

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:

Monday 18th December 2017

Ref:	Title	Portfolio Member	Page No.
ID3398	Speed Limit Review October 2017	Councillor Jeanette Clifford	3 - 16



This page is intentionally left blank

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 10th 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 10th 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 10th 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.

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:		Glyn Davis	
Date of assessment:		12/10/2017	
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			
Disability			
Gender			

Reassignment		
Marriage and Civil Partnership		
Pregnancy and Maternity		
Race		
Religion or Belief		
Sex		
Sexual Orientation		
Further Comments relating to the item:		
No individual strands directly affected. Setting an appropriate speed limit will guide drivers to drive at an appropriate speed.		
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: 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), for publication on the WBC website.

Draft Minutes of Speed Limit Review 2017

Held on 10th October 2017

Present Councillor Graham Pask (GP)
 Councillor Billy Drummond (BD)
 Chris Hulme TVP (CH)
 Glyn Davis WBC (GD)
 Cheryl Evans WBC (CE) (Minutes)

Apologies Alan Dunkerton WBC (AD)

Introduction	
<p>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. GP thanked everyone for their efforts around pulling the data together for the speed limit review with AD being poorly and wished him well.</p>	
Speed Limit Requests	
1. Enborne Road - request to reduce the 60mph speed limit to 40mph from the eastern village boundary to the Hamstead Marshall 30mph terminal signs	
Attendees	Parish Cllr Alan Croney (AC)
Discussion	<p>AC introduced the report which was aimed at introducing better road safety in the area. Reported high use by pedestrians/cyclists at the weekend using Enborne Road as a link between the various public right of ways in the area. The road is narrow and lack of verges in places hinders pedestrian movement. HGV, wide vehicles and busses use the road regularly and had witnessed reporting a number of wing mirror clippings (evidence of broken wing mirrors in the road).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recent local survey (high return rate – 43%) raised the issue of speeding as a major community concern • Travel route rather than just a village route. • Wild life is relevant in this area • 5 public right of ways <p>A number of crashes had also been recorded at the bend by the Craven Arms</p> <p>GP considered the request to be a few kilometres too much</p> <p>CH explained that isolated incidents / crashes at the Craven Arms should not be treated by changing speed limit.</p> <p>GD explained unrealistic speed limits will not change behaviour and was concerned request was too far west and had concerns as to the maintenance on the hill to the west of Enborne would be difficult and expensive due to the amount of traffic management required to maintain the speed limit repeater signs and posts.</p>

Draft Minutes of Speed Limit Review 2017 Held on 10th October 2017

	<p>GP suggested that as a compromise the speed limit is reduced closer to the village and not to the border with Hamstead Marshal.</p> <p>CH queried if a signed only speed limit would be enough to keep drivers within the speed limit and stressed that any requirement for police enforcement would be a low priority due to current commitments and cuts in the force.</p> <p>GP suggested that some of the maintenance costs will need to be paid for by the parish ie for gateways etc</p> <p>AC offered to provide help by contacting and dealing with landowners should any land be required to facilitate the new signs and gateways. AC also offered financial help to cover the cost of the signs and gateways.</p> <p>GP explained that at this point the recommendation will be put forward to the members for approval will be placed on the 2018/19 works programme.</p>
<p>Recommendation</p>	<p>GP/BD/CH/GD – agreed to put forward to reduce the speed limit ONLY between the two key public right of ways (or as close as feasible) to encourage walking/ cycling and in response to the community concerns raised. Enborne Parish to support the costs as necessary in relation to installing any gateways.</p>
<p>2. Yattendon - request to increase the 30mph speed limit to 40mph.</p>	
<p>Attendees</p>	<p>Cllr Virginia Von Celsing (VC)</p>
<p>Discussion</p>	<p>Request originated from Yattendon Parish Council after an on-site meeting with West Berkshire Council Traffic engineers, Parish and Local Member and Yattendon Estates.</p> <p>GD explained David Slack representing Yattendon estates supported the speed limit increase at the on-site meeting but voiced concern at the parish meeting. To date have had no response.</p> <p>VC felt the gateways were a good idea and had spoken to the Parish Chairman.</p> <p>VC also reported that it was important to ensure the elderly residents at the edge of the village are still covered by the 30mph limit as they need to walk along the road to get into the village.</p> <p>GP opened Google maps to have a better view of the road – the sewage works already has a school sign in that area so replacing it with a speed limit sign and gateway here would be appropriate. Back from this point the 400 metre buffer would be introduced. This would also cover local community concerns.</p>

Draft Minutes of Speed Limit Review 2017 Held on 10th October 2017

	<p>VC asked about payment</p> <p>GD reported there is Capital budget to cover speed limit changes.</p>
Recommendation	Re-locate the 30 mph limit to the entrance of the sewage works if possible and apply a 400m long 40mph buffer back from this point.
3. Compton, request by Compton Parish Council to reduce the speed limit to 20mph in School Road by the school and extending the new limit to include Cheap Street and Horn Street	
Attendees	Cllr Virginia Von Celsing (VC)
Discussion	<p>VC explained the Parish Council support the proposal</p> <p>GD Explained that traffic calming would be required to control speeds below 24mph. Some lighting will be required to highlight the feature changes but this will be kept to a minimum. If this scheme is approved it can only proceed should all stakeholders agree to the traffic calming and that it will be funded from Section 106 funds.</p> <p>CH commented that any features added needed to ensure the speeds are self enforcing.</p> <p>GD noted that speeds by the school are already low, traffic calming features will also be kept to a minimum.</p>
Recommendation	Speed limit to be reduced pending agreement, results of consultation and subject to S106 being available to fund the scheme
4. Fishers Lane, Cold Ash. Reduce the speed limit from 60mph (National) to 30mph. Resident request who submitted a 13 signature petition in support of this request. Legal advised to review.	
Attendees	Not represented
Discussion	GP/BD/GD/CH: The environment does not meet the criteria for a 30mph speed limit. Non compliance rates if introduced are expected to be high.
Recommendation	Current speed limit is appropriate. No change recommended.
5. Burdens Heath, Upper Bucklebury. Request from Bucklebury Parish Council to extend the current speed limit to cover a new property build.	
Attendees	Graham Pask (GP)
Discussion	GD explained <u>it is important to note</u> that planning had approved the access to the property using data from the current speed limit of the road (60mph) and that the visibility splay was increased to reflect the

Draft Minutes of Speed Limit Review 2017 Held on 10th October 2017

	<p>higher speeds. To make the required road changes to move the limit would incur considerable costs for such a small extension. An approximate estimation would be in the region of £5k. Section 106 money is available but should be used to support the whole community rather than one household.</p> <p>CH/BD – suggested costs to be covered by parish or property owner.</p> <p>GP in discussions with Parish had already concluded that it shouldn't come from tax payer's money unless it is legitimate use of 106 monies. The householder should be contacted to contribute towards the costs.</p>
Recommendation	GD to write to the parish council to suggest the costs to be covered by the parish or householder.
<p>6. B3051 Brimpton Common, Brimpton - reduction from 40mph to 30mph of the small section within the West Berkshire Area (approx 150 metres).</p>	
Attendees	Dennis & Mary Cowdrey (DC/ MC)
Discussion	<p>GP thanked Mr & Mrs Cowdrey for attending the meeting earlier than planned.</p> <p>DC/MC introduced the report and explained their frustrations as the road sits across two borders – Hampshire / West Berkshire. They thanked the board for giving the opportunity to be heard at the SLR.</p> <p>GP explained he would support the 30mph reduction if Hampshire agrees to the reduction.</p> <p>CH explained the collaboration between Hampshire and Thames Valley Police forces and agreed to ascertain the Hampshire CC view.</p> <p>GP reconfirmed GP previous reported concerns regarding the drain on lining and maintenance budgets.</p> <p>DC explained the Parish is becoming a 'competent parish council' and will be soon able to support cleaning and cutting back of foliage in respect to highway signage.</p> <p>GP expressed he was sympathetic of the proposal but the scheme was too small to do on our own but would support the proposal if Hampshire decide to treat the B3051 within the Hampshire border..</p>
Recommendation	Existing speed limit is appropriate and too small to be cost effective to change in isolation. But if Hampshire do reduce the speed limit to 30mph and lead on the speed reduction than we agree for HCC to an extension into the West Berkshire area as detailed on the SLR plan.
AOB	The SLR finished ahead of time as DC/MC were able to attend the meeting ahead of schedule. GD reported he had not received any

Draft Minutes of Speed Limit Review 2017 Held on 10th October 2017

	other notifications other than those that had attended the SLR. GP had matters to attend to so the SLR was closed ahead of time with a proviso that if representatives did turn up after the meeting had closed they could discuss any issues with GP directly.
Next Meeting (To be confirmed)	
End of meeting 12:45	

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

This page is intentionally left blank