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## Stratford on Avon Area Committee - 14 November 2007 Speed Limit Review of A and B Roads

## Report of the Strategic Director for Environment and Economy

## Recommendation

That the proposed procedures for taking into account community concerns in carrying out the review of $A$ and $B$ road speed limits be approved.

## 1. Introduction

1.1 At its meeting on 28 June 2007 the Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee supported a procedure (which was attached as an Appendix to the report to that Committee) for carrying out and implementing the speed limit review of $A$ and $B$ roads. The procedure was in two parts:-
(i) A technical review of all A and B class roads by officers. A report then to be taken to each Area Committee with a schedule of the $A$ and $B$ roads in its area provisionally prioritising the schemes based on the technical assessment.
(ii) A review of the provisional priority list by the Area Committee taking into account community concerns.
1.2 The Appendix to the Environment Overview and Scrutiny report also explained that Area Committees would need to further consider the procedure they wish to adopt in order to carry out b), the review of the provisional priority list. This report proposes a procedure, and recommends that the Area Committees should adopt it. It should be appreciated that at this stage this procedure is only concerned with establishing relative priorities.
1.3 The technical review is expected to be completed around the end of 2007.

## 2. The Area Committee Procedure

2.1 The results of the technical review by officers will be sent to all Members and posted on the Warwickshire Web. Hard copies will be available on request for those who do not have access to the web. District, Borough and Parish Councils, Warwickshire Police, and the community as a whole will be invited to comment.
2.2 A period of at least four weeks will be allowed for discussion, and response, by the communities and others concerned.
2.3 At the end of this period, the community responses will be collated, and lists will be prepared for the consideration of each of the Area Committees showing the responses in relation to each route.
2.4 Schemes will have been allocated a provisional place in the priority list as a result of the technical review, which will have taken into account road casualties, existing traffic speeds and the road environment (but not so far considered community concerns). Area Committees will then take into account the expressed community concerns, as a result of which they may well wish to move certain schemes up the list in view of these concerns, or otherwise alter the list.
2.5 The Council have allocated $£ 2$ million in total each year to the five Area Committees for maintenance and safety and Area Committees will have decided how much of their allocation they wish to allocate to implementing the speed limit review. Officers will then proceed to implement the new speed limits in descending order of priority until the budget for that year is exhausted. Work will then continue the following year from the point where it left off.
2.6 It should be noted that at this stage no firm proposals will have been made on any particular schemes. Therefore, in due course the normal procedure for advertising particular speed limits and receiving and considering objections will apply. This procedure will be carried out on each scheme after the Area Committees have established their priorities. For this reason, isolated opposition to a proposal need not delay entering the proposal in the priority list. However, where a committee considers there is considerable opposition to a proposal (or the absence of a proposal) to change an existing speed limit, they may wish officers to investigate it further. In this case it would be necessary to delay entering the scheme in the priority list until the issues are resolved.
2.7 Many communities have been waiting a long time for the review of speed limits. For this reason it is proposed that implementing changes to those limits where there appears to be a reasonable consensus should not be delayed because further consideration is required for other schemes.
2.8 Where the Committee asks for further investigation of a particular section of route, officers will report the results back to the Committee. If the Committee then decides that a scheme is needed to impose a new limit then it will need to determine its relative priority either using the technical review criteria, or if it so decides, on the basis of community concerns.
2.9 Each Area Committee is free to adopt its own criteria and to decide the weight it wishes to attach to community concerns against the technical criteria. However, in the interests of consistency across the county it is recommended that the five Area Committees should adopt the same procedural arrangements (as set out above) for considering these decisions.
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