



DERBY CITY COUNCIL

**PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION
24 NOVEMBER 2008**

Report of the Corporate Director of Corporate
and Adult Services

ITEM 4

Duffield Road Bus Lane

RECOMMENDATION

- 1 To review the decision of the Council Cabinet to make permanent the bus lane on the A6 Duffield Road.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 2.1 Duffield Road bus lane was placed on the agenda of the 22 September meeting of the Commission after Councillors Willoughby, Webb and Grimadell gave notice under overview and scrutiny rule 16. Councillor Willoughby addressed that meeting and requested the Commission to scrutinise the decision of Council Cabinet to make permanent the experimental bus lane on the A6 Duffield Road. He explained that he, the other two signatories and many of their constituents had concerns about the bus lane and the process by which the decision had been made [doc 13]. The Commission agreed to review the bus lane decision. This was to be done either at the next scheduled meeting or a special meeting. In light of the volume of business for the 4 November meeting and the need to give all stakeholders time to prepare it was decided to hold this special one item meeting.
- 2.2 Written evidence was invited from a wide range of stakeholders. The letter stressed that because the evidence-gathering has to be completed this evening, prior written submissions of views/evidence was strongly encouraged so that limited meeting time can be used efficiently. Everyone with an interest could then know in advance the viewpoint of other contributors.
- 2.3 The background information and evidence is listed in Appendix 2. This is divided into three chronological parts:
 - Up to the 2 September 2008 Council Cabinet Meeting [documents 1 to 12]
 - The request that the matter be scrutinised [documents 13 and 14]
 - List of the written submissions received for this meeting [documents 15 to 28 in order of receipt]The documentation itself forms Appendix 4 to this report.
- 2.4 Appendix 3 is a summary analysis of the written submissions.

For more information contact:	Rob Davison 01332 255596 e-mail rob.davison@derby.gov.uk
Background papers:	None
List of appendices:	Appendix 1 – Implications Appendix 2 – Documentation List at Appendix 5 Appendix 3 – Summary Analysis Appendix 4 – Bus Lane documentation

Appendix 1

IMPLICATIONS

Financial

- 1.1 None directly arising from this report

Legal

- 2.1 It has been explained to stakeholders that the Commission has no decision-making powers. It does have the right to look at both the decision making process and the merit of the decision. It can then make findings and recommendations and submit those to the Council Cabinet.

Personnel

- 3.1 None directly arising from this report

Equalities Impact

- 4.1 This scrutiny exercise addresses the competing needs for limited carriageway space between private car and public transport users and the impact on cyclists and local residents.

Our priorities for 2008-11

- 5.1 The issue relates to 'Leading Derby Towards A Better Environment', and 'Creating a 21st Century City Centre'.

This scrutiny exercise promotes the values of being open, transparent and honest about everything we do.

DUFFIELD ROAD – DOCUMENTATION LIST AT APPENDIX 5 AND AS DISPLAYED ON THE COUNCIL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM

- **Up to the 2 September Council Cabinet Meeting**

1. Chronology on Duffield Road Bus Lane - provided by the Regeneration and Community Department, R&CD
2. Experimental Traffic Order Procedure - explained by the R&CD
3. Question & Answers on Experimental Traffic Order Procedure – produced by West Berkshire
4. Local Transport Plan Appendix 3 – page 10
5. ‘Transport Improvements Duffield Road and Kedleston Road’ – the original web consultation
6. Area Panel 5 – Report in October 2006. There is a general reference to bus lanes at page 2. Page 6 has a specific reference to bus punctuality on Duffield Road.
7. Individual Cabinet Member Meeting – Report in December 2006 followed the public consultation
8. Decision on Experimental Traffic Order - Minute Extract
9. Three Month Review
10. Derby Cycling Group Newsletter - July 2007 – Extract
11. Report to Council Cabinet on 2 September 2008, including the 15 Month Review
12. Decision of Council Cabinet 2 September 2008

- **Request that the matter be scrutinised**

13. Notice under Overview and Scrutiny Rule 16 dated 5 September 2008 which required the issue to be included on the agenda of the 22 September meeting of the Planning and Transportation Commission
14. Decision of the Planning and Transportation to scrutinise the issue.

- **Written submissions for the special meeting on 24 November 2008 [in order of receipt]**

15. Duffield Road Bus Lane – Strategic Context. Provided by the Regeneration and Community Department.

16. Keith's Coaches, St Benedicts school bus operator
17. Graham and Chris Bennett, residents of South Avenue
18. Helen McCoy, resident of South Avenue
19. Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Chamber of Commerce
20. Derbyshire Constabulary
21. Campaign for Better Transport
22. Unite The Union
23. Trent Barton
24. Darley Neighbourhood Board
25. Duffield Road Action Group
26. Arriva Midlands
27. St Benedicts School
28. Bernice and Brian Read, residents of Windley Crescent.

Broadly speaking the responses can be said to fall into the categories of being:

- strongly in favour of retaining the bus lane,
- favourable but with modifications/qualifications
- strongly against

Strongly in favour of retaining the bus lane

Trent Barton, Arriva, the Chamber of Commerce and the Unite the Union point to the importance of punctuality as key to attracting passengers as an alternative to the car. In a detailed submission Trent Barton say increased ridership of 8.3% has exceeded all expectations. The company is the main operator down Duffield Road. It is not in favour of modifications as “long experience of bus lanes and bus priorities elsewhere convinces us that such measures should be all or nothing. For example the notion that bus lanes might only be in force at certain times of the day confuses the motorist, who might inadvertently contravene”. All three respondents see this decision as pivotal to the future of public transport in Derby. Trent Barton believes “the stakes could hardly be higher. Failure of this bus lane must signal that there will be no likelihood of any of the City’s other Local Transport Plan pledges being politically deliverable either”.

Favourable but with modifications/qualifications

Suggestions include:

- Abolishing the bus lane between Mileash Lane and the Broadway
- Lower speed at the southern end of the bus lane
- Keep the bus lane for peak time operation, allowing other users at other times
- Install an outbound cycle path on the grassed margin
- Widen some side road junctions to ease turns
- Ferrers Way (1): Consider abolishing the north bound right hand turn off Duffield Road
- Ferrers Way (2):re-align the northern kerb line to facilitate traffic turning left out of Ferrers Way
- Change Church Lane junction markings

Strongly against retaining the bus lane

DRAG believe the initial experiment followed flawed consultation and that “once the bus lane was introduced nothing was ever going to stop it and it was always intended to be a permanent fixture”. In a detailed submission, including diagrams, hyperlinks and photographs, they point to the width of the road (9 metres) as meaning a 3 lane “lay out that significantly increases the risk of accidents and reduces the use of the road for pedestrians and cyclists”. Concern is expressed about residents exiting their properties, and especially for those on the west side between the Broadway Public House and St Benedicts School. Cars overtake Northbound cyclists “in such a way that they compromise the safety themselves, oncoming traffic and the cyclist. In turn affected cars jettison in to the bus lane, which is used as a buffer lane... to avoid head on collision”. The “only responsible thing to do” is to end the bus lane and revert to the original layout”.

Observation

It is noteworthy how varied local opinions are. The Darley Neighbourhood Board was not able to reach a consensus and the individual members' comments were submitted. Further, two individuals who chose to comment had markedly different views even though they reside in the same street.