

## Appendix - 20mph Limits Report

20mph Limits Working Group – Information Overview		
<p><b>Group Participants</b></p> <p><b>Councillors:</b></p> <p>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><b>Officers</b></p> <p>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 &amp; Forestry  Scott Tompkins, Assistant Director – Environmental Services</p>		
1	<p><b>Summary of deliberations</b></p> <p><b>Meeting one:</b> 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><b>Meeting two:</b> 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><b>Meeting three:</b> 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><b>Actions</b></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"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- 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.</li> </ul> <p><b>Vote</b></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><b>That Cabinet:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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 &amp; Scrutiny Committee in February 2023.</li> <li>5. That metrics for success should be clearly defined before implementation and include the level of accidents plus other readily available relevant data.</li> </ol>	
---	--

This page is intentionally left blank