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

Portfolio Holder	Portfolio Holder for Transport and Planning
Date of decision	14th March 2022
	Signed

### 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 This Circular was subsequently superseded by Circular 01/2013.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

Representations-	Officer Response
Objections 2, Comments 2, Support 0.  Objection - from Resident of Avenue Road, SoA.  - Proposal does not match WCC or SDC commitment to Climate Change, Green Environment or safe utility cycling in the County/District.	- Noted, but beyond the remit of this proposal.
<ul> <li>Paragraph wanting "safe <u>segregated</u> cycle paths".</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Noted, but beyond the remit of this proposal.</li> </ul>
Proposes; - Bishopton Lane to be reduced to 20mph.	<ul> <li>A 20mph limit was looked at initially, but with the straight-line nature of the road an it being only 5.5 to 5.7m wide meant it was not feasible to introduce horizontal or vertical traffic measures. There would als be budget concerns if applied along the road's length.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>New segregated 2way cycleway along whole of Bishopton Ln</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Noted, but beyond the remit of this proposal.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>New foot &amp; cycle bridge introduced over the canal.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Noted, but beyond the remit of this proposal. However, a new link from Bishopton P&amp;R to SoA via the canal bridg is to be installed by Spring 22.</li> </ul>
- This area very dangerous, Resident has seen a few near misses and "cyclists hit by oncoming traffic".	This area is not dangerous so as to require further measures. A review of the Accide Database shows that over the last three years there were two 'slight' injury incident on Bishopton Ln. One 'slight' one 'serious both at the Glebe Rd junction. There were zero incidents recorded as being on the canal bridge.
bjection - from Resident of Packhorse Rd, SoA	T. 0.5: 1: 1: 1: 1: 1: 1: 1: 1: 1: 1: 1: 1: 1:
<ul> <li>States the Statement of Reason (SoR) is incorrect as it does not contain sufficient information.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>The SoR is designed to be a brief overvie 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> </ul>
<ul> <li>States WCC under no obligation to reduce the speed limit.</li> </ul>	- 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 wassessed by WCC Highway Engineers.

assessed by WCC Highway Engineers including reference to historic speed and accident data which showed the proposal

had merit, so WCC undertook the task to

reduce the speed limit.

4.3 The Ward Member Councillor Jenny Fradgley has been advised of this Restricted Roads Order via email on the 15.12.2021.

## 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.

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

Urgent matter?	No
Confidential or exempt?	No
Is the decision contrary to the	No
budget and policy	
framework?	

# **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