



## Buckinghamshire Council

# North West Chilterns and Missendens Community Board Meetings

---

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Response to two petitions to remove certain types of vehicles from identified roads in Great Kingshill</b>
<b>Date:</b>	25 <sup>th</sup> June 2021
<b>Lead Respondent :</b>	Graham Hillary – Transport Strategy Officer (Freight)
<b>Ward(s) affected:</b>	Ridgeway East
<b>Relevant councillor(s):</b>	Cllr David Carroll, Cllr Steven Broadbent and Cllr Clive Harris

### 1.0 Executive summary

A Petition has been submitted requesting the Council remove specific heavy good vehicle types off identified roads in the Great Kingshill, objecting to these vehicle types accessing Great Kingshill permanently other than for local house deliveries. The petition states that:

- For the last six months or more residents of Great Kingshill have seen a huge increase in lorries / HS2 trucks / skips and demolition vehicles travelling through residential roads in the village.
- The petition seeks residential support to remove these vehicles from the following roads permanently: Copes Road, Spurlands End Road, The Common, Cockpit Road and Stag Lane.

A second petition has been received on behalf of the Great Kingshill Residents' Association requesting that Buckinghamshire Council takes permanent action to ban HGVs from certain roads in the Great Kingshill village, with exceptions for access to homes and businesses.

This petition states:

- The village has seen a huge increase in the number of HGVs, coaches, skip lorries and demolition vehicles using its small narrow lanes.

- The petition suggests that some of this traffic is believed to be linked to local HS2 works, with similar traffic being generated by businesses on Binders Yard Industrial Estate, located on Cryers Hill Road.
- Large coaches make their way up and down the narrow Pipers Lane on a daily basis, choking the road with traffic every weekday morning and afternoon.
- Some of these vehicles are exceeding the 30 mph speed limit on these often narrow lanes, causing further danger to school children, walkers, animals, cyclists and (often elderly) villagers.
- The larger waste / skip lorries may also be carrying unsecured loads.
- Due to other disputes / safety initiatives in the surrounding area, the volume of such traffic may actually be set to increase. A current dispute between HS2 Ltd and Buckinghamshire Council regarding works traffic on the A355 / A413 may produce an increase in the usage of the village roads.
- HS2 traffic should not be travelling through Great Kingshill at all, as the village is not a designated route for that traffic. The same goes for their suppliers, we believe.
- The potential traffic calming in Widmer End, will surely lead to further increases from local traffic.
- Any expansion to Binders Yard Industrial Estate, or indeed to any of the companies, such as Wycombe Recycling, will see even more vehicles.

This document has been prepared to provide a considered response identifying relevant available information and some recommendations how to proceed. These include:

- Introduce some traffic calming measures
- Introduce a 7.5 tonne Environmental Traffic Regulation Order
- Install Advisory 'Unsuitable for HGV' signage
- Conduct investigations to identify the most appropriate solution

## **2.0 Recommendation:**

**This response has focused on offering a comprehensive initial assessment of existing traffic challenges as highlighted in the petitions. The intention is that this helps inform the Community Board and facilitates discussion as to how the local community would like to proceed. It is envisaged that village residents and their representatives work with the Community Board, Transport for Bucks and other interested stakeholders on investigating the concerns of the petitioners around Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGVs) movement and other vehicle challenges using this response to aid understanding and to provide detailed analysis of current traffic flows. This should enable the Community Board determine if and how they would like to move forward, requesting further TfB assessment of options if needed. It should be noted that Freight Strategy and TfB do not have any budget or resource available to undertake further studies or to implement agreed solutions; as such it is likely that the Parish Council and Community Board may need to fund or match fund these.**

### 3.0 Reason for recommendation:

Collision data, speed data and traffic count data has been reviewed by highways officers in Transport for Bucks (TfB). The collision record means that this site would not be prioritised for road safety measures, as there are currently a high number of higher priority sites to be treated. The speed data indicates that, as with many similar local roads, there is a level of speeding but, this is not exceptional and is best tackled by working with the police through community speed-watch in the first instance. The traffic counts suggest levels of all vehicles and, HGVs in particular, have not increased since 2018 and there would be no grounds for priority action to be taken in this location by the Highways Authority.

Taking the position of the Highway Authority into account the recommendation is that this response to the petitions received should be reviewed by the Community Board Transport sub-group, in the first instance and, that it is further appraised along with the sub-group input by the full Community Board. The Community Board will have the opportunity to discuss with the petitioners and wider community and, determine how they would like to proceed.

Any decision to commission TfB to undertake further feasibility studies may require funding from the Parish Council or Community Board. It is likely that any delivery of traffic restrictions and / or traffic calming measures will require a level of match funding.

A draft version of this response has already been reviewed by the local Buckinghamshire Council member, Councillor David Carroll and the Chair of the Hughenden Parish Council, Councillor Paul Nicholls. This review was carried out to validate the content, provide some local context and, to offer an initial view of how to proceed. The councillors' suggestions have been incorporated into the report and their suggestion of potential need for further feasibility work to be undertaken noted. These suggestions cover:

- Study 1: Addressing the Cockpit Road narrowing issue with say flow management initiatives such as traffic calming, shuttle working, signs or other measures.
- Study 2: A 7.5 tonne weight limit (except for access) for Cockpit Road.

The narrowness of Cockpit Road being viewed as the priority aspect to investigate.

It has been noted that the width of Cockpit Road is 5 metres with it widening to 6.2 metres at the point where cars are parked on the road. It is felt locally that the road is narrow, especially when two HGVs are approaching from both directions and when, usually one of the vehicles takes to driving on the pavement. It is also noted that widening the road is not possible and that vehicles driving on pavements is an illegal act, accepting that this is allowable for accessing a property or in taking emergency actions. The councillor's suggested that the use of traffic calming measures may be of value and as such a link to the TfB Traffic Calming Guide 2020 is provided here.

[Buckinghamshire Traffic Calming Guide 2020](#)

Results from commissioned traffic flow surveys in the area suggest that compared to historical records from the available date taken in October 2018 (\*) and from October 2016, there has been no significant change in recorded HGV numbers and total vehicle numbers. The latest survey was carried out at the junction of Heath End Road, Copes Road, Stag Lane and Cockpit Road on the 11<sup>th</sup> May 2021 and demonstrated changes in non – HGV and HGV numbers:-

(\* The October 2018 survey was the last available due to the program having been suspended due to the Covid-19 pandemic)

2021			
Road	All	HGV	LGV
Heath End Rd	2226	34	278
Copes Rd	3571	65	538
Cockpit Rd	2522	66	371
Stag Lane	3365	55	422

2016				2018			
Road	All	HGV	LGV	Road	All	HGV	LGV
Heath End	2161	31	149	Heath End	2314	27	157
Copes	3179	64	216	Copes	3594	74	296
Cockpit	2302	58	157	Cockpit	2384	63	175
Stag	2990	37	214	Stag	3362	36	264

- Counts taken over the 12 hour period 07:00 to 19:00
- The survey is not able to identify if the HGVs are skip lorries, groundworks vehicles or other models.
- The figures relate to vehicle movements in and out of the quoted roads providing an indication of traffic flows in both directions. This does not offer a view of total vehicle moves across the measured junction as individual vehicles are most likely to have been counted on one of the other roads.
  - For example a vehicle counted exiting Heath End Road and entering Cockpit Road will have been counted in the numbers on both roads.

Speed surveys conducted on Cockpit Road did identify some speeding by all types of vehicles, although this would appear to be in line with national statistics. However, any instances of speeding vehicles should be reported to the police. It is noted that the vehicle profiles from the traffic flow counts and from the speed surveys differ slightly. This is down to the different methods of the two systems and the accuracy identifying vehicle types on the speed focused process. However it's purpose was to provide a consideration of the flows and a focus on vehicle speeds, which it successfully did.

Enquires with HS2 and their main contractor in the area, Align JV, confirmed that there is no reason for HS2 contracted vehicles to be in the Great Kingshill area; that they have no commercial relationships with an local businesses and; that they have been unable to identify any HS2 construction traffic in the area. Any identified HS2 construction vehicles seen in Great Kingshill should be reported to HS2 using <https://www.hs2.org.uk/in-your-area/contact-us/>

As far as skip lorries are concerned there are two operators using these types of vehicles located in or near the Great Kingshill area; Wycombe Recycling based on Binders Yard, Cryers Hill Road and K & S Skips off Spurlands End Road. The use of these services are very much driven by domestic and commercial refurbishment and improvement projects. The recent lockdown, the unavailability of holidays, abroad or in fact in the UK appears to have resulted in people taking the opportunity to improve their housing. The rise in home improvements has generated greater demand for skip services the movement of which have become more noticeable as more people have been working from home.

The live planning application from Wycombe Recycling seeking to increase the daily vehicle movements from the present 80 to a new limit of 160 a day is being handled under the statutory planning process and as such is out of scope for this petition response. The determination date for the planning application is the 01<sup>st</sup> July 2021, though this may be delayed as the application has been referred to committee.

Concerns were also expressed about HGVs mounting pavements, specifically down Cockpit Road and especially when two trucks are trying to pass each other. Additional detail on the legal situation is covered in Appendix 13 however, it is illegal for vehicles to drive on pavements except to gain access to a property or in an emergency. As such any instances should be reported to the police.

The Community Board has contacts with the local Thames Valley Police (TVP) officers as such it is understood that they have and will continue to be taking the opportunity to discuss speeding vehicles and driving on pavements and how TVP may support.

Taking the above factors and considering the level of local opinion; it is apparent that there are genuine concerns about HGV and other vehicles movements throughout Great Kingshill, this is demonstrated by the presentation of the two petitions. The recommendation is for a review of the detail in this response take place by the Community Board, that they explore options and determine how to proceed. Should further studies be necessary these may require funding.

Although the two petitions submitted focus on HGV traffic, it is also clear that there are further concerns around the way other vehicle types are driven in the area; it may be appropriate to take a view on how to reduce speeding vehicles and to encourage more considerate driver behaviour, these should be discussed with Thames Valley Police as the enforcing authority.

The issues raised along with the resolution proposed in this petition demand further investigations to establish the validity of the concerns and, that the proposal is the most appropriate approach to adopt to address raised those concerns.

Committing to work collaboratively with residents, local members, commercial interests, the Parish Council, the Community Board and other stakeholders offers the opportunity to generate the most suitable approach, taking this forward via the Community Board for a qualified, cost efficient and effective solution.

Community Boards are the way of bringing the council, groups, organisations and local people together to look at local issues and find ways of improving them together.

As a community-led partnership, Community Boards will:

- influence how decisions are made and how services are delivered
- represent the voice of local people
- capture thoughts, ideas and suggestions
- bring together key community partners and residents
- identify local needs and work to produce creative solutions
- There will be many ways the boards will work with the community to identify what is important in each area and take action together.

Each board has an allocated budget to fund local projects and initiatives as prioritised by the board.

Transport for Bucks (TfB) and Freight Strategy have been working on a methodology and 'checklist' for the progression of transport proposals through the Community Boards to TfB for consideration. It is expected that this will help in the analysis and investigation of problems to be addressed and the development of solutions.



## 4.0 Considerations

To investigate the suggested actions made through the Petition, the following enquires were made, headlines are provided here with more detailed results are covered in the appendices:

- with **Transport for Bucks** to establish from the available records any history of events of damage to the roads and landscape caused by HGV traffic; to determine traffic flows to compare with historical counts and to measure vehicle speed at identified locations and on a by-demand basis.
- with the **Road Safety Team** to establish any records of injury collisions in Great Kingshill; to look at contributing factors, vehicle types and locations; and to assess the historical record of Great Kingshill compared to other areas in the county;
- with the council's **HS2 team** and the HS2 main contractor, Align JV, to establish the extent of HS2 contractor vehicles in the Great Kingshill area and any relationship with local businesses;
- with **Pipers Corner School** to establish coach operations serving the school and the scope of coaches using Pipers Lane as a 'rat-run';
- with **Transport Strategy** to determine the records of reported heavy goods (HGV) vehicle concerns raised within the Great Kingshill area.

## 5.0 Summary of Evidence

### 5.1 Record of Damage

Transport for Bucks (TfB) records for repairs (scheduled and unscheduled), maintenance, inspections, street works and logged customer reported issues. The records for the period 20<sup>th</sup> May 2016 to 20<sup>th</sup> May 2021 have been reviewed. This included in-house works and works carried out by third parties such as Affinity Water, BT and local resident contracted construction developments.

Incidents and Issues reported to involve HGV movements amounted to 7 reported events over the five year period:-

- 2 events involving damage to trees and paving
- No reported events involving HGV collision with people or personal property.

It is understood that reports of other issues involving HGV traffic may have reported elsewhere within the council, these may not have resulted in damage requiring TfB attendance and as such not appeared in the reports covered.

## 5.2 Traffic Volume Data

TfB collect traffic data manually at the junction of Stag Lane/Copes Road junction with Cockpit Road/Heath End Road, vehicle classified data is collected over a 12 hour (7-19) period, biennially, the latest information available from the 03<sup>rd</sup> October 2018. Later scheduled data surveys were delayed due to the Covid-19 pandemic. In order to provide a longer-term view of the traffic change the counts from this location of 05<sup>th</sup> October 2016 have also been reviewed. It is acknowledged that there will be some vehicle flows outside of the survey timings.

As a result of communications from the Great Kingshill; TfB collected new manual data at the same Stag Lane/Copes Road junction with Cockpit Road/Heath End Road location and; also for the junction of Cryers Hill Road/Missenden Road junction with Cockpit Road/Pipers Lane.

Headline results are shown here with more detailed results in the appendices.

- The data available from Oct 2018 only provides a view of HGV and non-HGV traffic; as a result the comparison has been presented in these two categories
- It must be taken into account that the captured data is counted manually by reviewing a recording of the two junction surveys and determining vehicle classifications.
  - The Automated Traffic Count (ATC) focusing on vehicle speed, carried out on Cockpit Road, records data using air switches to record the length between axles and internal software within the counter classifies the vehicle.
  - These two methods are different with the visual count generally more accurate; this would explain the differences in the presented vehicle classification numbers.
  - The ATC class data should be used, as has been done in the Speed Data sections, to give a feel for the composition of the traffic with a focus on the speed of vehicles.

## Heath End Rd / Copes Rd / Cockpit Rd / Stag Lane - 11<sup>th</sup> May 2021

- Total traffic flow amounted to 5,846 vehicles
  - Cars & Taxis - 4,780 = 82%
  - Light Goods Vehicles - 763 = 13%
  - Bus & Coaches - 101 = 2%
  - HGVs - 97 = 2%
- HGV Numbers by Route
  - Copes Rd to Cockpit Rd - 22
  - Cockpit Rd to Copes Rd - 20
  - Cockpit Rd to Heath End Rd - 14
  - Heath End Rd to Cockpit Rd - 10

## Heath End Rd / Copes Rd / Cockpit Rd / Stag Lane - 03<sup>rd</sup> Oct 2018

- Total traffic flow amounted to 5,827 vehicles (\*)
  - Non HGVs - 5,727 = 98%
  - HGVs - 100 = 2%
- HGV Numbers by Route
  - Copes Rd to Cockpit Rd - 26
  - Cockpit Rd to Copes Rd - 18
  - Cockpit Rd to Heath End Rd - 10
  - Heath End Rd to Cockpit Rd - 8

## Heath End Rd / Copes Rd / Cockpit Rd / Stag Lane - 05<sup>th</sup> Oct 2016

- Total traffic flow amounted to 5,316 vehicles
  - Non HGVs - 5,221 = 98%
  - HGVs - 95 = 2%
  - High Volume Routes
- HGV Numbers by Route
  - Copes Rd to Cockpit Rd - 26
  - Copes Rd to Stag Lane - 18
  - Cockpit Rd to Heath End Rd - 11
  - Heath End Rd to Cockpit Rd - 11
  - Stag Lane to Copes Rd - 10

### Comparisons

	Oct-16	Oct-18	May-21	Variance 2018 over 2016	Variance 2021 over 2016	Variance 2021 over 2018
Non HGV	5,221	5,727	5,749	506	528	22
HGV	95	100	97	5	2	-3
Total Vehicles	5,221	5,827	5,846	606	625	19
% HGVs of all vehicles	1.8%	2.0%	2.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%

We can see from the results that there was a large increase in total volume flows from 2016 to 2018 though HGV numbers remained pretty stable. There was little non-HGV and HGV variance from 2018 to 2021, though we have been through

pandemic lockdowns during this period but this is not felt to have significantly affected the HGV results. Detailed traffic data embedded in the traffic count appendix.

Further analysis has been conducted on the data to understand traffic flows on the specific roads of Copes Road, Cockpit Road, Heath End Road and Stag Lane. This has sought to capture traffic numbers covering both directions showing total vehicle numbers; HGV numbers and LGV numbers (\*)

(\* LGV are transit and sprinter type vans and rigid trucks with a maximum gross weight over 3,500 kgs and equal or less than 7,000 kgs. This class of vehicle has seen the highest growth of all vehicle types driven by increased demand for home delivery and online shopping, including groceries.)

All Traffic				HGV's				LGV's			
Road	2016	2018	2021	Road	2016	2018	2021	Road	2016	2018	2021
Heath End	2161	2314	2226	Heath End	31	27	34	Heath End	149	157	278
Copes	3179	3594	3571	Copes	64	74	65	Copes	216	296	538
Cockpit	2302	2384	2522	Cockpit	58	63	66	Cockpit	157	175	371
Stag	2990	3362	3365	Stag	37	36	55	Stag	214	264	422

  

2016				2018				2021			
Road	All	HGV	LGV	Road	All	HGV	LGV	Road	All	HGV	LGV
Heath End	2161	31	149	Heath End	2314	27	157	Heath End Rd	2226	34	278
Copes	3179	64	216	Copes	3594	74	296	Copes Rd	3571	65	538
Cockpit	2302	58	157	Cockpit	2384	63	175	Cockpit Rd	2522	66	371
Stag	2990	37	214	Stag	3362	36	264	Stag Lane	3365	55	422

Clearly the lockdown had an impact on traffic flows, car numbers fell as low as 20+% of pre-lockdown volumes. Commercial vehicle volumes also fell dramatically however a move to online purchasing and home deliveries resulted in a swifter bounce back. It did become apparent that more people working from home and the need to 'stay at home' has resulted in every goods vehicle movement being more noticeable. These two surveys have been conducted outside of any lockdown period although hospitality was still pending full reopening.

In order to further gauge vehicle flows through Great Kingshill a count was conducted on the 11<sup>th</sup> May at the crossroads of Cryers Hill Road / Missenden Road / Pipers Lane and Cockpit Road. The detailed results are covered in the appendices however the headlines are:

- Total Vehicles amounted to 11,762 broken down as below
  - Cycles 42 0.36%
  - Motorcycles 43 0.37%
  - Cars & taxis 9,917 84.31%
  - Bus & Coaches 150 1.28%
  - Light Goods Vehicles 1,420 12.07%
  - Heavy Goods Vehicles 190 1.62%

	All Vehicles	All Vehicles %	HGVs	HGVs %
Total Vehicles through the junction	11,762		190	
Flows Cryers Hill Rd <-> Missenden Road	7,759	65.97%	120	63.16%
Flows down Cockpit Rd away from the junction	1,283	10.91%	35	18.42%
Flows up Cockpit Road towards the junction	1,310	11.14%	33	17.37%
Flows down Pipers Lane away from the junction	858	7.29%	2	1.05%
Flows up Pipers Lane towards the junction	858	7.29%	2	1.05%

TfB further gathered new automated data on a temporary basis at Cockpit Road with volumetric, speed and vehicle classification data being collected. Surveys were conducted for the period 10<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> May and the period 17<sup>th</sup> – 23<sup>rd</sup> May. The later being run as it was felt that some local roadworks may have potentially affected results.

Automated Traffic Counts, as used on the speed survey on Cockpit Road are an automatic method of recording via the use of air switches that record the length between axles and then internal software within the counter classifies the vehicle. There are expected differences between this method of identifying the vehicle type and the visually checked traffic flow counts, these two methods are very different and should not be compared. The ATC class data should be used to give a feel for the composition of the traffic using the road focussing in this case on vehicle speeds.

This survey has focused on HGV traffic along Cockpit Road, a location where it has been reported that these trucks have been speeding however data for all vehicles along the route for the surveyed weeks has been collected and is summarised here. Additional information on HGVs and non-HGV traffic speed is included in the embedded files.

Specific reference has been made to skip lorries and although we are not able to identify these units it is likely that these are included in a classification recorded as HGVs within the data. They have therefore been incorporated in the summary data shown here.

## All Vehicle Results

### Week 1 - Monday 10<sup>th</sup> May to the Sunday 16<sup>th</sup> May 2021

This table summarises the week 1 movements by vehicle type and by speed band.

Daily figures are provided in the appendices along with the data sets.

Date: Week 10th-16th May 21		Numbers		Exceeding Speed Limit by (mph)				
Vehicle Type: All Vehicles	Totals	<= 30 mph	> 30 mph	<= 5mph	>5 =<10	> 10 =<15	>15 =<20	> 20
<b>Total on route</b>	<b>17357</b>	<b>9128</b>	<b>8229</b>	<b>5245</b>	<b>2173</b>	<b>636</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>NE towards Missenden Rd</b>	8522	5271	3251	2031	899	242	66	16
Motorcycles	45	24	21	11	7	3	1	2
Cars & Taxis	6191	3845	2346	1512	621	161	45	7
Small Vans / Pick Ups	2039	1207	832	472	256	77	20	7
Buses / Coaches	24	23	1	0	1	0	0	0
LGVs (Vans and Trucks to 7.5t)	161	119	42	29	12	1	0	0
HGV (Above 7.5t)	62	53	9	7	2	0	0	0
<b>SW towards Heath End Rd</b>	8835	3857	4978	3214	1274	394	73	25
Motorcycles	44	19	25	10	7	5	2	1
Cars & Taxis	6723	2930	3793	2482	937	305	50	19
Small Vans / Pick Ups	1756	722	1034	634	303	76	19	2
Buses / Coaches	32	28	4	3	0	0	0	1
LGVs (Vans and Trucks to 7.5t)	220	122	98	65	23	7	2	1
HGV (Above 7.5t)	60	36	24	20	4	1	0	1

## HGV Results

### Week 2 - Monday 17<sup>th</sup> May to the Sunday 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2021

This table summarises the week 2 movements by vehicle type and by speed band.

Daily figures are provided in the appendices along with the data sets.

Date: Week 17th - 23rd May		Numbers		Exceeding Speed Limit by (mph)				
Vehicle Type: All Vehicles	Totals	<= 30 mph	> 30 mph	<= 5mph	>5 =<10	> 10 =<15	>15 =<20	> 20
<b>Total on route</b>	<b>18102</b>	<b>6155</b>	<b>11947</b>	<b>6947</b>	<b>3693</b>	<b>998</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>NE towards Missenden Rd</b>	8493	3109	5384	3316	1565	371	102	30
Motorcycles	46	18	28	15	7	6	0	0
Cars & Taxis	6145	2196	3949	2482	1123	254	68	22
Small Vans / Pick Ups	2006	701	1305	743	412	108	34	8
Buses / Coaches	49	43	6	5	0	1	0	0
LGVs (Vans and Trucks to 7.5t)	174	96	78	54	22	2	0	0
HGV (Above 7.5t)	73	55	18	17	1	0	0	0
<b>SW towards Heath End Rd</b>	9609	3046	6563	3631	2128	627	133	44
Motorcycles	365	10	355	19	249	69	14	4
Cars & Taxis	7148	2392	4756	2777	1425	430	95	29
Small Vans / Pick Ups	1747	487	1260	703	407	117	23	10
Buses / Coaches	35	30	5	2	1	2	0	0
LGVs (Vans and Trucks to 7.5t)	236	82	154	105	39	8	1	1
HGV (Above 7.5t)	78	45	33	25	7	1	0	0

### 5.3 Road Safety

Looking at the collision data provided by TVP in the last 5 years up to and including 31<sup>st</sup> January 2021 there has been no reported collisions involving any vehicles over 3.5 ton.

There have been 9 Recorded collisions in the 5 years to 31<sup>st</sup> January 2021 involving cars, 2 vans and a horse & cart. No serious injuries were recorded as a result of these incidents

The Network Safety Team's method of identifying sites for potential casualty reduction remedial measures, This involves: -

- reviewing injury collisions which have occurred within the last 5-year period, in order to identify those sites and routes that have the highest collision rate and casualty severity.
- The safety team look at routes across the whole of the county and rank these routes by the rate of collisions per km that have resulted in a road user being Killed or Seriously injured (KSI rate per km).
- A search is also carried out for collision sites that have a history of 5 or more collisions (of any severity) within a 50m radius within the last 5 years.

There are currently over 160 sites meeting this criterion across Buckinghamshire; within the area of Great Kingshill there are currently no sites meeting these criteria.

Any instances of speeding vehicles and vehicles driving on pavements, presenting an increased risk to pedestrians and other road users should be reported to the police.

### 5.4 HS2

Following discussions with HS2 and the HS2 main contractor Align JV it has been established that:-

- No HS2 construction traffic identified in Great Kingshill
- No HS2 relationship with local businesses
- All HS2 construction traffic should carry HS2 identification; if seen in Great Kingshill these should be reported to HS2 using <https://www.hs2.org.uk/in-your-area/contact-us/>

Useful information for HS2 to investigate includes:-

- Day, Date, Time
- Location, Direction
- Vehicle Registration & Any Branding
- Photos would be very useful

## 5.5 Pipers Corner School

Contact was made with Pipers Corner School in May 2021 to establish coach operations serving the school and understand the perception of large coaches using Pipers Lane as a 'rat-run'.

- No larger coaches / buses service Pipers Corner School; coaches 33-seater maximum
- 14 school transport routes serving the school, using coaches and minibuses
- The school are constantly reappraising the impact of the school on Pipers Lane and the wider Great Kingshill community; they have explored the creation of passing points and work extensively with their school transport providers to minimise the window of operations.
- The school confirm that coaches are not able to utilise Pipers Lane / Boss Lane to gain access to Valley Road, Hughenden meaning it cannot be used as a 'rat-run'.

## 5.6 Transport Strategy for Freight

Records of communications received in the 'Freight' mailbox and by the Transport Strategy Officer for Freight have been reviewed to establish any relating to the Great Kingshill area.

- There have been no communications received by the Freight Mailbox or by the Transport Strategy Officer for Freight relating to HGV concerns for the period from March 2019 to April 2021.
- Since the start of April 2021, a number of communications have been received by various council functions regarding: -
  - HGV numbers increased
  - HGV speeds
  - HS2 construction vehicles
  - Skip lorries
  - Badly & dangerously driven trucks
  - Unacceptable risks to people and property
  - Location of skip operators
  - Breaches in planning conditions
  - Noise and pollution levels

Where possible these aspects have been covered in this response and the appendices.

## 6.0 Options considered

This section outlines potential options for the management of the impact of HGVs through the Great Kingshill village.

These options have been considered by the local Buckinghamshire Council member, Councillor David Carroll and the Chair of the Hughenden Parish Council, Councillor Paul Nicholls as part of their support in reviewing the draft version. They identified two studies as potentially the best approach to take.

- Study 1: Addressing the Cockpit Road narrowing issue with say flow management initiatives such as traffic calming, shuttle working, signs or other measures.
- Study 2: A 7.5 tonne weight limit (except for access) for Cockpit Road.

The narrowness of Cockpit Road being viewed as the priority aspect to investigate.

The scope of these potential studies will need to be understood by TfB, some estimate of cost provided and if pursued some financial contribution expected.

## 6.2 Introduce some traffic management measures

To reduce the impact of speeding vehicles, including HGVs and to encourage more considerate driver behaviour by introducing traffic management measures on routes where this is identified as a problem.

### Pros

- Should force all traffic to slow down reducing the risks to the public and property.
- Could encourage improved driver behaviour through traffic prioritisation and physical considerations.
- Could remove the need for vehicles to drive on pavements.
- Would continue to allow use of these routes, potentially reducing journey times, lowering distances driven, improve operational efficiency and enhance air quality and pollution impacts.
- Dependent on design may make the roads an unattractive option for HGVs.

### Cons

- Would not eliminate the use of the routes by HGVs.
- Experience suggests that such measures may encourage drivers to speed to avoid having to take measures to slow and allow other road users priority.
- Dependent on design may be an expensive option given the costs of installing physical calming measures.
- May require some funding of the necessary investigations and installations.
- Would require extensive investigations to determine the most suitable tools to manage vehicle movements.

## 6.2 Introduce a 7.5 tonne Environmental Traffic Regulation Order

To implement weight restrictions in the village on the roads requested allowing local access for residential and local commercial considerations.

Roads identified in the 1<sup>st</sup> petition: -

- Copes Road
- Spurlands End Road
- The Common
- Cockpit Road
- Stag Lane

The Great Kingshill Resident's Association petition identified the additional roads of

- Pipers Lane
- Hatches Lane
- Common Road

### Pros

- Focuses on prohibiting use of the village for HGV traffic passing through and using these roads as a cut-through.
- Will be signposted on the primary A4128 route and at key locations, that the use of these roads by HGVs is inappropriate.
- Should minimise the risk of damage to roads, pavements, verges, trees, motor vehicles although it has to be said there is no historical record of such damage.
- Should reduce any risk or personal injury to other road users, be they on foot, cycle or on horse.

### Cons

- Is only enforceable by Thames Valley Police and Trading Standards; Buckinghamshire Council, like other local authorities outside of London have no powers to enforce.
- No clear suitable route for displaced traffic considering the 26tonne structural weight restriction at the railway bridge in Great Missenden.
- Requires full Statutory Consultation and has legal aspects to be applied.
- Is an expensive and lengthy option. (Costs subject to TfB surveys and studies but could be as much as £15-30,000; could take 12-18 months to implement depending on complexity).
- Is not included in the initial suite of intervention locations in the Freight Strategy, which covers the period up to 2022-23 and as such may require 'match-funding'.
- Records of collision injury and damage to roads, verges, trees, buildings and other motor vehicles by HGVs within the village do not support the creation of a robust business case.

### 6.3 Install Advisory 'Unsuitable for HGV' signage

To install 'Unsuitable for HGV' signs on the primary route, the A4128 and at key locations around the area discouraging the use of the identified roads in the village by HGV traffic without a reason to enter.

Roads on which restrictions requested in the 1<sup>st</sup> petition:

- Copes Road
- Spurlands End Road
- The Common
- Cockpit Road
- Stag Lane

Additional roads as requested in the Great Kingshill Residents' Association petition:

- Pipers Lane
- Hatches Lane
- Common Road

#### Pros

- Relatively quick and inexpensive to introduce, easier to justify. (Could cost up to £10k depending on the actual scope)
- Can be a high visibility option on the primary routes to discourage HGV access onto roads in the village.
- Should minimise the risk of damage to roads, verges, trees, motor vehicles and buildings, although it has to be said there is no historical record of such damage.
- Should reduce any risk or personal injury to other road users, be they on foot, cycle or on horse.

#### Cons

- Is advisory and not enforceable.
- Is not included in the initial suite of intervention locations in the Freight Strategy, which covers the period up to 2022-23 and as such may require 'match-funding'.
- Will not guarantee that HGVs will not enter the village.
- Will not guarantee that HGVs will not continue to use the roads sign posted, especially if drivers are aware that trucks can navigate the routes.

## **6.4 Conduct investigations to identify the most appropriate solution**

To work with Transport for Bucks (TfB) to understand the challenges the petition is seeking to address; to conduct investigations and promote what is the most appropriate approach to minimising the potential impact of HGVs on the village.

### **Pros**

- Identifies all the concerns of the community
- Through a collaborative approach, explores root causes and develops qualified options to resolve.
- Ensures that the proposed solution generated is viable, cost effective and best meets the needs of the village.

### **Cons**

- Demands a commitment from the community to work on finding the best solution for the village
- May need some local funding for the necessary analysis
- Is dependent on TfB resource availability.

Reviews of this document by BC local member, Councillor David Carroll and Chair of the Hughenden PC, Councillor Paul Nicholls identified the following potential further studies may be useful.

- Study 1: Addressing the road narrows issue with say traffic calming, shuttle working, signs or other measures.
- Study 2: A 7.5 tonne weight limit (except for access) for Cockpit Road.

This document has been also reviewed by the CB Traffic and Road Sub-Group and their suggestions incorporated into the final version.

## **7.0 Legal and financial implications**

Options are subject to further study which cannot at this time determine any legal and financial impact. However, Traffic Regulations do have statutory and legal aspects. Both the TRO and Advisory Signage options have cost implications subject investigations by TfB.

## **8.0 Corporate implications**

At this point no potential implications on the relevant corporate plan priority from this report has been scoped. The implications for the issues listed below should be considered as part of the business case for the approach adopted.

- 8.1 Property
- 8.2 HR
- 8.3 Climate change
- 8.4 Sustainability
- 8.5 Equality (does this decision require an equality impact assessment)
- 8.6 Data (does this decision require a data protection impact assessment)
- 8.7 Value for money

## **9.0 Consultation with local Councillors & Community Boards**

Some outline discussion with local councillors had taken place though this was impacted by the pre-election Purdah period. The Community Board co-ordinator for North West Chilterns has been actively engaged in handling communications from the Great Kinsghill community and providing an interface with members.

A draft version of this document was kindly reviewed by the local Buckinghamshire Councillor member, Councillor David Carroll and Chair of Hughenden Parish Council, Councillor Paul Nicholls. Their comments and suggestions have been built into the document.

It has also been reviewed by the Community Board Traffic and Road Sub-Group before final submission.

## **10.0 Communication, engagement & further consultation**

To assist in preparation of this report approaches were made to the Road Safety Team, Air Quality Team and Transport for Bucks for input with available data regarding collision injury, air quality, damage incidents and reports logged. This report considers the views of these key functions as subject matter expects.

The draft report will be circulated within the Transport Strategy Group; Transport for Bucks; the Community Board Co-ordinator; the HS2 team and local members for comment before being finalised for presentation to the Community Boards

## **11.0 Next steps and review**

Following a review of this report at the North West Chilterns and Great Missenden Community Board meetings it would be useful to have a decision regarding how the Board would like to proceed. Depending on this outcome, it should be able to determine how best to coordinate any traffic studies and considerations necessary to proceed.

## **12.0 Background papers**

None



## Appendix 1 - Community Boards

Committing to work collaboratively with residents; local members; commercial interests; the Parish Council; the Community Board and other stakeholders offers the opportunity to generate the most suitable approach, taking this forward via the Community Board for a qualified, cost efficient and effective solution.

Community Boards are the way of bringing the council, groups, organisations and local people together to look at local issues and find ways of improving them together.

As a community-led partnership, Community Boards will:

- influence how decisions are made and how services are delivered
- represent the voice of local people
- capture thoughts, ideas and suggestions
- bring together key community partners and residents
- identify local needs and work to produce creative solutions
- There will be many ways the boards will work with the community to identify what is important in each area and take action together.

The boards use local data, intelligence and the views of people and partners in the community to identify key areas of focus and priorities for the board. These priorities will help determine where the boards take actions and allocate funding to improve the local area. Working groups will explore the local priorities, set up local projects and find creative ways to make local changes.

Each board has an allocated budget to fund local projects and initiatives.

There will be public meetings held each year at which, funding is allocated and feedback will be shared on the plan of action. Action notes from these meetings will be published online.

Transport for Bucks (TfB) and Freight Strategy have been working on a methodology and 'checklist' for the progression of transport proposals through the Community Boards to TfB for consideration. It is expected that this will help in the analysis and investigation of problems to be addressed and the development of solutions.

Some headline aspects to consider in gaining an understanding of the issues, have an appreciation of the 'knock-on' effects of potential resolutions and the sort of evidence it would be useful to capture:-

- If seeking to restrict HGV traffic on a road; is there a more suitable route available?  
(It is generally not appropriate to restrict HGV traffic on 'A' classified roads)
- What is the nature of the problem being sought to address? Are there any records of frequency or volume of events?
- Is there a clear root cause for the problem? (Nature of the route, width of the highway, proximity of buildings, lack of pavements)

- Is there a continuing need for HGV access? (deliveries, bus services, council services, emergency and critical service vehicles)
- What evidence is there of accidents, collision injuries directly related to HGV movements?
- Is there evidence of damage caused by HGVs? (rutting, damage to buildings, street property, other vehicles)
- What is the impact on local businesses? (Local deliveries, accessing the wider major road network.) Has any discussions taken place with these businesses to understand how they would be affected and to solicit support?
- What would be the impact of an identified diversionary route? (Additional mileage, journey times, impact on service provision and costs to operate.)
- Would there be a likely increase in traffic speeds on the restricted route(s)?
- What level of support is there in the wider community? (Residents, local councillors, schools, the elderly)
- Would this cause conflict with others? (Road users, residents on diversionary routes?)

## Appendix 2 - Road Safety

Looking at the collision data provided by TVP in the last 5 years up to and including 31<sup>st</sup> January 2021 there has been no reported collisions involving any vehicles over 3.5 ton.

Recorded collisions in the 5 years to 31<sup>st</sup> January 2021 are shown below; vehicles involved in the collisions recorded include cars, 2 vans and a horse & cart.

<b>Sun 04/09/2016</b>	16:41	Single Vehicle Accident V. Likely: Speed, control, driver behaviour	<b>Cryers Hill</b> Slight Injuries
<b>Fri 12/05/2017</b>	20:15	Two Car Accident V. Likely: Driver observation / actions Possible: Blind Spot, Other	<b>Stag Lane J/w The Common</b> Slight Injuries
<b>Mon 05/06/2017</b>	15:12	Car & Pedal Cyclist Possible: Blind Spot	<b>Copes Rd/ Stag Ln J/w with Cockpit Rd</b> Slight Injuries
<b>Fri 03/11/2017</b>	18:03	Two Car Accident V. Likely: Driver actions, distraction	<b>Cryers Hill A4128 Junct. with Pipers Ln</b> Slight Injuries
<b>Mon 11/02/2019</b>	16:10	Car & LGV (<3.5t mgw) Reported online / Car RT into Cockpit across LGW	<b>Cryers Hill A4128 Junct. with Cockpit Rd</b> Slight Injuries
<b>Fri 15/02/2019</b>	18:21	Car & Pedestrian Possible: Observation Dr & Ped, Ped actions, Speed	<b>A4128 Missenden Rd J/w Cherry Tree Cl</b> Slight Injuries
<b>Fri 25/10/2019</b>	17:15	Pedestrian & LGV (<3.5t mgw) Reported Online. Ped clipped on arm / shldr by van	<b>Hoppers Way</b> Slight Injuries
<b>Sun 28/06/2020</b>	12:02	Horse & cart, car & pedestrian Horse spooked, scrapped car, hit ped	<b>Spurlands End Rd</b> Slight Injuries
<b>Thur 17/09/2020</b>	10:10	Car & Pedestrian Reported Online. Ped clipped on hand by car	<b>Cockpit Road</b> Slight Injuries

- ❖ LGV = Light Goods Vehicle with a weight capacity less than 3.5 tonne m.g.w. This is typically Ford Transit / Mercedes Sprinter sized vans.

Transport for Bucks (TfB) receive many requests for the introduction of measures to reduce vehicle speeds and traffic calming to improve safety on sections of roads and/or junctions. The policy is to direct the available county funding for this type of work towards those sites which suffer from a poor personal injury collision record. This is because:-

- the main reason for installing road safety engineering measures is to reduce the casualty rate on a particular road.
- This policy has been adopted so that the detailed analysis of casualty data provided by Thames Valley Police can be closely investigated to ensure that schemes are designed to address the particular factors that have been attributed to the recorded collisions.

The Network Safety Team's method of identifying sites for potential casualty reduction remedial measures, This involves:-

- reviewing injury collisions which have occurred within the last 5-year period, in order to identify those sites and routes that have the highest collision rate and casualty severity;

- The safety team look at routes across the whole of the county and rank these routes by the rate of collisions per km that have resulted in a road user being Killed or Seriously injured (KSI rate per km);
- A search is also carried out for collision sites that have a history of 5 or more collisions (of any severity) within a 50m radius within the last 5 years;

There are currently over 160 sites meeting this criterion across Buckinghamshire.

Within the area of Great Kingshill there are currently no sites meeting this criteria, therefore it is not a site we can justify the funding of any measures from the safety scheme budget.



Transport for Bucks (TfB) records for repairs (scheduled and unscheduled), maintenance, inspections, street works and logged customer reported issues. The records for the period 20<sup>th</sup> May 2016 to 20<sup>th</sup> May 2021 have been reviewed. This included in-house works and works carried out by third parties such as Affinity Water, BT and local resident contracted construction developments.

Incidents and Issues reported to involve HGV movements were:

- **30<sup>th</sup> May 2017** – Lorry or the like has damaged the granite kerbing.  
**Limmers Mead / Pipers Lane**
- **19 Apr 2018** - Customer advised people driving at 50+ mph at all hours, day and night. The increase in traffic, especially HGVs it is getting worse.  
**Cryers Hill Rd / Missenden Rd**
- **12<sup>th</sup> June 2018** – HGVs using the lane off Warrendene Rd when it is restricted. Would it be possible for additional signage?  
**Warrendene Rd / Hampden Rd**
- **12<sup>h</sup> Sept 2018** – Concern over construction and dustbin lorry damage to junction of Spurlands End Rd and Country Lane.  
**Country Lane / Spurlands End Rd**
- **07<sup>th</sup> Feb 2020** – Pickerings Hire queried accessibility to their site whilst resurfacing work on Spurlands End Rd is carried out.  
**Spurlands End Road**
- **24<sup>th</sup> Aug 2020** – High sided vehicle broke branches and need clearing.  
**Junction of The Common and Stag Lane**
- **30<sup>th</sup> Apr 2021** – Noisy HGVs and speeding.  
**Great Kingshill area**

It is understood that reports of other issues involving HGV traffic will have reported elsewhere within the council, these may not have resulted in damage requiring TfB attendance and as such not appeared in the reports covered.

## Appendix 4 - Transport for Bucks

## Traffic Data

TfB collect traffic data manually at the junction of Stag Lane/Copes Road junction with Cockpit Road/Heath End Road, vehicle classified data is collected over a 12 hour (7-19) period, biennially, the latest information available from the 03<sup>rd</sup> October 2018. Surveys planned after this date were postponed due to the need for focusing resources on the council's response to the Covid-19 pandemic and protecting the most vulnerable and at risk. It should be noted that Oct 2018 is pre: Covid Pandemic and that as demonstrated later in national figures traffic volumes for all vehicle types dramatically reduced during the lockdown periods. Vehicle flows are increasing now with the commercial LGV and HGV fleets having grown beyond pre-lockdown levels driven to some extent by the growth in online buying trends and delivery at home.

Summary 05th Oct 2016	Heath End Rd to Copes Rd	Heath End Rd to Cockpit Rd	Heath End Rd to Stag Lane	Copes Rd to Heath End Rd	Copes Rd to Cockpit Lane	Copes Rd to Stag Lane	Cockpit Rd to Heath End Rd	Cockpit Rd to Copes Rd	Cockpit Rd to Stag Lane	Stag Lane to Heath End Rd	Stag Lane to Copes Rd	Stag Lane to Cockpit Rd	Total by Type
Non HGV	100	645	334	59	416	1006	631	417	76	361	1117	59	5221
HGV	2	11	4	0	26	18	11	8	1	3	10	1	95
<b>Total Vehicles</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>656</b>	<b>338</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>442</b>	<b>1024</b>	<b>642</b>	<b>425</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>364</b>	<b>1127</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>5316</b>
HGV as a % of all vehicles	2%	2%	1%	0%	6%	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%

Summary 03rd Oct 2018	Heath End Rd to Copes Rd	Heath End Rd to Cockpit Rd	Heath End Rd to Stag Lane	Copes Rd to Heath End Rd	Copes Rd to Cockpit Lane	Copes Rd to Stag Lane	Cockpit Rd to Heath End Rd	Cockpit Rd to Copes Rd	Cockpit Rd to Stag Lane	Stag Lane to Heath End Rd	Stag Lane to Copes Rd	Stag Lane to Cockpit Rd	TOTALS By Type
Non HGV	71	667	303	132	457	1283	706	368	55	408	1209	68	5727
HGV	1	8	2	1	26	10	10	18	0	5	18	1	100
<b>Total Vehicles</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>675</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>483</b>	<b>1293</b>	<b>716</b>	<b>386</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>413</b>	<b>1227</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>5827</b>
HGV as a % of all vehicles	1%	1%	1%	1%	6%	1%	1%	5%	0%	1%	1%	1%	2%

Summary 11th May 2021	Heath End Rd to Copes Rd	Heath End Rd to Cockpit Rd	Heath End Rd to Stag Lane	Copes Rd to Heath End Rd	Copes Rd to Cockpit Lane	Copes Rd to Stag Lane	Cockpit Rd to Heath End Rd	Cockpit Rd to Copes Rd	Cockpit Rd to Stag Lane	Stag Lane to Heath End Rd	Stag Lane to Copes Rd	Stag Lane to Cockpit Rd	TOTALS By Type
Non HGV	74	645	343	73	518	1269	681	464	71	329	1205	77	5749
HGV	1	10	3	1	22	11	14	20	0	5	10	0	97
<b>Total Vehicles</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>655</b>	<b>346</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>540</b>	<b>1280</b>	<b>695</b>	<b>484</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>334</b>	<b>1215</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>5846</b>
HGV as a % of all vehicles	1%	2%	1%	1%	4%	1%	2%	4%	0%	2%	1%	0%	2%

Variance 2018 over 2016	Heath End Rd to Copes Rd	Heath End Rd to Cockpit Rd	Heath End Rd to Stag Lane	Copes Rd to Heath End Rd	Copes Rd to Cockpit Lane	Copes Rd to Stag Lane	Cockpit Rd to Heath End Rd	Cockpit Rd to Copes Rd	Cockpit Rd to Stag Lane	Stag Lane to Heath End Rd	Stag Lane to Copes Rd	Stag Lane to Cockpit Rd	TOTALS By Type
Non HGV	-29	22	-31	73	41	277	75	-49	-21	47	92	9	506
HGV	-1	-3	-2	1	0	-8	-1	10	-1	2	8	0	5
<b>Total Vehicles</b>	<b>-30</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>-33</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>269</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>-39</b>	<b>-22</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>511</b>

Variance 2021 over 2018	Heath End Rd to Copes Rd	Heath End Rd to Cockpit Rd	Heath End Rd to Stag Lane	Copes Rd to Heath End Rd	Copes Rd to Cockpit Lane	Copes Rd to Stag Lane	Cockpit Rd to Heath End Rd	Cockpit Rd to Copes Rd	Cockpit Rd to Stag Lane	Stag Lane to Heath End Rd	Stag Lane to Copes Rd	Stag Lane to Cockpit Rd	TOTALS By Type
Non HGV	3	-22	40	-59	61	-14	-25	96	16	-79	-4	9	22
HGV	0	2	1	0	-4	1	4	2	0	0	-8	-1	-3
<b>Total Vehicles</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>-20</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>-59</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>-13</b>	<b>-21</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>-79</b>	<b>-12</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>19</b>

Variance 2021 over 2016	Heath End Rd to Copes Rd	Heath End Rd to Cockpit Rd	Heath End Rd to Stag Lane	Copes Rd to Heath End Rd	Copes Rd to Cockpit Lane	Copes Rd to Stag Lane	Cockpit Rd to Heath End Rd	Cockpit Rd to Copes Rd	Cockpit Rd to Stag Lane	Stag Lane to Heath End Rd	Stag Lane to Copes Rd	Stag Lane to Cockpit Rd	TOTALS By Type
Non HGV	-26	0	9	14	102	263	50	47	-5	-32	88	18	528
HGV	-1	-1	-1	1	-4	-7	3	12	-1	2	0	-1	2
<b>Total Vehicles</b>	<b>-27</b>	<b>-1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>256</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>-6</b>	<b>-30</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>530</b>

Variations	Oct-16	Oct-18	May-21	Variance 2018 over 2016	Variance 2021 over 2016	Variance 2021 over 2018
Non HGV	5,221	5,727	5,749	506	528	22
HGV	95	100	97	5	2	-3
<b>Total Vehicles</b>	<b>5,221</b>	<b>5,827</b>	<b>5,846</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>625</b>	<b>19</b>
% HGVs of all vehicles	1.8%	2.0%	2.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%

Further analysis has been conducted on the data to understand traffic flows on the specific roads of Copes Road, Cockpit Road, Heath End Road and Stag Lane. This has sought to capture traffic numbers covering both directions showing total vehicle numbers; HGV numbers and LGV numbers (\*)

(\* LGV are transit and sprinter type vans and rigid trucks with a maximum gross weight over 3,500 kgs and equal or less than 7,000 kgs. This class of vehicle has seen the highest growth of all vehicle types driven by increased demand for home delivery and online shopping, including groceries.)

All Traffic				HGV's				LGV's			
Road	2016	2018	2021	Road	2016	2018	2021	Road	2016	2018	2021
Heath End	2161	2314	2226	Heath End	31	27	34	Heath End	149	157	278
Copes	3179	3594	3571	Copes	64	74	65	Copes	216	296	538
Cockpit	2302	2384	2522	Cockpit	58	63	66	Cockpit	157	175	371
Stag	2990	3362	3365	Stag	37	36	55	Stag	214	264	422

2016				2018				2021			
Road	All	HGV	LGV	Road	All	HGV	LGV	Road	All	HGV	LGV
Heath End	2161	31	149	Heath End	2314	27	157	Heath End Rd	2226	34	278
Copes	3179	64	216	Copes	3594	74	296	Copes Rd	3571	65	538
Cockpit	2302	58	157	Cockpit	2384	63	175	Cockpit Rd	2522	66	371
Stag	2990	37	214	Stag	3362	36	264	Stag Lane	3365	55	422

The data sheets for this analysis have been embedded at the bottom of this appendix titled Traffic Flows by Road May 2021.

As a result of communications from the Great Kingshill; TfB gathered new automated data on a temporary basis at Cockpit Road with volumetric, speed and vehicle classification data being collected. TfB further collected new manual data at the same Stag Lane/Copes Road junction with Cockpit Road/Heath End Road location and; also for the junction of Cryers Hill Road/Missenden Road junction with Cockpit Road/Pipers Lane.

These surveys were carried out over the same 12 hour period, 07:00 to 19:00 , on the 11<sup>th</sup> May 2021, although as some police speed focus signage appeared on Missenden Road the survey at the junction with Cryers Hill Road / Pipers Lane / Cockpit Road may need to be rerun, in the meantime the results are shown in the embedded file below with a summary of the headlines provided.

It must be taken into account that as the junction traffic flow data is counted manually when viewing a recording of a junction and Automated Traffic Counts, as used on the speed survey on Cockpit Road are an automatic method of recording via the use of air switches that record the length between axles and then internal software within the counter classifies the vehicle, these two methods are very different and should not be compared. The ATC class data should be used to give a feel for the composition of the traffic using the road and the visually checked data as a more accurate/definitive picture.

<b>2021</b>	<b>Missenden Rd to Cockpit Rd</b>	<b>Cockpit Rd to Missenden Lane</b>	<b>Cockpit Rd to Cryers Hill Rd</b>	<b>Cockpit Rd to Pipers Lane</b>	<b>Cryers Hill Rd to Cockpit Rd</b>	<b>Pipers Lane to Cockpit Rd</b>	<b>TOTALS By Type</b>
Cycle	1	0	6	0	6	0	<b>42</b>
Motorcycle	0	0	4	0	6	0	<b>43</b>
Car & Taxi	68	45	855	137	829	148	<b>9917</b>
Bus & Coach	1	1	29	4	11	3	<b>150</b>
Light Goods Vehicle	12	16	174	6	157	6	<b>1420</b>
Heavy Goods Vehicle	1	2	30	1	33	1	<b>190</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>1098</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>1042</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>11762</b>



Great Kingshill  
Counts.xlsx



Traffic Flows by  
Road\_May 2021



## Summary Count Headlines

### • Missenden Road / Cryers Hill Rd / Pipers Lane / Cockpit Rd - 11<sup>th</sup> May 2021

- Total traffic flow amounted to 11,762 vehicles
  - Cars & Taxis - 9,917 = 84%
  - Light Goods Vehicles - 1,420 = 12%
  - Heavy Goods Vehicles - 190 = 2%
  - Bus & Coaches - 150 = 1%
  
- High Volume Routes
  - Missenden Rd / Cryers Hill Rd - 4,202
    - HGVs - 63
  - Cryers Hill Rd / Missenden Rd - 3,557
    - HGVs - 57
  - Cockpit Rd / Cryers Hill Rd - 1,098
    - HGVs - 30
  - Cryers Hill / Cockpit Rd - 1,042
    - HGVs - 33

### • Heath End Rd / Copes Rd / Cockpit Rd / Stag Lane - 11<sup>th</sup> May 2021

- Total traffic flow amounted to 5,846 vehicles
  - Cars & Taxis - 4,780 = 82%
  - Light Goods Vehicles - 763 = 13%
  - Bus & Coaches - 101 = 2%
  - HGVs - 97 = 2%
  
- High Volume Routes
  - Copes Rd to Stag Lane - 1,280
    - HGVs - 11
  - Stag Lane to Copes Rd - 1,215
    - HGVs - 10
  
- HGV Numbers by Route
  - Copes Rd to Cockpit Rd - 22
  - Cockpit Rd to Copes Rd - 20
  - Cockpit Rd to Heath End Rd - 14
  - Heath End Rd to Cockpit Rd - 10

- **Heath End Rd / Copes Rd / Cockpit Rd / Stag Lane** - 03<sup>rd</sup> Oct 2018
  - Total traffic flow amounted to 5,827 vehicles (\*)
    - Non HGVs - 5,727 = 98%
    - HGVs - 100 = 2%
  - High Volume Routes
    - Copes Rd to Stag Lane - 1,293
      - HGVs - 10
    - Stag Lane to Copes Rd - 1,227
      - HGVs - 18
  - HGV Numbers by Route
    - Copes Rd to Cockpit Rd - 26
    - Cockpit Rd to Copes Rd - 18
    - Cockpit Rd to Heath End Rd - 10
    - Heath End Rd to Cockpit Rd - 8
- **Variances Oct 2018 to May 2021**
  - Total traffic flow numbers up 19 vehicles = 0.32% increase
  - HGV numbers down 3 vehicles = 3.0 % reduction
  - HGVs on Copes Lane down 9 vehicles
  - HGVs on Stag Lane down 7 vehicles
  - HGVs on Heath End Rd up 7 vehicles
  - HGVs on Cockpit Rd up 3 vehicles

Information from survey across Buckinghamshire indicate traffic levels are generally back to pre-covid levels. The exceptions to this are that the afternoon peak is still slightly lower and longer inter-urban journeys appear to be slightly down.

There is nothing in the data to suggest that Covid had any impact on the type of commercial traffic concerning residents here as this type of traffic has remained fairly consistent following the initial government announcement that construction was an essential activity.



## Appendix 5 - Traffic Data National Trends

Looking at traffic trends on a national basis the latest available weekly usage by vehicle type is shown here.

- This takes a base line (100%) traffic usage from the 1<sup>st</sup> week in February 2020.
- Information available on a week by week day by day basis comparing the same day / week from the base week.
- Shown is information for the week commencing 01<sup>st</sup> March 2020 and for period from 09<sup>th</sup> May 2021 to 17<sup>th</sup> May 2021.
- The available report is embedded below.



COVID-19-transport-use-statistics to 17 05

<b>Date<sup>1</sup></b> (weekends and bank holidays in grey)	<b>Cars<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Light Commercial Vehicles<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Heavy Goods Vehicles<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>All motor vehicles<sup>2</sup></b>
01/03/2020	103%	111%	108%	104%
02/03/2020	102%	106%	103%	103%
03/03/2020	101%	105%	102%	102%
04/03/2020	101%	104%	103%	101%
05/03/2020	100%	103%	102%	100%
06/03/2020	102%	103%	102%	102%
07/03/2020	101%	109%	108%	102%
08/03/2020	105%	113%	112%	106%
09/05/2020	39%	46%	65%	41%
10/05/2020	35%	44%	77%	37%
11/05/2020	45%	58%	74%	49%
12/05/2020	45%	59%	75%	50%
13/05/2020	48%	61%	76%	53%
14/05/2020	50%	60%	75%	54%
15/05/2020	51%	61%	74%	55%
16/05/2020	52%	64%	80%	56%
17/05/2020	50%	63%	84%	54%
08/05/2021	84%	103%	112%	88%
09/05/2021	92%	113%	119%	96%
10/05/2021	88%	108%	110%	93%
11/05/2021	87%	106%	108%	92%
12/05/2021	88%	106%	108%	92%
13/05/2021	86%	103%	106%	91%
14/05/2021	91%	106%	106%	95%
15/05/2021	93%	112%	113%	96%
16/05/2021	93%	114%	120%	97%
17/05/2021	91%	110%	109%	96%

We can see from this available data for the week commencing Sun 01<sup>st</sup> March 2020 flows of all vehicle types were above those at the beginning of February 2020;

- cars at an average 101.43% peaking on Sundays at 103% ,
- Light Goods Vehicles avg 105.86% peak 111% on Sunday and
- Heavy Goods Vehicles avg 104.0% peaking at 108% on Sat / Sun.

By the week commencing Sun 10<sup>th</sup> May 2020, volume flows had significantly fallen as lockdown bit.

- Cars average 46.57% peaking at 52% on Sat.
- LGVs average 58.14% peaking at 64% on Sat.
- HGV average 75.85% peaking on a Sat at 80%

The latest available figures covering the week commencing Sunday 09<sup>th</sup> May 2021 demonstrate how commercial vehicle use has bounced back and exceeds the base week of 01<sup>st</sup> Feb 2020.

- Cars average 89.29%, peaking on Saturday at 93%
- LGVs average 107.72%, peaking Sunday at 113%
- HGVs average 110.00%, peaking Sunday at 119%

As National statistics these effectively cover primary, major and strategic routes and do not fully reflect what may be seen on a local road level, especially in rural areas. It does however give support to the view that the increase in goods vehicle moves is in many ways driven by a change in buying habits to online purchasing and home delivery. The distribution movements on the HGV fleets with last mile being undertaken on the LGV transit / sprinter sized vans.

Also embedded here is the Department for Transport Road Traffic Estimates Report 2020 released on the 28<sup>th</sup> April 2021. This provides further evidence of the impact of the Covid lockdown on the use of GB roads with all vehicle types being driven less miles on the network. Only pedal cycling saw an increase 45.7% above the 2019 level.



road-traffic-estimates  
-in-great-britain-2020

Other identified impacts of Covid-19 on the transport systems and infrastructures suggest:-

- Although perhaps totally attributable to Covid; road deaths were estimated to be 1,580 a 14% decrease, similar in the % fall in road traffic figures.
- Fewer traffic on the network is a factor involved in there being congestion and a decrease in average delays, 29.5% on the Strategic Road Network; traffic levels on the SRN at a lower level of 25.1%.
- On the A road network traffic levels lower at 22.3% and a decrease in average delays of 22.8%.
- Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions in the UK provisionally estimated to have fallen 10.7% 2020 compared to 2019. (CO<sub>2</sub>) from transport fell 19.6% in 2020.

TfB have commissioned speed monitoring on Cockpit Road, a location highlighted by residents as being one where speeding is prevalent by all vehicle types. Although speeding HGVs had been highlighted as a particular issue; it is apparent that the speed of non-HGV traffic is a more pressing challenge.

It should be noted that speeding is a matter that should be reported to the Thames Valley Police.

The summary reports on all vehicles is shown here; the core data which also identifies times of day are incorporated in the embedded reports.

Automated Traffic Counts, as used on the speed survey on Cockpit Road are an automatic method of recording via the use of air switches that record the length between axles and then internal software within the counter classifies the vehicle, this method is different to the traffic flow counts used at the junctions where vehicles are visually checked and classified. These two methods are very different and should not be compared. The ATC class data should be used to give a feel for the composition of the traffic using the road and the visually checked data as a more accurate/definitive picture.

### All Vehicle Results

#### Week 1 - Monday 10<sup>th</sup> May to the Sunday 16<sup>th</sup> May 2021

Date: Mon 10th May 2021		Numbers		Exceeding Speed Limit by (mph)				
Vehicle Type: All Vehicles	Totals	<= 30 mph	> 30 mph	<= 5mph	>5 =<10	> 10 =<15	>15 =<20	> 20
<b>Total on route</b>								
<b><i>NE towards Missenden Rd</i></b>								
Motorcycles	9	4	5	5	1			2
Cars & Taxis	996	385	611	371	192	37	8	3
Small Vans / Pick Ups	345	125	220	114	84	16	5	1
Buses / Coaches	3	3	0					
LGVs (Vans and Trucks to 7.5t)	27	16	11	9	2			
HGV (Over 7.5t)	11	9	2	2				
<b><i>SW towards Heath End Rd</i></b>								
Motorcycles	7	5	2	1		1		
Cars & Taxis	1048	371	677	426	176	64	10	1
Small Vans / Pick Ups	313	106	207	109	69	24	5	
Buses / Coaches	0	0	0					
LGVs (Vans and Trucks to 7.5t)	39	17	22	13	7	2		
HGV (Over 7.5t)	14	4	10	8	2			

Date: Tues 11th May 2021		Numbers		Exceeding Speed Limit by (mph)				
Vehicle Type: All Vehicles	Totals	<= 30 mph	> 30 mph	<= 5mph	>5 =<10	> 10 =<15	>15 =<20	> 20
<b>Total on route</b>								
<b>NE towards Missenden Rd</b>								
Motorcycles	8	2	6		3	2	1	
Cars & Taxis	967	335	632	387	176	52	15	2
Small Vans / Pick Ups	370	120	250	125	89	29	4	3
Buses / Coaches	2	1	1		1			
LGVs (Vans and Trucks to 7.5t)	39	20	19	11	7	1		
HGV (Above 7.5t)	22	16	6	5	1			
<b>SW towards Heath End Rd</b>								
Motorcycles	9	3	6	2	3			1
Cars & Taxis	1039	368	671	404	182	65	14	6
Small Vans / Pick Ups	319	100	219	123	78	14	4	
Buses / Coaches	12	10	2	2				
LGVs (Vans and Trucks to 7.5t)	51	27	24	13	7	2	2	
HGV (Above 7.5t)	16	7	9	8	1			

Date: Weds 12th May 2021		Numbers		Exceeding Speed Limit by (mph)				
Vehicle Type: All Vehicles	Totals	<= 30 mph	> 30 mph	<= 5mph	>5 =<10	> 10 =<15	>15 =<20	> 20
<b>Total on route</b>								
<b>NE towards Missenden Rd</b>								
Motorcycles	15	11	4	3	1			
Cars & Taxis	1041	790	251	172	63	11	5	
Small Vans / Pick Ups	334	235	99	68	19	9	1	2
Buses / Coaches	3	3	0					
LGVs (Vans and Trucks to 7.5t)	20	18	2	1	1			
HGV (Above 7.5t)	13	13	0					
<b>SW towards Heath End Rd</b>								
Motorcycles	6	2	4	2	1	1		
Cars & Taxis	1093	586	507	349	105	43	9	1
Small Vans / Pick Ups	296	143	153	100	38	13	1	1
Buses / Coaches	5	4	1					1
LGVs (Vans and Trucks to 7.5t)	46	28	18	14	3			1
HGV (Above 7.5t)	8	7	1	1				1

Date: Thurs 13th May 2021		Numbers		Exceeding Speed Limit by (mph)				
Vehicle Type: All Vehicles	Totals	<= 30 mph	> 30 mph	<= 5mph	>5 =<10	> 10 =<15	>15 =<20	> 20
<b>Total on route</b>								
<b>NE towards Missenden Rd</b>								
Motorcycles	0	0	0					
Cars & Taxis	910	731	179	134	36	6	3	
Small Vans / Pick Ups	311	242	69	47	17	4	1	
Buses / Coaches	3	3	0					
LGVs (Vans and Trucks to 7.5t)	32	26	6	5	1			
HGV (Above 7.5t)	8	7	1		1			
<b>SW towards Heath End Rd</b>								
Motorcycles	8	3	5	3	1		1	
Cars & Taxis	971	509	462	334	98	28	1	1
Small Vans / Pick Ups	276	138	138	95	33	8	1	1
Buses / Coaches	8	8	0					
LGVs (Vans and Trucks to 7.5t)	40	25	15	10	4	1		
HGV (Above 7.5t)	13	10	3	2	1	1		

Date: Fri 14th May 2021		Numbers		Exceeding Speed Limit by (mph)				
Vehicle Type: All Vehicles	Totals	<= 30 mph	> 30 mph	<= 5mph	>5 =<10	> 10 =<15	>15 =<20	> 20
<b>Total on route</b>								
<b>NE towards Missenden Rd</b>								
Motorcycles	7	6	1	1				
Cars & Taxis	968	820	148	108	28	10	2	
Small Vans / Pick Ups	328	273	55	41	9	4	1	
Buses / Coaches	11	11	0					
LGVs (Vans and Trucks to 7.5t)	39	37	2	2				
HGV (Above 7.5t)	6	6	0					
<b>SW towards Heath End Rd</b>								
Motorcycles	8	3	5	1	2	1	1	
Cars & Taxis	1158	574	584	412	133	33	4	2
Small Vans / Pick Ups	292	143	149	100	40	6	3	
Buses / Coaches	7	6	1	1				
LGVs (Vans and Trucks to 7.5t)	44	25	19	15	2	2		
HGV (Above 7.5t)	7	7	0					

Date: Sat 15th May 2021		Numbers		Exceeding Speed Limit by (mph)				
Vehicle Type: All Vehicles	Totals	<= 30 mph	> 30 mph	<= 5mph	>5 =<10	> 10 =<15	>15 =<20	> 20
<b>Total on route</b>								
<b>NE towards Missenden Rd</b>								
Motorcycles	2	1	1	1				
Cars & Taxis	699	577	122	88	21	11	1	1
Small Vans / Pick Ups	219	170	49	30	12	3	4	
Buses / Coaches	2	2	0					
LGVs (Vans and Trucks to 7.5t)	4	2	2	1	1			
HGV (Above 7.5t)	2	2	0					
<b>SW towards Heath End Rd</b>								
Motorcycles	2	2	0					
Cars & Taxis	789	340	449	309	112	22	4	2
Small Vans / Pick Ups	151	62	89	61	22	6		
Buses / Coaches	0	0	0					
LGVs (Vans and Trucks to 7.5t)	0	0	0					
HGV (Above 7.5t)	1	1	0					

Date: Sun 16th May 2021		Numbers		Exceeding Speed Limit by (mph)				
Vehicle Type: All Vehicles	Totals	<= 30 mph	> 30 mph	<= 5mph	>5 =<10	> 10 =<15	>15 =<20	> 20
<b>Total on route</b>								
<b>NE towards Missenden Rd</b>								
Motorcycles	4	0	4	1	2	1		
Cars & Taxis	610	207	403	252	105	34	11	1
Small Vans / Pick Ups	132	42	90	47	26	12	4	1
Buses / Coaches	0	0	0					
LGVs (Vans and Trucks to 7.5t)	0	0	0					
HGV (Above 7.5t)	0	0	0					
<b>SW towards Heath End Rd</b>								
Motorcycles	4	1	3	1		2		
Cars & Taxis	625	182	443	248	131	50	8	6
Small Vans / Pick Ups	109	30	79	46	23	5	5	
Buses / Coaches	0	0	0					
LGVs (Vans and Trucks to 7.5t)	0	0	0					
HGV (Above 7.5t)	1	0	1	1				

## HGV Results

**Week 2 - Monday 17<sup>th</sup> May to the Sunday 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2021**

Date: Mon 17th May 2021		Numbers		Exceeding Speed Limit by (mph)				
Vehicle Type: All Vehicles	Totals	<= 30 mph	> 30 mph	<= 5mph	>5 =<10	> 10 =<15	>15 =<20	> 20
<b>Total on route</b>								
<b>NE towards Missenden Rd</b>								
Motorcycles	6	1	5	2	2	1		
Cars & Taxis	908	441	467	313	121	26	5	2
Small Vans / Pick Ups	334	148	186	122	55	7	2	
Buses / Coaches	10	10	0					
LGVs (Vans and Trucks to 7.5t)	30	19	11	10	1			
HGV (Above 7.5t)	14	13	1	1				
<b>SW towards Heath End Rd</b>								
Motorcycles	4	2	2	1	1			
Cars & Taxis	1027	457	570	354	165	44	5	2
Small Vans / Pick Ups	287	103	184	99	64	14	5	2
Buses / Coaches	9	7	2		1	1		
LGVs (Vans and Trucks to 7.5t)	42	17	25	16	6	2	1	
HGV (Above 7.5t)	13	6	7	5	2			

Date: Tues 18th May 2021		Numbers		Exceeding Speed Limit by (mph)				
Vehicle Type: All Vehicles	Totals	<= 30 mph	> 30 mph	<= 5mph	>5 =<10	> 10 =<15	>15 =<20	> 20
<b>Total on route</b>								
<b>NE towards Missenden Rd</b>								
Motorcycles	8	3	5	5				
Cars & Taxis	1003	461	542	345	148	35	10	4
Small Vans / Pick Ups	309	127	182	122	46	13		1
Buses / Coaches	14	13	1	1				
LGVs (Vans and Trucks to 7.5t)	26	10	16	13	2	1		
HGV (Above 7.5t)	11	8	3	2	1			
<b>SW towards Heath End Rd</b>								
Motorcycles	7	3	4	2	1	1		
Cars & Taxis	1081	374	707	435	191	64	14	3
Small Vans / Pick Ups	272	74	198	117	62	15	4	
Buses / Coaches	8	7	1	1				
LGVs (Vans and Trucks to 7.5t)	43	12	31	22	8	1		
HGV (Above 7.5t)	13	10	3	3				

Date: Weds 19th May 2021		Numbers		Exceeding Speed Limit by (mph)				
Vehicle Type: All Vehicles	Totals	<= 30 mph	> 30 mph	<= 5mph	>5 =<10	> 10 =<15	>15 =<20	> 20
<b>Total on route</b>								
<b>NE towards Missenden Rd</b>								
Motorcycles	9	6	3	2	1			
Cars & Taxis	1021	309	712	458	195	44	11	4
Small Vans / Pick Ups	346	105	241	125	83	29	4	
Buses / Coaches	5	2	3	3				
LGVs (Vans and Trucks to 7.5t)	36	20	16	8	8			
HGV (Above 7.5t)	15	14	1	1				
<b>SW towards Heath End Rd</b>								
Motorcycles	5	1	4	4				
Cars & Taxis	1101	319	782	458	222	72	23	7
Small Vans / Pick Ups	289	68	221	118	80	19	3	1
Buses / Coaches	3	3	0					
LGVs (Vans and Trucks to 7.5t)	48	17	31	20	9	1		1
HGV (Above 7.5t)	14	8	6	6				

Date: Thurs 20th May 2021		Numbers		Exceeding Speed Limit by (mph)				
Vehicle Type: All Vehicles	Totals	<= 30 mph	> 30 mph	<= 5mph	>5 =<10	> 10 =<15	>15 =<20	> 20
<b>Total on route</b>								
<b>NE towards Missenden Rd</b>								
Motorcycles	4	1	3	2		1		
Cars & Taxis	968	316	652	399	193	43	13	4
Small Vans / Pick Ups	292	90	202	110	69	15	7	1
Buses / Coaches	9	9	0					
LGVs (Vans and Trucks to 7.5t)	37	22	15	12	3			
HGV (Above 7.5t)	17	9	8	8				
<b>SW towards Heath End Rd</b>								
Motorcycles	332	2	330	4	241	68	14	3
Cars & Taxis	1280	447	833	507	241	68	14	3
Small Vans / Pick Ups	343	111	232	136	65	27	3	1
Buses / Coaches	8	8	0					
LGVs (Vans and Trucks to 7.5t)	40	14	26	16	8	2		
HGV (Above 7.5t)	19	10	9	4	4	1		

Date: Fri 21st May 2021		Numbers		Exceeding Speed Limit by (mph)				
Vehicle Type: All Vehicles	Totals	<= 30 mph	> 30 mph	<= 5mph	>5 =<10	> 10 =<15	>15 =<20	> 20
<b>Total on route</b>								
<b>NE towards Missenden Rd</b>								
Motorcycles	9	3	6	2	2	2		
Cars & Taxis	942	228	714	425	223	46	15	5
Small Vans / Pick Ups	358	112	246	135	84	20	5	2
Buses / Coaches	8	7	1	1				
LGVs (Vans and Trucks to 7.5t)	30	17	13	6	7			
HGV (Above 7.5t)	11	6	5	5				
<b>SW towards Heath End Rd</b>								
Motorcycles	8	0	8	4	3			1
Cars & Taxis	1202	377	825	461	260	87	12	5
Small Vans / Pick Ups	299	79	220	126	61	24	5	4
Buses / Coaches	7	5	2	1		1		
LGVs (Vans and Trucks to 7.5t)	47	20	27	24	3			
HGV (Above 7.5t)	16	8	8	7	1			

Date: Sat 22nd May 2021		Numbers		Exceeding Speed Limit by (mph)				
Vehicle Type: All Vehicles	Totals	<= 30 mph	> 30 mph	<= 5mph	>5 =<10	> 10 =<15	>15 =<20	> 20
<b>Total on route</b>								
<b>NE towards Missenden Rd</b>								
Motorcycles	7	2	5	2	2	1		
Cars & Taxis	717	245	472	305	131	29	6	1
Small Vans / Pick Ups	228	69	159	81	50	13	11	4
Buses / Coaches	3	2	1			1		
LGVs (Vans and Trucks to 7.5t)	11	6	5	4	1			
HGV (Above 7.5t)	4	4	0					
<b>SW towards Heath End Rd</b>								
Motorcycles	4	1	3	2	1			
Cars & Taxis	815	241	574	308	195	51	15	5
Small Vans / Pick Ups	160	32	128	66	48	11	1	2
Buses / Coaches	0	0	0					
LGVs (Vans and Trucks to 7.5t)	11	0	11	6	5			
HGV (Above 7.5t)	2	2	0					

Date: Sun 23rd May 2021		Numbers		Exceeding Speed Limit by (mph)				
Vehicle Type: All Vehicles	Totals	<= 30 mph	> 30 mph	<= 5mph	>5 =<10	> 10 =<15	>15 =<20	> 20
<b>Total on route</b>								
<b>NE towards Missenden Rd</b>								
Motorcycles	3	2	1			1		
Cars & Taxis	586	196	390	237	112	31	8	2
Small Vans / Pick Ups	139	50	89	48	25	11	5	
Buses / Coaches	0	0	0					
LGVs (Vans and Trucks to 7.5t)	4	2	2	1		1		
HGV (Above 7.5t)	1	1						
<b>SW towards Heath End Rd</b>								
Motorcycles	5	1	4	2	2			
Cars & Taxis	642	177	465	254	151	44	12	4
Small Vans / Pick Ups	97	20	77	41	27	7	2	
Buses / Coaches	0	0	0					
LGVs (Vans and Trucks to 7.5t)	5	2	3	1		2		
HGV (Above 7.5t)	1	1						

The base data from the survey equipment is provided in the embedded reports below. This information identifies the day, date, time, direction, vehicle type and speed of each recorded movement.

It must be taken into account that as the junction traffic flow data is counted manually when viewing a recording of a junction and Automated Traffic Counts, as used on the speed survey on Cockpit Road are an automatic method of recording via the use of air switches that record the length between axles and then internal software within the counter classifies the vehicle, these two methods are very different and should not be compared. The ATC class data should be used to give a feel for the composition of the traffic using the road and the visually checked data as a more accurate/definitive picture.



From a national perspective, information on car speeds for the period January 2021 to March 2021 are available; the report and the table have been embedded here. Figures for other vehicle types not available at this time.

[Vehicle speed compliance statistics for Great Britain: January to March 2021 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk)



Quarter Speed tables  
March 2021.ods

In January to March 2021, 50% of cars in free-flowing conditions exceeded the speed limit on motorways. On National Speed Limit (NSL) single carriageways with a car speed limit of 60mph, 13% of cars exceeded the speed limit, while on 30mph roads 56% of cars exceeded the speed limit. These figures are slightly higher compared to the same period in 2019 and 2020, but in line with trends seen over the preceding 2 years.

More detailed information is available in the Quarter Speed Tables including a focus on speeds above the limit applicable for the road type.

## Appendix 7 - HS2 Construction Operations

Conversations have taken place between the Council's HS2 team, the HS2 organisation and their main contactor in the area, Align JV. Construction vehicles are to follow prescribed routes which include the A413; Great Kingshill is not on any agreed routing for construction traffic. There are no organisations in the Great Kingshill area accepting HS2 aggregates or ground spoil.

HS2 contacted vehicles all carry HS2 identification and if any are observed off the approved routes:- dates; times; locations; directions; vehicle registrations and any vehicle branding must be reported to the HS2 Helpline. Photos would also be useful.  
<https://www.hs2.org.uk/in-your-area/contact-us/>

It is, of course, possible that HS2 traffic may add to existing traffic flows and could result in some additional congestion at key points on the primary routes such as the A413 and potentially the A4128. It is difficult at this early stage in the HS2 construction phase to predict when, where and to what severity congestion may happen.

## Appendix 8 - Pipers Corner School

Discussions were held with the school in May 2021 to understand the traffic movements, establish if there are any issues with coaches, traffic passing the school and the challenges at the morning and afternoon peak times.

Pipers Corner School is an independent day school for girls aged 4 to 18 years. The school was founded in 1931 in Grove Park, Chiswick and settled on the current site in Great Kingshill, Buckinghamshire in 1945. There are presently 590 pupils; 370 of whom arrive and leave the site on coaches and mini-buses.

- The school constantly review their transportation needs to reduce the impact on the local community and to minimise the impact on the environment and landscape in Pipers Lane.
- Coach sizes have been reduced over time from the 70 plus and 53 seat capacity vehicles to 35 seat coaches and mini-buses.
- In the morning the 14 route vehicles arrive between 08:15 and 8:30 to offload students with the empty vehicles leaving the site between 08:35 and 08:40.
- In the afternoon all 14 vehicles are on site by 03:25 and have departed by 16:10.
- There may be additional movements for extra-curricula activities and sporting fixtures.
- The only coaches down Pipers Lane are attending the school; no coaches go beyond the school one-way system and cannot continue down Boss Lane to Valley Road, Hughenden.
- There are commercial coach operators at Binders Yard, Cryers Hill who fulfil travel needs for other school outside of Great Kingshill, in addition to Pipers Corner School and along with other coach based non-education service demands.

Reports of HGV incidents submitted to the Freight Mailbox and enquires sent direct to the officer working on the Freight Strategy, relative to the Great Kingshill area, are outlined below:

- **April 2021** – Received emails from the public and copied in by the Council’s HS2 team to a number of communications from multiple residents of the Great Kingshill area expressing concerns about:-
  - Increases in HGV traffic flows on the A4128 and roads off that major route, suggesting that 6 months earlier this type of traffic was not using these roads.
  - Increases in skip truck movements specifically from / to the recycling company at Binders Yard on Cryers Hill.
  - Loaded skip lorries not covered.
  - Extra HGV movements resulting from HS2 construction works.
  - Speeding vehicles including HGVs with specific mention of skip lorries and construction / demolition vehicles.
  - Vehicles driven dangerously and without consideration of other road users including pedestrians.
  - Increased risk to people and property due to roads not being wide enough or suitable for HGV traffic especially two HGVs passing each other and having to drive on the pavement.
  - Trees overhanging narrow pavements reducing safe pedestrian passage on Cockpit Road.
  - Narrow roads with HGV wing mirrors beyond pavement edge putting pedestrians at risk of being hit, as has happened including broken bones.
  - HGVs using roads in the area from 06:30 till past 18:30, increasing noise and pollution levels.
  - Large coaches using Pipers Lane weekday mornings and afternoons.
- **Pre - April 2021** – There are no recorded communications received by the Transport Officer for Freight relating to HGV traffic and impacts on the Great Kingshill community for the period from March 2019.
  - No results of any traffic surveys conducted attached, though commentary suggests the proposed restriction is required to manage increased HGV numbers that may result due to congestion on the local primary routes, that could be HS2 related.

This information informed the generation of options available and the identification and qualification of a recommended selection.

## Appendix 10 - Unsecured / Unsafe loads

The securing of a load must be of primary concern for all road users, whether using a seatbelt to secure our loved ones in the family car, or transporting groceries in lorries to the local supermarket. Not only does effective load securing prevent goods from falling onto roads causing danger to other road users, it also saves money by ensuring that goods arrive at their destination undamaged.

The safe loading and transportation, including if appropriate the covering, of loads is not wholly the responsibility of the driver of the vehicle but of all involved in the transportation chain. Legislation covering these aspects include:-

- [The Road Traffic Act 1988, section 40a](#)
- [The Road Vehicles \(Construction and Use\) Regulations 1986 \(legislation.gov.uk\)](#)

Employers have specific responsibilities under the Health and Safety legislation to ensure the health and safety of:

- their employees and;
- anyone else affected by their work activities
- [Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974 \(legislation.gov.uk\)](#)
- [The Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations 1999 \(legislation.gov.uk\)](#)

Guidance for operators and drivers on securing loads can be found using this link. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/load-securing-vehicle-operator-guidance/load-securing-vehicle-operator-guidance>

Any issues about unsecured loads should be reported to the DVSA, guidance provided using the link <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/report-a-lorry-bus-or-coach-driver-or-company> .

Details of the DVSA enforcement sanctions policy is available using the following link. The relevant section on loads is on page 71. [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/956087/dvsa-enforcement-sanctions-policy.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/956087/dvsa-enforcement-sanctions-policy.pdf)

## Appendix 11 - Skip Lorries Binders Yard

Although there has been three 'recycling/waste' companies based on Binders Yard two are no longer there. One has gone out of business, one has moved to a site on Spurlands End Road and Wycombe Recycling remain. As the remaining recycling skip company Wycombe Recycling have seen an increase in demand for their services. Some of this increase is from the need to take up slack created by the two companies leaving; some is down to an increase generated by residential and commercial property improvement.

There is no HS2 construction related product being delivered to Binders Yard.

Covid-19 lockdown demands on restricting domestic travel for business and social reasons; the fact that international travel for anything other than essential needs had not been allowed had meant that many had not been able to take overseas holidays and have had to stay at home has promoted many people to carry out home improvement projects, this has brought about increased skip lorry movements.

The restrictions placed on businesses to trade also created windows to allow refurbishment and developments without impacting on 'business as usual'; these projects also have created demand on the use of skip services. Much of the increased domestic demands and the construction, refurbishment and improvement growth necessitates the use of local roads for local access to effect 'first mile / last mile' needs.

An application (CM/0009/21) has been received by the Council and is currently in the first consultation stage pending comments from consultees, with a determination date of 1<sup>st</sup> July. The application seeks to vary the existing conditions as follows:

The current maximum total number of vehicle movements shall not exceed 80 (40 in, 40 out) per day.

The application requests that maximum total number of HGV movements (vehicles over 3.5 tonnes unladen weight) shall not exceed 160 (80 in, 80 out) per day.

The planning service are aware of the local concern in relation to Binders Yard, in particular the impact of HGV's accessing the site and the proposed increase in movements. We encourage residents to submit their comments formally via public access, so that they are taken into account as part of the determination of the planning application <https://www.buckscc.gov.uk/services/environment/planning/view-planning-applications/>). It should be noted that the application has been called in by Councillor Carroll and therefore will be considered and determined by planning committee.

## Appendix 12 - Speeding Vehicles

Speed surveys on Cockpit Road have been carried during the weeks commencing the 10<sup>th</sup> May 2021 and the 17<sup>th</sup> May 2021, results including the base data information is incorporated in Appendix 6 along with some national data from Central Government sources. This provides an insight to speeds by all vehicle types.

Issues with vehicles being driven dangerously and / or speeding is a matter for the police and should be reported accordingly. This includes all vehicle types.

Any other vehicle related concerns such as racing, anti-social behaviour and drugs related activities should also be reported. <https://www.thamesvalley.police.uk/>

There may be some opportunity to introduce some traffic management measures to help influence speed and driver behaviour, as such the recommendation is that the community board submission to TfB includes a request to consider the use of this focus.

The TfB guide for Traffic Calming is linked to here [Buckinghamshire Traffic Calming Guide 2020](#) .

## Appendix 13 - HGVs Driving on Pavements

With regard to vehicles being driven on the pavement, the Highway Code Rule 145 states that drivers “MUST NOT drive on or over a pavement, footpath or bridleway except to gain lawful access to property, or in the case of an emergency”.

The supporting legislation is section 72 of the Highways Act 1835 and section 34 of the Road Traffic Act 1988. The offence of driving on the footway is enforced by the Police and it is suggested that contact should be made to advise them about this problem.

It is however apparent that some roads in Great Kingshill do not allow uninhibited space for HGVs to pass each other safely and without driving on the pavement. As advised this is not an action permitted and the vehicle that is constrained, perhaps by parked vehicles, should allow the oncoming HGV to progress.

It is possible that there may be some traffic prioritisation tools that may eliminate the need for vehicles using the pavements. There may be additional benefits in the measures slowing down all vehicles and encouraging safer driving practices.

The TfB Traffic Calming Guide 2020 is embedded here.



BuckinghamshireTraffic Calming Guide 2020

## Appendix 14 - Overhanging Trees

It is suggested that some overhanging protected trees may be restricting pedestrian use of pavement space. At the time of submitting this response to the petition it has proved difficult to establish the status of the trees and hedges along Cockpit Road that may be restricting pedestrian movement.

A Tree Preservation Order (TPO) is a legal protection order for a tree covered under planning law. Undertaking ANY work to a protected tree without planning consent is an offence and the person doing it can be fined up to £20K per tree.

Transport for Bucks (TfB) as the highway authority can undertake 'emergency' works to protected trees but must notify the planning team / council arborists beforehand / immediately after and explaining the nature of the work (i.e. a branch has snapped and blocking the highway, we need to saw off a couple of limbs....). If it is needed to do further work, TfB would have to follow the application process.

General cutting back is not considered an emergency and if a TPO is in place, either TfB, the parish or the land owner would need to follow the necessary process.

Info on Buckinghamshire Council website for former Wycombe District Council planning / trees: <https://www.wycombe.gov.uk/pages/Environment/Trees-wildlife-and-ecology/Trees-and-hedges.aspx>

Steps have been taken to identify which trees and hedges are protected and who own these. Once this is established it will be progressed to arrange to have these cut-back inline with what is allowable and permitted by the owners, if appropriate.

Approaches are being made to the Parish Council and the residents of Cockpit Road to try to establish ownership of the trees and hedges and to determine if these fall under a TPO.

## **Appendix 15 - HGVs Using Roads before 06:30 and After 18:30**

HGVs, like other road users are entitled to make use of unrestricted highways 24 hours a day. The use of the highway at night by HGVs is generally driven by our demands for next day / same day provision of goods and services. This includes the movement of product to manufacturing facilities for efficient supply chain practices such as 'Just in Time'. The movement of finished product, including food and groceries, into regional distribution hubs and onward to local retail outlets is often carried out at night. This is at times when traffic levels are lower and journey times and fuel emissions are reduced with fuel economy improved. Factors which are not only better for the environment and the impact on people; the reduced operating costs support competitive pricing and savings for the customer.

It is interesting to note that the Euro 6 class of diesel engine used in the majority of HGVs producing less harmful emissions than many personal diesel cars including popular SUV models.

## Appendix 16 - Air Quality Considerations

As a Local Authority we implement the Local Air Quality Management regime and monitor to determine compliance with the Air Quality Limits. Short term monitoring as suggested below is generally not undertaken by Buckinghamshire Council for 2 reasons:

- Real time monitoring equipment that has been accepted for LAQM purposes by Defra is expensive to buy and run
- Passive diffusion tube monitoring costs a fraction of the price enabling the Council to have quite a large network. However they can only provide concentrations as monthly means which is sufficient to assess compliance with the limits.

The nearest monitoring location we have is opposite the shops on Wycombe Road in Prestwick. The annual mean limit for Nitrogen Dioxide  $40 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ . There is an hourly limit but it has been calculated that an annual mean in excess of  $60 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  is required to breach this limit. As you can see from the results in the table below concentration measured on this road is far below this.

Site ID	Site Name	Site Type	Pollutants Monitored	In AQMA?	Distance to Relevant Exposure (m) <sup>(1)</sup>	Distance to kerb of nearest road (m) <sup>(2)</sup>	Height (m)	NO <sub>2</sub> Annual Mean Concentration ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )				
								2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
CDC16	Outside 10 Wycombe Road, Prestwood	Roadside	NO2	NO	11.4	1.3	1.5	20	22	20.05	21.54	19.26

Although the location of this motoring site is outside of the Great Kingshill village it is reasonable to expect that the trend seen in Prestwood would be the same seen in Great Kingshill, at least on the main A4128. Pollutant levels on other roads in Great Kingshill would be lower than on the primary route.

The commissioned traffic monitoring will be used by the Air Quality team to give some indication of a change in air quality in the area, likely to be a trend rather an estimate of levels of NO<sub>2</sub>.