



A418 Aylesbury Road, Bierton Traffic Calming Consultation

Summary of Key Issues: **Designer (C&A) / BDW responses shown in red – Nov 2022. BC Highways DM comments in green and blue**

SHEET 1 OF 11: The unusual priority give-way arrangement could increase the likelihood of loss of control incidents, particularly if vehicles race for a gap. The priority feature looks tight for delivery vehicles and buses to negotiate the narrowing when moving from rest. Does there need to be a chicane directly after the mini-roundabouts, as well as the proposed build-out outside no. 45 Aylesbury Road?

An Independent Road Safety Audit will be carried out as part of the detailed design and a second one once the works are complete. Vehicle tracking will be undertaken as part of the detailed design to ensure larger vehicles can make the relevant movements. There needs to be an appropriate amount of different measures to deter through-traffic from using the route.

SHEET 2 OF 11: Whilst there is no objection to the removal of this particular bus stop lay-by, there are several comments that the removal of bus stop lay-bys will be an ineffective traffic-calming measure. There are no objections to the proposed crossing point.

It is considered that putting the bus cages on the carriageway will provide two functions. The first is to give priority to the buses and secondly when the bus is stopped in the cage it will give additional de facto traffic-calming.

The relocation of bus stops into the carriageway will result in vehicles having to stop and wait behind them, thus creating delay for general traffic. It is noted that there are no objections to the crossing point.

SHEET 3 OF 11: Arriva Bus UK has raised an objection to the loss of this bus lay-by timing point, where buses may need to wait for several minutes, if they are ahead of schedule. Arriva may reconsider, if it can be demonstrated that there will be a reasonable reduction in traffic using the route.

The overall traffic-calming scheme includes the traffic lights at the ELR Junction being reviewed in terms of a longer wait time for potential traffic heading through Bierton. This will discourage traffic from passing through Bierton and use the ELR and SLR through Kingsbrook as was originally intended. Signal timings may be amended as the Highway Authority see fit. We suggest no change unless instructed by the HA.

They are not being lost; the buses will stop on carriageway thus making cars stop behind them.

The Council's Passenger Transport Team notes, *'Bus timetables are built using historic information on journey times and in some cases best estimate times at certain stops along the route. Traffic conditions are considered, but as you know traffic conditions vary from day to day. The stops that have times are what is known as timing points. It is required that buses do not leave these timing points before the registered time. Wherever possible bus stop lay-bys are used as timing points, as on a very quiet traffic day the bus may have to wait time for 2 – 3 mins or more. These lay-bys have recently become timing points, moving from a previous stop that we received complaints about bus waiting times, therefore I would support retention of lay-bys at this site.'* Arriva Bus UK notes, *'We have worked closely with the Authority's Passenger Transport Team to identify suitable locations for buses to wait (as required by law) without impacting other road users, and the suggestion of knowingly using buses waiting time as a traffic calming feature poses a serious risk to the safety of our drivers and passengers. Arriva would strongly and publicly object to the removal of the bus stop lay-bys in question.'*

Prior to the consultation design, we were unaware of the recent change to making this lay-by timing point. The traffic-calming effect was purely based upon buses stopping in bus cages to pick up and set down passengers as is very normal across the network. There would be no increased risk to drivers and passengers over and above the many sites across the network, especially as this scheme along with the later declassification of this road will make this a much quieter and thus safer route.

The scheme designer has prepared an alternative scheme drawing to retain the existing bus lay-by timing point at the Aylesbury bound bus stop lay-by near to St James the Great Church. This is satisfactory to the Council's Passenger Transport team and given this is the only timing in Bierton it addresses Arriva's concerns and objection.

SHEET 3 OF 11: The proposed cycle lane would prevent on-street parking outside of 58 Aylesbury Road and the neighbouring property, and isolate them from future opportunities for on-street electric vehicle charging. These properties have limited off-street parking and parking occurs on the verge at present. Would it be possible to mark out parking bays on the road to assist? This would narrow the road and reduce traffic speeds.

There was never any intention to allow for on street parking as part of the scheme in this locality as there is a new cycle route shown which was requested by the Council. If parking bays are to be provided, they will not form part of these works and will need to be designed and funded by others.

The proposed cycle lane will not affect current parking arrangements.

This is an existing cycle lane which is being widened and coloured surfacing introduced. This would not affect existing parking on the highway verge.

SHEET 4 OF 11: The parking arrangement at St James the Great Church will not assist the Church and will have an adverse impact on the Great Lane Junction. The parking will not assist with traffic-calming and spaces are likely to be used by residents.

The spaces have been provided at Parish Council request. It was noted at the consultation that the "build outs" may be too close together. If the Council or the PC can give an indication as to the clear distance required between the "build outs", then these can be adjusted. Regarding residents using the spaces, this can be discouraged utilising parking enforcement such as permits. Again, this is seen as matter for the HA to resolve with the PC and we suggest no change unless instructed by the HA.

SHEET 4 OF 11: School parking and traffic affects access in and out of Parsons Lane. The imprint paving should be ramped, and school signs and parking restrictions are required.

Raised tables are not appropriate along a bus route and were specifically requested not to be used by the HA. We suggest no change unless instructed by the HA. School traffic issues are not relevant to the traffic-calming scheme

The primary reason for this scheme is to slow vehicles down through Bierton and to make this the less preferred route, thus improving the current situation.

Signs could be confusing as the school is located at the end of Parsons Lane, rather than on Aylesbury Road. The potential introduction of parking restrictions should be investigated outside of the traffic-calming scheme.

SHEET 4 OF 11: The give-way priority features give priority to traffic leaving Aylesbury and the proposed narrowings do not indicate who has priority.

Noted.

This is not a detailed design drawing and priorities and signs will be determined at a later design stage.

SHEETS 4 AND 5 OF 11: An existing pelican crossing outside of 74 Aylesbury Road should be relocated, or downgraded to an uncontrolled crossing, if the traffic is to be reduced and slowed.

This may be appropriate for the future, however, was never intended as part of the scheme. This is a decision for the HA to make at a later date and should only be considered after the scheme has been implemented. We suggest no changes unless instructed by the HA.

There is no reason to do as a signalised crossing is a safer method to cross the road than an uncontrolled crossing and has the bonus that it makes vehicles slow down or stop.

SHEETS 4, 5, 6, AND 7 OF 11: The existing footways are narrow, particularly at the Wing (eastern) end of the village. The scheme should include more footway widening.

There is no scope nor was there ever any intention of carrying out footway widening as part of the scheme. As this is a traffic-calming scheme not a sustainable travel improvement scheme, no amendment is required.

It is suggested that this should be reviewed, but in many areas, there is no highway land on which to widen into.

SHEETS 4, 5, AND 7 OF 11: The imprint paving will create a noise disturbance with little speed reduction. These areas should be raised or given the visual impression of being vertically raised.

Raised tables are not appropriate along a bus route and were specifically requested not to be used by the HA. We suggest no change unless instructed by the HA.

All consultations for vertical traffic-calming are met with vigorous objections, due to the noise caused by vehicles bumping and down them and so this option was discounted at design stage.

Vertical traffic-calming causes much more noise, and it is recognised throughout the industry that block paving (or the appearance of) does have a traffic-calming effect.

Para 7.2.15 of MfS1 notes, *'Research for MfS has shown that block paving reduces traffic speeds by between 2.5 and 4.5mph, compared with speeds on asphalt surfaces'*. Also, whilst not specifically mentioning imprint paving, Para 7.4.4 of MfS1 (psychology and perception) notes, *'Street features and human activity can have an influence on the speed at which people choose to drive. Research suggests that features likely to be effective include the following: – edge markings that visually narrow the road – speed reduction is likely to be greatest where the edging is textured to appear unsuitable for driving on'*. Furthermore, Local Transport Note 1/07 Traffic Calming notes, *'The effect of coloured surfaces can be difficult to separate from other techniques used simultaneously, and their additional effect is likely to be small. In a recent simulator study carried out as part of research into 'psychological' traffic calming measures, the results suggested that coloured surfacing alone, however elaborate, did little to slow traffic (Kennedy et al., 2005)'*.

SHEET 5 OF 11: A proposed give-way priority feature will affect access in and out of Miles Court.

This feature has been designed to avoid any "private drive" accesses and is felt to be in the most optimum location. We suggest no change unless instructed by the HA.

Whilst we believe that the current proposals will slow vehicles down through Berton and make this the less preferred route, thus making access and egress no worse than the current situation, we will review this with designers and reconsult these residents.

SHEETS 5 AND 6 OF 11: The raised pedestrian crossing near Plough End and give-way priority feature at Miles Court would conflict with existing and future agricultural accesses.

At the public consultation it was suggested that additional signage for farm vehicles be installed and BDW are happy to include these as part of this scheme. We await HA comments in this regard.

We are visibly not aware of any current or proposed accesses at Miles Court. We will review the location of the pedestrian crossing at Plough End to ensure that the current field access is still accessible.

The HA has reviewed the planning portal and there is no planning application for development of the field or a new access, or previous approval.

SHEET 8 OF 11: The majority of the traffic-calming measures are at the Aylesbury end of the village and very limited measures are proposed at the Wing end of the village.

Noted. The extent of the traffic-calming scheme is agreed in the s106 agreement and the scope of BDW's s106 commitments are shown on drawing 12-042-1/010 Rev B in the s106.

BDW has proposed measures at the Wing end of the village above that required by the s106.

SHEET 9 OF 11: There are no objections to these particular on carriageway bus stops and no specific objections to the proposed crossing point.

Noted.

Noted.

SHEET 10 OF 11: The on-road bus cage is shown on the plans across the driveway access to 200 Aylesbury Road which will block driveway access, when a bus is stopped. It is requested that the bus stop cage is located eastwards beside the actual bus stop and the footway where pedestrians currently wait for buses.

Noted. The exact position of the on-road bus cage can be dealt with at the detailed design stage.

SHEET 11 OF 11: The ELR Junction traffic lights have minimal waiting time to drive straight through Bierton. The waiting time should be increased significantly.

On completion of the scheme, the traffic signals will be rephased to give priority to traffic on the ELR and not through Bierton Village.

This is going to happen and will be one of the main reasons that the road through Bierton will become the less preferred route.

VARIOUS: The removal of bus stop lay-bys will be an ineffective traffic-calming measure.

This was previously discussed with Buckinghamshire Council's Passenger Transport Team, and it is considered that putting the bus cages "on highway" will provide two functions. The first is to give priority to the buses and secondly when the bus is stopped in the cage it will give additional de-facto traffic-calming. This occurs in many Local Authorities now, London being the most prominent. We suggest no change unless instructed by the Highway Authority.

VARIOUS: The give-way priority features / chicanes and narrowings will affect access and safety of cyclists and a comprehensive approach to cycle facilities is required.

Cyclists have been accommodated as they can cycle between the "features" and the main kerb edge as there are spaces left between the features and the kerb edge. We suggest no change unless instructed by the HA.

The primary reason for this scheme is to slow vehicles down and to make this the less preferred route, thus reducing traffic volumes. The upgrade of the existing cycle infrastructure is a by-product of this.

The highway consultation response for Kingsbrook development planning application 10/02649/AOP notes, 'Traffic calming is proposed through Bierton limiting the capacity of the route' and 'the provision of the SLR and NELR are proposed as strategic highway infrastructure and in conjunction with traffic calming proposed on A418 through Bierton provide an alternative route to the town centre for general traffic. The strategic modelling of the network indicates that the inclusion of traffic calming on A418 through Bierton along with a higher speed limit on the new strategic route encourages traffic movement to the use the new route in preference to the A418'.

VARIOUS: Additional speed cameras and enforcement is required.

This was not part of the original scheme brief and unlikely to assist in traffic management to deter vehicles using the route.

This is not a proposal at this time.

VARIOUS: A 20mph speed limit should be introduced.

This is a decision for the HA which we are happy to implement, if instructed.

A 20mph limit would not generally be supported by Thames Valley Police.

VARIOUS: A 7.5 tonne weight limit should be implemented

As above, but not a traffic-calming issue.

The primary reason for this scheme is to slow vehicles down and to make this the less preferred route, thus reducing traffic volumes of all weights of vehicles, so this should not be required.

VARIOUS: Traffic will continue to use the route and in particular Burcott Lane. Traffic-calming measures are required along Burcott Lane.

The traffic calming for Burcott Lane does not form part of the developer's obligation.

This could potentially be considered at a later stage, but as was mentioned earlier, the primary reason for this scheme is to slow vehicles down and to make the road through Bierton the less preferred route, thus reducing traffic volumes. The scope of BDW's S106 commitments are shown on drawing 12-042-1/010 Rev B in the s106.

VARIOUS: The scheme will not bring about significant traffic reductions, and the traffic-calming will cause delay, frustration, and create safety issues for remaining and local users.

This is an opinion. We have no response or commentary.

This is an opinion, that we cannot 100% discount, but if the current proposals do not bring the required reduction in traffic volumes and hence safety, this will be revisited after the Stage 3 Road Safety Audit.

VARIOUS: The narrowings and pedestrian refuges restrict access to driveways.

Noted, these will be checked at final design stage.

The road through Berton has many driveways and so finding locations that do not affect some to a lesser or greater extent is very difficult. This is currently the best compromise that we could find.

VARIOUS: Signage at either end of Berton and around Aylesbury, including the A418 Vale Park Drive and Park Street North will need to be changed. – The recently installed AD signage have blanking plates on them in readiness for the completion of the traffic calming works. Once the works are completed the blanking plates will be removed which will inform drivers that the road through Berton is to be used for “Local traffic”.

We are aware of this, but that is not within the scope of this consultation.

VARIOUS: The overall concept does little to change the environment from a direct A road to the intended local function. Whilst the traffic-calming features require road markings, there is an opportunity to review and remove existing road markings. The removal of centre road markings has been successful in lowering speed limits in urban areas.

Noted and this will be looked at in the final design pending comments and instruction from the HA.

The combination of the change of traffic signals timings and the multiple different traffic-calming features should add up to making this the less preferred route. After implementation, the scheme will be reviewed both for traffic flows and safety and changes can be made.

VARIOUS: The Council's Network Safety Team notes that, *'As this would remain the route of choice for cyclists, there should be a continuous facility, and careful consideration given to the introduction of intentional pinch-points which could increase the likelihood of conflict between cyclists and drivers / riders. The reallocation of road-space away from motorists to other users is likely to change the environment from a direct A road to the intended local function'*.

Noted, but the primary function is to calm traffic and thus making it safer for cyclists as a direct result.

We do not believe there is further work required in this regard, subject to HA comments and instruction.

The cost of schemes such as this need to be reasonable.

The NPPF notes that, *'In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that: any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree'*.

VARIOUS: The Council's Network Safety Team has recommended that a Road Safety Audit is undertaken on the scheme.

Noted and will be undertaken as part of the standard process.

Agreed.

NOT APPLICABLE: Traffic-calming is required along Mike Griffin Way and Bellingham Way.

This is not considered relevant to this scheme and does not form part of the developer's obligation.

The primary reason for this scheme is to slow vehicles down through Berton and to make this the less preferred route. This is a requirement of BDW's s106. If traffic-calming is implemented along both Mike Griffin Way and Bellingham Way it would be counterproductive to this scheme. The scope of BDW's s106 commitments are shown on drawing 12-042-1/010 Rev B in the s106.

As mentioned earlier, the highway consultation response for Kingsbrook development planning application 10/02649/AOP notes, *'Traffic calming is proposed through Berton limiting the capacity of the route' and 'the provision of the SLR and NELR are proposed as strategic highway infrastructure and in conjunction with traffic calming proposed on A418 through Berton provide an alternative route to the town centre for general traffic. The strategic modelling of the network indicates that the inclusion of traffic calming on A418 through Berton along with a higher speed limit on the new strategic route encourages traffic movement to the use the new route in preference to the A418'*.

NOT APPLICABLE: The southern section of the Eastern Link Road (ELR) to the A41 is required before the implementation of traffic-calming through Berton.

This element of the “overall highway design” is outside of the scope of BDW works and is not required prior to the implementation of the traffic-calming. This is confirmed within the s106 agreement.

BDW’s s106 commitment is to deliver this traffic-calming scheme. The ELR South is subject to a separate planning agreement and as such timescales could not have been predicted when the s106 was signed. The scope of BDW’s s106 commitments are shown on drawing 12-042-1/010 Rev B in the s106.