

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 13 December 2018

Ref:	Title	Portfolio Member(s)	Page No.
ID3664	Speed Limit Review - October 2018	Councillor Jeanette Clifford	3 - 20



This page is intentionally left blank

Individual Executive Member Decision

Speed Limit Review October 2018

Committee considering report:	Individual Executive Member Decision
Date ID to be signed:	13/12/2018
Portfolio Member:	Cllr Jeanette Clifford
Date Portfolio Member agreed report:	9 November 2018
Forward Plan Ref:	ID3664

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 17th October 2018 and to seek approval of the recommendations.

2. Recommendation

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 Graham Jones - Any comments received will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting. |
| Overview & Scrutiny Management | Cllr Emma Webster - Any comments received will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting. |

Commission Chairman:

Ward Members:

Cllr Adrian Edwards - Any comments received will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Cllr Howard Bairstow - Any comments received will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Cllr Anthony Stansfeld - Any comments received will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Cllr James Cole - Any comments received will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Cllr Dominic Boeck - Any comments received will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Cllr Gordon Lundie - Any comments received will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Cllr Mollie Lock - Any comments received will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Cllr Graham Bridgeman - Any comments received will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Cllr Hillary Cole – I am happy with this report and have no further comments to make.

Opposition Spokesperson:

Cllr Lee Dillon - Any comments received will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Local Stakeholders: N/A

Officers Consulted: Mark Edwards and Mark Cole

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 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 17th October 2018, was comprised of the following members:

- Councillor Graham Pask;
- Councillor Alan Macro;
- Glyn Davis, Principal Traffic & Road Safety Engineer;
- Chris Hulme, Thames Valley Police Traffic Management Officer;
- Cheryl Evans, Senior Road Safety Officer;
- Alan Dunkerton, Speed Co-ordinator Officer;

6.3 The Task Group considered six 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) B4000 Wickham Village – request for a 30mph speed limit.
- (4) Welford Village – request for a 30mph speed limit.
- (5) Eastbury, Lambourn – request for a 20mph speed limit.
- (6) Reading Road, Aldermaston/Burghfield – request for a 40mph speed limit between the Easter Park roundabout and the junction with Rectory Road.
- (7) Oxford Road, Chieveley – Request to reduce the current national speed limit to either a 40 or 50mph 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 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) 3: B4000 Wickham Village, Welford – request for a 30mph speed limit was rejected. The panel believe drivers are driving to the environment and reducing it would make the speed limit artificially low which would result in large scale non-compliance. It was recommended that the Council look at improving pedestrian facilities at the crossroads. The Parish Council also informed the panel that they were considering purchasing a VAS for south bound traffic. It was agreed that the current speed limit to the north west of the village is brought in closer to the village to increase its effect.
- (2) 4: Welford Village – The request to introduce a 30mph limit through the village was agreed. It was also agreed to extend the current 40mph limit on Rood Hill.
- (3) 7: Oxford Road, Chieveley, A request for a 50mph speed limit was approved.

7.2 The Task Group recommended that:

- (1) 1: A343 Andover Road, Newbury 20mph – request for a 20mph speed limit be rejected on the grounds that current speeds were too high for a 20mph to be introduced without installing traffic calming. When school time speed data was looked at in isolation mean speeds fell to 20mph. It was requested that the 30mph terminal signs to the south are improved.
- (2) 2: A343 Andover Road, Newbury 30mph – request to reduce the speed limit to 30mph be rejected. The panel said this was a high quality road with good visibility and pedestrian facilities. Drivers are driving to the environment and reducing it would be make the speed limit artificially low which would result in non-compliance.
- (3) 5: Eastbury, Lambourn – request for the 20mph zone in the village was rejected. Current mean speed in one direction is too high for a 20 mph zone to be introduced without traffic calming measures. It was agreed that a scheme to improve markings and investigate ways of slowing drivers down would be put forward for Member approval on the Traffic Management & Road Safety works programme for 2019/20.
- (4) 6: Reading Road, Aldermaston/Burghfield – speed limit request be rejected. A 40mph speed limit would be out of character to the environment and current speeds would indicate there would be an issue with non-compliance.

8. Conclusion

- (1) Following the task group meeting two of the seven requests were recommended for approval. A further change was recommended at Wickham which wasn't requested but was agreed with the Parish Council Chair at the review. The recommendations set out in 7.1 and 7.2 above are therefore put forward for approval.

Background Papers:

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

Subject to Call-In:

Yes: No:

Wards affected:

Falkland, Kintbury, Chieveley, Lambourn Valley, Aldermaston, Mortimer

Strategic Aims and Priorities Supported:

The proposals will help achieve the following Council Strategy aim(s):

- BEC – Better educated communities**
- SLE – A stronger local economy**
- P&S – Protect and support those who need it**
- HQL – Maintain a high quality of life within our communities**
- MEC – Become an even more effective Council**

The proposals contained in this report will help to achieve the following Council Strategy priority(ies):

- BEC1 – Improve educational attainment**
 - BEC2 – Close the educational attainment gap**
 - SLE1 – Enable the completion of more affordable housing**
 - SLE2 – Deliver or enable key infrastructure improvements in relation to roads, rail, flood prevention, regeneration and the digital economy**
 - P&S1 – Good at safeguarding children and vulnerable adults**
 - HQL1 – Support communities to do more to help themselves**
 - MEC1 – Become an even more effective Council**
-

Officer details:

Name: Glyn Davis
Job Title: Principal Engineer
Tel No: 01635 519501
E-mail Address: glyn.davis@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 17th October 2018

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:	Economy & Environment
Service:	Transport & Countryside
Team:	Traffic Management & Road Safety
Lead Officer:	Glyn Davis
Title of Project/System:	Speed Limit Review
Date of Assessment:	23/10/2018

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:	Glyn Davis
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: Glyn Davis

Date:23/10/2018

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.

This page is intentionally left blank

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	<p>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.</p> <p>Comments on video – Noted 30mph signs don't stand out. Garage/shop busy area. Good grass verge separates pavements from the carriageway.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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'.</p> <p>CH - These roads need to be traffic calmed otherwise there would be no way to make people comply without continued enforcement.</p> <p>CE – Education is key and the work needs to be delivered in primary schools to make a difference,</p> <p>GP – Drew the discussions back to speed limits</p> <p>AM – Can we enhance what is already on the road – roundel on road / larger 30mph sign and repeaters at the southern entrance.</p> <p>CH – Figures show the speed are lower during school times – if not then robust traffic calm will need to be added</p> <p>AM – 20mph lead to more pollution</p>
Recommendation	<p>20mph not recommended.</p> <p>Action – Improve 30mph signs and consider 30mph roundel markings at the 30mph terminal signs.</p>
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. 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>
<p>Recommendation</p>	<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>
<p>6. Reading Road, Padworth/ Aldermaston 40mph.</p>	
<p>Attendees</p>	<p>Cllr Graham Bridgeman, Cllr Dominic Boeck, PC Cllr Mike Warner</p>

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

	<p>GP – Reason for a speed limit and needs to meet with driver expectation</p> <p>GB – Reasonable to ask around the issues</p> <p>AD – Explained how the equipment works</p> <p>DB – Clarity around stats data, and there has not been a fatal at all</p> <p>CH – Provided details of the website where the information can be accessed tvphampshiretraffweb.co.uk</p>
Recommendation	Request for speed limit reduction rejected.
7. Oxford Road, Chieveley	
Attendees	Cllr Hilary Cole
Discussion	<p>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.</p> <p>HC – agrees with the engineers report and recommendations.</p> <p>GP – where the 40mph starts (Tudor Avenue) there is a reason for the speed limit reduction and properties although not excessive. Reluctant to dilute</p> <p>HC – happy to go with 50mph as acts as a reminder to the local residents</p> <p>CH – suggests data meets with 50mph, how would this be reported to other parishes making a similar request.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>CH – changes cannot make a precedence</p>
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