

---

# Speed Limit Review October 2017

---

**Committee considering report:** Individual Decision

**Portfolio Member:** Councillor Jeanette Clifford

**Report Author:** Glyn Davis

**Forward Plan Ref:** ID3998

---

## 1. Purpose of the Report

1.1 To inform the Executive Member for Highways and Transport of the recommendations of the Speed Limit Task Group following the speed limit review undertaken on the 10<sup>th</sup> October 2017 and to seek approval of the recommendations.

## 2. Recommendation

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

## 3. Implications

3.1 **Financial:** The recommendations with the exception of Burdens Heath 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:** The speed limit traffic regulation orders will follow the statutory consultation / advertisement procedure.

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

**Overview & Scrutiny Management Commission Chairman:** Cllr 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:** Cllr Alan Macro – Responded 21/11/17 *'I was a bit surprised to see my name under "ward members" as none of the requests were for my ward!'*

Cllr Virginia von Celsing – To date no response has been received from Councillor Virginia von Celsing, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Cllr Anthony Stansfeld – To date no response has been received from Councillor Anthony Stansfeld, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Cllr James Cole – Responded 21/11/17 *'I was unable to make the meeting, but I did email the day before that if I had been able to I would have had difficulty supporting the Enborne proposal. I accept what has been negotiated.'*

Cllr Dominic Boeck – Responded 21/11/17 *'I note your statement relating to the request for a 30 mph speed limit at Brimpton Common, item 6, that should Hampshire CC proceed and issue a TRO we would agree to our short section of the road in question being included and that the signage on our section would be funded by WBC. I will be happy to support this decision.'*

Cllr Garth Simpson – Responded 22/11/17 *I attended at the scheduled time, but as the meeting had been completed expeditiously, I found an empty room. I would not have supported the proposal mooted by residents of Fishers Lane, Cold Ash, as the speed data showed that average speeds were acceptable.*

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

Cllr Quentin Webb – To date no response has been received from Councillor Quentin Webb, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

**Opposition  
Spokesperson:**

Cllr Lee Dillon – Responded 23/11/17 *'I support the recommendations to proceed to the next level of consultation. Can we please, if not already, share the average speed data with the resident in Fishers Lane, Cold Ash that brought forward there proposal. This will help explain the decision not to progress this scheme at this time.'*

**Local Stakeholders:** N/A

**Officers Consulted:** Mark Edwards and Mark Cole

**Trade Union:** N/A

**5. Other options considered**

5.1 N/A

## Executive Summary

### 6. Introduction / Background

- 6.1 The Speed Limit Task Group carefully considers the introduction or amendment of 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 10<sup>th</sup> October 2017, is comprised of the following members:
- Councillor Graham Pask;
  - Councillor Billy Drummond;
  - Glyn Davis, Principal Traffic & Road Safety Engineer;
  - Chris Hulme, Thames Valley Police Traffic Management Officer;
  - Cheryl Evans, Senior Road Safety Officer;
- 6.3 The Task Group considered six requests for an amendment or introduction of a speed limit at the following locations:
- (1) Enborne Road, Enborne – request for a 40mph speed limit.
  - (2) Yattendon Lane, Yattendon – request for a 30mph speed limit to be brought in closer to the village and the existing 30mph outside the village to become a 40mph buffer zone.
  - (3) School Road & Sideroads, Compton – request for a 20mph speed limit.
  - (4) Fishers Lane, Cold Ash – request for a 30mph speed limit.
  - (5) Burdens Heath, Upper Bucklebury – request for an extension to the current 30mph speed limit.
  - (6) B3051 Brimpton Common, Brimpton – request for a 30mph speed limit.
- 6.4 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.
- 6.5 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 and Transport 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 is progressed to the statutory advertisement and consultation stage:

- (1) 1: Enborne Road, Enborne – request for a 40mph speed limit to be introduced as proposed was initially rejected on the grounds that all were concerned over the length of road involved. On discussion between the task group and Parish Councillor Alan Croney, it was agreed that a 40mph limit covering the village from the current eastern village sign to just beyond public right of way ENB0/13 would be acceptable to all and was recommended.
- (2) 2: Yattendon Lane, Yattendon – request to relocate the 30mph speed limit closer to the village, it was recommended that the area in between the current 30mph terminal signs and the new location is converted to a 40mph speed limit. Recommended for approval
- (3) 3: School Road, Compton – request for a 20mph speed limit between Compton Primary school and the village centre including associated side roads. This was agreed on the provision traffic calming measures are agreed with both the Parish Council and the public. The works will be subject to funding from Section 106 money.
- (4) 5: Burdens Heath, Upper Bucklebury – request for the 30mph to be extended to cover a newly built property on the edge of the village. This was agreed however the Chair recommended that this should not be funded from capital funding, the Chair recommended contacting the Parish for them to discuss the funding of the scheme with the applicant.
- (5) 6: B3051, Brimpton Common – the majority of the route for which the 30mph speed limit is requested falls under the remit of Hampshire County Council. Only a small section of the B3051 in Brimpton Common (approximately 150 metres) falls within the West Berkshire area. It was agreed that should Hampshire County Council proceed they should lead and we will agree to our small section being included within their Traffic Regulation Order, West Berkshire Council will fund any signage within our area out of our capital budget.

7.2 The Task Group recommended that:

- (1) 4: Fishers Lane, Cold Ash - the current unrestricted speed limit is appropriate and should not be changed.

## 8. Conclusion

- (1) Following the task group meeting five of the six requests were recommended for approval. The recommendations set out in 7.1 and 7.2 above are therefore put forward for approval.

## 9. Appendices

9.1 Appendix A – Equalities Impact Assessment

9.2 Appendix B – Minutes Speed Limit Review 10<sup>th</sup> October 2017

## Appendix A

### 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>		Glyn Davis	
<b>Date of assessment:</b>		12/10/2017	
<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			
Disability			
Gender			

Reassignment		
Marriage and Civil Partnership		
Pregnancy and Maternity		
Race		
Religion or Belief		
Sex		
Sexual Orientation		
<b>Further Comments relating to the item:</b>		
No individual strands directly affected. Setting an appropriate speed limit will guide drivers to drive at an appropriate speed.		
<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>
<b>Please provide an explanation for your answer: All highway users needs have been considered in undertaking this review.</b>		
<b>Will the proposed decision have an adverse impact upon the lives of people, including employees and service users?</b>		<b>No</b>
<b>Please provide an explanation for your answer: Reducing the speed of traffic where necessary has a positive impact on all people</b>		

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](#).

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

Name: Glyn Davis

Date: 12/10/2017

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.