

# Individual Decision

---



Scan here to access the public  
documents for this meeting

The attached report will be taken as an  
Individual Portfolio Member Decision on:

**Thursday 23 January 2020**

Ref:	Title	Portfolio Member	Page No.
ID3868	Speed Limit Review October 2019	Councillor Richard Somner	3 - 22



This page is intentionally left blank

## Individual Executive Member Decision

---

### Speed Limit Review October 2019

---

**Committee considering report:** Individual Executive Member Decision

**Date ID to be signed:** 23 January 2020

**Portfolio Member:** Councillor Richard Somner

**Forward Plan Ref:** ID3868

---

#### 1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To inform the Executive Member for Transport and Countryside of the recommendations of the Speed Limit Task Group following the speed limit review undertaken on the 9<sup>th</sup> October 2019 and to seek approval of the recommendations.

#### 2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That the Executive Member for Transport and Countryside approves the Recommendations as set out in the ID report.

#### 3. Implications

- 3.1 **Financial:** The recommendations will be funded from the Council's approved speed limit review capital budget.
- 3.2 **Policy:** The consultation is in accordance with the Council's Consultation procedures.
- 3.3 **Personnel:** None arising from this report.
- 3.4 **Legal:** None arising from this report.
- 3.5 **Risk Management:** None arising from this report.
- 3.6 **Property:** None arising from this report.
- 3.7 **Other:** N/A

#### 4. Consultation Responses

##### Members:

**Leader of Council:** Cllr Lynne Doherty

**Overview & Scrutiny Management Commission Chairman:** Cllr Alan Law

**Ward Members:**

Cllr James Cole  
Cllr Dennis Benneyworth  
Cllr Claire Rowles  
Cllr Steve Ardagh Walter  
Cllr Adrian Abbs  
Cllr David Marsh  
Cllr Tony Vickers  
Cllr Carolynne Culver  
Cllr Alan Law

**Opposition  
Spokesperson:**

Cllr Alan Macro

**Local Stakeholders:**

N/A

**Officers Consulted:**

Jon Winstanley and Neil Stacey

**Trade Union:**

N/A

**5. Other options considered**

5.1 N/A

## 6. Introduction/Background

- 6.1 The Speed Limit Task Group carefully considers the introduction of or amendment to speed limits that have been requested by Members, Parish or Town Councils, 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.
- 6.2 The Speed Limit Task Group, which met on 9<sup>th</sup> October 2019, was comprised of the following members:
- Councillor Graham Pask;
  - Councillor Alan Macro;
  - Glyn Davis, Principal Engineer ITS
  - Gareth Dowding Principal Engineer Traffic & Road Safety
  - Chris Hulme, Thames Valley Police Traffic Management Officer;
  - Cheryl Evans, Senior Road Safety Officer;
  - Graham Markham Speed Co-Ordinator Officer

The Task Group considered seven requests for an amendment or introduction of a speed limit at the following locations:

- (1) A343 Andover Road, Newbury – request for a 20mph speed limit.
  - (2) A343 Andover Road, Newbury – request for a 30mph speed limit to the south of Park House School.
  - (3) Cow Lane, East Ilsley – request for an extension of the existing 30mph speed limit.
  - (4) Colthrop Lane, Thatcham – request for a 30mph speed limit to tie in with existing in area (to correct a signing anomaly).
  - (5) Rectory Road, Streatley – request for the whole of Rectory Road to be subject to 30mph speed limit.
  - (6) Hungerford Common, Hungerford – request for a blanket 30mph speed limit between the Cattle Grid entry points onto Hungerford Common
  - (7) Lower Denford Road, Hungerford – Request to reduce the current national speed limit to a 30mph speed limit.
- 6.3 If the recommendations contained in this report are approved then the individual sites will be taken forward to the statutory advertisement 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.
- 6.4 If no objections to a proposed speed limit are received, the speed limit will be implemented. Any objections received during the formal consultation together with an officer's recommendation will be presented to the Executive Member for Transport and Countryside for Individual Decision. Should the proposal to introduce

or change a speed limit be considered appropriate then that proposal will be implemented.

## 7. Recommendations

7.1 The Task Group considered all of the above requests and recommended that the following are progressed to the statutory advertisement and consultation stage:

- (1) 2: A343 Andover Road Newbury: a partial extension of the speed limit from the existing 30MPH terminal to the junction of Conifer Crescent including the investigation of a new refuge Island in the vicinity of Badsworth Gardens to aid pedestrian crossing the Andover Road.
- (2) 4: Colthrop Lane Thatcham. The request to introduce a 30mph limit throughout the trading estate was agreed to resolve the anomaly currently present on site.
- (3) 5: Rectory Road Streatley: The quest for an extension of the 30 mph along the entire length of Rectory Road was not considered appropriate but the Task Group agreed that a partial extension to a point adjacent to the property known as The White Lodge (The Lodge) could be implemented.
- (4) 6: Hungerford Common. The request for the entire Common between the cattle grid access points to be changed from 40 mph to 30 mph was agreed.
- (5) 7: Lower Denford Lane Hungerford. Recommended the section between Hungerford Common and the cattle grid (just north of the canal bridge be reduced to 30mph to tie in with the recommended reduction on Hungerford Common. The remainder to remain unchanged.

7.2 The Task Group recommended that:

- (1) 1: A343 Andover Road, Newbury – the request for a 20mph speed limit was not considered appropriate on the grounds that current speeds were too high for a 20mph to be introduced without installing traffic calming. There is currently a trial being undertaken assessing the effectiveness of the '20mph when flashing' type signs and it was agreed that once the trial was complete the signs would not be removed.
- (2) 3: Cow Lane East Ilsley – the request to reduce the speed limit to 30mph was not considered appropriate. The panel could considered that there was no evidence to support this reduction and noted that drivers are driving to the environment. Reducing the speed limit would be make the speed limit artificially low which would result in non-compliance.

## 8. Conclusion

- (1) Following the task group meeting four of the seven requests were recommended for approval. It is therefore recommended that the speed limit changes set out in 7.1 above are taken forward to statutory advertisement, with any objections to the proposed Traffic Regulation Orders being considered by a further Individual Decision in due course.

---

### Background Papers:

Department for Transport Circular 1/2013 (setting local speed limits)

---

### Subject to Call-In:

Yes: ☒ No: ☐

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"/>

---

### Wards affected:

Newbury Wash Common, Hungerford & Kintbury, Thatcham Colthrop & Crookham  
Ridgeway, Streatley

---

### Officer details:

Name: Gareth Dowding  
Job Title: Principal Engineer  
Tel No: 01635 519226  
E-mail Address: Gareth.dowding@westberks.gov.uk

---

## Appendices

- 8.2 Appendix A – Data Protection Impact Assessment
- 8.3 Appendix B – Equalities Impact Assessment
- 8.4 Appendix C – Minutes Speed Limit Review 9<sup>th</sup> October 2019

## Appendix A

### Data Protection Impact Assessment – Stage One

The General Data Protection Regulations require a Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) for certain projects that have a significant impact on the rights of data subjects.

Should you require additional guidance in completing this assessment, please refer to the Information Management Officer via [dp@westberks.gov.uk](mailto:dp@westberks.gov.uk)

Directorate:	Place
Service:	Transport & Countryside
Team:	Traffic & Road Safety
Lead Officer:	Gareth Dowding
Title of Project/System:	Speed Limit Review
Date of Assessment:	9/10/2019



**Do you need to do a Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA)?**

	Yes	No
<b>Will you be processing SENSITIVE or “special category” personal data?</b>  Note – sensitive personal data is described as “data revealing racial or ethnic origin, political opinions, religious or philosophical beliefs, or trade union membership, and the processing of genetic data, biometric data for the purpose of uniquely identifying a natural person, data concerning health or data concerning a natural person’s sex life or sexual orientation”	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Will you be processing data on a large scale?</b>  Note – Large scale might apply to the number of individuals affected OR the volume of data you are processing OR both	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Will your project or system have a “social media” dimension?</b>  Note – will it have an interactive element which allows users to communicate directly with one another?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Will any decisions be automated?</b>  Note – does your system or process involve circumstances where an individual’s input is “scored” or assessed without intervention/review/checking by a human being? Will there be any “profiling” of data subjects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Will your project/system involve CCTV or monitoring of an area accessible to the public?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Will you be using the data you collect to match or cross-reference against another existing set of data?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Will you be using any novel, or technologically advanced systems or processes?</b>  Note – this could include biometrics, “internet of things” connectivity or anything that is currently not widely utilised	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

If you answer “Yes” to any of the above, you will probably need to complete [Data Protection Impact Assessment - Stage Two](#). If you are unsure, please consult with the Information Management Officer before proceeding.

## Appendix B

### Equality Impact Assessment - Stage One

We need to ensure that our strategies, policies, functions and services, current and proposed have given due regard to equality and diversity as set out in the Public Sector Equality Duty (Section 149 of the Equality Act), which states:

- “(1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:***
- (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;***
  - (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; This includes the need to:***
    - (i) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;***
    - (ii) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;***
  - (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it, with due regard, in particular, to the need to be aware that compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others.***
- (2) The steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities.***
- (3) Compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others.”***

The following list of questions may help to establish whether the decision is relevant to equality:

- Does the decision affect service users, employees or the wider community?
- (The relevance of a decision to equality depends not just on the number of those affected but on the significance of the impact on them)
- Is it likely to affect people with particular protected characteristics differently?
- Is it a major policy, or a major change to an existing policy, significantly affecting how functions are delivered?
- Will the decision have a significant impact on how other organisations operate in terms of equality?
- Does the decision relate to functions that engagement has identified as being important to people with particular protected characteristics?
- Does the decision relate to an area with known inequalities?
- Does the decision relate to any equality objectives that have been set by the council?

Please complete the following questions to determine whether a full Stage Two, Equality Impact Assessment is required.

<b>What is the proposed decision that you are asking the Executive to make:</b>	To approve the recommendations put forward from the Speed Limit Review.
<b>Summary of relevant legislation:</b>	Department for Transport Circular 1/2013 (setting local speed limits)
<b>Does the proposed decision conflict with any of the Council's key strategy priorities?</b>	No
<b>Name of assessor:</b>	Gareth Dowding
<b>Date of assessment:</b>	

<b>Is this a:</b>		<b>Is this:</b>	
<b>Policy</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>New or proposed</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Strategy</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Already exists and is being reviewed</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Function</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Is changing</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Service</b>	<b>Yes</b>		

<b>1 What are the main aims, objectives and intended outcomes of the proposed decision and who is likely to benefit from it?</b>	
<b>Aims:</b>	To review speed limits on our highways within the current Department for Transport guidelines.
<b>Objectives:</b>	To set appropriate and consistent speed limits within our district taking into consideration government guidance, accident history and community benefits.
<b>Outcomes:</b>	Setting the correct speed limit will help in addressing poor injury accident records, guide drivers as to the appropriate speed for a route and address community concern.
<b>Benefits:</b>	A safer improved highway network.

<b>2 Note which groups may be affected by the proposed decision. Consider how they may be affected, whether it is positively or negatively and what sources of information have been used to determine this.</b> (Please demonstrate consideration of all strands – Age, Disability, Gender Reassignment, Marriage and Civil Partnership, Pregnancy and Maternity, Race, Religion or Belief, Sex and Sexual Orientation.)		
<b>Group Affected</b>	<b>What might be the effect?</b>	<b>Information to support this</b>

Age	None	All groups will be effected equally
Disability	None	All groups will be effected equally
Gender Reassignment	None	All groups will be effected equally
Marriage and Civil Partnership	None	All groups will be effected equally
Pregnancy and Maternity	None	All groups will be effected equally
Race	None	All groups will be effected equally
Religion or Belief	None	All groups will be effected equally
Sex	None	All groups will be effected equally
Sexual Orientation	None	All groups will be effected equally
<b>Further Comments relating to the item:</b>		
None		

<b>3 Result</b>	
<b>Are there any aspects of the proposed decision, including how it is delivered or accessed, that could contribute to inequality?</b>	<b>No</b>
Please provide an explanation for your answer: All highway users needs have been considered in undertaking this review.	
<b>Will the proposed decision have an adverse impact upon the lives of people, including employees and service users?</b>	<b>No</b>
Please provide an explanation for your answer: Reducing the speed of traffic where necessary has a positive impact on all people	

If your answers to question 2 have identified potential adverse impacts and you have answered 'yes' to either of the sections at question 3, or you are unsure about the impact, then you should carry out a Stage Two Equality Impact Assessment.

If a Stage Two Equality Impact Assessment is required, before proceeding you should discuss the scope of the Assessment with service managers in your area. You will also need to refer to the [Equality Impact Assessment guidance and Stage Two template](#).

4 Identify next steps as appropriate:	
Stage Two required	No
Owner of Stage Two assessment:	N/A
Timescale for Stage Two assessment:	N/A

Name: Gareth Dowding

Date:11/11/2019

---

Please now forward this completed form to Rachel Craggs, Principal Policy Officer (Equality and Diversity) ([rachel.craggs@westberks.gov.uk](mailto:rachel.craggs@westberks.gov.uk)), for publication on the WBC website.

This page is intentionally left blank

# Minutes of Speed Limit Review 2019

## Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> October

**Present**

Councillor Graham Pask (GP)  
 Councillor Alan Macro (AM)  
 Chris Hulme TVP (CH)  
 Glyn Davis WBC (GD)  
 Gareth Dowding WBC (GD2)  
 Cheryl Evans WBC (CE) (Minutes)  
 Graham Markham WBC (GM)

**Apologies**                None

### Introduction

All the task group members introduced themselves to those attending the review. GP gave an overview of process for the speed limit review and roles of the Task Group. There was a recap of the last meetings minutes and a brief update on the items discussed at the previous meeting.

### Speed Limit Requests

#### A343 Andover Road, Newbury 20mph

##### Attendees

Cllr Adrian Abbs (AA) , Cllr David March (DM)  
 Apologies Cllr Tony Vickers

##### Discussion

Presented at last years speed limit review but because of under reporting and quality of Police casualty data the Parish requested a review.

There had been a school pupil incident at the site although completely unconnected to the general school community times. The contributing factors were not speed related.

Video played: – as previously noted. Garage/shop busy area. Good grass verge separates pavements from the carriageway.

GD introduced the site and explained again why West Berkshire do not operate the '20mph when flashing' type signs in general but due to support the parish has initiated a trial to capture any evidence of reductions in speed.

CE explained this is currently not available but would be the information and data would be shared once available. CE expressed her concern that the sign designs were not as originally agreed (as the cost was substantial £7K) and that what actually went up was already being reported as being ignored. GD agreed that once the data had been collected the information would be used to establish the next steps and possibly a bigger sign if budgets allow. CE mentioned BRITE report regarding speed reductions encouraging more sustainable transport but these roads need to support a driver's acceptance to 20mph suitability.

## Minutes of Speed Limit Review 2019

### Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> October

	<p>DM reported that he felt the average speed data disguises the issue as stationary traffic in one direction can affect the results. Also school activities are extended beyond the core school times at a secondary school so the school flashing sign in this area is not flashing long enough. CE explained the sign times can be changed.</p> <p>GD added schools are not operational 24/7 and therefore compliance to the speed limit difficult to justify</p> <p>CH stated for the whole road to be changed to 20mph the road would need to be self-enforcing. The speed cameras in the area would also have to be removed.</p> <p>AA – Requested 20mph to slow the road at key times, to address the safety of times when child movement is peak, to consider air quality outside schools. DM would welcome a permanent 20mph sign. Dft views where we have Urban areas this is a standard approach. GD – Speeds are too high to install a 20mph limit and traffic calming in the form of vertical features will be required to make it ‘self-enforcing’. CH - These roads need to be traffic calmed otherwise there would be no way to make people comply without continued enforcement. At school movement times or school holidays the safety for ALL needs to be considered. GP – Drew the discussions back to speed limits and felt that a permanent 20mph limit would not be a solution to effectively reduce speeds. DM – wants something that works AA – wants 20mph where it can be most effective and requested to see the data hour by hour.</p> <p>CH – Figures show the speed are lower during school times – if not then robust traffic calm will need to be added AM – 20mph lead to more pollution</p>
Recommendation	<p>20mph not recommended <b>but agreed that there were no plans to remove the 20mph when flashing signs when the trail was complete</b></p> <p>Action – CE to keep AA / DM updated on 20mph school flashing signs project.</p>
<b>2. A343 Andover Road, Newbury 30mph</b>	
Attendees	<p>Cllr Adrian Abbs (AA) , Cllr David March (DM) Apologies Tony Vickers</p>



## Minutes of Speed Limit Review 2019

### Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> October

Discussion	<p>Video played</p> <p>DM – Residential both sides of Badgerwood Garden, system of street lights, low stats 19, low average speed – residents cut off from library, bus stop and continue to have noise issues. Pedestrian crossing would help to reach these services and encourage more walking and cycling. AA – stated DM's report was comprehensive and added the area is Urban, housing is evident so why not 30mph at the top of the hill and there is a blind bend near to Coniston Road.</p> <p>GP agrees there has been considerable development in the area but asked CH to explain the reasons around missing data.</p> <p>CH – TVP only look at accident history when reported (stats 19). Near misses are not reported and therefore not relevant to this meeting. History leads to speed limit reviews.</p> <p>AA – History not actual that communities are dealing with</p> <p>CH – A lower speed limit should not be set on isolated incidents.</p> <p>AA – need more police / more enforcement</p> <p>GP – reminded group this is not relevant for today's discussions</p> <p>DM added support for crossing the road is in the 40mph and it would be sensible to move the 30mph where there is a change in character.</p> <p>GD – suggested a light controlled crossing is <b>feasible but would need to be properly assessed. This would need to be requested through other channels.</b></p>
Recommendation	<p><b>Recommended</b> partial 30mph. <b>The current 30mph speed limit to be extended south to the vicinity of Conifer Crescent.</b> The remainder to remain at a 40mph speed limit</p>
<b>3. Cow Lane, East Ilsley</b>	
Attendees	PC Andrew Sharp Apologies Cllr Carolyn Culver
Discussion	<p>Video played</p> <p>AS – 1700 more houses being developed in this area. East to West road, setting sun issues vision out of road is not easy to blind hill. Empty Farm being to holiday lets, business units and other planning. Economic input to village to encourage the area to thrive.</p> <p>GD2 – having checked the planning approval, stated the access to the exciting site would be no different and changes to the highway would not be considered any more than expected than the original site usage.</p> <p>AM – felt it shouldn't be national speed limit</p> <p>CH – 85<sup>th</sup> – 47.8mph</p> <p>GD – reported there is safe passage for pedestrians <b>which runs</b></p>

## Minutes of Speed Limit Review 2019

### Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> October

	<p><b>behind</b> the hedgerow. GM – good view to the left and reasonable right</p>
Recommendation	<p>30mph not approved, no evidence to reduce road to 30mph. Actions – AS stated he will return to SLR once the planning has been implemented.</p>
<b>4. Colthrop Lane. Thatcham</b>	
Attendees	Cllr <b>Owen Jeffery (OJ)</b>
Discussion	<p>Video played GD explained the anomaly with the current speed limit and recommended on basis of the speed data a 30mph speed limit be introduced. <b>OJ</b> - delighted with the recommendation and thanked the SLR task group for recognising the anomaly.</p>
Recommendation	Agreed to 30mph limit introduced as per plan
<b>5. Rectory Road, Streatley</b>	
Attendees	Nicola Swan representing PC, Trevor Long – resident, PC Alan Clerk
Discussion	<p>Video played</p> <p>GP – Opening comments: SLR takes into account local views within National policy our own considerations around speed limits where they are needed. 30 cannot be everywhere and common sense is required. If there are other factors not brought to SLR will be considered and this particular road has been before SLR twice and in 2004 the 30mph limit was extended from the golf club. Serval houses in the area and the mean speed in very low. A rural road in an area of natural beauty, and a change to 30mph will require further signage. As speeds are already low – why treat?</p> <p>AC reported considerable vehicles braking at the brow NS added there was a large equestrian business and continued to describe the road, blind bend on hill, single track that leads to houses. The Ridgeway is a National Trust Trial and a byway 5 months of the year. Warren Farm and Meadow Farm are being developed. Appreciates it is a rural road and wants it to stay an area of natural beauty but also safety for vulnerable users. Speaks on behalf of the Parish / residents but feels the SLR document is not a true representative of the area. West has double the residents of the East where it is 30mph. included in this school aged children walk and cycle regularly.</p>

## Minutes of Speed Limit Review 2019

### Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> October

	<p>Because it is a National Trust trial it also encourages other users including but not exclusive to Scout groups, Duke of Edinburgh and Ramblers Association.</p> <p>The Equestrian Centre has 21 horses exercising on road as well as those using vehicles to get to the centre.</p> <p>Data was taken in August at a time when users are potentially at peak and others on holiday and a more in-depth analysis of the data might help support this. The Parish would continue to use SID to support awareness and appreciates 85% respect the current speed limit. But more than double of the residents live and travel where the speed limit is higher.</p> <p>GP acknowledged NS thorough report and asked AC/TL if they had any new evidence to add</p> <p>AC added that there has been an increase in overall traffic around delivery vans and those using the area see the National speed limit as right to achieve inappropriate speeds.</p> <p>GP suggested the area in the main is used by residents – will they keep to the speed limit?</p> <p>NS felt residents do support the safe passage of the local school aged children</p> <p>CH suggested that the speed limit guidance was never going to meet the lower speed limit and this was a case of more inappropriate speeding.</p> <p>NS reported in his experience the locals are very supportive of the 30mph and would abide by the limit set.</p> <p>CH warned that it would not be appropriate to extend all along the road and that the required signage has a minimum sight line for road users and this may be difficult to achieve.</p> <p>GP commented it is a narrow rural road would a speed limit encourage more caution? And asked if GD could confirm the required distance between repeaters.</p> <p>GP offered his experience around Quite Lane signs (18 years in Bucklebury), in general they are to support all users.</p> <p>GD stated: <b>A pilot scheme was undertaken in the Bucklebury area but no changes were detected so we have</b> moved away from installing these types of schemes.</p> <p>GP reminded those present across West Berkshire we have pockets of houses in National Speed limit Roads, this road is not a rat run or a through road.</p> <p>AM added it was also important to recognise why roads are derestricted and not to extend into what is classed as countryside.</p>
Recommendation	<p>Approved with restrictions.</p> <p>Action: 30mph to be extended to the region of White Lodge (The Lodge). Signs for the Equestrian Centre to be erected.</p>
<b>6. Hungerford Common, Hungerford</b>	

## Minutes of Speed Limit Review 2019

### Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> October

Attendees	James Cole, Helen Simpson, John Downe, Rob Chicken (HTC), Nicolas Lumley, Phillip Porter (HT&M)
Discussion	<p>Video played</p> <p>GD explained that this road had moved from National to 40mph approx. 9/10 years ago. The speed surveys were carried out when cattle were on the common and majority of the users are travelling <b>below</b> 40mph. 2006 SLR it was agreed to reduce the road to 30mph and was sent to GOSE for authorisation. This was before the time GD attended the SLR and was unable to provide clarification why there was no <b>record of the GOSE response or any record of why the recommendation went from 30mph to a 40mph but a 40mph limit was approved at I.D.</b></p> <p>GP acknowledged the common was wide, open and obviously cattle roam freely.</p> <p>NL explained the cattle roam 8 months of the year April to October 24/7</p> <p>PP explained there is a dip/ blind bend (zero visibility) and cows gather in those areas</p> <p>GD/GM confirmed data was collected to encompass these areas</p> <p>CH asked if cattle grids were present – YES</p> <p>NS reported 4 cows / 1 pedestrian injured</p> <p>PP felt there was a need to slow vehicles down</p> <p>RC suggested roundabouts or dummy cattle grids (rumble strips)</p> <p>JC need to slow the speeds down but won't solve all the problems and shared his personal experiences being cattle aware</p> <p>GP understood the New Forest have 180 animals hit per year</p> <p>CH reinforced that lowering a speed limit does not change the attitude of the road user.</p> <p>PP when a cow is involved it's a problem</p> <p>CH appreciated this can be controversial</p> <p>GD2 confirmed that a roundabout needs to be lit as part of the highway</p> <p>CE suggested introducing signs to raise awareness around cattle during April to October</p> <p>GD <b>Minchinghampton Common had used</b> signs/ silhouettes of cattle along the route.</p> <p>CH reported in his experience if the speed limit of a road is too low this can lead to more road users breaking the speed limit due to overtaking</p> <p>JC asked if speed limit could be seasonal</p> <p>HS the parish have embraced SID training and will continue to build rapport</p> <p>RC suggested it could be beneficial to create a promotional video to raise awareness</p> <p>NL felt there was no support from police with the six incidents</p>

## Minutes of Speed Limit Review 2019

### Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> October

	<p>reported</p> <p>AM recognised the issues and reminded all that Greenham Common was 30mph and for the sake of consistency it would make sense for Hungerford Common to also be 30mph. GD mentioned that Greenham Common was different in nature with bends and properties along the route.</p>
Recommendation	Request for 30mph speed limit approved.
<b>7. Lower Denford lane, Hungerford</b>	
Attendees	James Cole, Helen Simpson, John Downe, Rob Chicken (HTC), Nicolas Lumley, Phillip Porter (HT&M)
Discussion	<p>Video played</p> <p>GD opening comments, speeds are very low and are already below the requested 30mph. Installing a 30mph will require a system of repeater signs in an ANOB. Do not feel this is required or appropriate for this route.</p> <p>NL reported there are cows in this area too</p> <p>PP added the speed was national before bridge and it's a narrow road</p> <p>GD remarked, 60mph doesn't mean drivers need to drive at this speed</p> <p>JC reported that vehicles exiting the A4 that high speeds are achievable and many are rat running with local development this will make this worse. Common to A4 no issues, A4 to common is significant includes negotiation of bridges and road narrowing</p> <p>GM disagreed that drivers could speed in these areas</p> <p>GP state if by putting speed limits on roads that can't actually reach the speed – is this a perception of speed?</p> <p>JC suggested resident perception is that there is a speeding issue</p> <p>AM thought that extending the 30 to reach the cattle grid was appropriate</p> <p>JC considered local has issues at the A4 end</p> <p>GP confirmed that this was perceived</p> <p>JC agreed</p> <p>GP making un-necessary changes brings the SLR process into disrepute</p> <p>HS asked if reminder signs were a possibility</p> <p>GD suggested that it was not required the speeds were already low</p> <p>NL reported there was local support for no right turn and discourage rat running</p> <p>AM commented that opposing traffic helps slow traffic coming off</p>

## Minutes of Speed Limit Review 2019

### Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> October

	<p>A4</p> <p>JC felt the traffic coming off the A4 needed to be addressed GP asked officers to review to see if there was anything that could be offered to support and supported AM extending the small length linked to the common reducing to 30mph</p>
Recommendation	<p>30mph <b>approved but only on the section from Hungerford Common to the cattle grid. The remainder between the A4 and the cattle grid to remain unchanged.</b></p> <p>Actions Officer assessment to consider what else could be done to improve the junction. The small length of road linked to the common to be part of the reduction of the speed limit related to Hungerford Common.</p>
<b>AOB</b>	<p>GP / AM Thanked Glyn Davis and Alan Dunkerton (now retired) for their contribution to the SLR process over the years and welcomes Gareth Dowding in his role as the new Principal Engineer.</p>
<p><b>Next Meeting</b> (To be confirmed)</p>	
<p><b>End of meeting 14:15</b></p>	

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