



Traffic management in Rampton



Existing Measures

- ▶ Build outs at each end of the village.
- ▶ Speed bumps, now removed.
- ▶ 3 flashing 30 signs.



Survey Responses

- ▶ 190 responses – some highlights
 - ▶ Concerned about speed **156**, no opinion **18**, disagree **17** **82%**
 - ▶ A reduction in the speed of traffic would make it a more pleasant and safer environment **168**, no opinion **14**, disagree **9** **88%**
 - ▶ Cushion removal **89**, no opinion **27**, disagree **75** **46%**
 - ▶ Cushion keep **81**, no opinion **33**, disagree **77** **42%**
 - ▶ No speed measures **12**, no opinion **32**, not support **146** **6%**
 - ▶ ... Or inverting the above **76%** would no support removal of speed measures entirely.



Survey conclusions

- ▶ Speed cushions were removed
- ▶ The majority of the village
 - ▶ Are concerned about speed on this road
 - ▶ Would feel that reduced speed would make the area more pleasant and safer
 - ▶ Would not support complete removal of traffic management measures



Proposal 1

Table junction towards the centre of the village

Table Junction

- ▶ Full width of road
- ▶ Reduces problems with optimistic drivers taking at speed as will fully displace all wheels and hence keep distance between vehicle undercarriage and road surface constant.
- ▶ Suggested siting – End of Cow Lane near the Green or outside the garage



Survey results

--%

Included as speaking with villagers during survey it seemed that this was one interpretation of "flat-topped humps"

Cost

Small	£7,000 - £9,000
Large	£14,000 - £20,000



Flat Topped Humps Pros and Cons

Pros

- Most effective traffic calming treatment
- Can be used as part of an informal crossing for pedestrians
- More acceptable than speed humps to buses
- The size of the speed table is flexible to fit an area with a safety concern. It could span all parts of a four-arm junction, or be placed on a single straight section of road

Cons

- Large speed tables are expensive
- Managing water drainage could be complex and costly
- Buses, cyclists and emergency vehicles will need to reduce their speed
- Some traffic is likely to transfer onto alternative routes, potentially causing a problem somewhere else
- Noise and vibrations can impact local residents
- Additional cost may be required to resurface sections of the road before new cushions are installed



Proposal 2

Flat topped hump towards the centre of the village

Flat-topped hump

- Full width of road
- Reduces problems with optimistic drivers taking at speed as will fully displace all wheels and hence keep distance between vehicle undercarriage and road surface constant.



Survey results
Support **115**
No opinion **30**
Not support **46**

60%

Cost

£14,000 - £22,000



Flat Topped Humps Pros and Cons

Pros

- More effective than speed cushions and horizontal treatments
- Can be adapted so that drainage should not be affected

Cons

- Buses, cyclists and emergency vehicles may need to slow down
- Bus companies normally oppose speed humps
- Some motor vehicle traffic is likely to transfer onto alternative routes, potentially causing a problem somewhere else
- Noise can impact local residents
- Additional cost may be required to resurface sections of the road before new cushions are installed



Proposal 3

MVAS – Mobile Vehicle Activated Sign

MVAS

- ▶ Mobile signage to remind drivers of the speed limit and their current speed.
- ▶ Includes recording of data which can be analysed to assess effectiveness of other measures and to assist in decision making.



Survey results **52%**
Support **100**
No opinion **39**
Not support **52**

Cost £4,000 - £7,000



MVAS Pros and Cons

Pros

- No discomfort or delay experienced by any vehicle user
- Relatively cheap
- Continue to have a positive effect over time if relocated regularly.
- Moving between different sites can increase effectiveness

Cons

- Not as effective as vertical interventions
- Too many of these devices could diminish their effectiveness



Proposal 4

40 Mph Buffer Zones

Buffer Zone

- ▶ Up to 400 metres in length
- ▶ Would allow for relocation of build-outs



Survey results --%

Not in survey, but added due to amount of observations about build-outs

Cost £4,500 - £16,000



Buffer Zone

Pros

- Relatively cheap
- Nationally recognised signing
- No discomfort experienced by any vehicle user

Cons

- Not as effective as vertical interventions
- Effectiveness can be diminished if incorrect limit is installed
- Cost increases when additional measures are required
- Reduction in enforcement can reduce effectiveness
- An inappropriately low speed limit can lead to an increase in poorly judged overtaking and related accidents
- An inappropriately low speed limit is likely to result in speeding issues



Proposal 5

Removal of road markings

Changing Lane Markings

- Various options, such as
 - Peripheral hatching to artificially reduce road width
 - Removal of centre line
- These measures reduce the feeling of space drivers have, which may help to reduce their speeds.



Survey results --%
Not in survey, but added as a possible extra

Cost £2,500 - £5,000



Buffer Zone

Pros

- ▶ Does not introduce discomfort to motor vehicle drivers
- ▶ Relatively cheap
- ▶ Does not reduce accessibility for emergency vehicles or buses
- ▶ Peripheral hatching can hold a build of debris due to it not being trafficked.

Cons


- ▶ Peripheral hatching could be ignored by some motor vehicles drivers, who might still drive in this space
- ▶ Removing the centre line may cause some confusion to motor vehicle drivers
- ▶ Can become a maintenance liability if the lining requires refreshing regularly



Summing Up



Scheduling

- ▶ All work is done by highways and subject to their work schedule
 - ▶ This is seen as an ongoing process and complementary schemes could be spread over several years.
- 



Funding the project(s)

- ▶ Local Highways Initiative (LHI)
 - ▶ CCC Scheme to provide post funding for local highways projects
 - ▶ Typically, in the past, we've received 50% funding for schemes under this initiative.
 - ▶ This year's initiative is relatively small and is to add a lamppost to fill a gap on King Street
- ▶ Precept – main source of income for RPC
 - ▶ Part of council tax, RPC receive approx. £13,000 per annum
 - ▶ Per household this is ~£67 per year (for band D)*
- ▶ Reserves
 - ▶ We have healthy reserves, and could use these to help fund schemes

*~£5.20 per £1000 of precept per household per year



Summary

- Option 1 Table Junction £7,000 ... £20,000
- Option 2 Flat-topped humps £14,000 ... £22,000
- Option 3 MVAS £4,000 ... £7,000
- Option 4 Buffer Zone £4,500 ... £16,000
- Option 5 Change Road Markings £2,500 ... £5,000
- Funded by: -
 - LHI – dependent on winning grant ~50% of costs
 - Precept – Increase per household



What Next?

- ▶ Survey sent out with newsletter to gather opinions
- ▶ This presentation will be available on the website <http://rampton.org>
- ▶ Updates in newsletter & website