

Minutes of Speed Limit Review 2018

17th October 2018

Present

Councillor Graham Pask (GP)
 Councillor Alan Macro (AM)
 Chris Hulme TVP (CH)
 Glyn Davis WBC (GD)
 Cheryl Evans WBC (CE) (Minutes)
 Alan Dunkerton WBC (AD)

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 Edwards (AE)

Discussion

GD introduced the site and explained why West Berkshire do not operate the '20mph when flashing' type signs – Most Schools within the district have had school flashing signs installed. GP mentioned USA and how effective this can be when rigorously enforced.

Comments on video – Noted 30mph signs don't stand out.
 Garage/shop busy area. Good grass verge separates pavements from the carriageway.

AE – Requested 20mph starts just south of the church and runs to just south of the roundabout which will be about 400 yards to keep drivers down to a reasonable speed.

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.

CE – Education is key and the work needs to be delivered in primary schools to make a difference,

GP – Drew the discussions back to speed limits

AM – Can we enhance what is already on the road – roundel on road / larger 30mph sign and repeaters at the southern entrance.

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

Recommendation

20mph not recommended.

Action – Improve 30mph signs and consider 30mph roundel markings at the 30mph terminal signs.

2. A343 Andover Road, Newbury 30mph

Minutes of Speed Limit Review 2018

17th October 2018

Attendees	Cllr Adrian Edwards (AE)
Discussion	<p>AE - Badgeworth House converted into mature housing units – if the residents wish to go from Conifer Crest (large residential estate) the crossing is too far away for residents to access.</p> <p>GD – Speed data lower than expected. Wide road and grass verges separate pedestrian from the carriageway and visibility is excellent.</p> <p>CE – Issue is crossing not pedestrian use of pavements</p> <p>GP – Would zebra be an option</p> <p>GD – Need to look at the demands and calculate if a crossing is justified in terms of pedestrian and vehicle movements but is confident this site would not meet the criteria. Zebra crossings can only be installed in a 30 mph speed limit.</p>
Recommendation	Request rejected, current speed limit for the road is considered appropriate.
3. B4000 Baydon Road, Wickham Village	
Attendees	PC Cllr David Hunt, Cllr James Cole
Discussion	<p>GD – Stated he had driven the route at the suggested 30mph and it didn't feel right as 30mph</p> <p>Comments on video – 4 fatal accidents on this road, wide road, cross roads number of issues. Speed limit has been pushed out, hope to install new VAS on North West approach. Why is the limit out so far?</p> <p>DH – Issue is crossing the road traffic volume used to be 6000 v/p/d and has increased to 20K v/p/d. Has looked at crossing times and it takes 9secs to cross the road and vehicle visibility times are lower than this in some areas as low as 4secs. VAS not been working for a number of years – risks of pedestrians crossing the road.</p> <p>GP – We should not implement a speed limit to deal with a specific problem, is it possible to incorporate crossing support.</p> <p>GD – Could look at introducing a pedestrian refuge providing we have sufficient road width. This could be funded with capital providing it is agreed by Members, could put it on the provisional programme for 2019/20 FY.</p> <p>CH – Questioned why on the 'west side' is the speed limit so far outside the village? Not getting the benefit of the lower speed limit. The data supports the current limit – DfT guidelines means reducing to 30 will only give a mean reduction to 37.5mph and therefore huge number of non-compliance.</p> <p>JC – Uses the crossroads regularly and has trouble exiting the junction due to the speed of some traffic, would like to see speeds reduced at this the crossroads.</p>
Recommendation	<p>30mph not approved, no evidence to reduce road to 30mph.</p> <p>Actions – bringing limit in from the North West towards the top of the hill near the pub. Possible VAS for south-east bound traffic to be funded by Parish Council, Investigate feasibility of pedestrian refuge at the crossroads as part of 2019/20 working programme (pending Members approval).</p>

Minutes of Speed Limit Review 2018

17th October 2018

4. Welford Village.	
Attendees	PC Cllr David Hunt, Cllr James Cole
Discussion	<p>GD Explained that he had made changes to the original extents of the request by bringing the terminal 30mph closer into the start of the village and by extending it to cover the church and estate offices entrance. This has been communicated to the Parish Council.</p> <p>DH Agreed that the changes were a good idea.</p> <p>Comments on video – Couldn't do more than 30mph / no pavement for pedestrians going to church.</p> <p>CH – speed is already low</p> <p>JC – doesn't cover main entrance to Welford Park</p>
Recommendation	Agreed to 30mph limit introduced as per plan ALSO amend existing 40mph on Rood Hill to cover entrance to the village and prevent a 40-60-30mph scenario.
5. Eastbury.	
Attendees	Cllr Graham Jones, PC Cllr Moz Bullbeck- Reynolds & Cllr Deborah Phillips
Discussion	<p>Comments on video – Good gateway, road is fairly straight looking to have 20mph from main section of housing, very narrow roads, no pavements. Centre lines have been removed, white lines have been removed.</p> <p>CH – Speed limit should not be introduced that relies on the police to enforce.</p> <p>MBR – Traffic come round the corners at speed, loss of wing mirrors been reported but residents tired of no action.</p> <p>DP – Requesting access only to back street as used as rat run, if drivers stuck behind tractors. Valley of horses and children with no pavements.</p> <p>135 houses in village – want to present a petition 253 signatures</p> <p>98.72% of village Cllr Jones will be presenting the petition to executive 18th October. Traffic calming needs to be sympathetic where there are areas of natural outstanding beauty. Example document presented with photos detailing calming in Dorset using coloured surfacing.</p> <p>CH – How many residents would support this if they were aware vertical traffic calming is required.</p> <p>MBR – This a through road and it is the through traffic which is causing problems for local residents recognised by SID operator. Digital age – more home deliveries, plenty of horse traffic and one stable growing.</p> <p>Traffic calming in a subdued way would be beneficial</p> <p>DP – There are 5 walkways off Back Road</p> <p>GP – Would Back Road as one way system work?</p> <p>GD – A one way system will increase speeds so this would not be a good idea.</p> <p>Open discussions – road flooding and other issues.</p> <p>CH – If not keeping to 30mph why would drivers keep to 20mph. It needs to be traffic calmed. Data obtained by LPC 19 road collisions</p>

Minutes of Speed Limit Review 2018

17th October 2018

	<p>from the police is not a true representation of RTC stats collisions in Eastbury used for the discussion around speed limit review.</p> <p>GP – How can we be positive, sometimes we look beyond the speed limit to support the environment/ community?</p> <p>MBR – what can be done without coloured paint?</p> <p>GD – Expensive to maintain, only use where there is an accident history where speed is a contributory factor.</p> <p>DP – what are the other options?</p> <p>MBR – coloured bitumen?</p> <p>GD – Don't use, again due to the high cost of maintenance.</p> <p>GP – Not going to have the answer today if we need to look at other technologies.</p> <p>MBR – Suggested putting traffic calming away from residential area</p> <p>GD – Explained two types of physical calming. Horizontal measures examples are chicanes and build outs, these rely mainly on opposing traffic flow which Eastbury doesn't have due to the low traffic volumes. Vertical measures such as humps or cushions these are effective but produce noise, vibration and increased pollution and are not popular with most residents</p> <p>CH – concern speed average is higher</p> <p>AM – road markings can they be used?</p> <p>GD – yes in accordance with Dft.</p> <p>DP – not understand why traffic calming has to happen at the point of need, it should be as you enter the village.</p> <p>GP – Have any other options been investigated, looking for a more holistic approach.</p> <p>DP – Kintbury has set a precedence</p> <p>GD – The area where the 20mph zone was introduced in Kintbury was all within the guideline figure of 24mph or below.</p> <p>GP – Can the team look at what is achievable, physical or what can actually be done?</p> <p>GD – We can look at this as a scheme for next year to be investigated and work alongside the Parish Council in looking for solutions. However this will need to be approved by Members and it can be included in the 2019/20 TM works programme for consideration. Needs more speed data to determine the scale of the issue?</p> <p>GJ – Positive turn and sounds like a sensible way forward</p> <p>GJ – Lambourn is unique and needs supporting to create an environment to live in</p> <p>GP - presentation passionately delivered and highlighted</p> <p>MBR – wants to look at Gateways other villages more elaborate</p> <p>CH – Is strongly opposed to an access only type prohibition order for Back Lane and if it is introduced it will not be enforced by the police</p> <p>.</p>
Recommendation	<p>Request for 20mph rejected.</p> <p>Action: To be included in next year's works programme for investigation with a view to installing possible markings or similar to attempt to slow traffic down and improve environment for pedestrians.</p>
6. Reading Road, Padworth/ Aldermaston 40mph.	
Attendees	Cllr Graham Bridgeman, Cllr Dominic Boeck, PC Cllr Mike Warner

Minutes of Speed Limit Review 2018

17th October 2018

Discussion	<p>GD Explained that the original request was for a 40mph speed limit between Easter Park and Rectory Road. However if this were introduced it would change from a 40 to a 50 back to a 40 and up to 50mph again over a short distance. So they had reviewed the whole of the route.</p> <p>Comments on video – none</p> <p>DB – Number of collisions is excessive with two fatal accidents, view supported by two members of Aldermaston Parish Council</p> <p>GD – Our database only covers injury accidents not damage only. We have record of only two accidents in the past three years neither were fatal.</p> <p>CH – Confirmed no recent fatal accident</p> <p>DB – Number of vulnerable users and riders struggle with the back wash of HGV's using the route. Poor adherence of the speeds of vehicles have been challenged, riders that access the equestrian facility is frequent. Access to common encouraged West Berkshire Council should be supporting better general access.</p> <p>AD – reported SDR (Black cats used) 24/7 – 6 days this particular data set</p> <p>CH – Advised don't get entangled in the number of people speeding as it is about mean speed in relation to setting speed limit reviews.</p> <p>DB – Wanted to establish where the data was collected, wants to only focus on the complaint received</p> <p>MW – Expressed suspicions as to placement of the data recorders, they weren't placed at the quickest areas such as the dangerous area is further on from The Slade at the blind corner where the fishing shop is currently.</p> <p>GD – One was placed where the complaint was made and the other at a suitable site between the start of the speed limit and Easter Park. Placing them at the fastest area would not support their request for a lower speed limit as the mean speeds should not be more than a few mph faster than the proposed limit.</p> <p>MW – A clump site – 7 serious accidents/ 3 fatal on that particular corner over 40 years. If speed limit reduction requests to extend beyond Round Oak residential property to support the crossroads. Also equestrian / Jubilee nursery therefore lots of parents using the road.</p> <p>GB – Physiological need to reduce speed limit of this road to encourage drivers to reduce their speed and have requested this over a number of years. Accepts the officer report, well maintained road in normal road conditions these are the right speed limits of the road. It is clearly marked – but there has been a number of serious incidents on the bend and on the road when conditions are not normal.</p> <p>CH – Stated again you do not introduce a specific speed limit for a specific issue. Whole road reduction not appropriate, area of complaint, houses set well back.</p> <p>Defined hazards as bend, junctions, horses entering the highway, cyclists – incidents are mostly due to driver error – lowering the speed limit by 10mphs isn't going to make a difference.</p> <p>AM – Empathises with residences but feels speed limit is appropriate.</p> <p>GP – Appreciates the review of the whole road, and appreciates access/ entries to properties are a concern.</p> <p>MW – Feels psychologically having a lower speed will encourage drivers to reduce their speed.</p>
------------	--

Minutes of Speed Limit Review 2018

17th October 2018

	GP – Reason for a speed limit and needs to meet with driver expectation GB – Reasonable to ask around the issues AD – Explained how the equipment works DB – Clarity around stats data, and there has not been a fatal at all CH – Provided details of the website where the information can be accessed tvphampshiretraffweb.co.uk
Recommendation	Request for speed limit reduction rejected.
7. Oxford Road, Chieveley	
Attendees	Cllr Hilary Cole
Discussion	Comments on video – East Lane is where the doctor's surgery and drivers just pull out. Foliage can be a problem in areas along the road. As approach 40 mph limit new development and redevelopment of local garage. HC – agrees with the engineers report and recommendations. GP – where the 40mph starts (Tudor Avenue) there is a reason for the speed limit reduction and properties although not excessive. Reluctant to dilute HC – happy to go with 50mph as acts as a reminder to the local residents CH – suggests data meets with 50mph, how would this be reported to other parishes making a similar request. GD – difference here is where the junctions have visibility issue which cannot be easily resolved without obtaining land to improve visibility the council cannot make any changes without huge costs. CH – changes cannot make a precedence
Recommendation	Request to change the road to 50mph approved
AOB	None
Next Meeting (To be confirmed)	
End of meeting 13:35	

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