

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 9th 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 Carlyne 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 9th 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

Delays in implementation could have serious financial implications for the Council

Delays in implementation could compromise the Council's position

Considered or reviewed by Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission or associated Task Groups within preceding six months

Item is Urgent Key Decision

Report is to note only

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 9th 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

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
<p>Will you be processing SENSITIVE or “special category” personal data?</p> <p>Note – sensitive personal data is described as “<i>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</i>”</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Will you be processing data on a large scale?</p> <p>Note – Large scale might apply to the number of individuals affected OR the volume of data you are processing OR both</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Will your project or system have a “social media” dimension?</p> <p>Note – will it have an interactive element which allows users to communicate directly with one another?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Will any decisions be automated?</p> <p>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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Will your project/system involve CCTV or monitoring of an area accessible to the public?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Will you be using the data you collect to match or cross-reference against another existing set of data?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Will you be using any novel, or technologically advanced systems or processes?</p> <p>Note – this could include biometrics, “internet of things” connectivity or anything that is currently not widely utilised</p>	<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.

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

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

1 What are the main aims, objectives and intended outcomes of the proposed decision and who is likely to benefit from it?	
Aims:	To review speed limits on our highways within the current Department for Transport guidelines.
Objectives:	To set appropriate and consistent speed limits within our district taking into consideration government guidance, accident history and community benefits.
Outcomes:	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.
Benefits:	A safer improved highway network.

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.		
(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.)		
Group Affected	What might be the effect?	Information to support this

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
Further Comments relating to the item:		
None		

3 Result	
Are there any aspects of the proposed decision, including how it is delivered or accessed, that could contribute to inequality?	No
Please provide an explanation for your answer: All highway users needs have been considered in undertaking this review.	
Will the proposed decision have an adverse impact upon the lives of people, including employees and service users?	No
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), for publication on the WBC website.