

APPENDIX B

From: Cllr G Lamb
Sent: 01 February 2023 10:55
To: Naomi Perry; Emily Summers
Subject: Tutbury Road application

Naomi , Emily

I am hoping following yesterday's deferment, that when the application comes back the concerns I have raised will have been addressed.

Some of them have changed with the information provided yesterday. Which at last had some transparency from the county council.

Below is my amended list of concerns, happy to discuss this with planning, the county council and the developer.

My aim is not to stop the housing getting built but to mitigate the traffic issues and ensure the crossings are safe for pedestrians.

graham

Modeling Questions

Have the junctions been modeled with the traffic flows that I have reported?

If not for what reason?

If not then, specifically the volume of traffic turning right from Rolleston Road into Bitham Lane is over 6 times more than modelled, what is the risk of that on the proposed solution?

I ask this because in the Road Safety audit it says

The proposed scheme provides a non-blocking right turn storage space, which would provide an improvement above the existing situation where there is no facility. Swept path analysis shows ahead traffic is able to pass a car waiting to turn right which would represent a typical situation.

That space only allows one car – if 20 cars in an hour are making that turn it may work but 130-140??? Which is why we need a realistic model.

Traffic Lights

I will accept, after yesterday's meeting clarified, that a double roundabout can be less safe than a signaled junction.

I would accept that if the Traffic lights all allowed pedestrians to cross it should be safer than having lollypop attendants and for the times they are not there.

However the combination of one pedestrian crossing and two lollypop attendants seems unsafe with the volume of traffic and pedestrians of using the junction.

I understand from the developer the county council don't want a fully pedestrian signaled solution due to the impact on traffic. It seems to me that doesn't resonate with a focus on safety!

I would ask for a safety audit of this proposed junction as I fear for the lives of children and lollypop attendants. Drivers are stopped at lights, the lights go green the drives pull away and suddenly people are in the road. While a safety audit has taken place that doesn't mention that lollypop attendants will be operating on the other legs and it form my comment above is not aware of the traffic volumes.

From my observation 95% of people who used the north lollypop attendant, then crossed Harehedge Lane with the other lollypop attendant.

My rough analysis showed each of the lollypop attendants seems to stop the traffic about the same numbers of time. However about 20% of the crossing used the North Lollypop attendant, 30% the Harehedge Lane attendant and 50% the South attendant. So where the pedestrian crossing is located is the least used?

I will do further monitoring of this in future weeks

Traffic Trial

The county councils have proposed a trial of restricting access to Harehedge Lane between 8.30 to 9.30 to those who live in the street and teachers going to the school.

What is the impact of this on traffic flows.

Wouldn't this make the community parking inaccessible.

Location of the community centre parking.

I do see there are arguments for and against the location. My concerns would be the safety of pedestrians crossing that access road.

Would it be better to move the zebra crossing, outside the school entrance, to the other side of the access road?

APPENDIX B

Alan Harvey

From: Cllr G Lamb
Sent: 06 February 2023 10:53
To: Emily Summers
Cc: Naomi Perry; Cllr V Gould
Subject: Re: Tutbury Road application

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi

Some more figures from this morning, 0800 to 0900 and yes it was a bit cold

Traffic from Rolleston Road from Horninglow towards the staggered junction

	mode	actual 6/2/23
Left turn into harehedge lane	30	81
straight down Rolleston Road	50	66
right turn into bitham lane	20	147

To have at the junction, one space for a car to wait and turn right is clearly not going to work when 50% of the traffic turns right at the junction.

From Rolleston left turn into Bitham Lane	2	64
---	---	----

In terms of the lolly pop attendant's

Junction Arm	times stopped traffic	people who crossed road
North Of Junction on Rolleston Road	46	119
On Harehedge Lane	40	135
South Of Junction on Rolleston Road	52	179

So the North Junction is the least used but is where it's proposed to have the crossing point

Very happy to meet with Staffs County Council at the junction during this peak morning hour, so they can see for themselves

Graham

From: Emily Summers <Emily.Summers@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>
Sent: Friday, February 3, 2023 5:03 PM
To: Cllr G Lamb <Graham.Lamb@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>

Cc: Naomi Perry <Naomi.Perry@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr V Gould <Vicki.Gould@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Tutbury Road application

Dear Councillor Lamb,

Thank you for your further comments post committee. In line with the deferral of the application we are engaging further with SCC Highways on the matters raised. As with your other submissions I have shared these comments with SCC Highways as well.

I have cc'ed Councillor Gould into this email as Chair of Planning Committee.

Kind regards,

Emily

From: Cllr G Lamb <Graham.Lamb@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>

Sent: 01 February 2023 10:55

To: Naomi Perry <Naomi.Perry@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Emily Summers <Emily.Summers@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>

Subject: Tutbury Road application

Naomi , Emily

I am hoping following yesterday's deferment, that when the application comes back the concerns I have raised will have been addressed.

Some of them have changed with the information provided yesterday. Which at last had some transparency from the county council.

Below is my amended list of concerns, happy to discuss this with planning, the county council and the developer.

My aim is not to stop the housing getting built but to mitigate the traffic issues and ensure the crossings are safe for pedestrians.

graham

Modeling Questions

Have the junctions been modeled with the traffic flows that I have reported?

If not for what reason?

If not then, specifically the volume of traffic turning right from Rolleston Road into Bitham Lane is over 6 times more than modelled, what is the risk of that on the proposed solution?

I ask this because in the Road Safety audit it says

The proposed scheme provides a non-blocking right turn storage space, which would provide an improvement above the existing situation where there is no facility. Swept path analysis shows ahead traffic is able to pass a car waiting to turn right which would represent a typical situation.

That space only allows one car – if 20 cars in an hour are making that turn it may work but 130-140??? Which is why we need a realistic model.

Traffic Lights

I will accept, after yesterday's meeting clarified, that a double roundabout can be less safe than a signaled junction.

I would accept that if the Traffic lights all allowed pedestrians to cross it should be safer than having lollypop attendants and for the times they are not there.

However the combination of one pedestrian crossing and two lollypop attendants seems unsafe with the volume of traffic and pedestrians of using the junction.

I understand from the developer the county council don't want a fully pedestrian signaled solution due to the impact on traffic. It seems to me that doesn't resonate with a focus on safety!

I would ask for a safety audit of this proposed junction as I fear for the lives of children and lollypop attendants. Drivers are stopped at lights, the lights go green the drives pull away and suddenly people are in the road. While a safety audit has taken place that doesn't mention that lollypop attendants will be operating on the other legs and it form my comment above is not aware of the traffic volumes.

From my observation 95% of people who used the north lollypop attendant, then crossed Harehedge Lane with the other lollypop attendant.

My rough analysis showed each of the lollypop attendants seems to stop the traffic about the same numbers of time. However about 20% of the crossing used the North Lollypop attendant, 30% the Harehedge Lane attendant and 50% the South attendant. So where the pedestrian crossing is located is the least used?

I will do further monitoring of this in future weeks

Traffic Trial

The county councils have proposed a trial of restricting access to Harehedge Lane between 8.30 to 9.30 to those who live in the street and teachers going to the school.

What is the impact of this on traffic flows.

Wouldn't this make the community parking inaccessible.

Location of the community centre parking.

I do see there are arguments for and against the location. My concerns would be the safety of pedestrians crossing that access road.

Would it be better to move the zebra crossing, outside the school entrance, to the other side of the access road?

Alan Harvey

From: Cllr G Lamb
Sent: 20 February 2023 12:05
To: Emily Summers; Naomi Perry
Subject: Traffic Flows at Harehedge Lane, Bitham Lane, Rolleston Road junction

Hi

I have done another survey today, knowing its half term, I expected very low traffic volumes.

I thought it would be a good to consider that against the model and I have also shown the figures from my last school survey of 6th feb

Traffic from Rolleston Road from Horninglow towards the staggered junction

	model	actual 6/2/23	actual 20/2/23
Left turn into harehedge lane	30	81	9
straight down Rolleston Road	50	66	27
right turn into bitham lane	20	147	62
From Rolleston left turn into Bitham Lane	2	64	22

While the traffic flows were much lower than on the 6/2 you can see the right turns into Bitham Lane were still well in excess of the model figure of 20 at 62 ! The left turns to are understated into Bitham Lane

So on a non school day the model still completely understates the amount of right turns.

graham

Alan Harvey

From: Cllr G Lamb
Sent: 17 March 2023 17:44
To: Naomi Perry
Cc: Emily Summers
Subject: Re: Tutbury Road

Naomi

Ok, I had had a few other emails earlier in the week, which are below

not sure why there has been any confusion, as these were all related to the points I made in my previous comments on the application and during my talk at the planning meeting.

Certainly, I am happy to do a site visit with Emily and you as well if that helps, around 8.20 for about 30 minutes any school day shows the problem well.

On a positive note, I do think some progress is being made in understanding the concerns at SCC.

graham

Dear Cllr Lamb,

Modelling for lollypop attendants is a bit tricky as their role is essentially to act as a signalised/zebra crossing on demand and the frequency they enter the highway is subject to how clustered pedestrians are.

We did look at all signal crossings but the performance impact on the junction was substantial as you've set out and issues were arising over the timings which impaired the junction's efficiency. The advantage of utilising lollypop attendants is that they can be deployed for a set period of time and that they provide pedestrian priority over vehicles, something that signalised crossings aren't able to achieve.

Something to note is that because of the traffic lights, there will be a control on the flow of traffic that will ensure pedestrians can cross knowing that no vehicles can move in a certain direction, whereas the current scenario is down to driver judgement (so less predictable).

I hope this helps, have you managed to have any dialogue with SCC on this matter?

Kind Regards,

Ragu Sittambalam
Senior Planning & Enabling Manager



07929 822 939

One Friargate
Coventry
CV1 2GN

#MakingHomesHappen

We're the government's housing accelerator. We have the appetite, influence, expertise and resources to drive positive market change. [Find out more and help make this happen.](#)

Please forward any Freedom of Information Requests to: infogov@homesengland.gov.uk



OFFICIAL



Homes England is the trading name of the Homes and Communities Agency. Our address for service of legal documents is One Friargate, Coventry, CV1 2GN. VAT no: 941 6200 50. Unless expressly agreed in writing, Homes England accepts no liability to any persons in respect of the contents of this email or attachments.

Please forward any requests for information to: infogov@homesengland.gov.uk

CONFIDENTIALITY AND PRIVACY

This message is intended solely for the addressee and may contain confidential information. If you have received this message in error, please reply to this e-mail highlighting the error to the sender, then immediately and permanently delete it. Do not use, copy or disclose the information contained in this message or in any attachment.

For information about how we process data and monitor communications please see our [Personal Information Charter](#).

Reply

Forward

CLlr G Lamb



To:

- Ragu Sittambalam <Ragu.Sittambalam@homesengland.gov.uk>
Wed 3/15/2023 6:12 PM

Ragu

As you know my major concern is safety, so I prefer a solution with more controlled crossing and not reducing it by removing the only proposed crossing point.

It does not surprise me that the revised junction will be worse than the current model as the current model doesn't use the realistic right turn figures.

Where I struggle is how do they model the traffic flow disruption caused by the lolly pop attendants.

I can see like you said if they had 3 controlled crossings it has a bad impact on traffic.

However during the peak hour the lolly pop attendants are also having a bad impact on traffic.

So would 3 controlled crossings be that worse than having lollypop attendants, while it should be safer.

graham

From: Ragu Sittambalam <Ragu.Sittambalam@homesengland.gov.uk>

Sent: Monday, March 13, 2023 5:52 PM

To: Cllr G Lamb <Graham.Lamb@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: Tutbury Road - Highways Response

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe. If the sender appears as someone within ESBC - BEWARE!

Dear Cllr Lamb,

Further to your email last week our transport consultant has reviewed the information and has set out the following based on your traffic count plus the development. He has raised that we're not comparing like for like data so need to be cautious about the conclusions we draw;

- The results demonstrate that in most scenarios the proposed scheme provides a significant benefit;
- Increasing the right turn from 20 to 140 vehicles per hour would worsen junction performance. This could be mitigated by operating the pedestrian crossing to the north as an uncontrolled crossing;
- However, we are conscious that scheme should not just be designed with cars in mind, but that all users are considered, particularly those more vulnerable.

Off the back of this I'd be wary about reviewing a solution without the signalised crossing as there is an existing safety issue there. Please note that the above commentary should not be considered in isolation as it does not factor in safety, only traffic flow.

Would you like to discuss this further? We can look into a non-signalised solution but would only do it at your request.

Kind Regards,

Ragu Sittambalam

From: Naomi Perry <Naomi.Perry@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2023 4:53 PM
To: Cllr G Lamb <Graham.Lamb@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>
Cc: Emily Summers <Emily.Summers@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>
Subject: Tutbury Road

Dear Cllr Lamb,

Cllr Lamb, many thanks for making me aware that a site visit had been arranged with the agent Ragu Sittambalam for the Tutbury Road site. I understand the site visit has now taken place and I have been in receipt of the e-mail exchange between yourself and the agent (which you recently shared with Emily as the case officer). Outside of this LPA and SCC officers have been working on matters in order to bring the item back to committee as expediently as possible, with additional information from the applicant being sought as well as a revised consultation response from Staffordshire County Council – addressing the detailed matters which you raised and queried. As a result there have been a number of meetings between the parties. Some of the matters discussed between yourself and the agent have caused some confusion however and in order to help bring the matter to a conclusion I would advise that moving forward it would be beneficial if all communication could ideally go via Emily as the case officer (certainly at least as cc). This is to ensure officers are fully aware of any salient matters and that all relevant information is in the public domain and that there is no confusion on any of the highway aspects of the proposal. If you do receive any further communication from the agent please could you continue to share this with Emily.

Kind regards

Naomi

Naomi Perry
Planning Manager
East Staffordshire Borough Council
The Town Hall
King Edward Place
Burton upon Trent
DE14 2EB

Tel: 01283 508611
www.eaststaffsbc.gov.uk