

Individual Decision

The attached reports will be taken as
Individual Portfolio Member Decisions on:

Friday 20 November 2015

Ref:	Title	Portfolio Member	Page No.
ID3054	Speed Limit Review September 2015	Councillor Garth Simpson	3 - 18
ID3047	B4000, A4 to Stockcross 50 mph Speed Limit Order	Councillor Garth Simpson	19 - 30



This page is intentionally left blank

Individual Executive Member Decision

Title of Report:	Speed Limit Review - September 2015
Report to be considered by:	Individual Executive Member Decision
Date on which Decision is to be taken:	20 November 2015
Forward Plan Ref:	ID3054

Purpose of Report: To inform the Executive Member for Highways, Transport and Emergency Planning of the recommendations of the Speed Limit Task Group following the speed limit review undertaken on 28th September 2015 and to seek approval of the recommendations

Recommended Action: That the Executive Member for Highways, Transport and Emergency Planning resolves to approve the recommendations as set out in section 3 of this report.

Reason for decision to be taken: Speed Limit Review

Other options considered: N/A

Key background documentation:

- Criteria for setting local speed limits
- Reports for Task Group
- Minutes of Task Group
- Appendix A –Ward Members comments

Portfolio Member Details	
Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor Garth Simpson - Tel (01635) 40438
E-mail Address:	gsimpson@westberks.gov.uk

Contact Officer Details	
Name:	Glyn Davis
Job Title:	Principal Traffic & Road Safety Engineer
Tel. No.:	01635 519501
E-mail Address:	gdavis@westberks.gov.uk

Implications

Policy:	The consultation is in accordance with the Council's Consultation procedures.
Financial:	The recommendations will be funded from the Council's approved capital budget.
Personnel:	None arising from this report.
Legal/Procurement:	The speed limit traffic regulation orders will follow the statutory consultation / advertisement procedure.
Property:	None arising from this report.
Risk Management:	None arising from this report.

Is this item relevant to equality?	Please tick relevant boxes	Yes	No
Does the policy affect service users, employees or the wider community and:			
• Is it likely to affect people with particular protected characteristics differently?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• Is it a major policy, significantly affecting how functions are delivered?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• Will the policy have a significant impact on how other organisations operate in terms of equality?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• Does the policy relate to functions that engagement has identified as being important to people with particular protected characteristics?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• Does the policy relate to an area with known inequalities?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Outcome (Where one or more 'Yes' boxes are ticked, the item is relevant to equality)			
Relevant to equality - Complete an EIA available at http://intranet/EqIA			<input type="checkbox"/>
Not relevant to equality			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Consultation Responses

Members:

Leader of Council:	Councillor Gordon Lundie - To date no response has been received from Councillor Gordon Lundie, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
Overview & Scrutiny Management Commission Chairman:	Councillor Emma Webster - To date no response has been received from Councillor Emma Webster, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
Ward Members:	See Appendix A for Ward Members comments.
Opposition Spokesperson:	Councillor Billy Drummond - To date no response has been received from Councillor Billy Drummond, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
Local Stakeholders:	Will be consulted as part of the statutory consultation process

Officers Consulted: Mark Edwards and Mark Cole

Trade Union: N/A

Is this item subject to call-in?	Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No: <input type="checkbox"/>
If not subject to call-in please put a cross in the appropriate box:		
The item is due to be referred to Council for final approval		<input type="checkbox"/>
Delays in implementation could have serious financial implications for the Council		<input type="checkbox"/>
Delays in implementation could compromise the Council's position		<input type="checkbox"/>
Considered or reviewed by Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission or associated Task Groups within preceding six months		<input type="checkbox"/>
Item is Urgent Key Decision		<input type="checkbox"/>
Report is to note only		<input type="checkbox"/>

Supporting Information

1. Background

- 1.1 Twice each year the Speed Limit Task Group carefully considers the introduction or amendment of speed limits that have been requested by Members, Parish or Town Councils, members of the public or officers. These requests are assessed with regard to the Department for Transport Circular 1/2013 (setting local speed limits), the character and nature of the road, the recorded injury accident record and any available traffic survey data.
- 1.2 The Speed Limit Task Group, which met on 28th September 2015, is comprised of the following members:
- Councillor Graham Pask;
 - Councillor Billy Drummond (Absent);
 - Glyn Davis, Principal Traffic & Road Safety Engineer;
 - Alan Dunkerton, Speed Management Co-ordinator;
 - Chris Hulme, Thames Valley Police Traffic Management Officer.
- 1.3 The Task Group considered a total of 14 requests for an amendment or introduction of a speed limit at the following locations:
1. B4000 Baydon Road, Shefford Woodlands – request for a 50mph speed limit;
 2. Rectory Road, Padworth – request for either a 30mph speed limit and if this was not agreed a request for a 40mph speed limit;
 3. Padworth Lane, Padworth – request for either a 30mph speed limit and if this was not agreed a request for a 40mph speed limit;
 4. Silver Lane, Padworth – request for either a 30mph speed limit and if this was not agreed a request for a 40mph speed limit;
 5. School Road, Padworth – request for either a 30mph speed limit and if this was not agreed a request for a 40mph speed limit;
 6. Sopers Lane, Padworth – request for either a 30mph speed limit and if this was not agreed a request for a 40mph speed limit;
 7. Goring Lane, Wokefield, between Burghfield Common and the boundary to Wokingham Borough Council – request for a review of the current 50mph section, a review of the current unrestricted section and a request to extend the current 30mph out of Burghfield Common;
 8. Goodboys Lane, Wokefield – request for a lower speed limit;
 9. One Way system, East Ilsley – request for a 20mph speed limit;
 10. Church Hill, East Ilsley – request for a 20mph speed limit;
 11. Carbinswood Lane, Woolhampton – request for a lower speed limit;
 12. A329 Purley Rise, Purley – request for an extension to the existing 30mph speed limit;
 13. A339 Vodafone roundabout, Shaw-cum-Donnington – request for an extension to the 50mph speed limit;
 14. A343 Sandpit Hill, Newbury – request to extend the 40mph speed limit.

2. Speed Limit Process

- 2.1 If the recommendations contained in this report are approved then the individual sites will be taken forward to the statutory consultation stage, which means that the formal and public consultation of a speed limit can be undertaken. This will include consulting a wide range of statutory consultees together with the appropriate parish/town council, local members and local residents by the way of a notice published in the local newspaper, notices erected on site and publication on the Council's web site.
- 2.2 A report of any comments and objections received during the formal consultation together with an officer's recommendation will be presented to the Executive Member for Highways, Transport and Emergency Planning for Individual Decision. Should the proposal to introduce or change a speed limit be considered appropriate then that proposal will be implemented.

3. Recommendations

- 3.1 The Task Group considered all the above requests and recommended that the following are progressed to the statutory advertisement and consultation stage:
9. One Way system, East Ilsley – request for a 20mph speed limit;
 10. Church Hill, East Ilsley – request for a 20mph speed limit;
 12. A329 Purley Rise, Purley – request for an extension to the existing 30mph speed limit;
 13. A339 Vodafone roundabout, Shaw-cum-Donnington – request for an extension to the 50mph speed limit;
 14. A343 Sandpit Hill, Newbury – request to extend the 40mph speed limit.
- 3.2 The Task Group recommended that no further action is taken on the following requests with regard to the speed limit, but further measures should be considered where shown below:
1. B4000 Baydon Road, Shefford Woodlands – request for a 50mph speed limit; *Road markings are renewed next year.*
 2. Rectory Road, Padworth – request for either a 30mph speed limit and if this was not agreed a request for a 40mph speed limit; *improved signing considered.*
 3. Padworth Lane, Padworth – request for either a 30mph speed limit and if this was not agreed a request for a 40mph speed limit; *improved signing considered.*
 4. Silver Lane, Padworth – request for either a 30mph speed limit and if this was not agreed a request for a 40mph speed limit;
 5. School Road, Padworth – request for either a 30mph speed limit and if this was not agreed a request for a 40mph speed limit;
 6. Sopers Lane, Padworth – request for either a 30mph speed limit and if this was not agreed a request for a 40mph speed limit
 7. Goring Lane, Wokefield, between Burghfield Common and the boundary to Wokingham Borough Council – request for a review of the current 50mph section, a review of the current unrestricted section and a request to extend the current 30mph out of Burghfield Common; *Accident investigation carried out at the junctions with Lockram Lane and Hollybush Lane.*
 8. Goodboys Lane, Wokefield – request for a lower speed limit;

11. Carbinswood Lane, Woolhampton – request for a lower speed limit;

- 3.3 All the persons requesting the speed limit amendments will be informed of the Executive Member's decision.
- 3.4 Subject to there being no objections received to the statutory consultation for individual Traffic Regulation Orders for each speed limit, the advertised restrictions will be introduced.

4. Equalities Impact Assessment Outcomes

- 4.1 The recommendations in this report do not impact on equality issues so no Equality Impact Assessment has been undertaken.

5. Conclusion

- 5.1 Following the task group meeting five of the fourteen requests were recommended for approval, nine were not recommended for a speed limit change. Further investigation/work was recommended at four locations. The recommendations set out in section 3 above are therefore put forward for approval.

Appendices

Appendix A – Ward Members comments

Appendix B – Minutes from Speed Limit Review Task Group 28 September 2015

SPEED LIMIT REVIEW – 28th September 2015

Speed Limit Request	Ward Member	Comments
A329 Purley Rise, Purley	Rick Jones	I fully support this. I and the residents will very much appreciate this - small step which I hope will make a difference
	Tim Metcalfe	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
Goring Lane, Wokefield	Graham Bridgman	The review minutes refer to “ <i>Accident investigation carried out at the junctions with Lockram Lane and Hollybush Lane</i> ”. To flesh this out, our recollection is that there needed to be a review of data relating to the numerous accidents at those junctions (nb that at a recent Wokefield Parish Council meeting the comment was made that not all collisions at those sites get reported, as evidenced by the quantity of parts of vehicles strewn along the verges) in order to assess the causes of those accidents and the extent to which speed played a part. There was also a need to review sight lines.
	Mollie Lock	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
Goodboys Lane, Wokefield	Graham Bridgman	No comment regarding Goodboys Lane.
	Mollie Lock	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
Rectory Road, Padworth Lane, Silver Lane, School Road & Sopers Lane, Padworth	Graham Bridgman	There was also discussion regarding road safety in the vicinity of the two Jubilee Nursery sites, for example a 20 mph zone with appropriate warning signage. Padworth Parish Council is currently discussing the issue with Nursery management.
	Mollie Lock	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

SPEED LIMIT REVIEW – 28th September 2015

Carbinswood Lane, Woolhampton	Dominic Boeck	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
One way system & Church Hill, East Ilsley	Clive Hooker	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
B4000 Baydon Road, Shefford Woodlands	Gordon Lundie	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
	Graham Jones	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
A339, Speen	Paul Bryant	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
	Marcus Franks	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
A343, Newbury	Howard Bairstow	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
	Adrian Edwards	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Minutes of Speed Limit Review 2015

Held on 28th September 2015

Present Councillor Graham Pask (GP)
 Chris Hulme TVP (CH)
 Glyn Davis WBC (GD)
 Alan Dunkerton WBC (AD)
 Matthew McMahon WBC (MM) (Minutes)

Apologies Councillor Billy Drummond
 Councillor Tim Metcalfe

Introduction	
All the task group members introduced themselves to those attending the review. (GP) Gave an overview of process for the speed limit review.	
Speed Limit Requests	
1. A343 Newbury - request to extend the 40mph speed limit.	
Attendees	Cllr Howard Bairstow (HB)
Discussion	<p>GD introduced the report – Request from WBC after a traffic management assessment report identified an issue with accidents occurring at the Wash Water junction (x3) accidents. Speed limit increases from 40mph to 50mph to the north of the Wash Water junction, this encourages southbound drivers to speed up just before the hazard (junction) and this is the location where the accidents have occurred. Additionally the footpath on the A343 switches sides at the junction and there is also a public house on Wash Water near the junction with no footways along Wash Water. The traffic assessment report recommends improved signing and a reduction to a 40mph speed limit.). Average speed is 37mph</p> <p>HB People are coming straight off the A34 at high speed and have a high speed mentality travelling from the south along the A343 into a local road still doing up to 50mph. 100 meters past the little bridge there is a blind junction on the left which is dangerous. Would like to see the limit reduced to make this safer and the hedge cut back 10 feet giving people better clarity going along the road. People doing up to 50mph having less time to react.</p> <p>CH Concern that a speed limit reduction should not be considered for isolated hazards such as this and other measures should be considered first. The mean speed is 37 and therefore a 85th percentile speed of low 40's. So lowering the speed limit without other measures will not make a sufficient difference. The sign improvements may work without a speed limit reduction.</p> <p>GP West Berkshire Council are currently looking into the possibility of a footpath along Wash Water. Using this junction a lot I understand the danger that this junction presents. I see the logic in this change and understand the police will not see it as a priority for enforcement. A driver travelling at the current 50mph limit will find that the junction can</p>

Minutes of Speed Limit Review 2015 Held on 28th September 2015

	be upon you very quickly whilst travelling at 40mph will have more time to react to any vehicles at the junction.
Recommendation	That the speed limit is reduced to 40mph and to investigate enhancing signs at the junction.
2. B4000 Ermin Street, Shefford Woodlands - request for a 50mph speed limit.	
Attendees	Parish Cllr Janice Winfield (JW)
Discussion	<p>GD introduced the report – The B4000 is a ‘B’ class road with a weight restriction. Request received by three residents whose properties front the B4000. Concerns about the speed travelling past their properties and problem with visibility to the east when exiting their driveways where visibility is restricted by a slight hill and bend. Only 1 injury accident recorded causation attributed to animal on road. 85th percentile speed is around 60mph. Traffic team believe that the existing limit is appropriate for this road.</p> <p>JW Thanked the committee for the chance to speak about this again. There are a number of farm entrances on both sides. One of the main hazards is a junction on the north side of the B4000 into Templers farm. Long yard entrance has a number of commercial properties and the number of commercial vehicles is a particular concern. In wet conditions you are unable to see the SLOW markings as they have faded. There is a problem with overhanging vegetation, highways only cutting back certain areas and local farmers helping where they can. There are a lot of farm vehicles using the road and frustrated drivers overtaking on blind bends. There are lots of reports of near misses on this road. Traffic is increasing and concerned that as the speed data was collected in February during the holidays it would not reflect normal traffic numbers. Other implications such as cyclists using this route. Understands that this may fall under isolated hazards and what other measures could be looked at if the lower speed limit can't be taken forward?</p> <p>CH The road has a number of isolated hazards. Based on the speed data he is not be in favour of reducing the speed limit, as it would not serve any real purpose.</p> <p>GP Suggested it was clear there are number problems along this road. Also from commuters using it as a ‘rat run’. Understands that there are a number of residents that have concerns for this area. But from the comments made from traffic (GD) and the police (CH) would say it is not a speed limit issue and the road markings should be refurbished.</p>
Recommendation	Existing speed limit is appropriate. To refurbish the road markings when new budgets become available. Check signing locations and enhance warning signs. Pass on concern about overgrown vegetation to County Side department for consideration.
3. Padworth - Rectory Road, Padworth Lane, Silver Lane, School Road, Sopers Lane - request for a lower speed limit	

Minutes of Speed Limit Review 2015 Held on 28th September 2015

Attendees	Cllr Graham Bridgman (GB), Parish Cllr Mike Warner (MW)
Discussion	<p>MW Expressed the Parishioners concerns about the various roads around Padworth. With the main concern being Rectory Road and Padworth Lane as they form a link between the A4 and Reading Road. Rectory Road is very narrow being single track in places with a national speed limit, the road also has a width restriction of 6ft 6". Problem times are morning and evenings where commuters using the route as a 'rat run' along with parents going to the two schools. Doesn't make sense that they go from a 50mph on Reading Road into a national limit on a narrow road with blind corners. There have been two minor shunt accidents in the last couple of months that the Council are probably not aware off. Understands that it is likely to be un-enforceable and initially wanted a 30mph but having spoken with GD, decided to apply for 40mph speed limit. Concerned about location of where speed data was collected and traffic slowing down for a tight corner. Lower lodge farm has a number of works vehicles that use the road. It would be wrong to reject a speed limit here for the reason that other rural areas might decide to apply as well.</p> <p>GB There is an issue on these roads and concern has been expressed from residents in the area. We need to consider what can be done to address these issues. Implementing a lower speed limit is likely to change the driver's mindset. Currently message being sent to the drivers that they can now do up to 60mph on this road and this should be considered when deciding on whether to change the speed limit. Signs and issues at the school should also be investigated..</p> <p>CH Based on the speed data and that drivers should drive to the environment/conditions. Doubts that putting a lower speed limit on these routes are unlikely to have any effect on speeds as data shows drivers speeds are already low and proposed speed limit is higher than the current 85th percentile speeds (around 38mph). These roads are very rural and contain hazards that cause the majority of people to drive slower. Lots of the rural roads around West Berkshire have similar problems to those around Padworth. If there is a problem at the locations of the schools, we need to address the problems instead of changing the speed limit for the entire stretch.</p> <p>GP We have a large network of rural roads across the county and if we introduce a speed limit in here, similar cases could be made for all these areas. This would contravene both the DfT guidelines for setting speed limits and the West Berkshire policy of keeping lower speed limits tight to village or urban boundaries. Having recently driven the roads around Padworth I note that most of these are single track roads and generally only able to drive at 30mph. Although driving from a 50mph into national speed limit, in reality you're not going to drive at the national limit as speed will be controlled by the road layout. If the speed limit was to be lowered it I fear it would have no effect on speeds with those that drive at inappropriate speeds still doing so.</p>
Recommendation	Although a difficult decision it is felt the current national speed limit is appropriate and that speeds are currently controlled by road layout.

Minutes of Speed Limit Review 2015 Held on 28th September 2015

	Improvement to signs should be investigated along with electronic signs at the schools.
4. Goring Lane - request for lower speed limit and the 30mph out of Burghfield to be extended. 2:05	
Attendees	Cllr Graham Bridgman, Parish Cllr Jim Thompson
Discussion	<p>GD introduced the report – Request by ex Cllr Geoff Mayes to review the whole length of Goring Lane from Burghfield to the district border. A further request had been received from the Burghfield Neighbourhood Action Group (NAG), to extend the 30mph speed limit leaving Burghfield to prevent drivers speeding up when they see the unrestricted signs from within the 30mph speed limit. There are several clusters of accidents at the junctions of Hollybush Lane and Lockram Lane. It was also noted during the site survey that the visibility exiting Hollybush Lane was restricted by vegetation; this has now been cut back. There were reports that people were speeding over the two mini roundabouts as they entered Goring Lane. We have investigated this issue and intend to dome the mini roundabouts to reduce speeds. Accidents are not speed related and are either failure to negotiate bend or failure to give way.</p> <p>AD National terminals signs can be seen from the roundabouts. If moved back that they won't be able to see these until further down the road and drive at more appropriate speeds.</p> <p>JT Informed us that GH felt that it was particularly dangerous to walk along the Lane in between Burghfield and Goddards Green. The road has a staggered junction. Bridal way with ditches with water flowing across the road which can freeze in winter. People are accelerating as they see the national terminal signs from Burghfield. Have not had any further issues around Hollybush Lane since GH previous request to review. A number of long straights leading into tight bends. People misjudging the speed of traffic coming up Goring Lane.</p> <p>GB Accidents start from the bend before the staggered junction of Hollybush Lane. There is evidence of a number of accidents along this road and asked the committee, would a change of speed limit help this or is it another issue?</p> <p>CH It is a very rural road and did not support the idea of moving the signs further out as this would not be effective. The national speed limit should start from the mini roundabout and was extended by the panel to cover the exit of the residential properties. However, drivers are never going comply with the 30mph at this location due to the nature of the route and lack of development. Currently a strain on police resources where there are other higher priority locations in the area. Thought the current speed limits on Goring lane were appropriate.</p> <p>GP It is a commuting 'rat run'. The 30mph is already a long way out. People should be doing 30mph until the hit the national limit, but</p>

Minutes of Speed Limit Review 2015 Held on 28th September 2015

	clearly they are accelerating before. Against moving the 30mph further away from existing location. The domed roundabouts should help the speeding issue from the mini roundabouts. Concerned about the number of accidents within the location. Is there something we have missed through this section and what action can be taken? Issue of Hollybush Lane area that needs to be looked at.
Recommendation	Current speed limits on Goring Lane are appropriate. Accidents at the two junctions should be investigated.
5. Goodboy's Lane, Wokefield - request for a lower speed limit.	
Attendees	Cllr Graham Bridgman, Parish Cllr Jim Thompson
Discussion	<p>JT Request received from a resident. Goodboy's Lane is used by many drivers travelling to and from Wokefield Park who are being directed by their sat navs. Drivers travel at speed along this route. Mixed message of drivers coming into narrow lane being told they can do national speed limit along a narrow route with sharp bends that cyclists and pedestrians regularly use. There are two recycling businesses plus other businesses along the route who manage their deliveries to use the more suitable entrance to sites. There is also a dairy farm that move cattle down the lane which includes a blind 'S' bend between fields.</p> <p>CH No different to other rural narrow roads mentioned previously. Understands there are a number of local issues made but doesn't consider changing the speed limit would solve this. Does not support a change of speed limit.</p> <p>GD The speed limit is controlled by the nature of the road and survey speeds were very low.</p> <p>GP Similar to Padworth Lane and other rural routes. Although signs are posted at national limit it doesn't mean that people will drive at that speed. Typical single track road that is not appropriate for a lower speed limit. Doesn't have support from local police or traffic officers and need to be consistent of these types of roads.</p>
Recommendation	Current speed limit is appropriate no change recommended.
6. One way system/Church Hill, East Ilsley - request for a 20 mph speed limit.	
Attendees	Parish Cllr Roger Hick (RH) Councillor Clive Hooker CH
Discussion	GD A 20mph limit or zone should be self enforcing and speed data collected shows speeds already low enough to implement a lower speed limit. If a 20mph were introduced roundels markings would be considered to reinforce the 20mph limit and no need for further traffic calming measures. There are two public houses a church and a school within the area with a fair amount of pedestrian and cycle traffic between the facilities..

Minutes of Speed Limit Review 2015 Held on 28th September 2015

	<p>RH Speed around village is already slow. It is a very pedestrian village and seems sensible to control the speed. Traffic volumes can be high and rushing through the village heading to the A34. Bus stop on blind corner with lots of children gathering in the mornings.</p> <p>CH 20mph zones should be self enforcing and not require police enforcement. The amount of extra signs to the village will need to be considered. Will not feature for police enforcement.</p> <p>GP It is a village with limited footpaths and a high number of pedestrians in the road. Good reasons suggested for applying a 20mph through village.</p>
Recommendation	20mph speed limit is introduced to cover the one way system and Church Hill.
7. A329 Purley Rise - request for an extension to the 30mph speed limit.	
Attendees	Cllr Rick Jones (RJ)
Discussion	<p>GD introduced the report – Complaints from residents living near the 30mph terminal sign that people are entering the village at high speeds. Concern over safety exiting Beech Road which is close to the current 30mph terminal signs. Existing VAS Further in village.</p> <p>RJ 30mph terminal signs not visible until you come round the bend, moving them will increase visibility. 30mph is currently within the residential area. The 50mph signs are visible from a distance within the village and people are speeding up before reaching the signs.</p> <p>CH Concern that existing speed limit already extends a fair distance out of village, going against policy to keep lower speed limits tight to village and this would extend it further.</p> <p>GP This is a visibility issue and should be resolved by moving the speed limit by only a short distance.</p>
Recommendation	Agreed to extend the current 30mph speed limit by approximately 100 metres.
8. Carbinswood Lane, Woolhampton - request for a lower speed limit.	
Attendees	-
Discussion	<p>GD introduced the report – Request from a local resident to lower the speed limit to 30mph reports that drivers are travelling too fast along Carbinswood Lane and he has concerns over the safety of his family that walk along the lane..</p> <p>GP The road is narrow and has a number of bends. 85th percentile for the area 26/28mph. Speed limit is low due to self enforcing nature of road and continuing with policy rural roads around West Berkshire, the</p>

Minutes of Speed Limit Review 2015 Held on 28th September 2015

	speed limits won't be changed.
Recommendation	Current speed limit is appropriate and speeds are currently controlled by the nature of the road.
9. A339 Shaw-cumDonnington – request extension to the 50mph speed limit.	
Attendees	-
Discussion	<p>GD introduced the report – This is a traffic management request in response to a traffic management assessment. We have an accident issue with vehicles failing to negotiate the Vodafone roundabout from the northern approach. Whist most of the accidents are damage only there is a maintenance liability in repairing signs and street furniture. The report recommended that the chevron signs were upgraded, this has now been done. The report also highlighted that the 50mph speed limit is only a short distance from the roundabout; it also notes that the nearside 50mph sign is located within the left turn lane to Vodafone and this restricts visibility to the sign on the approach. Moving the limit to a point before the splay will increase visibility to the signs as well as covering an uncontrolled pedestrian crossing point across the A339.</p> <p>GP The approach is well sign posted and other measures. It shouldn't be an issue, but agreed to the measures based on the results of the assessment.</p> <p>CH There are no target enforcements along this stretch and this new section would also be unenforceable.</p>
Recommendation	Agreed to extend the 50mph speed limit by approximately 100metres to the north.
Speed Limit Update	
<p>Mill Lane Objections were received during the statutory consultation. This will be now be taken to ID.</p> <p>Westwood Road Previously tasked with collecting further speed data and costing for traffic calming measures. AD has completed the speed checks. Most of them are around 24mph, with some being slightly over this. The road condition is pretty poor and there are concerns that when re-surfaced the speeds will increase. To be self enforcing traffic calming measures will be required to make this a 20mph zone. The cost of introducing traffic calming will be in the region of £75k. Our current view is to only install traffic calming as a last resort where there are injury accidents where speed is a contributory factor. We do not have accidents of this nature at this location so would not be able to fund this from our safety scheme budget.</p> <p>Radley Bottom, Hungerford We applied to the DfT for a shorter then approved stretch of 30mph speed limit as requested by this panel. This request was rejected by the DfT so we are going to advertise for a 40mph limit.</p> <p>B4000 between Stockcross and Speen</p>	

Minutes of Speed Limit Review 2015

Held on 28th September 2015

An objections to the 50mph speed limit has been received and we are in the process of taking this to ID.

Stockcross

Northern entrance, road marking scheme has been ordered and will be implemented soon..

AOB

GP has been contacted by a local police about wanting to increase local speed enforcement.

GD Looking at possibility of reducing Speed Limit reviews to one per year. With expected lower budget and staffing resources.

GP Understands the issues behind this and there is a need to continue looking at the speed limits. GD to propose this in the future.

GP was unsure about being able to attend the proposed next meeting date and will advice GD on this.

GP thanked GD for all his hard work and preparation on his first speed limit review.

Next Meeting

18th February 2016 (To be confirmed)

End of meeting

Note: This is a summary of the Speed Limit Review meeting

Individual Executive Member Decision

Title of Report:	B4000, A4 to Stockcross 50 mph speed limit order
Report to be considered by:	Individual Executive Member Decision
Date on which Decision is to be taken:	20 November 2015
Forward Plan Ref:	ID3047

Purpose of Report: To inform the Executive Member for Highways, Transport and Emergency Planning of the proposed speed limit, as agreed by the speed limit review panel in October 2014.

Recommended Action: That the Executive Member for Highways, Transport and Emergency Planning resolves to approve the recommendations as set out in section 4 of this report.

Reason for decision to be taken: As a result of formal consultation one objection has been received, original decision to be reconsidered in the light of this objection.

Other options considered: Not applicable.

Key background documentation: E mail objection.
Minutes of Speed limit review

Portfolio Member Details	
Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor Garth Simpson - Tel (01635) 40438
E-mail Address:	gsimpson@westberks.gov.uk
Date Portfolio Member agreed report:	01 September 2015

Contact Officer Details	
Name:	Glyn Davis
Job Title:	Principal Traffic and Road Safety Engineer
Tel. No.:	01635 519501
E-mail Address:	gdavis@westberks.gov.uk

Implications

- Policy:** The consultation is in accordance with the Council's Consultation Procedures.
- Financial:** The implementation of the speed limit will be funded from the approved capital programme.
- Personnel:** None arising from this report.
- Legal/Procurement:** The sealing of the traffic regulation order will be undertaken by Legal Services.
- Property:** None arising from this report
- Risk Management:** None arising from this report.

Corporate Board's Recommendation:

Is this item relevant to equality?	Please tick relevant boxes	Yes	No
Does the policy affect service users, employees or the wider community and:			
• Is it likely to affect people with particular protected characteristics differently?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• Is it a major policy, significantly affecting how functions are delivered?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• Will the policy have a significant impact on how other organisations operate in terms of equality?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• Does the policy relate to functions that engagement has identified as being important to people with particular protected characteristics?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• Does the policy relate to an area with known inequalities?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Outcome (Where one or more 'Yes' boxes are ticked, the item is relevant to equality)			
Relevant to equality - Complete an EIA available at http://intranet/EqIA			<input type="checkbox"/>
Not relevant to equality			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Consultation Responses

Members:

- Leader of Council:** Councillor Gordon Lundie - To date no response has been received from Councillor Gordon Lundie, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
- Overview & Scrutiny Management Commission Chairman:** Councillor Emma Webster - To date no response has been received from Councillor emma Webster, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
- Ward Members:** Councillor Paul Bryant and Councillor Marcus Franks - To date no response has been received from either Councillor Paul Bryant or Councillor Marcus Franks, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Opposition Spokesperson:

Councillor Billy Drummond -To date no response has been received from Councillor Billy Drummond, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Local Stakeholders:

Have been consulted as part of the statutory consultation process

Officers Consulted:

Mark Edwards and Mark Cole

Trade Union:

N/A

Is this item subject to call-in?	Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No: <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>If not subject to call-in please put a cross in the appropriate box:</p> <p>The item is due to be referred to Council for final approval <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Delays in implementation could have serious financial implications for the Council <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Delays in implementation could compromise the Council's position <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Considered or reviewed by Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission or associated Task Groups within preceding six months <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Item is Urgent Key Decision <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Report is to note only <input type="checkbox"/></p>		

Supporting Information

1. Background

- 1.1 The speed limit on this section of road was first considered in 2009 as part of the assessment of all A and B class roads, at that time it was decided the national limit was appropriate.
- 1.2 As a result of local concerns, raised by Members, the limit was considered again by the speed limit review panel in August 2012. At that meeting it was decided to leave the limit unchanged but to investigate if improved signing and lining was needed, subsequently this was discounted.
- 1.3 At the speed limit review panel in October 2014 the limit was considered again, the minutes to this meeting are attached, a 40mph limit was requested but a 50mph limit was agreed. This was confirmed by ID report.

2. Responses to Statutory Consultation

- 2.1 After advertisement of the proposed traffic order, one objection was received which is the subject of this decision. In the three years prior to advertisement there were no injury accidents recorded on the road, since then one has occurred, this was a slight injury and involved a car running into the rear of another which was waiting to turn right.

3. Equalities Impact Assessment Outcomes

- 3.1 The recommendations in this report do not impact on equality issues so no Equality Impact Assessment has been undertaken.

4. Conclusion

- 4.1 Although there is no recent history of speed related accidents, there is long standing concern about safety, particularly for vehicles turning right into the golf course and hotel.

5. Recommendation

- 5.1 The speed limit should be introduced as agreed by the speed limit review panel and the objector should be informed accordingly.

Appendices

- Appendix A - Minutes of speed limit review October 2014
- Appendix B - Objection from Mr Deans

DRAFT - Minutes of Speed Limit Review 2014

Held on 29 October 2014

Present Councillor Graham Pask (GP)
 Councillor Keith Woodhams (KW)
 Andrew Garratt WBC (AG)
 Alan Dunkerton WBC (AD)
 Chris Hulme TVP (CH)
 Speciosa Nakavuma (Taking notes)

Apologises

Introduction	
All the task group members introduced themselves to those attending the review.	
Speed Limit Update	
<p>AG explained that all approved speed limits have been implemented except the 20mph speed limit for Mill Lane, Boundary Road and Kings Road as it was delayed due to the pending planning application for the Sterling Cables link road. To avoid any further delay it was recommended that a 20mph speed limit be advertised for Mill Lane and Boundary Road only, which the task group agreed too.</p> <p>CH commented that the Police can enforce 20mph speed limits and zones but they should not need to as they should be self enforcing as per the DfT guidance. The Police have received requests for enforcement in Kintbury and there was a discussion about the traffic calming measures that were recommended for Kintbury but the residents did not want them.</p> <p>AG explained about the Speed Intervention Programme where identified locations are escalated from roadside SID checks to Community Speedwatch to Police enforcement and then possible engineering measures.</p> <p>KW requested that all councillors should be informed that they should not expect the Police to enforce 20mph limits and if an update could be sent to them explaining the situation. It was agreed that AG would do this.</p>	
Speed Limit Requests	
1. Newport Road & Walton Way, Newbury – Consideration of 20mph speed limit	
Attendees:	Cllr Jeff Beck & Cllr Roger Hunneman
Discussion:	<p>AG introduced the report.</p> <p>RH supports the recommendation and JB commented that the Dorneywood Way 20mph works well.</p> <p>CH commented that the 85th percentile was high for a 20mph speed limit and engineering solutions should be in place. Various types of physical measures were discussed and AG suggested traffic calming could be implemented by formalising parking.</p> <p>GP pointed out that 20mph schemes in other places have produced good results. He questioned the implementation date and possible issues that may cause delay. AG informed the group that advertising could be carried out this financial year following the Individual Decision programmed for December 2014. He also stated that the works are likely to form part of the 2015/16 Traffic & Road Safety works programme.</p>

DRAFT - Minutes of Speed Limit Review 2014 Held on 29 October 2014

Recommendation:	All agreed with the recommendation to introduce 20mph speed limit.
2. A4 Marsh Benham – Request for a 60mph speed limit to be lowered to 50mph	
Attendees:	Cllr Paul Bryant, Parish Cllr Alan Booth
Discussion:	<p>AG introduced the report and explained the background to the residents concerns and what other options have been considered to address these.</p> <p>GP emphasised the benefits of the remedial measures at Kintbury.</p> <p>PB commented that the local residents requested a lower speed limit to assist horses and pedestrians crossing the road. The option of a One Way on the side roads may not be favourable due to increased journeys.</p> <p>The various measures were discussed and AB commented that due to limited overtaking areas, hatching will not prevent overtaking at the seemingly available opportunity on the straight. KW stated during a site visit he was overtaken at 60mph within a double white line stretch. Suggesting blocking off first junction but introduce an island road widening at second junction.</p> <p>CH stated that there has been a number of varying accidents, which are not related to speeding.</p> <p>AB agreed that engineering measures are the solution.</p>
Recommendation:	It was recommended that the current speed limit is appropriate and discussions of the various options are continued with the residents.
3 (A). B4000 between the A4 and Stockcross Village - request for a lower limit of 40mph	
Attendees:	Cllr Paul Bryant, Parish Cllr Alan Booth
Discussion:	<p>AG introduced the report and explained that the road was reviewed in May 2009 when it was agreed that the existing speed limits are appropriate. It was considered again in August 2012 when it was agreed not to reduce the speed limit but consider reducing traffic speeds by using road markings.</p> <p>AG explained that an investigation was carried out and it was found that the road is too narrow for right turn lanes to be installed for the various entrances. It was also explained that the owners of properties should ensure that they have a safe access onto the highway and speed limits should not be introduced for isolated hazards.</p> <p>PB has received several letters expressing concerns for access from the golf club and vineyard and the lack of footpath. Some residents would like a 30mph limit.</p> <p>AB considers a 50mph speed limit to be more appropriate.</p> <p>CH considers that traffic speeds are appropriate for a 50mph but is concerned about similar requests for the rest of the B4000.</p> <p>It was agreed that other sections of B4000 would be considered on their merits and a 50mph speed limit should be introduced.</p> <p>KW does not want residents to complain about speeds and request enforcement when a 50mph is introduced.</p>

DRAFT - Minutes of Speed Limit Review 2014 Held on 29 October 2014

Recommendation:	It was agreed to introduce 50mph on B4000 between the A4 and Stockcross village.
3 (B). B4000 Western End of Stockcross Village – possible extension to 30mph or 40mph buffer	
Attendees:	Cllr Paul Bryant, Parish Cllr Alan Booth
Discussion:	<p>AG introduced the concerns of a local resident and the issues with traffic speeds from numerous SDR surveys.</p> <p>PB is concerned about the speed of traffic past the entrance to the recreation ground.</p> <p>CH suggested a mobile camera van could be used to deter those accelerating before the speed terminal sign. AG commented that he is due to meet the Police with regard to requesting enforcement at a number of identified locations where speeding is a concern. This location is on the list.</p> <p>GP queried what type of physical measures could be introduced. There was a discussion about various measures and the concerns about approach speeds and forward visibility.</p>
Recommendation:	It was agreed not to extend the speed limit or introduce a 40mph buffer speed limit, but to investigate if a build out (or similar) could be introduced by the recreation ground to reduce traffic speeds.
4. Crookham Common Road, Brimpton - Request for 40mph limit (between Thornford Road and Crookham Park entrance)	
Attendees:	Parish Cllr Brian Barnes
Discussion:	<p>AG introduced the report and explained about a 113 signature petition requesting 'a 40 mph speed limit from Thornford Road to the junction of Crookham Park Home site'.</p> <p>There was a discussion about linking the two 40mph speed limits and CH commented that a continuous 40mph will lessen its effect in keeping speeds low.</p> <p>GP emphasised 40mph without an obvious reason would lead to speeding. He believes motorist can develop a culture of responding to signs appropriately once they learn signs are there for a genuine reason.</p> <p>There was a discussion about improving visibility at the entrance and measures to make driver aware of the entrance.</p> <p>KW recommended finding out the land owner then write to the management with highway guidelines on visibility. Improve visibility by clearing vegetation, put up stop line closer to the road and put up junction warning sign to make entrance clear and obvious.</p>
Recommendation:	All agreed with the recommendation in the report not to alter the speed limit but to investigate if the signing and lining can be improved.
5. Radley Bottom Road, Hungerford - extension to introduce 30mph speed limit in residential section	

DRAFT - Minutes of Speed Limit Review 2014 Held on 29 October 2014

Attendees:	Town Cllrs Rob Brookman and Colin Bumbieris
Discussion:	<p>AG introduced the report and recommended extending the 40mph speed limit to cover the residential properties.</p> <p>RB commented that the pub in the area is very popular leading to relatively small parking space hence parking on the road.</p> <p>There was a discussion about the merits of a 30mph and a 40mph. GP favours a 30mph limit.</p> <p>AG stated that the introduction of a 30mph limit would mean extending it beyond the residential properties as the minimum length of a speed limit specified in Circular Road 1/13 setting local speed limits states <i>'The minimum length of a speed limit should generally be not less than 600 metres to avoid too many changes of speed limit along the route. In exceptional circumstances this can be reduced to 400 metres for lower speed limits, or even 300 metres on roads with a purely local access function, or where a variable 20 mph limit is introduced, for example outside a school. Anything shorter is not recommended.'</i></p> <p>The length of road under consideration is approximately 280 metres.</p> <p>There was a discussion about the legality of the length of speed limit and if the minimum specified in Circular Roads 1/13 is only guidance or has to be adhered to.</p> <p>GP proposed the aim should be to introduce 30mph for the 280 metres after legal consultation. It was agreed for AG to find out the legality and to contact DfT.</p> <p>It was also agreed not to introduce a speed limit between the A338 and Lower Farm</p>
Recommendation:	All agreed to introduce a 30mph depending the outcome of the investigation on the minimum length of a speed limit. Should the minimum legal length be that specified in Circular Roads 1/13 then a 40mph speed limit would be introduced.
6. A340 Tidmarsh – request for a 30mph speed limit extension further south	
Attendees:	None
Discussion:	<p>AG introduced the report and commented that Cllr Tim Metcalfe agreed with the recommendation, but the Parish Council requested the 30mph speed limit be extended before the bends.</p> <p>It was agreed that extending the speed limit prior to the bends is unlikely to have any impact on vehicle speeds and the existing speed limit location is appropriate in terms of forward visibility to the signs.</p>
Recommendation:	All agree with the recommendation not to alter the start of the existing speed limit.
7. Inglewood Road, Kintbury – request for a 30mph speed limit	
Attendees:	None
Discussion:	AG explained the reason for the request and commented that the road is rural with low traffic volumes. All agreed that the existing speed limit is appropriate for the nature of the road.

DRAFT - Minutes of Speed Limit Review 2014 Held on 29 October 2014

Recommendation:	All agreed with the recommendation that the existing speed limit is appropriate.
8. Oxford Road, Chieveley – request to reduce 60mph to 50mph	
Attendees:	None
Discussion:	<p>AG introduced the report and explained that this length of road was considered in January 2012. The task group were made aware of Councillor Cole's comments for the request.</p> <p>AD commented that cutting vegetation at the junctions and at a few residential accesses would improve the visibility.</p> <p>GP comment that the visibility is not a speed limit issue and agreed improvements could be made by cutting back the vegetation.</p>
Recommendation:	All agreed with the recommendation in the report that the existing speed limit is appropriate for a road of this nature and it be investigated if the vegetation can be cut back at the junctions.
<p>AOB</p> <p>GP reminded AG to circulate to all councillors a note about 20mph speed limits and the desire to have speed limits enforced by the Police.</p>	
<p>Next Meeting</p> <p>To be scheduled for March 2015.</p>	
<p>End of meeting.</p>	

Note: This is a summary of the Speed Limit Review meeting

This page is intentionally left blank

WEST BERKSHIRE (B4000 between the A4 at Speen and Stockcross Village (50 MPH SPEED LIMIT) ORDER 201

Ref: 004259MS. Closing date 20th August 2015.

If you wish to object to the proposals, please do so in the space below stating your grounds for objection. Please also provide your name and address / email, so that we can respond to your objection in due course.

NAME: Michael Dean
ADDRESS: 37 Simmons Field, THATCHAM, RG18 4ET

E-MAIL: mdd150407@gmail.com

I wish to object to the proposal on the grounds that:-

The road is largely straight with good lines of vision and even when exiting from the few side points there is vision of another vehicle travelling at 60mph.

The Statement of reasons contains no accident data let alone any evidence that any accidents, should they have existed, have been proven to be speed related.

By all means, the residents of Stockcross should object if motorists are flouting their local 30mph speed limit but the mere fact they are local to a national speed limit road is surely not sufficient grounds to reduce the road speed to the detriment of other motorists.

Please email or post this form back to the officer dealing with the proposal, Bob Bosley.

Bob Bosley,
Project Engineer,
Traffic and Road safety
West Berkshire District Council,
Market Street
Newbury
RG14 5LD rbosley@westberks.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank