

Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Date: Monday 9 May 2022
Time: 9.00 am
Venue: Committee Room 2, Shire Hall

Membership

Councillor Jeff Clarke (Chair)
Councillor Jonathan Chilvers (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Richard Baxter-Payne
Councillor Jackie D'Arcy
Councillor Jenny Fradgley
Councillor Dave Humphreys
Councillor Bhagwant Singh Pandher
Councillor Daren Pemberton
Councillor Tim Sinclair
Councillor Andrew Wright

Items on the agenda: -

1. General

(1) Apologies

(2) Disclosures of Pecuniary and Non-Pecuniary Interests

2. Public Speaking

3. 20mph Speed Limits - Task & Finish Group Recommendations

3 - 22

Monica Fogarty
Chief Executive
Warwickshire County Council
Shire Hall, Warwick

To download papers for this meeting scan here with your camera



Disclaimers

Webcasting and permission to be filmed

Please note that this meeting will be filmed for live broadcast on the internet and can be viewed on line at warwickshire.public-i.tv. Generally, the public gallery is not filmed, but by entering the meeting room and using the public seating area you are consenting to being filmed. All recording will be undertaken in accordance with the Council's Standing Orders.

Disclosures of Pecuniary and Non-Pecuniary Interests

Members are required to register their disclosable pecuniary interests within 28 days of their election of appointment to the Council. Any changes to matters registered or new matters that require to be registered must be notified to the Monitoring Officer as soon as practicable after they arise.

A member attending a meeting where a matter arises in which they have a disclosable pecuniary interest must (unless they have a dispensation):

- Declare the interest if they have not already registered it
- Not participate in any discussion or vote
- Leave the meeting room until the matter has been dealt with
- Give written notice of any unregistered interest to the Monitoring Officer within 28 days of the meeting

Non-pecuniary interests relevant to the agenda should be declared at the commencement of the meeting.

The public reports referred to are available on the Warwickshire Web <https://democracy.warwickshire.gov.uk/uuCoverPage.aspx?bcr=1>

Public Speaking

Any member of the public who is resident or working in Warwickshire, or who is in receipt of services from the Council, may speak at the meeting for up to three minutes on any matter within the remit of the Committee. This can be in the form of a statement or a question. If you wish to speak please notify Democratic Services in writing at least two working days before the meeting. You should give your name and address and the subject upon which you wish to speak. Full details of the public speaking scheme are set out in the Council's Standing Orders.

COVID-19 Pandemic

Any member or officer of the Council or any person attending this meeting must inform Democratic Services if within a week of the meeting they discover they have COVID-19 or have been in close proximity to anyone found to have COVID-19.

Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee

9 May 2022

Call-in – 20mph Speed Limits Task and Finish Group Recommendations

Recommendation

That Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee consider the call-in request.

1. Key Issues/Background

- 1.1. On 12 April 2022, Cabinet considered the recommendations made by the Task and Finish Group reviewing the implementation of 20mph speed limits. A copy of the report to Cabinet is attached as Appendix A.
- 1.2. The minutes of the Cabinet meeting are attached as Appendix B. Cabinet resolved:
 - That Cabinet:
 1. Supports the recommendations of the Task and Finish Group on 20mph speed limits as set out in paragraph 4.8 of the report;
 2. Asks that all Members be informed of the options for using their Delegated Highways Budgets to fund speed limits and engineering measures designed to reduce speed, the potential availability of the Community Action Fund, the preferred approach of targeting specific locations, the criteria for 20 mph speed limits and what evidence is required to support a proposed 20 mph speed limit; and
 3. Asks the Strategic Director for Communities to monitor the use of Members' Delegated Highways Budgets for 20 mph limits and report back to the Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee in February 2023.
- 1.3. Following the publication of the decision it was called in by Councillors Jonathan Chilvers, Bill Gifford, Tracey Drew and Will Roberts. The reasons for the call-in were given as:
 - 1.3.1. The evidence from a wide range of other local authorities and studies on the experience of implementing 20mph limits was not properly considered or published in the report.

- 1.3.2. The desk based exercise on New Arley and Kenilworth was not published as part of the report and was not summarised accurately.
- 1.3.3. The report runs contrary to the Council Plan by not being consistent with:
 - i) a 'community powered Warwickshire approach' (p17)
 - ii) 'making it easier to make more sustainable journeys using cycling, walking or public transport' (p11)
 - iii) the commitment to residents to 'be safe and feel safe' (p10) and to 'live in a safe environment that is connected to your community' (p16)
- 1.4. A full response will be provided to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee by officers at the meeting.
- 1.5. The Task and Finish Group was convened following a motion at full council. Its remit was to consider the evidence, cost, impact and/or benefit of 20mph speed limits in residential areas including schools and other sites of wider interest across Warwickshire.
- 1.6. The Group considered options for advisory signage and what would benefit schools in particular. It engaged with the Police and considered information about the likely costs and benefits of specimen blanket schemes in areas of New Arley and Kenilworth.
- 1.7. The Group concluded that a blanket approach offered little benefit
- 1.8. The procedure for call in is set out in Standing Order 13. Having considered the call-in request, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee may (i) refer the matter back to the decision maker for reconsideration setting out in writing the nature of its concerns or (ii) decide to take no action.
- 1.9. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee is asked to consider the matter and decide whether to return the matter to Cabinet for reconsideration with an explanation of its concerns or to take no action (with or without comment) in which case Cabinet's decision will be implemented with immediate effect.

2.0 Environmental Implications

The environmental implications relating to the original decision that is the subject of this call in are covered in the report of 12 April 2022.

3.0 Financial Implications

The financial implications relating to the original decision that is the subject of this call in are covered in the report of 12 April 2022.

4.0 Appendices

Appendix A – Cabinet Report

Appendix B - Cabinet Minutes for the Report subject to call in

5.0 Background papers

5.1 Call In request

	Name	Contact Information
Report Author	Nic Vine Garry Palmer	nicholavine@warwickshire.gov.uk garrypalmer@warwickshire.gov.uk
Assistant Director	David Ayton-Hill Scott Tompkins	davidayton-hill@warwickshire.gov.uk scottompkins@warwickshire.gov.uk
Strategic Director	Strategic Director for Communities	markryder@warwickshire.gov.uk
Portfolio Holder	Portfolio Holder for Transport	wallaceredford@warwickshire.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Cabinet

12 April 2022

20mph Speed Limits - Task & Finish Group Recommendations

Recommendation(s)

That Cabinet:

1. Supports the recommendations of the Task and Finish Group on 20 mph speed limits as set out in 4.8.
2. Asks that all Members be informed of the options for using their Delegated Highways Budgets to fund speed limits and engineering measures designed to reduce speed, the potential availability of the Community Action Fund, the preferred approach of targeting specific locations, the criteria for 20 mph speed limits and what evidence is required to support a proposed 20 mph speed limit.
3. Asks the Strategic Director for Communities to monitor the use of Members' Delegated Highways Budgets for 20 mph limits and report back to the Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee in February 2023.

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 At the County Council's meeting in July 2021, it was agreed that a short-term task and finish group (TFG) should be set up to: "to consider the evidence, cost, impact and/or benefit of 20mph speed limits in residential areas including schools and other sites of wider interest across Warwickshire as part of the Speed Management Strategy refresh and to report the outcome of this work to Cabinet".
- 1.2 A cross party task and finish group was subsequently established comprising 9 members which met on 4 occasions. The group looked into a blanket approach (a large area covered, e.g. a whole village or town), areas around schools (including roads leading to them) and very specific areas such as specific roads.
- 1.3 The Group concluded that a blanket approach would have little if any benefit and that consideration of 20 mph speed limits should be confined to specific locations. The Group also identified the possibility that Members could use and pool their Delegated Highways Budgets for road safety schemes, including the introduction of 20 mph speed limits where the relevant criteria were met and evidence demonstrated that the scheme would be cost

effective. The Group agreed a set of related recommendations which are set out in Section 4 below.

2. Financial Implications

- 2.1 As this money has already been allocated in the budget, there would be no financial implications.
- 2.2 When the Community Action Fund is launched in Spring 2022, funding raised through this fund will be matched by the County Council. The funding for this has already been set aside.

3. Environmental Implications

- 3.1 The environmental impacts of 20 mph zones will vary according to the circumstances and would need to be factored into decision-making on a scheme-by-scheme basis. Lower speeds can reduce fuel consumption and air and noise pollution as well as encouraging the confidence of walkers and cyclists, but speed limits and associated engineering measures can increase acceleration and deceleration and potentially displace traffic to other roads. However, there is little evidence that a reduction in speed limits alone will lead to reduced speeds.

4. Supporting Information

- 4.1 The Group discussed how effective a 20mph limit would be with drivers, the effectiveness of 20mph limits already implemented in Warwickshire, the option of advisory 20mph limit signs outside schools and specific roads that would benefit most from 20mph limits, e.g. outside schools.
- 4.2 Two locations in Warwickshire were investigated for a blanket approach, i.e. the whole area being put into a 20mph limit. The findings were that this approach in a village (New Arley) would have no benefits and in a town (Kenilworth) it would have a small benefit. Full details of cost estimates are available on request. The village would cost £34,000 for a blanket approach and the town would cost £141,000-£167,000 depending on the extent of coverage.
- 4.3 Following the assessment of the blanket approach, it was agreed that blanket approaches were not effective when considering cost and impact and more focused targets should be reviewed instead, e.g. specific roads. However, there was a disagreement on the size of the radius that would be needed around schools to protect pupils travelling to and from school (some of the options for radiuses would cover whole towns).
- 4.4 The Group were informed that SatNav data is useful for identifying potential schemes, but all proposed schemes should have appropriate up to date traffic speed surveys to confirm average speeds.

- 4.5 The Group were made aware that they could use their delegated budgets for road safety engineering measures to reduce speeds, whether to support 20mph limits or independent of a reduction in the speed limit.
- 4.6 Based on experience of 20mph zones that have already been introduced elsewhere, the Group was informed by officers and Warwickshire police that 20mph limits were only effective if drivers were already abiding by the speed limit and the average speed in an area was 26-27mph in a 30mph zone. In the London Borough of Islington when the speed limit was reduced to 20mph, there was only a 0.5 mph speed reduction on average by drivers.
- 4.7 Before the Group debated and agreed its recommendations in July 2021, all elected members were given a presentation by the '20s plenty' campaign with their evidence for 20mph limits.
- 4.8 The final agreed recommendations of the group were approved by a 6-3 vote. These recommendations were that the Group:
- Informs all elected members that they can legitimately use their delegated budgets for road safety schemes in their division, including the implementation of 20mph limits where appropriate. This includes the ability for members to put their delegated budgets together for larger schemes that would cross divisions. Schemes are more likely to be appropriate for a 20mph limit where the current average speed across a road or group of roads is 24mph or less, based on existing sat nav data, and are within 1.6km (1 mile) of a school.
 - Recommend that all proposed road safety schemes, including a reduction in speed limits, are reviewed by the engineering teams first, to assess the effectiveness of the proposed scheme.
 - Allow the Road Safety team to notify elected members on how they could spend their delegated budgets on road safety measures, including 20mph limits when appropriate.
 - Recommend that the engineering teams monitor the success or otherwise of the use of Members' Delegated Budget for 20mph limits and report back to Communities O&S in February 2023.
 - Metrics for success should be clearly defined before implementation and include the level of accidents plus other readily available relevant data.

5. Timescales associated with the decision and next steps

- 5.1 If the recommendations are approved, officers will advise all Members of the options for using delegated budgets and the opportunities which will be offered by the Community Action Fund.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Summary of deliberations of final meeting

Background Papers

None

	Name	Contact Information
Report Author	Isabelle Moorhouse <i>on behalf of: Jo Edwards, Garry Palmer & Paul Taylor</i>	isabellemoorhouse@warwickshire.gov.uk Tel: 01926 412159
Assistant Director	David Ayton-Hill Scott Tompkins	davidayton-hill@warwickshire.gov.uk scotttompkins@warwickshire.gov.uk
Strategic Director	Strategic Director for Communities	markryder@warwickshire.gov.uk
Portfolio Holder	Portfolio Holder for Transport and Planning	wallaceredford@warwickshire.gov.uk

The report was circulated to the following members prior to publication:

Local Member(s): n/a

Other members: Councillors Clarke, Chilvers, D'Arcy and Fradgley

Appendix - 20mph Limits Report

20mph Limits Working Group – Information Overview		
<p>Group Participants</p> <p>Councillors: Councillor Jonathan Chilvers Councillor Bill Gifford Councillor Clare Golby Councillor John Holland Councillor Jan Matecki Councillor Wallace Redford (Chair) Councillor Tim Sinclair Councillor Richard Spencer Councillor Martin Watson</p> <p>Officers Jo Edwards, Lead Commissioner - Safety Engineering Isabelle Moorhouse, Democratic Services Officer Garry Palmer, Lead Commissioner - Strategy and Policy Sally Rolfe, Traffic Management Advisor - Warwickshire Police Paul Taylor, Delivery Lead - Minorworks & Forestry Scott Tompkins, Assistant Director – Environmental Services</p>		
1	<p>Summary of deliberations</p> <p>Meeting one: In the first group meeting, the elected members discussed their knowledge of 20mph limits and what they wanted the Group to look at. The DfT (Department for Transport) commissioned a study into the effectiveness of 20mph limits which concluded that some 20mph limits worked better than others. The Police stated that 20mph limits/zones were only enforced if there was a specific problem in an area. The Group agreed that a blanket approach would not work.</p> <p>Meeting two: Following an assessment of two locations in Warwickshire, the Group were informed that a 20mph blanket approach in New Arley (a small village) would cost less than £34,000 and there would be no safety benefits. A blanket approach in Kenilworth (a larger town) would cost between £141,000-£167,000 because of the signs that would be needed; 6 out of 36 accidents could have been prevented with a 20mph limit rather than 30mph. There were already 20mph areas in Leamington, Stratford, Rugby, Nuneaton, Warwick, and Alcester. The road safety team were allocated £350,000 annually to be used countywide. The Group were reminded that they could use their delegated budgets to put 20mph limits in their divisions.</p> <p>Meeting three: In the last two meetings, the Group focused on finalising their recommendations and discussing delegated budget issues and options; this included the new Highways Community Action Fund. The DfT's Atkins report was shared with the Group and was used as a comparison guide for 20mph limits in other areas of the country. For 20mph limits to be effective, other measures would be needed too including frequent repeater signs and speed humps which would cost £6000</p>	<p>Actions</p>

Information excerpt shared with group**Summary 20mph zones cost analyses**

	area (m2)	no. entry points	no. repeaters*	total costs (£)	inc CMIS	total installation costs £		TM tbc (£)	staff costs (£)	Roundels (£)	TRO (£)	TOTAL (£)
						per area m2	per no. entry points					
New Arley	590,675	5	88	4405.72	4846.29	0.01	969.26	7000.00	12210	3750	3000	30806.29
Kenilworth zones	3760790	96	675	45888.10	50476.91	0.01	525.80	30000.00	24420	39712	3000	147608.91
Kenilworth all one zone	6399632	10	1037	23260	25585.72	0.004	2558.57	30000	24420	39000	3000	122005.72

Meeting four: Recommendation discussions from final meeting

The focus of the meeting was on draft recommendations (proposed by Councillor Sinclair) that would be made to Cabinet by members of the working group.

The recommendations were;

That Cabinet:

1. Informs all elected members that they can legitimately use their delegated budgets for road safety schemes in their division, including the implementation of 20mph limits where appropriate. This includes the ability for members to put their delegated budgets together for larger schemes that would cross divisions. Schemes are more likely to be appropriate for a 20mph limit where the current average speed across a road or group of roads is 24mph or less, based on existing sat nav data, and are within 1.6km (1 mile) of a school.
2. Recommend that all proposed road safety schemes, including a reduction in speed limits, are reviewed by the Safety Engineering team first, to assess the effectiveness of the proposed scheme.
3. Allow the road Safety team to notify elected members on how they could spend their delegated budgets on road safety measures, including 20mph limits when appropriate.
4. Recommend that the Safety Engineering team work with Public Health to monitor the success or otherwise of the use of Members' Delegated Budget for 20mph limits and report back to Communities O&S in February 2023.
5. Metrics for success should be clearly defined before implementation and include average speed, accidents and reported near misses and levels of walking and cycling, plus other appropriate quantitative and qualitative data.

The discussion included consideration of Conservative (proposed by Councillor Matecki) and Green/Liberal Democrat amendments (proposed by Councillors Chilvers and Gifford) to the original draft recommendations. The debate considered the two amendments suggested by Councillor Matecki, proposed to ensure such matters were addressed efficiently within the Council and that the recommendations put forward to Cabinet were practical; namely

1. To amend Recommendation 4 – to the effect that the reference to ‘public health’ be removed’. This was accepted by Councillor Sinclair
2. To amend Recommendation 5 – such that it read ‘Metrics for success should be clearly defined before implementation and include the level of accidents plus other readily available relevant data.’ This was accepted by Councillor Sinclair

The debate also considered the amendments suggested by Councillor Chilvers and Gifford as below

That Cabinet:

1. Supports the consideration of 20mph limits in village and urban areas where there is community support as a way of making streets safer, healthier and encouraging walking and cycling journeys especially to and from schools.
2. Sets out principles for where 20mph limits are likely to be appropriate and a clear process for obtaining them so that towns, parishes, elected members

- and local communities are clear on steps needed.
3. Uses the following principles. 20mph limits are likely to be appropriate where:
 - the current mean average speed across a road or group of roads is 24mph or less based on existing sat nav data. Groups of roads could equate to a whole village, town or suburb or a smaller number of streets.
 - are within 1.6km (1 mile) of a school.
 - There are indications of community support. This could be through one of Parish/Town Council motion, petition or other informal consultation with businesses, schools and residents.
 4. Uses the Highways Community Action Fund as a key mechanism for delivering 20mph limits. The fund should provide matched funding up to an agreed limit for 20mph limits which could be matched by member delegated budgets, district, town or parish funds or other funding pots.
 5. Informs all elected members that they can legitimately use their delegated budgets for 20mph limits where appropriate including for members to put their delegated budgets together for larger schemes that would cross divisions.
 6. Recognises that 20mph limits are most effective when there is widespread public awareness and community buy-in for the reasons for the 20mph limit (e.g. health, safer more accessible streets). All new 20mph limits should include publicity around the reasons for the change working with the communications team within existing resources.
 7. Recommend that the highways teams work with public health to evaluate the implementation of 20mph limits and report back to Communities O&S. Metrics for success should be clearly defined before implementation and include average speed, accidents and reported near misses, levels of walking and cycling and other appropriate quantitative and qualitative data.

Councillor Chilvers stated that these recommendations were made to encourage villages, parts of urban areas or towns to be able to implement 20mph limits where members of the public wanted it. The recommendations noted the Community Action Fund which could be used to deliver 20mph limits and that these recommendations were to make 20mph limit zones happen for residents who wanted them.

During the ensuing debate the following points were made:

- Jo Edwards advised that any speed change requests the Minor Works team receive would first be considered by the Safety Engineering team, to ensure a consistent approach to speed limits. She advised that all 20mph limit requests were investigated if funding was available and the criteria were met.
- Councillor John Holland stated that it is essential to have a clear statement of what the procedure is as part of the Group's outcome, but the Group should follow the DfT guidance of residential streets being 20mph.
- Councillor Matecki stated that both sets of recommendations orientated around delegated budgets, but he felt that the Green/Liberal Democrat amendments would create cost increases and take longer to progress.
- Councillor Sinclair commented that there may be a perception that 20mph limits were the right thing for safety when that may not always be correct. It was important that resources required to implement 20mph limits were focused at locations in which they would have the most impact.
- Councillor Gifford supported the Green/Liberal Democrat recommendations as 20mph was enough for residential areas and 20mph limits would only be

<p>implemented with community support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Councillor Clare Golby commented that she felt that the Green/Liberal Democrat recommendations penalised Nuneaton and Bedworth because they do not have parish/town councils and would miss out on a funding stream because of this. She added that it could force work onto the borough/district councils which would not be within their remit. - Scott Tompkins informed the group that the Highways Community Action Fund will launch in Spring 2022 and community groups could apply for schemes too, as well as borough or district councils. <p>Vote</p> <p>Councillor Sinclair formally proposed the Conservative recommendations (as amended by Councillor Matecki. Councillor Matecki seconded these recommendations.</p> <p>Councillor Chilvers formally proposed his amendments to the recommendations. This was seconded by Councillor Gifford.</p> <p>The vote for the Green/Liberal Democrat recommendations were as follows: 3 members voted for these recommendations and 6 voted against. Therefore, the Green/Liberal Democrat recommendations were lost.</p> <p>The vote for the Conservative recommendations were as follows: 6 members voted for these recommendations and 3 voted against. Therefore, the Conservative recommendations were approved as the recommendations from the Group.</p> <p>The recommendations agreed by the Working Group to put forward to Cabinet were as follows:</p> <p>That Cabinet:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Informs all elected members that they can legitimately use their delegated budgets for road safety schemes in their division, including the implementation of 20mph limits where appropriate. This includes the ability for members to put their delegated budgets together for larger schemes that would cross divisions. Schemes are more likely to be appropriate for a 20mph limit where the current average speed across a road or group of roads is 24mph or less, based on existing sat nav data, and are within 1.6km (1 mile) of a school. 2. Recommends that all proposed road safety schemes, including a reduction in speed limits, are reviewed by the engineering teams first, to assess the effectiveness of the proposed scheme. 3. Allows the road Safety team to notify elected members on how they could spend their delegated budgets on road safety measures, including 20mph limits when appropriate. 4. Recommends that the engineering teams monitor the success or otherwise of the use of Members' Delegated Budget for 20mph limits and report back to Communities Overview & Scrutiny Committee in February 2023. 5. That metrics for success should be clearly defined before implementation and include the level of accidents plus other readily available relevant data. 	
---	--

This page is intentionally left blank

Draft Cabinet Minutes – 12 April 2022

6. 20mph Speed Limits - Task & Finish Group Recommendations

Councillor Wallace Redford (Portfolio Holder for Transport and Planning) explained that the Task and Finish Group had been convened following a motion at full council to consider the evidence, cost, impact and/or benefit of 20mph speed limits in residential areas including schools and other sites of wider interest across Warwickshire and to report the outcome of this work to Cabinet. The Group had concluded that a blanket approach offered little benefit and had engaged in discussion over a wide range of how effective 20mph schemes already implemented in Warwickshire were and also looked at the options for advisory signage and what would benefit schools in particular. To support the work, the Group had looked at two specific areas in Warwickshire investigated for a blanket approach (New Arley and Kenilworth) but neither showed the benefits for full schemes and this supported the Group's conclusion that a targeted approach was more suitable. Discussions with the Police had drawn the conclusion that 20mph limits were only effective when motorists were already abiding by 30mph limits. The final recommendations were set out in the report.

Councillor Tracey Drew read a statement from Councillor Jonathan Chilvers who was unable to attend the meeting. The statement reflected on Councillor Chilver's perception of the approach the Task and Finish Group had taken to the topic and the resulting quality of its report, which Councillor Chilvers considered mis-represented the findings. Councillor Chilvers suggested that Cabinet should request further work be undertaken to assess the success of schemes around the country in places like Warwickshire and then put in place a fair and costed process to support communities that wanted 20 mph speed limits. Councillor Seccombe requested that the statement be sent to the Portfolio Holder in accordance with normal custom and practice.

Councillor Drew drew attention to the government's £30 million investment in highways decarbonisation projects which would enable councils to complete for small amounts of money to deliver 'pioneering projects' to decarbonise. She noted that residents in Kenilworth were supportive of a change to slower speed limits and traffic calming subject to consultation, and that road safety was a key concern for residents hesitating to walk and cycle who would have greater confidence if there was a 20mph speed limit. She considered that the benefits were tangible and credible. She asked how quickly the council could consider applying to the aforementioned fund with an innovative scheme to effectively introduce 20mph speed limits.

Councillor John Holland recognised that there were clearly divided views on the subject. He noted that the Secretary of State had indicated a presumption that residential streets would be subject to 20mph speed limits, which were also popular with residents. However, he noted that there were two elements to their introduction with the council being required to implement them and the police to enforce them. He welcomed the report's emphasis on the role of the local councillor in the debate and considered that this represented a workable way forward if the Portfolio Holder was minded to work with local councillors. In terms of using delegated budgets, he

believed that the costs of introducing lower speed limits could be less than the costs indicated in the report as it was feasible for well-informed local councillors to take advantage of opportunities that arose when roads were scheduled for repair and align the introduction of traffic calming works in order to limit the additional costs.

Councillor Martin Watson, who had been a member of the Task and Finish Group, commented on the work of the group, contradicting the statement of Councillor Chilvers in terms of the approach that had been taken. He advised that the Task and Finish Group had looked at the introduction of a blanket scheme but understood that it would not be universally welcomed. He also referred to an article in the Shipston Forum which stated that it would be pointless to implement a reduced speed limit that would not be enforced and therefore technology in the form of speed cameras, etc was required to support enforcement. He highlighted the view of the Task and Finish Group that one size did not fit all and that was the reasoning behind the conclusions.

Councillor Jerry Roodhouse noted that the Task and Finish Group report gave a flavour of the debates that had taken place and welcomed the presentation of the report in that sense. Referring to the last bullet point of paragraph 4.8 of the covering report, regarding the definition of the metrics for success, he considered that there was merit in the elected member for the area working within specified parameters, but he was unclear what the metrics for success actually were, particularly around the weight of community opinion (eg in Shipston) and he sought an understanding of how the metrics would be put together into a framework. He was of the view that it would be a worthwhile exercise for the metrics to be delivered through the scrutiny function to ensure member and community involvement and allow more discussion and debate to take place.

Councillor Judy Falp considered that it was important to have the option to implement 20mph limits but noted that 20mph limits were not universally welcomed. She felt that it was important to address existing issues with delegated budgets before Councillors were expected to engage with their residents as per the recommendations.

Councillor Izzi Seccombe reflected that when she had joined the Council there were five 20mph trial schemes in place which were not extended due to limited requests to do so. In the division she represented, a number of Parish Councils had asked to join the debate and make their views known but only one was interested in pursuing a 20mph area. She noted that implementing lower speed limits required expenditure of public funds and not all residents were supportive of them. In fact, she was aware that despite the presentation of a petition of over 1000 signatures from Shipston, the Town Council had not given the idea support. She advised that there were villages in the division she represented where a 20mph limit would be welcome outside schools but not in the wider area and she did not consider that a wider speed limit was useful if drivers were not compliant. Compliance with speed limits was an operational police matter and, at the time of the meeting, police resources were stretched and she was, therefore, conscious that the decision would have an impact on the Council's partners. She considered that the report presented a compromise to those

individuals who were interested in a 20mph zone, not a blanket approach, and she was of the view that this was more in-line with the Warwickshire way of working.

Councillor Andy Crump stated that as part of his role, he was a member of the Road Safety Partnership and considered that there were still too many fatalities on roads. He referred to one of the public speaker's comments about the similarities between Shipston and other communities but considered that this was not the case and the approaches taken required some finesse. He referenced projects in the division he represented where residents had been accepting of measures in place but considered that measures required public support to be successful. He considered there were other issues to be tackled, eg around education, as speed was a small factor in accidents at low speed, and agreed that the Task and Finish Group's recommendations had merit.

Councillor Wallace Redford acknowledged the comments that had been shared. He noted that there was a member development seminar due to take place on 27 April 2022 which he trusted would clear up any confusion around the use of delegated budgets. He also noted Councillor Roodhouse's comments regarding the metrics for success and suggested that the seminar should cover this point as well so that members were aware of the information, data and communication required.

Resolved:

That Cabinet:

1. Supports the recommendations of the Task and Finish Group on 20 mph speed limits as set out in paragraph 4.8 of the report;
2. Asks that all Members be informed of the options for using their Delegated Highways Budgets to fund speed limits and engineering measures designed to reduce speed, the potential availability of the Community Action Fund, the preferred approach of targeting specific locations, the criteria for 20 mph speed limits and what evidence is required to support a proposed 20 mph speed limit; and
3. Asks the Strategic Director for Communities to monitor the use of Members' Delegated Highways Budgets for 20 mph limits and report back to the Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee in February 2023.

This page is intentionally left blank

CALL-IN REQUEST	Please state your name	Which Committee do you Chair?
Request by Chair of relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committee	Councillor	
Request by other Councillors		
	1.Councillor Jonathan Chilvers	
	2.Councillor Bill Gifford	
	3. Councillor Tracey Drew	
	4. Councillor Will Roberts	
Decision maker <i>(please state Cabinet or member or name and title of officer)</i>	Date of Decision	
Cabinet	Tue 12 April 2022 (published 13 April)	
Relevant Decision <i>(please identify the particular decision that is being called in)</i>		
Item 6: 20mph speed limits. Task and finish group recommendations.		
Reasons for Call-in <i>(please give nature of concerns)</i>		
<p>The reasons for this call in are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The evidence from a wide range of other local authorities and studies on the experience of implementing 20mph limits was not properly considered or published in the report. 2. The desk-based exercise on New Arley and Kenilworth was not published as part of the report and was not summarised accurately. 3. The report runs contrary to the Council Plan by not being consistent with: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) a 'community powered Warwickshire approach' (p17) ii) 'making it easier to make more sustainable journeys using cycling, walking or public transport' (p11) iii) the commitment to residents to 'be safe and feel safe' (p10) and to 'live in a safe environment that is connected to your community' (p16) 		
Office Use Only – To be completed by Democratic Services in consultation with the AD Governance and Policy		
Date Request Received	Is the request valid? <i>(If not please give reason for invalidity)</i>	

This page is intentionally left blank