

DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, STREETSCENE AND BROADBAND – CLLR JOHN THOMSON

HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT SERVICE

OFFICER CONTACT: Gareth Rogers 01225 713384 email: gareth.rogers@wiltshire.gov.uk

REFERENCE: HSB-017-13

SPEED LIMIT REVIEW
BATCH 25 A354 COOMBE ROAD, SALISBURY / A345 OLD SARUM, SALISBURY
B3080 DOWNTON

Purpose of Report

1. To consider the comments received following the advertisement of the Traffic Regulation Orders associated with the speed limits proposed within Batch 25 following the review of A and B class roads.

Relevance to the Council's Business Plan

2. Outcome 3 of the Business Plan – Everyone in Wiltshire lives in a high quality environment.
Outcome 5 of the Business Plan – People in Wiltshire have healthy, active and high quality lives.

Background

3. In October 2009 the Department for Transport Circular 01/06 'Setting Local Speed Limits' was adopted as the basis for the Council's speed limit strategy. The Circular requested that all Highway Authorities complete an assessment of existing speed limits on their A and B class roads and implement any amendments by 2011. The purpose of the review is to ensure a consistent approach to the setting of speed limits nationwide and to improve respect and adherence to speed limits.
4. The review of Wiltshire's A and B class roads was undertaken using the methodology set out in Circular 01/06 and its supporting documents and involved a comprehensive data collection and analysis process. The initial results of the review were extensively discussed with the Police prior to the final results being disseminated to Town and Parish Councils.
5. Town and Parish Councils were invited to comment on the recommendations of the review and were given the opportunity to put forward their case, should they wish to see a different result from that proposed by the review. All the review recommendations, together with background information, were made available on the Council's website. The Town and Parish Councils were requested to put forward their comments in terms of the criteria set out in Circular 01/06 to enable a review of their case.

6. Following the initial consultation period a number of the affected Town and Parish Councils commented on the proposals. Those which responded are outlined in the following table:

Town / Parish Council	Response
Salisbury City Council	No response received.
Laverstock Parish Council	No objection.
Downton Parish Council	Response received requesting change.
Redlynch Parish Council	No objection.

Following the comments received from Downton Parish Council, a request was made to provide further detailed reasons as to why its suggestion should be considered. This was duly received and the comments were outlined in a Cabinet Member Report (Reference HT-038-10 Appendix B).

7. The project has now progressed to the implementation of the changes. The process in which the review's recommendations are being implemented has been outlined in detail in the Cabinet Member Report (Reference HT-043-11). In summary, the individual proposals have been collated together into batches, which in turn have been prioritised based upon the rate of collisions resulting in personal injury.
8. The Traffic Regulation Orders, associated with the proposed changes included within Batch 25, have recently been advertised. This batch includes the following proposals:

Description	Existing Restriction	Proposed Restriction
A354 COOMBE ROAD, SALISBURY	30 mph	40 mph
A345 OLD SARUM, SALISBURY	40 mph	50 mph
B3080 LODE HILL, DOWNTON	National Speed Limit	40 mph

9. During the advertisement period for the Traffic Regulation Order, a total of 82 comments have been received, along with 64 copies of a standard form objecting to a proposal.

A354 Coombe Road, Salisbury

- Seventy one comments outlining objection. Including comments from the elected Wiltshire Councillor (Cllr Brian Dalton), Salisbury City Council, Harnham Neighbourhood Association, Harnham Speedwatch Group and Harnham School Travel Group.
- Five comments of support.
- Two letters of general comment.
- Sixty four copies of a standard form outlining objection to the proposal.

A345 Castle Road, Salisbury

- One comment of objection from Salisbury City Council.
- Two comments from the elected members (Cllrs Mary Douglas and Ian McLennan).

B3080 Lode Hill, Downton

- One letter of support from the Parish Council.
10. In January 2013, the Department for Transport published revised guidance on the setting of speed limits in the form of Circular 01/013: 'Setting Local Speed Limits'. This revised guidance supersedes the previous advice given to local authorities in Circular 01/06. Following the publication of Circular 01/13, the advertised proposals have been reviewed in line with the latest guidance and are considered to accord with the information provided within Circular 01/13.

Main Considerations for the Council

A354 Coombe Road, Salisbury

11. To consider the comments received during the consultation period. A summary of the issues raised is included in **Appendix 1**. Details of those who commented are provided in **Appendix 2**.
12. The substantial points of objection are:
- The proposed increase in limit will increase the risk to pedestrians wishing to cross the A354, as the existing facilities provide a limited provision.
 - The proposed increase in limit will increase the risk presented to motorists wishing to exit the side road junctions of Andrews Way, Francis Way, Portland Avenue and private accesses.
 - Correspondents propose a 40 mph restriction should be introduced prior to the existing 30 mph restriction incorporating the junctions with Old Blandford Road and Hommington Road.
 - Cars are already exceeding the existing speed limit. Increasing the limit will result in vehicles travelling at greater speeds.
13. The assessment has been completed using the Department for Transport Circular 01/06: 'Setting Local Speed Limits'. This provides guidance to Highway Authorities on the factors which need to be taken into consideration when appraising an appropriate limit.
14. When selecting the most appropriate speed limit for a particular location it is imperative that the limit is conducive to the surrounding environment. It is this primary factor which reinforces the purpose and need for the restriction. Where a speed limit is set in isolation, or is unrealistically low, it is likely to be ineffective and lead to disrespect for the speed limit, as well as requiring significant and avoidable enforcement costs. This may also result in substantial numbers of drivers continuing to travel at unacceptable speeds, thus increasing the risk of collisions and injuries.
15. The aim of this proposal is to set the level of restriction to that which motorists perceive to be appropriate for the environment and encourage greater adherence and respect for speed limits. It is acknowledged there remains a proportion of travelling motorists whose general respect for all limits remains low, and consequently there will be a requirement to undertake some enforcement activity to reinforce the restriction.
16. Where specific concerns exist with features on the highway network, such as junctions, accesses etc., the guidance is clear in its advice that:

Speed limits should not be used to attempt to solve the problem of isolated hazards, for example, a single road junction or reduced forward visibility such as a bend, since speed limits are difficult to enforce over such a short length. Other measures, such as warning

signs, carriageway markings, junction improvements, superelevation of bends and new or improved street lighting, are likely to be more effective. Similarly, the provision of adequate footways can be an effective means of improving pedestrian safety as an alternative to lowering a speed limit over a short distance.

17. Where concerns exist regarding a particular hazard, such as the warning of the junction or a lack of pedestrian facility, then it is appropriate to use conventional highway methods to manage this type of hazard. This will normally result in measures such as improved road signing, road markings or improvement to footways/crossing facilities. It is not appropriate to use a speed restriction to mitigate a specific hazard, particularly where the environment is insufficient to reinforce the justification for a lower speed limit to the motorists.
18. The pedestrian crossing provision for the A354 is predominantly served by two distinct crossing locations, firstly, at the bottom of the steps to Bouverie Avenue South (known locally as Dogdean Steps) and secondly, the pedestrian refuge to the south of St Andrews Way. The Dogdean Steps crossing has been subject to significant longstanding local concern, and has been raised with the Salisbury Community Area Transport Group. Previous investigations have identified the crossing point is substandard in its current setting, and its use should be discouraged. The geometry and location of the crossing dictates the visibility, and the level of speed restriction will not alter this. Whilst the route is used regularly, it is done so by users at their own risk. The Highway Authority's viewpoint is that this crossing location should be removed from the network and pedestrian crossing demand accommodated by utilising the alternative pedestrian refuge to the south of St Andrews Road.
19. It is understood that some concern exists regarding this refuge island; however, there remains the opportunity to undertake engineering works to either improve the facility or alter the type. Throughout the remainder of the length, it is accepted that the pedestrian provision is disjointed; however, this is not uncommon within a semi-urban environment.
20. The criteria relating to 30 mph in urban areas is given as:

The standard limit in built-up areas with development on both sides of the road.
21. The criteria relating to 40 mph in urban areas is given as:

On higher quality suburban roads or those on the outskirts of urban areas where there is little development, with few cyclists, pedestrians or equestrians. On roads with good width and layout, parking and waiting restrictions in operation, and buildings set back from the road. On roads that, wherever possible, cater for the needs of non-motorised users through segregation of road space, and have adequate footways and crossing places.
22. The nature of the limited frontage development throughout the length of the proposed restriction is that it is predominately located on a single side of the road, albeit not all on the same side. The vast majority of the proposed restriction is subject to no frontage development, is predominately set back from the carriageway and subject to a degree of masking due to vegetation. Consequently, this sets an environment which does not provide motorists with the cognitive messages that encourage motorists to drive in abeyance with the existing restriction, thus realigning vehicle speeds with the level of restriction.
23. When assessing the proposal against the criteria provided for a 40 mph restriction, it is accepted that the needs of non-motorised users are not as those desired by the guidance, i.e. full segregation of road space for all non-motorised road users. However, it is considered that the provision provided does remain adequate for the majority of non-motorised users.
24. When considering the requests for the introduction of a 40 mph buffer prior to the existing restriction, this section of the A354 is not subject to any frontage development and again is considered unlikely to suggest or warrant the need of a limit to motorists.

Consequently, this will result in a restriction with little respect, and is likely to create a further enforcement issue for the Police as the enforcement agency.

25. Acknowledge that five comments in support of the proposal had been received.

A345 Castle Road, Salisbury

26. To consider the comments received during the consultation period. A summary of the issues raised, along with officer comments, are included in **Appendix 3**. Details of those who commented are provided in **Appendix 2**.

B3080 Lode Hill, Downton

27. To consider the comments received during the consultation period. A summary of the comments, along with officer comments, are included in **Appendix 4**. Details of those who commented are provided in **Appendix 2**.

Safeguarding Implications

28. There are no safeguarding considerations relating to this proposal.

Public Health Implications

29. The introduction of speed restrictions which comply with the relevant guidance are likely to result in greater levels of adherence, this is considered likely to result in an improvement in road safety.

Environmental Impact of the Proposal

30. The installation of speed limit signs and posts, particularly repeater signs where none previously existed, together with road markings and coloured surfacing, could be considered detrimental to the visual vista and street scene.

Equalities Impact of the Proposal

31. There are none with this proposal.

Risk Assessment

32. If schemes, programmed for design or delivery within the current financial year, are not progressed the Council risks the potential of delayed delivery in subsequent years due to other funding demands and uncertainty of future budget.

Financial Implications

33. There is an allocation in the 2013-14 Local Transport Plan (LTP) Integrated Transport budget for design, construction, supervision and monitoring works.
34. If a decision is taken to delay current proposals this may result in the loss of the budget.

Legal Implications

35. None.

Options Considered

A354 Coombe Road, Salisbury

36. To:

- (i) Implement all the proposals as advertised.
- (ii) Abandon the proposal.
- (iii) Amend the proposal in accordance with the comments received during the consultation period.

A345 Castle Road, Salisbury

37. To:

- (i) Implement all the proposals as advertised.
- (ii) Abandon the proposal.
- (iii) Amend the proposal in accordance with the comments received during the consultation period.

B3080 Lode Hill, Downton

38. To implement all the proposals as advertised.

Reason for Proposals

39. A354 Coombe Road, Salisbury

It is acknowledged that the correct level of restriction, in compliance with the guidance is 40 mph; however, given the substantial objection to the proposal from the locally elected Council Member, the City Council, Local Stakeholder groups and the strength of objection from members of public, it is considered that the proposal should not be progressed further.

A345 Castle Road, Salisbury

40. The proposals have been assessed and are in accordance with the guidance provided by The Department for Transport, Circular 01/13 'Setting Local Speed Limits'. However, following consideration of an objection received since publishing the intention to make this decision, it is considered that the proposal should not be progressed further.

B3080 Lode Hill, Downton

41. The proposals have been assessed and are in accordance with the guidance provided by The Department for Transport, Circular 01/13 'Setting Local Speed Limits'.

Proposals

42. That:

- (i) The proposal for the A354 Coombe Road, Salisbury be deleted from the programme.
- (ii) The proposal for the A345 Castle Road, Salisbury be deleted from the programme.
- (iii) The proposal for the B3080 Lode Hill, Downton be implemented as advertised.
- (iv) The objectors be informed accordingly.

The following unpublished documents have been relied on in the preparation of this Report:

None