

# Portfolio Holder Decisions/Leader Decisions

Monday 14 March 2022

## Minutes

### Attendance

#### Committee Members

Councillor Wallace Redford

#### Officers

Mike McDonnell, Senior Engineer

Isabelle Moorhouse, Democratic Services Officer

#### Public Speaker

Carl Conn

### 1. "The Warwickshire County Council (The Ridgeway & Bishopton Lane, Stratford upon Avon) (Restricted Road) Order 2022

Councillor Wallace Redford stated that any member of the public had the right to object to consultation process or recommendations that the council/a councillor planned to make. The purpose of this meeting was to decide whether the planned decision needed to be changed or rejected and there would be no decision made in this meeting.

Mr Carl Conn was grateful for the information being made available, and he objected to this order based on two things: 'that the County Council were failing at actioning their climate change emergency declaration from 2019 as they were prioritising car transport and not making enough cycling provisions. It was also not addressing the obesity epidemic, the issue of poorer people wanting to cycle as they could not afford cars or the fact that cycling was not safe. The order did not acknowledge the 3000 houses that were being developed at the time of the meeting which will mean an extra 4000 car journeys on the road. There was land on the plan that had been reserved for further development which could mean an extra 5000 houses and 5-7000 extra car journeys. The plan did not address the 'pinch point' over the bridge (which is the responsibility of the Canal Trust) which was dangerous without the extra houses. The order also did not include a cycle plan for the school and students who may plan to cycle on this road which lead to the A46, M40 and railway station due to the speed cars go on it. Roads need to be prioritised for pedestrians and cyclists with a separate cycleway, more people were likely to cycle due to increased petrol and gas prices. The council's plans were short term and needed to be developed for the distant future. It was the council's responsibility to make roads safe for all cyclists in Stratford'.

In response to Mike McDonnell (Senior Engineer), Carl Conn stated that they knew there would be 3000 houses on the one spot of land as well as all the land going towards Wilmcote.

Mike McDonnell was aware of developments south of the A422 which were all decisions made by Stratford District Council; this plan was to accommodate the 500 houses being developed between Bishopston Lane and the A46 which was currently a 40mph road. There were also a number of crossing points between Bishopston and Stratford; to mitigate this flow five uncontrolled crossing points and two pelican crossings either side of the traffic island were planned. The order also proposed a 30mph speed limit reduction from the current 40mph so it would be safer to cross. Speed data on Bishopston lane was obtained and shared with the police and this showed that the average speed limit on this road was 35mph and on the Ridgeway it was 38-39mph. Ladder markings were proposed to go in the road to reduce the road space to 2.4m each direction to make vehicles travel slower.

Carl Conn stated that pinch points bring cars and cyclists closer together and the highway code was 1.5m distance between cars and cyclists. Cyclists i.e. children who do not cycle straight would be hit by cars and cars always move towards the pavement at pelican crossings and could hit a cyclist.

In response to Carl Conn, Mike McDonnell stated that segregated cycle lanes were beyond the remit of this scheme.

Councillor Redford noted that there was a climate emergency agenda, but it was not part of the remit that Mike McDonnell had to work to. There was a climate emergency policy implemented that the highways team worked to as well as a cycling infrastructure plan which linked to the national one. There were cycling plans in place which take time to be implemented and other plans did include cycling provisions but this proposal did not.

Carl Conn said that other Stratford residents he spoke to said it was too dangerous to cycle on Bishopston road.

Mike McDonnell contacted that transport planning team and they stated that cycling will be used to create a modal shift and cycling schemes will run alongside road schemes. He reiterated that scheme was to reduce the speed limit on the road to 30mph and not about cycling; cycling schemes would be part of a different plan.

Carl Conn said that people want safe cycling schemes now. He expressed concerns about the pinch point on the bridge and that the traffic lights were not adhered to.

Mike McDonnell stated that they could not build another bridge for cyclists and pedestrians as it was not county council land and bridge construction was a lot more than this scheme was asking for and covered. Transport planners look at the whole area where a scheme is proposed and cost everything together and make sure all the schemes link up. There had been no accidents on the Ridgeway for five years but there had been two collisions at the Glebe Road junction.

A discussion followed about which direction commuters would go to get to specific locations.

Mike McDonnell stated that the planning teams asked him to look at a cycle/pedestrian path from the Stratford park & ride via the canal into the town centre. Carl Conn noted that thousands of workers commuted on Timothy Bridge Road and children going to and from Stratford school would also use this road.

Councillor Redford noted the issues raised and decided to get further information and clarity before deciding. He informed Carl Conn that he would receive a formal written response when he had made his decision.

Councillor Redford noted that there was a climate emergency agenda, but it was not part of the remit that Mike McDonnell had to work to. There was a climate emergency policy implemented that the highways team worked to as well as a cycling infrastructure plan which linked to the national one. There were cycling plans in place which take time to be implemented and other plans did include cycling provisions but this one did not.

Carl Conn said that other Stratford residents he spoke to said it was too dangerous to cycle on Bishopston road.

Mike McDonnell contacted that transport planning team and they stated that cycling will be used to create a modal shift and cycling schemes will run alongside road schemes. He reiterated that scheme was to reduce the speed limit on the road to 30mph and not about cycling; cycling schemes would be part of a different plan.

Carl Conn said that people want safe cycling schemes now. He expressed concerns about the pinch point on the bridge and that the traffic lights were not adhered to.

Mike McDonnell stated that they could not build another bridge for cyclists and pedestrians as it was not county council land and bridge construction was a lot more than this scheme was asking for and covered. Transport planners look at the whole area where a scheme is proposed and cost everything together and make sure all the schemes link up. There had been no accidents on the Ridgeway bridge for five years but there had been two collisions at the Glebe Road junction.

A discussion followed about which direction commuters would go to get to specific locations.

Mike McDonnell stated that the planning teams asked him to look at a cycle/pedestrian path from the Stratford park & ride via the canal into the town centre. Carl Conn noted that thousands of workers commuted on Timothy Bridge Road and children going to and from Stratford school would also use this road.

Councillor Redford noted the issues raised and decided to get further information and clarity before making a decision. He informed Carl Conn that he would receive a formal written response when he had made his decision.

Meeting concluded at 10:27

This page is intentionally left blank

## Portfolio Holder Decision

### The Warwickshire County Council (The Ridgeway & Bishopton Lane, Stratford upon Avon)(Restricted Road) Order 2022

<b>Portfolio Holder</b>	<b>Portfolio Holder for Transport and Planning</b>
<b>Date of decision</b>	<b>14th March 2022</b>
	<b>Signed</b> 

#### 1. Recommended Decision

- 1.1 That the Portfolio Holder for Transport and Environment agrees that The Warwickshire County Council (The Ridgeway & Bishopton Lane, Stratford upon Avon)(Restricted Road) Order 2022 be introduced as advertised.

#### 2. Reasons for decisions

- 2.1 The revocation of The Warwickshire County Council (The Ridgeway, Stratford upon Avon) (40mph Speed Limit) Order 2004 has been proposed and, as a consequence, a 30mph speed limit will come into force by virtue of the street lighting. A plan showing the effect of this proposal is appended to this report in Appendix A.
- 2.2 These proposals were published on 16th December 2021 in the Stratford Observer and notices were also displayed on site. This report considers the objections received as a result of the consultation. See Appendix B
- 2.3 The Statement of Reasons for the proposed speed limit changes is appended to this report in Appendix C.

#### 3. Background information

- 3.1 The Ridgeway Order also includes Bishopton Lane as far as Timothy's Bridge Road and the A422 Alcester Road between The Ridgeway, to the A46.

- 3.2 In 2007, a new Speed Management Strategy was approved by the County Council as a result of the Speed Limit Circular 01/2006 issued by the Department for Transport (DfT). This Circular was subsequently superseded by Circular 01/2013. The Circular covers three key areas: Education; Engineering; and Enforcement. The setting of speed limits is a key element of this strategy. See Appendix D
- 3.3 The DfT Circular 01/2013 advises that the following criteria are applied when setting speed limits:
- (i) Analysing the existing speed data to identify the mean speed of drivers;
  - (ii) To consider the environment and nature of the road; and
  - (iii) To consider any relevant injury accident data.
- The three roads each contain a significant length of frontage which is undergoing substantial planned housing development and a number of new access roads.
- Along these routes there have been three personal injury collisions in the past three years. The relationship between speed and likelihood of collisions as well as severity of injury is complex, but there is a correlation. Lower speed limits will improve the safety of the three roads and the proposed new accesses.
- 3.4 The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 enables the Council to make orders prohibiting the driving of motor vehicles on a road at a speed exceeding that specified in the order. The matters that the Council must take into consideration when making a decision upon making such an order are also set out in Appendix D annexed.
- 3.5 This proposal was originally put forward in November 2017 and attracted one Objection from the Police. Since then, a system of centre carriageway 'ladder markings' has been put forward in an effort to encourage motorists to adhere to the new 30mph limit. See Appendix E. The Police no longer object.
- 3.6 The previous Report was presented to the Portfolio Holder in September 2018 and was signed off to be introduced as advertised. However, problems on site meant the Developer was not in a position to introduce the TRO within the two-year time frame allowed and as a consequence, the original proposal had to 'lapse' and the whole TRO process re-started at zero cost to WCC. See Appendix F

#### 4. Consultation

- 4.1 Consultation has been carried out with the Local Member, Local Borough Council, Warwickshire Police, Fire Service, Ambulance Service, Road Haulage Association and other statutory consultees.
- 4.2 Public notices advertising the revocation of The Warwickshire County Council (The Ridgeway, Stratford upon Avon) (40mph Speed limit) Order 2004, "The Warwickshire County Council (The Ridgeway & Bishopton Lane, Stratford upon

Avon)(Restricted Road) Order 2022” were published in the Stratford Observer newspaper on 16.12.21 (Appendix B). Notices were also displayed on street outlining the proposals. This resulted in the receipt of two Objections, summarised in the table below; Redacted Objection emails in Appendix G

Representations-	Officer Response
Objections 2, Comments 2, Support 0.	
<p><b>Objection - from Resident of Avenue Road, SoA.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposal does not match WCC or SDC commitment to Climate Change, Green Environment or safe utility cycling in the County/District.</li> <li>- Paragraph wanting “safe <u>segregated</u> cycle paths”.</li> </ul> <p>Proposes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bishopton Lane to be reduced to 20mph.</li> <li>- New segregated 2way cycleway along whole of Bishopton Ln</li> <li>- New foot &amp; cycle bridge introduced over the canal.</li> <li>- This area very dangerous, Resident has seen a few near misses and “cyclists hit by oncoming traffic”.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Noted, but beyond the remit of this proposal.</li> <li>- Noted, but beyond the remit of this proposal.</li> <li>- A 20mph limit was looked at initially, but with the straight-line nature of the road and it being only 5.5 to 5.7m wide meant it was not feasible to introduce horizontal or vertical traffic measures. There would also be budget concerns if applied along the road’s length.</li> <li>- Noted, but beyond the remit of this proposal.</li> <li>- Noted, but beyond the remit of this proposal. However, a new link from Bishopton P&amp;R to SoA via the canal bridge is to be installed by Spring 22.</li> <li>- This area is not dangerous so as to require further measures. A review of the Accident Database shows that over the last three years there were two ‘slight’ injury incidents on Bishopton Ln. One ‘slight’ one ‘serious’, both at the Glebe Rd junction. There were zero incidents recorded as being on the canal bridge.</li> </ul>
<p>-----</p> <p><b>Objection - from Resident of Packhorse Rd, SoA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- States the Statement of Reason (SoR) is incorrect as it does not contain sufficient information.</li> <li>- States WCC under no obligation to reduce the speed limit.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The SoR is designed to be a brief overview on how a particular proposal came about and generally explain the grounds for a decision. They are intended to be about one page and not over burden a reader with unnecessary data. That is historical data which can be obtained via other routes.</li> <li>- Whilst factually true, this was a request as part of a package that came to WCC from a Stratford District Council Planning Approval. Their request had merit and was assessed by WCC Highway Engineers including reference to historic speed and</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Single access on Bishopton Ln has a roundabout which will reduce speeds.</li> <li>- No accident or speed data provided in the SoR to justify.</li> </ul>	<p>accident data which showed the proposal had merit, so WCC undertook the task to reduce the speed limit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Whilst factually true, there are also four other junctions onto Bishopton Ln, one of which has had two collisions in the last three years.</li> <li>- The new estate will have up to 500 dwellings. This will introduce two new traffic junctions, five uncontrolled pedestrian crossing points, one of which will be the new signal control over the canal bridge and two Pelican crossings. See Appendix H</li> <li>- With an expected increase in traffic and pedestrians crossing the road, this will significantly change the current environment. Therefore, it would seem prudent to reduce the current speed limit to 30mph even though it may differ with the given DfT advice</li> </ul>
<p><b>Comment - from Warwickshire Police.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No Objection.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment - from Warwickshire Fire &amp; Rescue.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No Objection.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Noted</li> <li>- Noted</li> </ul>
<p>4.3 The Ward Member Councillor Jenny Fradgley has been advised of this Restricted Roads Order via email on the 15.12.2021.</p>	

## 5. Financial implications

- 5.1 The funding for this scheme is within the current Capital Programme. It will be fully funded by a developer contribution as part of a Section 278 scheme. There are no alternative uses for the contribution and the addition of the scheme will not affect the overall level of available capital resources.
- 5.2 It has been identified that to assist the motorists to adhere to the lower speed limit certain traffic calming features may need to be installed. The Planning Officers have secured a S278 Bond from the Developer to cover all of the costs of this particular element, which would be introduced before occupancy of the first property is completed.

<b>Report Author</b>	Mike McDonnell mikemcdonnell@warwickshire.gov.uk,
<b>Assistant Director</b>	David Ayton-Hill
<b>Strategic Director</b>	Mark Ryder
<b>Portfolio Holder</b>	Portfolio Holder for Transport and Planning



<b>Urgent matter?</b>	<i>No</i>
<b>Confidential or exempt?</b>	<i>No</i>
<b>Is the decision contrary to the budget and policy framework?</b>	<i>No</i>

### Appendices

1. Appendix A - (Para 2.1) Plan of 40mph to 30mph speed limit.
2. Appendix B - (Para 2.2) 30mph Public Notice.
3. Appendix C - (Para 2.3) Statement of Reasons. (*The Ridgeway / Bishopton Ln*).
4. Appendix D - (Para 3.2) Statutory Criteria for Making Decisions on Speed Limits.
5. Appendix E - (Para 3.5) Traffic Calming suggestions plan for the Developer.
6. Appendix F - (Para 3.6) Decision Notice from September 2018.
7. Appendix G - (Para 4.2) Objections emails in full, but redacted.
8. Appendix H - (Reps Table) Major Works general arrangement plan.  
(*Showing traffic island, five uncontrolled ped crossing points and two Pelican crossing's*)

### Members and officers consulted and informed

Portfolio Holder – Councillor Wallace Redford

Corporate Board – Mark Ryder

Legal – Ian Marriott

Finance – Andrew Felton

Equality – n/a

Democratic Services – Helen Barnsley

Councillors – Jeff Clarke, Jonathan Chilvers and Jackie D'Arcy

Local Member(s): Councillor Jenny Fradgely

This page is intentionally left blank