WEST WYCOMBE PARISH COUNCIL

TRAFFIC CALMING & ROAD SAFETY FOR WEST WYCOMBE

AUGUST 2010

NEIL TIMBERLAKE CMILT

West Wycombe Parish Council has repeatedly expressed concern over a number of highways issues which affect the Parish and its citizens and users. In general these relate to traffic issues along the A4010 and A40 through the parish, and associated air quality, congestion, noise, and parking issues.

A specific concern which has achieved prominence of late has been the speed of traffic entering the village from the west along the A40 corridor. This has been highlighted by two recent crashes involving speeding motor vehicles – a crash in September 2009 which involved a car hitting and damaging Ness Cottage at the junction of the A40 and Chorley Road and Church Lane; and more recently still the accident on 2 June 2010 which resulted in the death of a pedestrian, Judy de Gelas, and the serious injury to her two grandchildren.

West Wycombe Parish Council has accordingly sought to engage local residents and the County Council in seeking to address these matters 'once and for all' and to try to secure specific action that will remedy, or at least mitigate, our concerns.

This report has been drafted in advance of a meeting with Buckinghamshire County Council on 3 August 2010 to share our understanding of potential remedies, and to seek to secure Buckinghamshire County Council support for effective measures to be implemented to provide a remedy for villagers' concerns.

We recognise that there are perhaps two (albeit related) issues which we seek to address: (1) to secure a means to reduce traffic speeds entering the village from the west along the A40; and (2) to secure a containment of traffic speeds in the village itself, along the High Street, travelling in either direction.

We recognise that different remedies will be likely to be appropriate to each objective.

We recognise that, in the current financial climate, with severe restraint being exercised on public expenditure, the cost of implementing any scheme cannot be ignored as a consideration.

We recognise, finally, that none of the schemes considered or suggested is likely to have an impact on those drivers who are drunk or recklessly careless about their vehicle's speed, but we *can* ensure that their driving as a result of their lack of judgement has minimal impact on our community. No scheme can be designed that will minimise all potential dangers from all sources, and we can only hope to reduce the likelihood of crashes and to mitigate the worst consequences of them. We may never be able to prevent the reckless from crashing, but there may be some value in seeking to control where their accident occurs, by making them 'hit' something outside of the village, or to forcibly slow their progress such that they can do little harm by the time they reach it.

Ness Cottage, situated as it is on the outer radius of the curve from the A40 as it enters West Wycombe Village and becomes High Street, has been repeatedly damaged by collisions with motor vehicles the drivers of which have lost control.

Ms Christine Barry, the owner of the property, has kindly provided details of these collisions, as well as a photograph of the aftermath of one of them.

Ms Barry purchased Ness Cottage in July 1986 and reports that in the week prior to the exchange of contracts the property was hit no less than three times, each occasion causing minor damage to the house.

Since then there have been five major incidents involving damage to the building:

1) In 1987, when a car left the road and hit the kitchen window nearest to the road. A new window was required on this occasion.

2) In December 1992, when very substantial damage was caused, involving the floor joists being pushed right through the house. The cost of repairs on this occasion was £25,000. The driver of the vehicle almost had to have a leg amputated to release him from the wreckage.

3) A car left the road, somersaulted and landed upside-down on the bank. On this occasion damage to the house was confined mainly to the brickwork to the right of the kitchen window. (see photo overleaf of this incident)

4) In September 2009, when very substantial damage was caused once again – probably the worst damage to the property thus far. A speeding motorist lost control on the corner and crashed his car into the house. The cost of repairs on this occasion was £56,000 and the tenants had to move out for a period of four months as the building was considered by the local authority's Buildings Inspector to be unsafe for habitation.

5) In June 2010, when a driver (who was over the legal limit for alcohol in her bloodstream) lost control of her car and caused minor damage to Ness Cottage, demolished a lamp-standard, and collided with three pedestrians, killing one of them.

During the 24 years since Ms Barry acquired the property she reports that there have been many minor accidents at the road junction – most of which have not been reported to the police, and so which would probably not have appeared in statistical information.

This report has been written with two objectives and audiences in mind:

1) To provide information on various traffic-calming measures to a ‘lay’ audience, setting out the full range of potential options open to highways engineers and elected members, and exploring the benefits and disbenefits of each; and

2) To argue the case in front of the ‘expert’ audience of Buckinghamshire County Council highways engineers for specific identified measures to be applied to West Wycombe, which we believe represent an achievable and affordable mix of solutions appropriate to the particular circumstances of this historic village.

Traffic Calming:

The Department for Transport's speed policy review recognised road humps, chicanes and other road engineering measures as currently the most effective method of reducing vehicle speeds in urban (and some rural) areas. It found that there was no evidence that, when negotiated at sensible speeds, these cause damage to vehicles. However, along strategic routes for emergency services, consideration needs to be given to the most appropriate design that can minimise delay to emergency services while at the same time reducing and controlling the speed of other vehicles. A similar consideration needs to be given to bus routes.

To ensure that traffic calming features are not themselves a cause of accidents, it is recommended that traffic calming schemes are subjected to safety audit reviews. Potential risks should be identified and ameliorated where this is possible without destroying the scheme objectives, but their likelihood and severity must be balanced against likely social, environmental, economic and safety benefits of the scheme as a whole.

A traffic calming scheme can provide an opportunity for the local community to get involved in the redesign of their street: considering uses, streetscape and sense of place as well as specific measures.

Vertical deflections (road humps, speed tables):

The Highways (Road Humps) Regulations 1999 are the current regulations setting out provisions for road humps in England and Wales. They allow local authorities to install humps (including speed cushions) on roads with a speed limit of 30 mph or less, provided the humps are between 25mm and 100mm high, at least 900mm long in the direction of travel, and have no vertical face greater than 6mm.

These regulations provide local highway authorities with considerable flexibility in the design and placement of road humps. However, the regulations make local authorities responsible for the design and placement, so authorities will need to ensure that an adequate duty of care is exercised.

Clearly such a speed-limiting device might have a role within the village, but almost certainly could not be used to reduce the speed of traffic entering the village.

Other traffic calming measures:

Other powers in the Highways Act 1980 include: section 64 (roundabouts), section 68 (pedestrian refuges), section 75 (variations in the relative width of carriageways and footways), section 77 (alterations in the level of a highway), and section 90 (build-outs, chicanes, pinch-points, gateways, islands, overrun

areas, and rumble devices). There is no requirement in the Act limiting the installation of these measures to roads with a speed limit of 30mph or less.

Further consideration of these measures therefore might suggest an appropriate means of reducing the speed of traffic entering the village from the fast A40.

Local Authorities may be able to make use of the MOLASSES project. This project, initiated by the County Surveyors' Society (now known as ADEPT – the Association of (Local Government) Directors of Environment, Economy, Planning and Transport), is able to assess different treatments in relation to specific accident problems. The aim is to give individual authorities a better idea of the effectiveness of different types of scheme. The traffic calming measures used in the plans can be evaluated by following the procedures given in the RoSPA Manual (2002). Progress reports of the MOLASSES Project have been produced (Mackie, 1997; Gorell & Tootill, 2001). The website www.trl.co.uk/molasses dedicated to MOLASSES enabled local authorities to submit information and queries.

Need for consultation:

Highways Authorities have a statutory duty to consult the police when road hump schemes are proposed for a road or area, and they must also post notices in the street and in local papers advertising the scheme.

The 1999 Highways (Road Hump) Regulations require consultation with the fire service, ambulance service, and organisations representing those who use the road. This would include the residents' organisations and bus operators, but it may also include haulage operators or agricultural organisations in certain areas. It is also recommended that the consultation process does not just cover the statutory requirements, but that authorities should open up a dialogue with all interested parties (including pedestrians, disabled people, cyclists' groups and, where appropriate, equestrians) to try to ensure that there is a consensus in favour of the scheme.

Highways authorities also have a statutory duty to consult the police when traffic calming measures other than road humps are proposed. The authority must also consult organisations or groups who use the road or others who are likely to be affected by the traffic calming work. Whilst these regulations are less prescriptive than the hump regulations, it is suggested that authorities may use the same overall consultation procedure as for road humps for all traffic calming schemes.

When considering the use of schemes that are not fully self-enforcing, attention should be paid to the consultation provisions of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 regarding the level of police enforcement that might be required to ensure significant reductions in speed.

Additional contextual information:

The situation of West Wycombe along a designated A-route creates significant constraints on what methods can legitimately be applied to reducing traffic speeds.

The use of the road as an alternative through route when the M40 is obstructed or reduced in capacity for any reason (by the direction of the emergency services as well as by road users using their own discretion) also imposes significant hurdles to those seeking solutions to villagers' concerns.

The A40 route through the village already becomes heavily congested in such circumstances, and DfT advice on traffic calming measures warns against implementing schemes which would be likely to have the effect of creating significant congestion or other environmental detriments (noise, vibration, air quality) themselves.

The route is also used by regular bus services - currently the 40 linking High Wycombe with Thame, via Stokenchurch and Chinnor, the 2a/2c circulars serving High Wycombe, Stokenchurch, Lane End, the 737 express coach linking Oxford and Stansted Airport, and sundry other less frequent services. Longer distance coach services which normally use the M40 also divert via the A40 and West Wycombe village in common with other traffic when there are problems with the motorway route.

The route is clearly likely to be an important route for emergency service vehicles, and so great care will be needed to avoid compromising the ability of police, fire and ambulance services to meet their required response times to emergency calls. Any scheme not meeting these objectives is likely to be strongly objected to at the consultation stage, and would in any case be illogical in the context of seeking to reduce harm to citizens from accidents.

Possible treatments applicable to West Wycombe:

Essentially, the full range of possible treatments that might be applied to the objective of reducing traffic speeds on entry to the village includes:

Road humps

Speed cushions

Speed tables

Rumble strips

Entry treatments

Signing – accident statistics

Signing – vulnerable users

Vehicle-actuated signage

Speed cameras

Traffic islands and pedestrian refuges

Pedestrian crossings

Chicanes

Pinch points

Roundabouts

Of these, speed tables, rumble strips, and entry treatments have already been applied to the village, and it is questionable whether they have proved effective. The Parish Council believes that additional measures are now required.

In addition, road humps or speed cushions are inapplicable to a road to which the national speed limit still applies up to a point only some 50 metres or less before the entry to the village.

In detail:

Road humps

These are the most widely-used form of traffic calming because they are generally effective at controlling speeds. The original work on developing this measure was as far back at 1973 in the UK.

Road hump geometry can affect the degree of discomfort experienced by road users and the subsequent speed-controlling effect.

It is strongly recommended (though not obligatory) that a speed-reducing feature is provided before the first hump in a series, so that drivers approach the first hump at an appropriate speed. Adequate warning (e.g. traffic signing) should be provided before drivers encounter road humps.

Original road humps in the UK had a round profile and were 100mm high.

Nowadays, 75mm humps are generally recommended by the DfT and these are more widely used. Lower height features generally cause less discomfort at a given speed and less delay for bus operators and the emergency services, and have been shown to give speed reductions comparable to those from 100mm humps.

Other, lower profiles of road humps are permitted, 65mm or 50mm, and these may be more appropriate in circumstances where there is a perceived risk of certain long-wheelbase low-chassis vehicles (e.g. sports cars, stretched limousines, cars towing caravans, low-loaders, and some farm machinery) grounding, but will be likely to have less effect in reducing average traffic speeds.

Ramp gradients can be varied to lessen the impact of a hump, and it is suggested that a maximum of 1 in 10 combined with a height of 75mm should avoid grounding of almost all vehicles. It should be noted than gradients of 1:15 have been found to be the best compromise between speed reduction and discomfort for bus passengers.

A maximum spacing of 150 metres is normally recommended for round-top and flat-top road humps but at this spacing (closer for 50mm humps) there may be more braking and accelerating than if the spacing is below 100 metres.

Other hump profiles have been trialled in various locations: Sinusoidal humps; H-humps; S-humps; thermoplastic humps (‘thumps’); and speed cushions.

A typical round-top or flat-top hump is likely to cost some £500 to £1,000.

Sinusoidal humps have been little used in the UK and have been found to give slightly greater discomfort to vehicle occupants but can give slightly lower levels

of noise and vibration than flat-top humps. The costs of installation of sinusoidal humps also appears to be higher.

H-humps were designed so that buses and cars could travel over the hump at similar speeds. Cars, which have a narrower track, have to use the steeper part of the hump, whereas buses, which have a wider track, are able to use the less severe outer ramps. This benefits large buses and fire appliances, but may not be as effective for minibuses or smaller ambulances.

A practical constraint is that additional drainage gullies are needed to prevent water ponding in the indentation formed by the H. The ramps on the stems of the H also require careful construction to ensure that any side slopes do not cause difficulties to any cyclists or motor-cyclists. The speed differential between cars and buses was about 6mph, which is similar for those for round-top or flat-top humps, but the average speeds were higher at the H-humps.

The cost of installation for an H-hump is around £2,500 to £3,000, significantly higher than a standard hump.

S-humps were designed by Fife Council in Scotland using similar principles to the H-hump. As with the H-hump, vehicles with a narrow track have to use the steeper part of the hump, whereas those with a wider track are able to use the less severe outer ramps. A spacing of 100 metres was found to be acceptable.

The cost of installation for an S-hump is around £2,000 to £2,500.

Thermoplastic humps ('thumps') were first used as a low-cost alternative to the standard road-top road humps. Thumps are generally about 40mm high, as thumps in excess of 50mm may cause considerable discomfort to vehicle occupants. For this reason, the DfT does not recommend thumps of these dimensions.

A major disbenefit in the context of West Wycombe is that thumps are not authorised without either (a) white triangle road markings on the thump itself, or (b) creating the thump out of yellow thermoplastic. This may be considered unsightly and out of keeping with the historic nature of the village.

The installation cost for a thump is around £350 to £550.

Speed cushions are narrow rectangular humps which allow wide-tracked vehicles such as buses or large emergency vehicles to straddle or partially straddle the speed cushion. For fire engines in particular, it means that their speed can be less compromised compared to traversing a conventional hump. However, short length cushions of less than 200mm may create a risk of grounding for cars and certain other road vehicles if the height of the cushion is greater than about 65mm.

A maximum spacing of 70 metres is normally appropriate, but closer spacing is likely to be necessary if an objective of the scheme is to control speeds to around 20mph

The cost of installing a speed cushion is generally £250 to £750.

Effects on vehicle speeds:

Past studies have shown that round-top and flat-top humps applied at intervals of approximately 100 metres can be expected to reduce mean traffic speeds from 35mph to 24mph, with 85th percentile speeds around 4 to 5mph higher than the mean speed.

Sinusoidal humps have roughly similar effectiveness in reducing speeds.

H and S humps have been found to be most suitable for 30 mph roads that have a bus route. Mean speeds for humps spaced at 100 metre intervals were about 26mph for cars and 22mph for buses, with 85th percentile speeds reduced by roughly 7mph from about 36.5mph to 29.5mph.

Thumps spaced at 40 to 75 metre intervals reduced 85th percentile speeds to 28mph, with mean speeds at around 23mph. Thumps were not generally popular with bus passengers, however.

The effectiveness of speed cushions varies widely, depending on the width, length, height and spacing of the cushions. Analysis of a number of speed cushion installations has shown that, for an average cushion spacing of 70 metres and cushion width of 1700mm, average speeds were reduced by about 10mph to an overall average of 22mph and an 85th percentile of 26mph.

The effectiveness of cushions for controlling speeds can be improved if they appear more formidable than they actually are. This is usually achieved by coloured cushion, contrasting with the surrounding road surface. However, this has to be balanced with the visual intrusion that would be introduced into an historic streetscape.

The mean speed of buses over cushions is generally similar to or slightly greater than cars. Fire appliances on urgent responses can cross cushions at speeds 10mph to 20mph higher than standard 75mm humps. Ambulances can cross wide (1.9 metres) cushions at similar speeds to 75mm humps, and cross at slightly higher speeds for narrower (1.5 to 1.7 metre) cushions.

Effects on accidents:

It has been shown that on average each 1mph reduction in mean vehicle speed results in an average accident reduction of 5%. Hence a 10mph speed reduction may give a 50% accident saving.

Traffic calming measures have been shown to reduce the frequency of accidents involving pedestrians, cyclists and motorcyclists.

Environmental impacts:

Noise

The introduction of speed-controlling measures can influence traffic noise. For instance, lowering the speed of traffic may mean that vehicle noise emissions are reduced.

However, the effects on noise emissions can be radically different, depending on the composition of the traffic, and the types of speed-limiting measures introduced.

In all cases, studies have found that the effects on noise reduction overall are reduced the greater the proportion of buses and commercial vehicles in the traffic composition, and in many cases the overall traffic noise would be expected to ***increase*** if certain traffic calming measures were to be installed.

Narrow cushions will typically reduce traffic noise by up to 4.5 db(A) in situations where bus and commercial vehicle traffic is no greater than 6% of all traffic, but will create an **increase** in noise of up to 2 db(A) where bus and commercial traffic is greater than 6%.

Wider cushions will typically reduce traffic noise by up to 5.5 db(A), but only in situations where traffic is composed of 100% car traffic. Any other mix of vehicle types is likely to lead to **increases** in overall traffic noise of up to 8.5 db(A).

Flat top road humps are similarly effective only in cases where bus and commercial traffic is no more than a negligible constituent of overall traffic. Noise reductions of almost 8db(A) are possible in 100% car environments, but for 6% or greater composition of bus and commercial vehicles the traffic noise will be likely to increase by 4 db(A) to 8 db(A).

Round-top road humps are the most effective at the widest ranges of traffic composition, producing noise reductions of between 8 db(A) and 0.5 db(A) at compositions between 2% and 21% bus and commercial traffic, and a tiny increase in noise at bus/commercial compositions above 25%.

However, changes in traffic noise levels are highly sensitive to changes in vehicle speeds.

Vibration

Studies have shown that speed cushions and road humps can produce perceptible levels of ground-borne vibration, and that vehicles with a gross vehicle weight of more than 7.5 tonnes generate the highest levels. Under the

most severe conditions this can lead to complaints and anxieties concerning building damage. However, even under the worst case conditions, it is very unlikely that the introduction of road humps and speed cushions pose a significant risk of even minor damage to property.

For a given speed, the narrowest cushions produced the least vibration. This is to be expected, as commercial vehicles can straddle the cushion if it is located correctly.

Visual intrusion

In the context of an historic streetscape, with many 'Listed' buildings and venerable structures, it will be very important that any traffic-calming measure which might be adopted should be sympathetic to the visual appeal of the village.

This is particularly likely to be an issue with road humps, or other 'built' schemes, and clearly the use of high-quality materials and minimal road markings and other signage will be sought as a key component of any scheme.

Rumble devices

Rumble strips are already located on the A40 adjacent to the gate entry feature, and some 200 metres before the start of the 30mph zone.

Given the continuing accident statistics, their effectiveness may be questioned. Certainly, we would argue that they have proved ineffective without additional 'reinforcing' measures.

We would be concerned, however, at measures which might add unnecessarily to the visual intrusion and, rather than additional rumble strips, would recommend an area of 'Rumblewave' be installed into the road surface.

Signing – accident statistics

We consider that such signs, indicating the number of accidents which have occurred on a given stretch of road ahead, are ineffective at reducing mean traffic speeds, and are widely disregarded by motorists.

Signing – vulnerable users

Whilst such additional signage, for example indicating the presence of a school, might be considered worthwhile by some, we do not regard such signs as being likely to enforce safe driving behaviour, and do not consider them likely to contribute meaningfully to reducing mean traffic speeds.

Vehicle-actuated signage

We have long regarded such signs as an effective measure, and would welcome the installation of such equipment, with a suitable message to drivers, on the approach to (or just after the start of) the 30mph zone.

Speed cameras

We consider these to be effective in reducing speeds, although we have some reservations regarding their visual intrusion. In the light of current budget cuts affecting local government, and news that Oxfordshire County Council has very recently switched off its speed cameras and that Buckinghamshire County Council is likely to reduce the number of its working cameras, both due to a loss of partnership funding for them, we hesitate to recommend such a speed camera for West Wycombe at the present time.

Traffic islands and pedestrian refuges

The provision of a traffic island in the middle of the A40 as traffic approaches the village has certain features which recommend itself. It would provide a fairly safe opportunity for pedestrians to cross the road just outside the village – we do have a number of pedestrians from Piddington who attend the village in this way, not least some school-children.

The effect on traffic of such a visual obstacle is likely to reduce approach speeds to the village.

It has been observed also that such a measure, in the case of a drunk or recklessly careless driver, would given them something to crash into *away* from properties in the village.

We recognise that the overall width of the road would probably need to be widened adjacent to the refuge, to maintain an appropriate width for vehicles passing either side of the central refuge. There is no shortage of space to do so, and we believe that the visual intrusion and change of character of the roadscape at this point would not be disproportionate to the benefits of doing so.

Pedestrian crossings

There is already a zebra crossing in the village, adjacent to the Village Hall. An additional zebra crossing at the approach to the village from the west might be thought to have similar effects to that of a refuge. However, we would be concerned that pedestrians using such a crossing could potentially be put at significant risk on such a fast stretch of road, as the zebra crossing itself would be unlikely to produce a traffic-calming effect.

A light-controlled pelican or puffin crossing would create visual intrusion and would, we feel, be of very limited value in traffic-calming terms as it would be almost permanently offering a green light to oncoming motorists.

Chicanes

Whilst a road-narrowing measure such as a chicane would certainly be effective at reducing mean traffic speeds, and would provide a something for a drunk or recklessly careless motorist to crash into outside of the village, we cannot ignore the likelihood that police or emergency services may object to such a measure, and are particularly mindful of the impacts on traffic congestion (with its associated problems) and traffic tailbacks through the village, which would be likely to be a consequence of such a measure, particularly at peak times or whenever the M40 is experiencing problems.

Any chicane in this location is likely therefore to need to be built with a means of opening up the road to its full width (perhaps by means of hinged gates and an overrun area) when necessary.

Pinch points

Many of the same arguments can be deployed in favour of pinch-points creating a narrowing of the road entrance to the village. We are mindful that the same disbenefits also apply!

Roundabouts

This is effectively our ‘ultimate weapon’ in the context of West Wycombe village. This would see the present triangle junction at the western end of the village replaced with a roundabout, and would include an arrester bed of gravel as part of the central surface of the roundabout, as a means of capturing any speeding vehicle which might lose control and otherwise hit Ness Cottage or an adjacent structure.

The cost of the envisaged roundabout would be considerable – we suppose some £200,000 or more – and we recognise therefore that such a measure cannot really be contemplated until other much less expensive measures have been tried and proved to have failed.

However, we reserve our position in respect of this measure, and do not rule out campaigning and lobbying vocally for such a scheme if it seems necessary in future.

Recommendations:

Having reviewed the range of options potentially available, and considered the competing needs of road-users (especially the emergency services), residents, the visual impact of certain scheme options, and the costs associated with different scheme options, we are minded to suggest the following, in order of increasing expenditure. We recognise that not all might be affordable, at least initially

1) That the start of the 30mph zone be moved westwards some 200 metres along the A40 towards Piddington.

2) That the start of this zone be marked by speed limit signs backed by a yellow rectangular board, to raise visual awareness of the change in the speed limit.

3) That the existing entry-feature white fencing be used as the start point of the extended 30mph zone, reinforcing the visual messages from the other signing.

4) That a vehicle-actuated speed-indicating sign be installed some 100 to 200 metres in advance of the start of the 30mph zone (and in sight of the 30mph signs marking the start of the zone) OR a vehicle-actuated 30mph repeater sign be installed some 100 metres after the start of the 30mph zone, to reinforce the message of the 'fixed' signs at the start of the zone.

5) That 'rumblewave' carriageway texture changes be installed on the approach side of the carriageway to give an audible & physical reinforcement of the visual messages, without creating a noise nuisance external to the vehicles. (We recognise that emergency services, particularly the ambulance service, may have objections to this measure, and we would be willing to be persuaded to modify our stance regarding this measure in the light of any legitimate objections that might be raised by them). If this were to be the case, however, we would seek the extension westwards of the 'conventional' rumble strips installation.

We hope that these measures would prove to be effective, but if they did not we would reserve the option to further campaign for the installation of either:

(a) A chicane situated to coincide with the (relocated, as per (1) above) start of the 30mph zone. This could include an over-run area, and would be likely to require a means to rapidly move or dismantle the measure when over-riding traffic considerations made this necessary.

or

(b) A roundabout to replace the present triangular junction of the A40/High Street/Chorley Road/Church Lane. This roundabout, in order to offer further protection to Ness Cottage and adjacent properties, should include a

central bed of gravel material so as to act as an ‘arrester bed’ for out-of-control traffic. This could be masked by an outer annular soil bed planted with flowers and/or bedding plants so as to provide the best possible visual appearance commensurate with its speed-control and accident-avoidance role.

We feel that the issue of controlling vehicle speeds within the village High Street, and for traffic entering the village from the east, requires further consultation with residents and other stakeholders, given the balance between the effects on speed reduction offered by traffic-calming measures, and the potential negative perceptions of visual intrusion, noise, and vibration.

The Parish Council would be fully committed to working with Buckinghamshire County Council in helping to carry out or facilitate such consultations or potential exhibitions of possible measures that might be adopted.

It will be important to achieve widespread local public support before any measures are introduced in the village High Street. At present, given the recent tragic accidents, it is likely that there would be a groundswell of support. Accordingly, West Wycombe Parish Council recommends that formal studies and consultation should begin as early as possible, so that progress can be made before any more such accidents occur.

We give priority to measures designed to reduce the speed of vehicles entering the village from the west, because we believe that these can be achieved at low cost and without negative effects, and will address the most pressing issues behind the spate of recent accidents.

Bibliography:

In compiling these briefing notes and recommendations I have had the benefit of the following publications:

“Traffic Calming” – DfT ‘Local Transport Note 1/07’, March 2007

“Traffic Calming in Practice” – County Surveyors’ Society and others, Nov. 1994

“A Guide to Traffic Calming Techniques” – Groundwork Southwark

“The Use of Coloured Road Surfaces” – County Surveyors’ Society, May 2000

“Traffic Calming Techniques” – Institution of Highways & Transportation with County Surveyors’ Society – January 2005

“Village Traffic Calming” – DETR Traffic Advisory Leaflet 11/00, December 2000

“Traffic Calming on Major Roads” – DETR Traffic Advisory Leaflet 14/99, Dec 1999

“Traffic Calming in Villages on Major Roads” - DETR Traffic Advisory Leaflet 1/00, March 2000

“Safer by Design” – Department of Transport, 1994

This publication has been written for West Wycombe Parish Council by parish councillor Neil Timberlake and hopes to represent the views of the parish council. However, any views expressed and any errors or omissions are the responsibility of the author alone.

August 2010