



Officer Report

Decision Date:	[democratic services will fill this in]
Reference number:	[democratic services will fill this in]
Title:	Proposed Traffic calming on Stratford Drive, Bourne End
Cabinet Member(s):	Councillor Steve Broadbent
Contact officer:	Joe Bates Transport Co-Ordinator Joe.Bates@buckinghamshire.gov.uk
Ward(s) affected:	The Wooburns, Bourne End & Hedsor;
Decision:	It is decided that the proposed raised table for Stratford Drive be established.
Reason for decision:	There is a planning condition on this development to install a raised table on Stratford Drive under planning consent 18/05597/OUT. Thames Valley Police also have no objections to the scheme.

1. Executive summary

- 1.1 Buckinghamshire Council, in conjunction with Croudace Homes Ltd proposes to establish the Traffic Calming feature in the publicly maintained section of Stratford Drive, Wooburn Green. These works will consist of a raised table with ramps on Stratford Drive which will be located approx. 74 metres north of the junction of Town Lane and Stratford Drive.

2. Content of report

- 2.1 These proposed works would be carried out in accordance with and pursuant to a Section 278 Agreement which the developer will enter into in relation to the development approved under planning consent 18/05597/OUT.

- 2.2 A statutory consultation was undertaken on the proposal from 25th August to 4th October 2023.
- 2.3 Thames Valley Police and the Road Safety Team as well as other internal and external stakeholders were consulted.
- 2.4 Three formal objections were received during the consultation stage (See Section 9 for Consultation Responses).

3. Other options considered

- 3.1 The raised table was proposed by the developer. However, it was roughly in line with the former District Council's view to calm traffic in consideration that the Slate's Meadow development was going to introduce vehicle movements associated with 150+ houses to Stratford Drive, in addition to concerns about those generated by the existing St Pauls School. We do not believe that there was an absolute requirement for a raised table or that other schemes were actively discussed. Ergo, it would be up to the Highway Authority what would be the best measure to deploy in this location.
- 3.2 The pros of the raised table option:
 - a) Reduction in vehicle speeds creates a safer environment for pedestrians
 - b) Improved accessibility for pedestrians including wheel-chair and buggy users
 - c) Improved visual appearance of the area
 - d) This raised table is a condition of the developer's planning consent and is therefore required.

Cons of the raised table option:

- a) A short section of footway (approx. 6.5m in length) will lose a kerb upstand making it more difficult for the visually impaired to navigate and there will be less protection to the footway from vehicle overrun. We have attempted to mitigate the issue with the introduction of bollards in this area.

4. Legal and financial implications

- 4.1 There will be no direct financial resource implications because the consultation and highway works are to be funded by the developer.

The Council's main powers in relation to provision of Traffic Calming are set out in the [Highways Act 1980](#) ("the Act"). Section 90G of the Act allows a highway authority

to establish traffic calming works in a highway maintainable at the public expense for which they are the highway authority.

Before carrying out such works, the highway authority is required under section 4 of the Highway Traffic Calming Regulations 1999 to consult the chief officer of police about the proposal and to consult such person or organisations representing persons who use the highway or who are otherwise likely to be affected by the works as the highway authority thinks fit.

It has been held by the courts that to be effective, consultation must meet the following tests:

- the consultation must be at a time when proposals are still at a formative stage;
- the proposer must give sufficient reasons for any proposal to permit of intelligent consideration and response;
- adequate time must be given for consideration and response; and
- that the product of the consultation must be conscientiously taken into account in finalising any statutory proposals.

It would appear from the content of this report and the background documentation that the above tests were met in this instance.

5. Corporate implications

- 5.1 All works including this consultation were funded by the developer.
- 5.2 An equality impact assessment has been carried out and signed off by Legal and Policy & Partnerships Officer. This assessment has been annexed onto this report (See Section 9).

6. Local councillors & community boards consultation & views

- 6.1 A Statutory Public Consultation was carried out between 25th August 2023 and 4th October 2023. This consisted of notices being erected onsite and letter drops to all residents directly affected by the proposals. The consultation was also available to view on the Councils 'Your Voice Bucks' website. We also emailed the consultation to all internal and external stakeholders, including but not limited to the emergency services, road safety and local Councillors. Councillor Wilson provided some comments with regards to surface water drainage and existing road condition which have been dealt with later in this report. Councillor Kayani and Councillor Drayton did not provide any comments or objection to the proposals. I have since provided a further opportunity for comment with no further responses.

6.2 We received ten responses in total with three objections, albeit this objection was with regards to the planning consent of the development rather than the traffic calming scheme specifically. Some concerns were raised in relation to the works that will be considered in conjunction with the remit of the works. The themes for these concerns covered drainage, road safety, noise, parking and material specification.

- a) Drainage: Three of the ten comments raised concerns in relation to drainage along Stratford Drive. It is understood that there are some existing areas of ponding during periods of rainfall and the concerns are that the works, by nature of raising the road level, will exasperate this issue. We have considered drainage and have designed the scheme to provide additional drainage within the road. We will monitor the scheme post completion, for a minimum of 12 months, to ensure any ponding or further drainage concerns are resolved to the Council's satisfaction.
- b) Road Safety: three of the ten responses raised concerns in relation to road safety. One from our Road Safety Team who would prefer High Friction Surfacing on the raised table rather than an imprint finish. They feel that the imprint could increase the likelihood of slips trips falls in wet icy conditions as the imprinted pattern is likely to retain water. We have used imprint resin on others schemes throughout the County as this forms part of the Council's adoptable specifications. We are not concerned that imprint resin will cause any additional highway safety issues in comparison to traditional asphalt paving. Additionally, we would not want to see High Friction Surfacing on a pedestrian crossing points as it could cause additional injury if someone was to trip and fall. We will monitor the scheme post completion, for a minimum of 12 months, to ensure any ponding or further drainage concerns are resolved to the Council's satisfaction.
- c) A second road safety concern was in relation to the absence of a speed limit reduction to 20mph. Such a change would require a TRO with further consultation and support with statutory parties. Such an amendment has not been considered a requirement of the developer as part of the planning process and as such this is considered outside the scope of these works.
- d) A further road safety concern was submitted by the school who implied that they may have been expecting further highway works to be undertaken than that proposed. Any further highway works would be outside the scope of this consultation.
- e) Noise: One respondent out of the ten responses raised concerns over noise levels from the impact of vehicles travelling across the ramps. It is considered that noise levels will not be significant and so we would be

willing to accept this concern subject to monitoring after the scheme has been implemented. The developer would indemnify the Council against any claims made because of increased noise associated with the works.

- f) Parking: Two respondents out of the ten responses raised concerns over the ability of residents to utilise on-street parking as they currently do. No parking restrictions are proposed and so road users will be able to park lawfully within these works as per the existing situation.
- g) Road condition: one respondent, out of the ten responses, raised concerns that the works do not include existing areas of Stratford Drive that may require pothole repair. It would be unreasonable for the Council to expect the developer repair areas of Stratford Drive as part of these works. However, in cases where the developer has been proved to have caused damage to the highway we can pursue them to rectify the damage as part of these works.

6.3 Thames Valley Police responded to the consultation stating that they do not object to these proposals.

7. Communication, engagement & further consultation

7.1 The school have raised some queries since the end of the consultation period regarding the consultation process and we will continue to liaise with them to resolve any concerns they have in relation to these works.

8. Next steps and review

8.1 This decision will allow the Section 278 Agreement to be progressed and once completed the developer will be able to apply for a permit to secure dates to carry out these works.

8.2 Once the decision has been made we will notify all responders to the consultation of the decision.

8.3 The Bucks 'Have your say' consultation webpage will be updated to reflect the decision outcome.

9. Background papers

[Consultation Notice](#)

[Consultation Letter](#)

[Proposed Raised Table Plan](#) – there has been a minor amendment since the consultation and thus an updated drawing is attached.

[Consultation Responses](#)

[Equality Impact Assessment \(EqIA\)](#)

[Planning Consent](#)

10. Your questions and views (for key decisions)

- 10.1 If you have any questions about the matters contained in this decision please get in touch with the Highways Development Management Team.

