1.2.

Option 2

Not approve the recommendation set out in section 1.2.

Option 1 is the recommended option.

1.7 Reasons for recommended option:

Option 1 is recommended as the proposal will improve road safety as it is expected to reduce traffic speeds to within standard thresholds.

1.8 Appendices:

Appendix 1 Details of objections and associated correspondence

Appendix 2 Notice of Intention advertised on site

Appendix 3 Copy of Proposed Plan

1.9 Contact officers:

Andrew Flynn, Integrated Transport Manager, 0191 643 6083

Nicholas Bryan, Highway Network Manager, 0191 643 6622

Nick Saunders, Senior Traffic Engineer, Capita, 0191 643 6598

Cathy Davison, Principal Accountant Investment (Capital) and Revenue, 0191 643 5727

1.10 Background information:

[North Tyneside Transport Strategy](#)

[North Tyneside Travel Safety Strategy](#)

[North Tyneside Cycling Strategy](#)

PART 2 – COMPLIANCE WITH PRINCIPLES OF DECISION MAKING

2.1 Finance and other resources

Funding is available from the 2020/21 (Road Safety Initiatives) Local Transport Plan capital budget.

2.2 Legal

Schemes that involve the construction of road humps on the public highway 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.

All such schemes are formally advertised and include a 21-day period for objections. Before implementing the proposed scheme, the Authority must consider all objections made and not withdrawn and can decide whether to implement the proposed scheme unchanged, to implement it with modifications or not to proceed with the scheme.

In accordance with the Authority's scheme of Delegation to Cabinet Members, if any objections cannot be resolved, then the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport is asked to consider these and thereafter determine if the proposed scheme should be implemented.

2.3 Consultation/community engagement

2.3.1 Internal consultation

Ward members' views on the proposal were sought as described in section 1.5.1.

2.3.2 Community engagement

Local residents' 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 1.5.2.

2.4 Human rights

The proposals within this report do not have direct implications in respect of the Human Rights Act 1998.

2.5 Equalities and diversity

There are no adverse equalities or diversity issues arising from this report.

2.6 Risk management

There are no risk management implications directly arising from this report.

2.7 Crime and disorder

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

2.8 Environment and sustainability

There are no environment and sustainability implications directly arising from this report.

PART 3 - SIGN OFF

- Chief Executive X
- Head of Service X
- Mayor/Cabinet Member X
- Chief Finance Officer X
- Monitoring Officer X
- Head of Corporate Strategy and Customer Service X

Details of Objection – Ms. A (Dated 21 September 2020)

Firstly I wish to state clearly that I am totally against the proposed speed cushions on Beaumont Drive and Red House Drive. This is totally unnecessary and a complete waste of precious funds. I have lived on Beaumont Park for 36 years and in all of that time I am not aware of any need for these measures I am however aware of many incidents of minor injury caused by uneven pavements on the estate.

I am dismayed at the underhand way in which residents have been notified of your intentions. I noticed a lady pinning a notice to a lamppost when I drove past on Saturday, I thought she must have lost her cat. My husband and myself looked yesterday whilst out for our walk and there is one small notice on Beaumont Drive and one on Red House Drive. Shame on North Tyneside Council.

In recent weeks we have been presented with the absurd changes to Park View and the cycle route from Whitley Bay to Tynemouth neither of which I saw advance notice of. Was there a notice on a lamppost somewhere? All of these measures are causing disruption to motorists and unnecessary pollution to the environment.

Officer Response (Dated 3 December 2020)

Following your formal objection to the proposed traffic calming on Red House Drive / Beaumont Drive, I have reviewed your comments and concerns.

To address your comments relating to the funding for this proposal being able to be used in other areas such as maintenance, I can confirm that the funding is not allocated in that way and therefore this kind of proposal and a maintenance proposal such as footpath or pothole repairs would not come from the same budget. I have contacted our inspectors and requested that they look at the entire estates' footpaths and highways and any issues will be rectified in due course.

With regards to your concerns relating to the consultation process relating to the scheme. I can confirm that during the consultation the local ward members were informed of the scheme, following this a local residents group was given the proposal as part of an initial consultation and then following this during the legal consultation four notices were placed at various locations on Red House Drive as well as being displayed on the North Tyneside Council website and in the local press. Whilst I do appreciate that it would be easier for residents if we were to letter drop everyone in the estate however it was not seen appropriate due to the minimal impact that the scheme will have on residents within the estate.

Finally, with regards to the other temporary schemes that have been installed such as the 'pop-up cycle lane' and the Park View closures, I am unsure about the exact consultation procedure that was taken for those schemes as I was not directly involved with their installation. If you would like me to get more information relating to this I can pass your contact details onto the project manager who would have dealt with the consultation.

If you would like to withdraw your objection in light of the information provided above I would be grateful if you could let me know in writing by 11th December 2020. If I do not hear from you before then, I will assume that you still object to the proposed scheme and your objection will be included in a report to be presented to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport for consideration in the near future. You will be notified of the Cabinet Member's decision about this scheme in due course.

Details of Objection – Ms. T (Dated 23 September 2020)

I wish to object to the above planned speed cushions. As far as I am aware there have been no road accidents on this stretch of road. The road is open to fields with no footpath on one side at one of the proposed locations so is not an area where pedestrians cross. I do not believe this proposal to be the most effective use of public money.

However, spending money on the footpaths around Beaumont Park would be most welcome as there are numerous accidents with children and adults alike tripping or falling off bikes and scooters Due to the uneven paving flags.

Officer Response (Dated 3 December 2020)

Following your formal objection to the proposed traffic calming on Red House Drive / Beaumont Drive, I have reviewed your comments and concerns.

With regards to your comments relating to the purpose of the scheme due to the lack of accident history, I can confirm that at the location where the traffic calming is proposed the speeds are above the acceptable thresholds and would be deemed dangerous by police and department for transport guidance.

To address your comments relating to the funding for this proposal being able to be used in other areas such as maintenance, I can confirm that the funding is not allocated in that way and therefore this kind of proposal and a maintenance proposal such as footpath or pothole repairs would not come from the same budget. I have contacted our inspectors and requested that they look at the entire estates' footpaths and highways and any issues will be rectified in due course.

If you would like to withdraw your objection in light of the information provided above I would be grateful if you could let me know in writing by 11th December 2020. If I do not hear from you before then, I will assume that you still object to the proposed scheme and your objection will be included in a report to be presented to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport for consideration in the near future. You will be notified of the Cabinet Member's decision about this scheme in due course.

Details of Objection – Mr. T (Dated 24 September 2020)

I refer to the proposal to install Speed humps on the perimeter road on Redhouse /Beaumont Drive.

On what basis has the Council arrived at this decision?

Can you provide instances of accident data .Have other methods of traffic calming been considered? i.e. speed reduction to 20 .additional signing ,enhanced and updated electronic speed warning in place of the current signs, which are often obscured by branches and foliage. Speed cameras and additional mobile van presence.

As you are aware speed humps add to CO2 emissions as vehicles slow down on approach and accelerate away. Data is available on which confirms this. This method of speed control also adds to noise pollution for nearby residents.

Thanking you in anticipation.

Officer Response (Dated 3 December 2020)

Following your comments relating to the proposed traffic calming on Red House Drive / Beaumont Drive, I have reviewed your comments and concerns.

With regards to the origins of the scheme, I can confirm that whilst there are no concerns relating to accidents on this stretch of road there are real speeding concerns due to a lack of compliance with the existing 30mph speed limit at the section which we propose to traffic calm.

Other methods of traffic calming were considered such as chicanes however the budget allocation for the proposal meant that we would be able to achieve the greatest reduction in traffic speeds with speed humps. With regards to other methods such as simply reducing the speed limit to 20mph - we would not be comfortable doing that without having additional traffic calming measures due to the already - above threshold speeds.

Whilst I appreciate your concerns relating to the increased pollution caused by vehicle acceleration and deceleration, due to the low volume of vehicles travelling on this road every day and the lack of an existing pollution concern at this site, the advantages of reducing the traffic speeds to within the acceptable thresholds are seen as an adequate reason for the proposal.

Could you please confirm if you would like to formally object to the proposal before the 11th December. If I do not hear back by that date I will presume you are satisfied with my response and do not wish to object.

Details of Objection – Mr. W (Dated 28 September 2020)

Grounds for my Objections to This Proposal

1. In my view most vehicles observe the speed limit as per the council's speed indicators. I regularly walk on Beaumont Drive/Red House Drive, so observe the speed indicators as cars pass.
2. Speed cushions force a driver to slow down to 10 mph, (e.g. the speed cushions at Brierdene) depending on the severity of the incline which produces more pollution.
3. There is very little traffic travelling on these roads as they are generally only used for access to the housing estates and not a through road
4. If there is money available it would be more profitably spent on replacing the many broken paving stones on the footpaths and potholes in the roads on the estate which are becoming a hazard for pedestrians and drivers.

Lack of consultation

A small number of laminated paper notices wrapped round a pole does not in my opinion constitute informing the public of your intentions. The notices are not conspicuous and only able to be read by pedestrians.

Officer Response (Dated 4 December 2020)

Following your formal objection to the proposed traffic calming on Red House Drive / Beaumont Drive, I have reviewed your comments and concerns.

Whilst I appreciate your comments relating to the fact that the majority of vehicles are travelling within the speed limit, I can confirm that on the section of road where the traffic calming is

proposed, vehicles are travelling in excess of the speed limit and above the acceptable threshold.

To address your comments relating to the funding for this proposal being able to be used in other areas such as maintenance, I can confirm that the funding is not allocated in that way and therefore this kind of proposal and a maintenance proposal such as footpath or pothole repairs would not come from the same budget. I have contacted our inspectors and requested that they look at the entire estates' footpaths and highways and any issues will be rectified in due course.

Finally to address your concerns relating to the consultation process relating to the scheme. I can confirm that during the consultation the local ward members were informed of the scheme, following this a local residents group was given the proposal as part of an initial consultation and then following this during the legal consultation four notices were placed at various locations on Red House Drive as well as being displayed on the North Tyneside Council website and in the local press. Whilst I do appreciate that it would be easier for residents if we were to letter drop everyone in the estate however it was not seen appropriate due to the minimal impact that the scheme will have on residents within the estate.

If you would like to withdraw your objection in light of the information provided above I would be grateful if you could let me know in writing by 11th December 2020. If I do not hear from you before then, I will assume that you still object to the proposed scheme and your objection will be included in a report to be presented to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport for consideration in the near future. You will be notified of the Cabinet Member's decision about this scheme in due course.

Details of Objection – Ms. W (Dated 28 September 2020)

Grounds for my Objections to This Proposal

1. In my view most vehicles observe the speed limit as per the council's speed indicators. I regularly walk on Beaumont Drive/Red House Drive, so observe the speed indicators as cars pass.
2. Speed cushions force a driver to slow down to 10 mph, (e.g. the speed cushions at Brierdene) depending on the severity of the incline which produces more pollution.
3. There is very little traffic travelling on these roads as they are generally only used for access to the housing estates and not a through road
4. If there is money available it would be more profitably spent on replacing the many broken paving stones on the footpaths and potholes in the roads on the estate which are becoming a hazard for pedestrians and drivers.

Lack of consultation

A small number of laminated paper notices wrapped round a pole does not in my opinion constitute informing the public of your intentions. The notices are not conspicuous and only able to be read by pedestrians.

Officer Response (Dated 4 December 2020)

Following your formal objection to the proposed traffic calming on Red House Drive / Beaumont Drive, I have reviewed your comments and concerns.

Whilst I appreciate your comments relating to the fact that the majority of vehicles are travelling within the speed limit, I can confirm that on the section of road where the traffic calming is

proposed, vehicles are travelling in excess of the speed limit and above the acceptable threshold.

To address your comments relating to the funding for this proposal being able to be used in other areas such as maintenance, I can confirm that the funding is not allocated in that way and therefore this kind of proposal and a maintenance proposal such as footpath or pothole repairs would not come from the same budget. I have contacted our inspectors and requested that they look at the entire estates' footpaths and highways and any issues will be rectified in due course.

Finally to address your concerns relating to the consultation process relating to the scheme. I can confirm that during the consultation the local ward members were informed of the scheme, following this a local residents group was given the proposal as part of an initial consultation and then following this during the legal consultation four notices were placed at various locations on Red House Drive as well as being displayed on the North Tyneside Council website and in the local press. Whilst I do appreciate that it would be easier for residents if we were to letter drop everyone in the estate however it was not seen appropriate due to the minimal impact that the scheme will have on residents within the estate.

If you would like to withdraw your objection in light of the information provided above I would be grateful if you could let me know in writing by 11th December 2020. If I do not hear from you before then, I will assume that you still object to the proposed scheme and your objection will be included in a report to be presented to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport for consideration in the near future. You will be notified of the Cabinet Member's decision about this scheme in due course.

Details of Objection – Mr. A (Dated 28 September 2020)

I would like to record my objections to the proposed works. I believe this type of speed restriction is counterproductive as far as the environment is concerned with vehicles constantly slowing down and speeding up and polluting the environment further whilst doing so. I also believe there is no safety reason for this proposal

Can I add the councils manner of informing residents in appalling two small notices attached to lampposts half a mile apart is not good enough and makes the council appear underhand.

A similar scheme was proposed and massively rejected by residents at a public meeting all be it many years ago.

However, I am happy to go along with the majority view as long as consultation on this issue which affects every car user is conducted in an open and democratic manner.

Officer Response (Dated 4 December 2020)

Following your formal objection to the proposed traffic calming on Red House Drive / Beaumont Drive, I have reviewed your comments and concerns.

Whilst I appreciate your concerns relating to the increased pollution caused by vehicle acceleration and deceleration, due to the low volume of vehicles travelling on this road every day and the lack of an existing pollution concern at this site, the advantages of reducing the traffic speeds to within the acceptable thresholds are seen as an adequate reason for the proposal.

I can also understand your comments relating to the lack of accidents at the location however I can confirm that at the location where the traffic calming is proposed the speeds are above the acceptable thresholds and would be deemed dangerous by police and department for transport guidance.

If you would like to withdraw your objection in light of the information provided above I would be grateful if you could let me know in writing by 11th December 2020. If I do not hear from you before then, I will assume that you still object to the proposed scheme and your objection will be included in a report to be presented to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport for consideration in the near future. You will be notified of the Cabinet Member's decision about this scheme in due course.

Details of Objection – Mr. B (Dated 28 September 2020)

I have lived in Gainsborough Close since 1984. In all my time I only recall 1 road traffic accident on Beaumont Drive/Red House Drive. I also see very little speeding on the Estate. Speed humps are not conducive with the Ambulance Service vehicles, Fire Service vehicles, local Bus service vehicles or indeed any vehicle for that matter. Houses on the Estate are far enough back from the road which does not create any problem to drivers. My Wife and I strongly object to this proposal with the cost better spent on repairs and the like.

Officer Response (Dated 4 December 2020)

Following your formal objection to the proposed traffic calming on Red House Drive / Beaumont Drive, I have reviewed your comments and concerns.

Whilst I appreciate your concerns relating to the humps being detrimental to the response times of the respective emergency services, I can confirm that we have designed the proposal with traffic calming which can be straddled by vehicles which will significantly reduce the impact on these vehicles during rapid response periods as well as this the emergency services are also notified of the proposal during the initial consultation period.

With regards to the placement of the traffic calming, I can confirm that we looked at the vehicle speeds and have proposed the traffic calming on the section of road which does not currently comply with the acceptable thresholds.

Finally, to address your comments relating to the funding for this proposal being able to be used in other areas such as maintenance, I can confirm that the funding is not allocated in that way and therefore this kind of proposal and a maintenance proposal such as footpath or pothole repairs would not come from the same budget. I have contacted our inspectors and requested that they look at the entire estates' footpaths and highways and any issues will be rectified in due course.

If you would like to withdraw your objection in light of the information provided above I would be grateful if you could let me know in writing by 11th December 2020. If I do not hear from you before then, I will assume that you still object to the proposed scheme and your objection will be included in a report to be presented to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport for consideration in the near future. You will be notified of the Cabinet Member's decision about this scheme in due course.

Details of Objection – Ms. C (Dated 28 September 2020)

In response to the proposed speed cushions on Red House Drive and Beaumont Drive, I have no objection to the plans and happy action is being taken to tackle the issue of speeding cars on this road. However, I do have concerns that the speed cushions have been limited to only part

of the road which is experiencing issues with speeding cars. My family and I have been residents of Westgate Close since 1988 and have been in contact with Councillor Judith Wallace over the past year or more to express my concerns about cars on Red House Drive which have repeatedly caused problems ever since Beaumont Drive and Red House Drive were adjoined. The proposed plans will slow down traffic travelling from Beaumont Park to Haddington Road but the ring road continues for a further 0.6 miles before reaching the roundabout at the top of Red House Drive. It is in this area that I have expressed my concerns to Councillor Judith Wallace and is the area which cars drive at high speeds on a daily basis. I sincerely hope that North Tyneside Council will consider the addition of speed cushions further up Red House Drive towards Monkseaton Drive to eliminate the issue of speeding cars and to protect the residents including school children and visitors of the area who wish to cross these roads safely.

Officer Response (Dated 4 December 2020)

Following your formal objection to the proposed traffic calming on Red House Drive / Beaumont Drive, I have reviewed your comments and concerns.

Whilst I appreciate your concerns relating to the minimal extents of the scheme, I can confirm that we have focused on the area that has the least compliance with the existing speed limit and therefore if the scheme was to go ahead, I can confirm that we would continue to monitor the vehicle speeds on the road and if further traffic calming is required it could be installed as part of a future proposal.

If you would like to withdraw your objection in light of the information provided above I would be grateful if you could let me know in writing by 11th December 2020. If I do not hear from you before then, I will assume that you still object to the proposed scheme and your objection will be included in a report to be presented to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport for consideration in the near future. You will be notified of the Cabinet Member's decision about this scheme in due course.

Details of Objection – Ms. A (Dated 30 September 2020)

To whom it may concern,
this is actually a plea to extend the proposal in 2 ways.
Firstly could the construction also include a hedgehog pass, as we do have a thriving community of hedgehogs both on the footpath towards the wagon way, and in Beaumont estate. However every year there are many yearlings killed by the passage of the cars between especially Earnshaw Way and just past Beaconsfield. I apologise if this is in some way included, but cannot visualise where the constructions would actually be placed.
Secondly many vehicles while slowing somewhat at the crossing for the school, then increase their speed massively all the way to Haddington, with several near miss accidents.
I would also like to ask if there could be warnings of hedgehogs placed from the newly built bungalows, to Haddington, large Hedgehog signposts, to further deter vehicles from speeding between the ramps.
If it is at all possible, can you advise me where I could see a map of the proposed constructions, or might it be possible to email me.
I apologise for the delay in this response, which is due to health issues in the home, and much appreciate your attention.

Officer Response (Dated 4 December 2020)

Following your formal objection to the proposed traffic calming on Red House Drive / Beaumont Drive, I have reviewed your comments and concerns.

Whilst I appreciate your concerns relating to the minimal extents of the scheme, I can confirm that we have focused on the area that has the least compliance with the existing speed limit and therefore if the scheme was to go ahead, I can confirm that we would continue to monitor the vehicle speeds on the road and if further traffic calming is required it could be installed as part of a future proposal.

With regards to the local wildlife, if the scheme does go ahead I would be able to look at having some wildlife caution signs erected to make drivers more aware of animals crossing the road.

If you would like to withdraw your objection in light of the information provided above I would be grateful if you could let me know in writing by 11th December 2020. If I do not hear from you before then, I will assume that you still object to the proposed scheme and your objection will be included in a report to be presented to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport for consideration in the near future. You will be notified of the Cabinet Member's decision about this scheme in due course.

**NORTH TYNESIDE COUNCIL
PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF SPEED CUSHIONS
RED HOUSE DRIVE & BEAUMONT DRIVE, WHITLEY BAY**

In accordance with Section 90C of the Highways Act 1980 North Tyneside Council gives notice that it proposes to construct speed cushions on:

Red House Drive

- At a point 20m south west of its junction with Haddington Road
- At a point 51m north east of its junction with Haddington Road

Beaumont Drive

- At point 22m south west of its junction with Beaconsfield Close
- At a point 95m south west of its junction with Beaconsfield Close

The speed cushions proposed will each be 1.7 metres wide, 3.7 metres long, with a ramp gradient of 1 in 13. The reason for the speed cushions is to reduce vehicular speeds on Red House Drive and Beaumont Drive and increase safety of all highway users.


If you wish to object to the proposals you should send the grounds for your objection in writing to the undersigned or via email to democraticsupport@northtyneside.gov.uk by 1 October 2020.

Any objections received may be published as part of any reports to councillors on the matter.

17 September 2020

Head of Law & Governance, Quadrant, Silverlink North, Cobalt Business Park, NE27 0BY



<p>E-mail: traffic@northtyneside.gov.uk Web: www.northtyneside.gov.uk</p>		 <p>Working in partnership with CAPITA <small>North Tyneside Council</small></p>		<p>Drawn JIG Checked NS Scales NTS Date Drawn 24/07/20</p>		<p>Client North Tyneside Council Project Title Red House Drive Traffic Calming Consultation Drawing</p>		<p>Project No. NA Drawing No. NA Revision A Sheet Size A3</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--