

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**Executive Decision Record**

Decision Maker:	Executive Member for Economy, Transport and Environment
Date:	26 November 2015
Title:	Springvale Road, Kings Worthy – Proposed 30mph Speed Limit
Reference:	7047
Report From:	Director of Economy, Transport and Environment

Contact name: Andy Smith

Tel: 01962 832292

Email: andy.smith@hants.gov.uk

1. The decision:

- 1.1 That the Traffic Regulation Order to reduce the speed limit along Springvale Road, Kings Worthy, from 40mph to 30mph is implemented.

2. Reason for the decision:

- 2.1. In recent years the elected County Member, Councillor Porter, and Kings Worthy and Headbourne Worthy Parish Councils, have pursued a reduction of the speed limit on Springvale Road from 40mph to 30mph in response to requests from some local residents and local safety-related concerns. In support of the request from local councillors, a scheme was developed and the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) advertised in accordance with the statutory procedure. Following advertising the TRO, the balance of responses was broadly supportive and under current policies it is therefore considered appropriate to proceed with the Order.

3. Other options considered and rejected:

- 3.1. To not implement the Traffic Regulation Order. This option was rejected on the basis of public support for the proposal, notwithstanding some objections, and the fact the current policies would, on balance, favour the progression of the order.
- 3.2 To implement a 30mph speed limit just on a shorter length of the road where the mean speed is currently at a more appropriate level for Police support. Mean speeds vary along the length of Springvale Road and it would be possible to implement a 30mph limit only over that section where vehicle speeds are at or close to this speed. This option is not recommended as it could lead to confusion, and additionally the associated 40mph terminal sign

exiting the 30mph limit could encourage higher speeds. If a new 30 mph speed limit were to be introduced, it is considered more appropriate to implement a consistent new limit of 30mph.

4. Conflicts of interest:

4.1. Conflicts of interest declared by the decision-maker:

4.2. Conflicts of interest declared by other Executive Members consulted:

5. Dispensation granted by the Conduct Advisory Panel: none.

6. Reason(s) for the matter being dealt with if urgent: not applicable.

7. Statement from the Decision Maker:

Approved by: ----- Executive Member for Economy, Transport and Environment Councillor Seán D T Woodward	Date: 26 November 2015
---	---

Decn/7047/AS

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**Decision Report**

Decision Maker:	Executive Member for Economy, Transport and Environment
Date:	26 November 2015
Title:	Springvale Road, Kings Worthy – Proposed 30mph Speed Limit
Reference:	7047
Report From:	Director of Economy, Transport and Environment

Contact name: Andy Smith

Tel: 01962 832292

Email: andy.smith@hants.gov.uk

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1. This report seeks to make the case to implement a Traffic Order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the effect of which would be to impose a 30mph speed limit (existing 40mph) on that length of C95 Springvale Road, between its junction with C196 Lovedon Lane and a point approximately 2150 metres south-west thereof.

2. Background information

- 2.1 In recent years the elected County Member, Councillor Porter, and Kings Worthy and Headbourne Worthy Parish Councils, have pursued a reduction of the speed limit on Springvale Road from 40mph to 30mph in response to requests from some local residents and local safety-related concerns. In March 2010 a petition with 381 signatures was raised by local children, which was forwarded to Hampshire County Council by Kings Worthy Parish Council.

Since then, Kings Worthy and Headbourne Worthy Parish Councils have organised questionnaire surveys with local residents to establish the extent of local support for a reduced speed limit. The first survey in 2010 had a low response rate of only 160 out of 1800 slips returned. The Parish Councils undertook a further survey in 2013 that produced 440 responses, with 58% in favour of the 30mph limit and 42% against.

- 2.2 When this matter was first considered, there had been one injury accident reported in November 2007 with excess speed noted as a contributory factor. This was a single vehicle loss of control incident at the northern end near Lovedon Lane junction, resulting in serious injuries. There had also been two injury-accidents involving child pedestrians where vehicle speed was not noted

as a contributory factor, one in December 2009 at the northern end near Lovedon Lane when a twelve year old child ran into the path of a car and was seriously injured, and one in February 2006 towards the southern end at Nations Hill junction when a ten year old child crossed the road into the path of a car and received slight injuries.

The injury-accident record has improved throughout the section of Springvale Road in question. In the five year period up to 30/04/15 there has been one injury-accident recorded. This occurred in January 2011 and involved two motorcycles traveling north in collision with a car turning right out of Cundell Way (towards the northern end of Springvale Road). This resulted in slight injuries sustained by one of the motorcycle riders and a causation of 'travelling too fast for conditions' was reported by the Police.

- 2.3 Since this matter has been under investigation, speed surveys have been carried out at regular intervals at four locations throughout the section of road in question. Mean speeds have varied slightly, but have always remained within the low to mid thirty range and around a level appropriate for a 30mph speed limit to be considered (see following table with mean averaged speeds shown in mph).

Location (north to south)	Sept 2010		Sept 2012		June 2014	
	Nbd	Sbd	Nbd	Sbd	Nbd	Sbd
South of The Pastures	36.2	35.7	26.9	26.4	34.7	34.2
North of Cundell Way	27.5	28.8	29.9	29.7	31.2	31.7
North of Haydn Close	35.0	32.8	34.3	34.7	37.4	35.9
South of Nations Hill	33.3	35.1	31.7	33.2	34.5	35.4

Current guidance states that for the Police to support a new speed limit, existing mean speeds should be at or close to the proposed new limit (see para 4.2 below). In sections of Springvale Road, the existing mean speeds are slightly higher than the Police would ideally like to fully support a consistent new limit of 30mph along the length of Springvale Road to link with the existing 30mph limit at the southern end.

- 2.5 Attached are :

A location plan, and
A descriptive plan of the area.

3. Cost

- 3.1. The cost of advertising the Traffic Regulation Order has been met from the ordinary Traffic Management Programme. If the Traffic Regulation Order is not progressed further, there are no further costs associated with this project.

4. Consultations

- 4.1 The proposed 30mph speed limit was publicly advertised from 19th June to 10th July 2015.
- 4.2 130 representations were made supporting the proposal, comprising 79 emails/letters and 51 by return of a tear-off slip provided in a Liberal Democrat promotional leaflet.
- 4.3 A total of 53 objections were received during the 21-day formal advertising period. Some objectors additionally have criticised the use of the leaflet as a means of promoting the scheme and as it only allowed for residents to show support.
- 4.4 Objectors raised a number of issues with the proposal. In general, the prevailing point made was that a 30 mph speed limit is not needed for road safety, and there were concerns that introducing a 30 mph limit on Springvale Road would devalue the importance of speed control in locations where inappropriate speeds present a greater danger, and therefore have a negative effect on safety in the wider area. There was also a belief that a revised limit would be ignored by many motorists, leading them to overtake or tailgate drivers complying with the lower speed limit, and potentially presenting a greater hazard than the existing 40 mph limit.

5. Local Member's View

- 5.1. County Councillor Jackie Porter supports the original proposal to reduce the speed limit to 30mph.

6. Police View

- 6.1 Whilst the Police have indicated that they do not fully support the implementation of a 30mph limit throughout the whole section of road in question, they have not objected to the proposal.

7. Conclusion

- 7.1 The decision whether or not to implement the Traffic Regulation Order is a finely balanced judgement because the accident record alone would not justify the further progression of the Traffic Regulation Order. However, under current policies other considerations also bring influence to bear, and since the divided community view tends, on balance, towards support for the scheme it is recommended that it be implemented and that consequently the investment in the proposal thus far is not abandoned.

8. Recommendation

- 8.1 That the Traffic Regulation Order to reduce the speed limit along Springvale Road, Kings Worthy, from 40mph to 30mph is implemented.

Rpt/7047/AS

CORPORATE OR LEGAL INFORMATION:**Links to the Corporate Strategy**

Hampshire safer and more secure for all:	yes
Corporate Improvement plan link number (if appropriate):	
Maximising well-being:	yes
Corporate Improvement plan link number (if appropriate):	
Enhancing our quality of place:	yes
Corporate Improvement plan link number (if appropriate):	

Section 100 D - Local Government Act 1972 - background documents

The following documents discuss facts or matters on which this report, or an important part of it, is based and have been relied upon to a material extent in the preparation of this report. (NB: the list excludes published works and any documents which disclose exempt or confidential information as defined in the Act.)

DocumentLocation

None

IMPACT ASSESSMENTS:

1. Equality Duty

1.1. The County Council has a duty under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 ('the Act') to have due regard in the exercise of its functions to the need to:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act;
- Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, gender and sexual orientation) and those who do not share it;
- Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Due regard in this context involves having due regard in particular to:

- a) The need to remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons sharing a relevant characteristic connected to that characteristic;
- b) Take steps to meet the needs of persons sharing a relevant protected characteristic different from the needs of persons who do not share it;
- c) Encourage persons sharing a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.

1.2. Equalities Impact Assessment:

The proposals in this report have been developed with due regard to the requirements of the Equality Act 2010, including the Public Sector Equality Duty and the Council's equality objectives.

It is considered that the issues covered by this report will not have impacts requiring further specific actions by the Council above those already established in its existing policies and working procedures.

2. Impact on Crime and Disorder:

2.1. No impact

3. Climate Change:

How does what is being proposed impact on our carbon footprint / energy consumption?

No impact

3.1. How does what is being proposed consider the need to adapt to climate change, and be resilient to its longer term impacts?

No impact