

OFFICER DECISION REPORT - TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER (TRO)

4

OUTCOME OF TRO PROCESS – OBJECTIONS RECEIVED

PREPARED BY: Traffic Management Team, Highways and Traffic Group

TITLE OF REPORT: A4 Newbridge Road / Upper Bristol Road

PROPOSAL: 20 M.P.H Speed Limit

SCHEME REF No: 26-028

REPORT AUTHOR: Gina West

1. DELEGATION

The delegation to be exercised in this report is contained within **Part 2 Section 2.35** of the Constitution under the **Delegations of Functions to Officers**, as follows:

Section A	The Chief Executive, Executive Director - Chief Operating Officer, Directors and Heads of Service have delegated power to take any decision falling within their area of responsibility...."
Section B	Without prejudice to the generality of this, Officers are authorised to: serve any notices and make, amend or revoke any orders falling within their area of responsibility.
Section D	An Officer to whom a power, duty or function is delegated may nominate or authorise another Officer to exercise that power, duty or function, provided that Officer reports to or is responsible to the delegator.

For the purposes of this report, the Director of Place Management and the Head of Highways Delivery hold the delegated power to make, amend or revoke any Orders.

2. LEGAL AUTHORITY

This proposal is made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, which under Section 1 provides, generally, for Orders to be made for the following reasons, and in the case of this report specifically for the reason(s) shown below:

(a)	for avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising, or	X
(b)	for preventing damage to the road or to any building on or near the road, or	
(c)	for facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians), or	

(d)	for preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which, is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property,	X
(e)	(without prejudice to the generality of paragraph (d) above) for preserving the character of the road in a case where it is specially suitable for use by persons on horseback or on foot, or	
(f)	for preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs, or	X
(g)	for any of the purposes specified in paragraphs (a) to (c) of subsection (1) of section 87 of the Environment Act 1995 (air quality)	

3. **PROPOSAL**

To introduce a 20 mph speed limit on the A4 Newbridge Road starting northwest of its junction with Old Newbridge Hill extending along Upper Bristol Road to the existing 20 mph speed limit.

4. **REASON**

Please refer to the Statement of Reasons.

The Council has had in mind and discharged the duty (as set out in section 122(1) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984) to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) so far as practicable. It has also had regard to the factors which point in favour of imposing a 20mph speed limit at A4 Newbridge Road / Upper Bristol Road. It has balanced the various considerations and concluded that it is appropriate to promote the 20mph speed limit. The Council has also considered and discharged its network management duty under section 16 of the Traffic Management Act 2004. It has concluded that the proposed 20mph speed limit is consistent with that duty, having regard to its other policies and objectives.

5. **IMPACT ON EQUALITIES**

An Equality Impact Assessment has been undertaken in relation to the introduction of traffic management measures, which is available upon request. The Council has had due regard to the needs set out in section 149(1) of the Equality Act 2010. It considers that the proposed Order is consistent with the section 149 public sector equality duty, which it has discharged.

6. **IMPACT ON HUMAN RIGHTS**

The proposals are considered to have a minimal impact on human rights (such as the right to respect for private and family life and the right to peaceful enjoyment of property). However, the Council is entitled to affect these rights where it is in accordance with the law, necessary (in the interests of public safety or economic well-being, to prevent disorder and crime, to protect health, or to protect the rights and freedoms of others), in pursuit of a legitimate aim and proportionate to do so. The proposal(s) within this report are considered to be in accordance with the law, necessary, in pursuit of a legitimate aim and proportionate.

7. SOURCE OF FINANCE

The scheme is included in the 2026/27 Local Active Travel and Safety Programme.

8. CONSULTATION REQUIREMENT

The proposal requires consultation with the Chief Constable, Emergency Services, Road Haulage Association, Freight Transport Association (Logistics UK), Parking Services, Waste Services, Ward Members and the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Transport Delivery.

The responses to the informal consultation can be found in TRO report number 3.

9. OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS RECEIVED (following the public advertisement of the proposal(s))

The comments received have been recorded below with an officer response to the objections in italics underneath.

16 Support / 1 Party Support / 18 Objections.

- I am responding on behalf of 20s Plenty Bath.

BANES councillors unanimously supported Vision Zero in 2023. This accepts that humans make mistakes and we need a transport system that minimises the chances of death and injury when those mistakes occur.

Safe speeds is a key plank of Vision Zero. Although the ‘signs only’ approach has limitations, the resultant reduction in driver speed is still significant. This approach was tested in Wales at scale. Today, 11 people alive there who would otherwise be dead if the previous trends in 30mph areas had continued.

Put simply, the less energy that is taken into a collision, the fewer tragic outcomes there are and the lesser the injuries that do occur. That is people, their families, friends, and communities spared.

Every road in Bath is one where all forms of transport mix: people walking, wheeling, cycling, scooting, on motorbikes, driving vehicles. Desire lines criss-cross our city everywhere. It is a busy, slightly chaotic environment, where people are going to make mistakes. For instance, driving a vehicle whilst scrolling on social media is a mistake. Slower speeds make allowances for those errors.

The Department for Transport Circular 01/2013 states speed limits should be: “evidence-led and self-explaining”. We have plenty of evidence of the benefits of 20mph. In terms of “self-explaining” the current situation where the speed limit can yo-yo on similar looking roads is not a good situation for anyone, especially drivers (examples on our website <https://bath20mphcity.org/>). A consistent speed limit across a wide area provides the most coherent message to everyone of what is expected at a system level, delivers the best value for money and the best overall compliance (verses a fragmented approach).

In summary, the sooner we get to a situation where the presence of street lights is a key visual cue to people that they are in a 20mph area (unless otherwise signposted), the better. Bath is 95% of the way there already, with 9 miles (of 159) remaining at 30mph by April 2027.

The new National Road Safety Strategy proposes significant targets to reduce road death and injury. BANES itself has many policies which are supported by lower speeds, including on:

- Clean air- Lower speeds reduce brake wear and consequent dust
- Connected communities- Lower speeds make it easier for people to cross roads
- Active travel- Lower speeds provide safer spaces for people to walk, wheel and cycle
- Public health- Lower speeds enable active travel, benefitting physical and mental health
- Safe routes to school (our view is safe speeds should cover 500m from the gate of all schools)

We urge the council to make the TRO decision with consideration to the full context of their policies and objectives. A measure such as 'how many people have died on this stretch of road' fails to capture the full context ie. we know people are being killed and injured in near identical circumstance elsewhere in the system.

Measures of average/mean/85% percentile speeds similarly fail to reflect the level of concerns around road danger, concerns that fill Councillor inboxes on a daily basis. We cannot hold off on safer speeds on the grounds that drivers are not driving sufficiently close to limits yet to be introduced. There is a rolling programme of physical changes being delivered to give appropriate visual cues, for instance new crossings (eg. Bottom of Old Newbridge Hill), anti-slip surface treatments, and protected cycle lanes.

We would like to encourage BANES to look at further methods to adapt the road environment to engender safer behaviours, for instance:

- Working with the Tree Officer to add street trees and SUDS features
- Not renewing centre road markings ('naked streets' principle)
- Narrowing lanes by moving parking away from the kerb (notably on Newbridge Road)
- Commissioning murals on concrete 'A-Road' style structures eg. Retaining walls next to roads
- Having a policy of 'humped' crossings as the default design eg. Humped zebra crossings
- Continuing the policy of narrowing junction splays ('bell mouths') and adding 'build outs' wherever possible
- Embracing the opportunity for side-road zebra when that materialises
- Deploying footway level crossings at some side road (as seen on Upper Bristol Road)
- Fitting technology to council vehicles to ensure speed limits are not exceeded

- Making technology to limit speed and monitor driver behaviour a requirement when new contracts are tendered (as found in supermarket home delivery vehicles)
- At signals, advanced green for cyclists as the default design
- Looking at the recently introduced 'cycle street' in Cambridge to see if a similar approach can be applied to Bath eg. on Weston Road or Walcot Street

30mph in places where people live, work and play is akin to indoor smoking. We will look back with shaking heads and think "how on earth did we tolerate that for so long?".

We commend this TRO and urge councillors and officers to bring the benefits of safe speeds to all urban areas of BANES as soon as possible.

Bath 20mph City
Local branch of 20s Plenty

- I support the proposal of introducing a speed limit in this area to make the area a safer space for pedestrians and cyclists.
- I support the proposal but I'm interested to know why 25mph is never considered.
- This is bloody brilliant! Well done BANES. I do wish you'd do much more and be far bolder on the climate emergency, but credit where it's due: this is a great idea. It's a great thing for safety and a great thing for public health. Wholly support. I think you should consider putting some speed cameras in though. People absolutely hoon it along here. 60mph + some times. A camera or two would slow them down and would raise a bit of revenue. And maybe I'm stretching your budget for the year, but more crossings would also have this affect. There isn't one between Newbridge post office and the bottom of Charmouth road. It forces lots of people to take their lives in their hands and cross between them.
- This stretch of road is home to many young families and reducing the speed limit will be wonderful for making the area safer and more navigable for residents. It will also reduce environmental noise as well as antisocial driving behaviours around the traffic lights onto Newbridge Hill. Thank you for your consideration!
- This is a great proposal and will help improve the safety of the area for my family which has no option but to walk along this road. Many drivers between Windsor bridge and Newbridge road 'race the light' already drive far more than the 30mph current limit, around a blind corner. I think this proposal is a great improvement but would also suggest a speed camera to ensure it is actually adhered to.
- Support this for safety reasons
- As a road with little crossing areas for children - 20 is needed.

- I have walked young children along this stretch for over 15 years. It is a route for Newbridge Primary School and to access Peter Pan Preschool / First Steps Twerton. I also regularly walk and cycle into the centre of town along the route. I like on the road too.

During the day I would say this would help lower risky driving. Many drivers slow down for urban areas but some consistently drive at 40mph+. People often speed up on the wider earlier (Bristol-end) stretch and then come in too fast for the bend after Charmouth Road, where you have two junctions (Avondale Rd bridge + Rosslyn Rd) and the school. I experienced people running the red light at the school traffic crossing once every 1-2 months, as they were going too fast and not concentrating- this is where children often cross to/from school, often unattended (they can walk on their own from 10). There have been several incidents of heavy goods vehicles and vans colliding with the bus stop there, as they were going too fast and couldn't stop for the lights.

We also witnessed a year or so ago a collision outside our house. A contractor was slowly exiting our driveway and an older lady was driving too fast, couldn't slow down, went onto the other side of the road and collided with another older lady driving the other way. The force was such the other car was pushed into the wall of the house opposite, demolishing it. The first driver vehemently denied she did anything wrong or was going too fast.

I've also noticed that there are two classes of driver that are regularly driving 40mph+: boy racers/sports car owners and those driving at night past 10pm.

During most day commute times many drivers do end up driving near to 20mph anyway (e.g. as traffic lights, general load, and bus stopping slows down traffic) - so the speed limit would help to enforce pre-existing norms for many good drivers and help develop an often naturally occurring behaviour while reducing the riskier drivers and those that don't realise.

Having the limit would help encourage children to walk and cycle to school and take up healthy behaviours. It would enable residents to more safely exit their properties. It would make the road more pleasant. We already have a budding community along the road, but the traffic is often a dampening factor on that (compare with pictures 80-120 years ago where there were many people walking and playing along the road).

- As residents of Newbridge Road for over 25 years and having brought a family up here, we welcome the move to 20mph asap. The change will help make the road safer and remind drivers it is residential. Please ensure adequate comms and signage around the change as there was some confusion when it changed by the park. Thank you.

- I have lived in Newbridge Road for over 10 years and have become increasingly concerned about the numbers of drivers who are clearly exceeding the current speed limit. I would wholly welcome a 20 mph limit for safety, noise and environmental reasons.
- Very happy to support this and please add speed cameras to catch nighttime racers as I am regularly woken up by vehicles speeding past my house. It's dangerous to be 30 in residential area near a primary school with lots of children.
- I am pleased to see this being introduced along the full length of Newbridge Road and believe it will be beneficial to the safety, health and wellbeing of the local community.
- Supportive of a speed reduction especially with the Hartwells development likely to add c.300 more residents in this area. A friend has been struck by a car with her son whilst crossing the road at a green man crossing - car missed the red light due to speed.
- I spent 10 years living in Park Road (just off Chelsea Road), and honestly the traffic noise was the worst thing about the whole area. Anything you can do to reduce the speed a little, reduce the noise a little, or reduce the pollution a little would be most welcome.
- I fully support lowering the speed limit along Newbridge Road. This route is used by significant number of children during school hours.
- Due to the open road, many drivers already exceed the current speed limit.
- I don't want support this at all. This is not necessary. No thank you.
- Being a major trunk road, I am not in favour of reducing the existing 30mph speed limit. You have not provided any facts or figures supporting the proposal. The existing 30mph has been in existence for some years from a much higher limit. I appreciate that there have been accidents along this stretch of road, but I can't see by lowering it again it would prevent accidents from happening
- My objections are that it is primarily the appalling neglect of the carriageway/road surface, and the size of vehicles using the road, that are the main issues. If 30 mph was effectively enforced this would be sufficient-no change needed. As the Chief Constable is not planning to increase enforcement, this scheme looks like it will just cause us residents extreme inconvenience and very little noticeable benefits, and is a waste of very scarce resources.
- This is not needed at all. It is a wide road and used to have a 40 miles/hour speed limit which was then reduced to 30 miles/hour.

It will add to travel times and keep traffic on the road for longer adding to noise pollution.

What will be gained by doing this?

- There is no need to reduce the speed limit to 20 miles and it better remain 30mph as currently which is very safe. This is a very wide road with hardly any pedestrians. There have been no accidents to my knowledge.
- Is there sufficient evidence to show that a reduction in the speed limit for, effectively, the entire length of Newbridge Road, would reduce the number of accidents and injuries occurring here? How many speed related incidents are there annually?
- Most of the vehicle accidents that I am aware of occur at junctions, specifically with Ashley Avenue and Chelsea Road/Station Road, where the factors are more likely to be visibility and carelessness than speed. I do concede that, as a pedestrian, I can feel vulnerable on the first stretch of Newbridge Road - from Ashley Avenue to Station Road, particularly on the south-side (where I am resident). In addition to the speed of vehicles travelling up the hill out of Bath, this is accentuated by the narrow pavement, a bus stop and the lack of visibility on that bend. However, I would judge that many vehicles are exceeding the existing 30 mph speed limit and there appears to be little or no effort to enforce it. Would a further reduction to the limit make any noticeable difference unless it is enforced? I would also suggest that there are other risks to pedestrians in this area which could be mitigated by enforcing existing regulations: west-bound vehicles missing the red-light on the crossing directly in front of The Weston, the use of bicycles, e-bikes and e-scooters on pavements and, predominately, large vans inconsiderately parked or stopped on pavements leaving insufficient room for pedestrians, let alone buggies or mobility scooters to pass. This latter problem results in pedestrians having to walk in or to cross this already hazardous section of road.
- There is no need to reduce the speed limit to 20 miles and it better remain 30mph as currently which is very safe. This is a very wide road with hardly any pedestrians. There have been no accidents to my knowledge.
- Please do not make this 30mph. It is a big road and will just result in pointless traffic. I strongly object. This is a waste of public resources.
- The road is not currently dangerous, reducing to 20mph is unnecessary and will simply be a nuisance for those living there or driving through.
- Please do not make this 30mph. It is a big road and will just result in pointless.
- The road is not currently dangerous, reducing to 20mph is unnecessary and will.

- I do not see a need for a 20 mile speed limit in this area.
- I travel to Bath so often for my work from my home, traffic in Bath is always heavy and make me so stressed. If it would be limited to 20mph, traffic there is even worse and I find much more stressed on travelling for my work.
- There is zero need for this
- I am writing to express my strong concern regarding the proposed reduction of the speed limit from 30mph to 20mph on Kelston Road/Newbridge Hill 26-027, Newbridge Road/Upper Bristol Road 26-028 and London Road West 26-029.

I find it difficult to understand the justification for this change. The existing 30mph limit has been in place for many years and I do not believe reducing them to 20mph is necessary. These roads are key routes into and around Bath and reducing the speed limit is likely to increase congestion and lengthen journey times for residents, commuters and businesses.

I am also concerned about the impact this may have on drivers. I personally have experienced abuse from other road users for simply driving at the legal speed limit, even in 30mph zones. Reducing the limit to 20mph, may increase driver anxiety, as many motorists may feel pressured by impatient drivers when attempting to comply with the law.

I am also concerned about whether those making decisions on these proposals fully understand the day-to-day realities of using these roads. Residents and first hand road users have first-hand experience of traffic conditions, congestion and the practical impacts of changes to speed limits. I hope that the views of local people who live, work and travel in Bath are being given significant weight in the decision making process.

Many residents and motorists already face increasing congestion and longer journey times. Lowering the speed limit further is likely to add to these frustrations while providing little practical benefit. It also raises concerns about whether the council resources could be better directed towards addressing road maintenance, potholes, parking issues and other local priorities that affect residents on a daily basis.

If the council believes these changes are necessary, I would appreciate seeing the evidence used to support the decision, including accident statistics, traffic studies, environmental assessments and any evaluation of the likely impact on local residents, businesses and traffic flow.

I urge the council to reconsider these proposals and to ensure that any changes to speed limits are based on clear evidence and genuine local need rather than a blanket policy approach. Given the importance of these roads as major transport routes into Bath, any changes should be carefully justified and subject to meaningful public consultation.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my comments. I look forward to your response.

- The change in the speed to 20mph seems unnecessary. The traffic along here self regulates to 20mph along the length for most of the time due to the narrowness of the road because of the parking. Living in the area I am not aware of accidents along this stretch, other than the knocking of parked cars wing mirrors when trying to pass when it is narrow. The occasional speeding car can be heard, but they are intentionally driving significantly above 30mph at night and the change in speed limit isn't going to stop them.

To make the area safer for children and pedestrians, the better option would be to introduce zebra crossings at appropriate points. At the moment there are no reasonable crossing points near the Old Newbridge Hill junction for the school. A crossing near 167 Newbridge Hill would seem sensible, away from junctions to allow crossing. A crossing closer to Newbridge Surgery would also be sensible, though there is already one close by for the school.

The junction with Old Newbridge Hill seems to be the biggest safety concern, and yet nothing is proposed for that as many vehicles place themselves badly in the road. The speed of the road isn't what makes this junction dangerous, it is the visibility problems caused by the steepness of the road and the wall and railings heading towards the school. Also to note, less vehicles would be on the road if public transport was more reliable. The digital updates on the bus stops are not accurate. Buses are cancelled with no updates, and the timetables cannot be treated as reliable.

It seems as though the proposal has been put forward without looking at other road issues that will help people actually be safer when crossing the road.

- This really is an unnecessary waste of money. If as claimed the objective is to increase safety, then it will make no difference as the existing 20mph limits are most often ignored. Much evidence has shown that speed limits will only be obeyed by the majority of drivers if they are seen as appropriate. If you really want to increase road safety enforce the existing limits and police, the road users. A previous councillor when questioned about the introduction of 20mph limits said it reduced the typical speed to around 29mph from nearer 40. Well, if that is the case then the existing 30mph limits are correct and just need to be enforced. There is also the hidden advantage of the main roads remaining at a higher limit in that it will discourage rat-running through the residential areas that 20mph limits were intended to protect in the first place. Also if drivers are distracted by constantly checking their speedometer, they are not looking at the road for other hazards.

There is much evidence of unlicensed electric scooters and modified electric assisted bicycles which are by definition uninsured by users who have no idea of the highway code or road safety. Even the rental scooters which are legal are not being used correctly. They are regularly seen being ridden 2 up and by people not wearing any form of protection.

You have put in numerous cycle lanes, but they are frequently ignored by those they were put in for, whether on the Upper Bristol Road or the A4 towards Newton St Loe.

Quite simply, road safety would be much improved if people actually obeyed, the existing rules and regulations by having them enforced rather than by the council bending over backwards to make allowances for those who have no respect for the law.

Inappropriate and wrongly sighted highway infrastructure 'improvements' do not help the council. For example, the pedestrian crossing by the bottom of Old Newbridge Hill is ignored by the pupils of Oldfield school as they cross nearer to the park and ride. It would have been better if when doing all that work to have put in full traffic lights at the crossing of Newbridge Road, Old Newbridge Hill and Brassmill Lane with pedestrian crossing incorporated. The same can also be said of the junction of Newbridge Road and Chelsea Road/Station Road where people cross directly between Chelsea Road and Station Road without going to the crossing at the post office.

- I am a daily user of this road for the RUH and to Bristol. This road is only remaining high quality route exiting west of Bath as it is 30mph without major roundabout or roadworks (unlike A36 Lower Bristol Road). There is already heavy traffic turning into Old Newbridge Hill (due to tight turning right into Newbridge Hill) this means the traffic backflows onto the A4, slowing the traffic down. There is also a park and ride traffic light which holds traffic further down. Significant traffic enters Brassmill Lane through Rudmore Park hence causing stop and start traffic during rush hour. Putting 20mph through Newbridge Road reduces the throughput massively westbound, causing tailbacks at the traffic lights splitting from Upper Bristol Road into Newbridge Hill/Newbridge Road. This also delays the over-loaded X39 line even further with a tightly-run timetable.

I fear that the 20mph will cause unnecessary delays, and adversely affects daily commute into the hospital, when there is little public transport provision to RUH and the tight staffing in the hospital.

Officer response:

It is acknowledged that traffic speeds can be affected by factors such as congestion, parking activity, junction delays and peak-period traffic demand. However, the purpose of a speed limit is not solely to address existing average vehicle speeds but also to establish an appropriate maximum speed for the character and function of the road and for the protection of all road users, notably pedestrians and cyclists.

The Council has considered the residential nature of the route, the presence of schools, pedestrian activity and active travel objectives when developing these proposals. In particular, the Newbridge Road / Upper Bristol Road route serves Oldfield School and Newbridge Primary School, and the proposals seek to improve conditions for more vulnerable road users in these areas.

The absence of personally observed collisions does not necessarily indicate the absence of road safety concerns. Speed management is intended to reduce both the likelihood of collisions occurring and the severity of injuries when collisions do occur.

Comments have suggested that pedestrian crossings, junction improvements and parking management may provide greater safety benefits than a reduction in the speed limit.

The Council agrees that road safety is best delivered through a combination of measures rather than through speed limits alone. However, the consideration of crossings, junction improvements and parking controls falls outside the scope of the current proposals, which relates solely to the proposed speed limit change.

Comments have been received regarding:

- pedestrian crossing provision near Old Newbridge Hill;*
- pedestrian movements near Newbridge Surgery;*
- the operation of the Old Newbridge Hill junction;*
- parking-related road narrowing; and*
- pedestrian crossing behaviour at existing crossing facilities.*

These issues are beyond the scope of the current proposals and would need to be considered separately through future highway improvement programmes where funding and prioritisation permit. The existence of other potential highway improvements does not necessarily negate the potential benefits of a lower speed limit.

Concerns have been raised that some existing 20mph limits are not fully observed and that enforcement would be more effective than introducing additional restrictions.

Speed limits form one element of a wider speed management strategy. The Council has consulted Avon and Somerset Police as part of the statutory process. The Police have advised that speed limits should be supported by an appropriate road environment and that enforcement resources are necessarily targeted and intelligence led.

The Council recognises that a reduced speed limit may result in instances of non-compliance. However, the possibility that some drivers may exceed the limit is not considered sufficient reason to retain a higher speed limit where a lower speed limit is considered appropriate for the road environment.

Furthermore, speed limits establish the legal framework within which enforcement can take place. Enforcement and speed limits are complementary rather than mutually exclusive measures.

Several objections suggest that a reduction from 30mph to 20mph will result in increased congestion, longer journey times, reduced network capacity and delays to buses and hospital-related traffic.

The Council has considered these concerns carefully. Existing traffic conditions on the route are already influenced by a number of factors including:

- traffic signals;*
- junction turning movements;*
- bus stops;*
- pedestrian activity;*
- parking activity;*
- peak-hour traffic demand;*
- access to the RUH; and*
- congestion associated with the wider road network.*

As a result, average journey speeds are often significantly below the existing 30mph speed limit, particularly during peak periods.

The proposal does not include physical traffic-calming measures such as speed humps, chicanes or carriageway narrowing. Consequently, there will be no reduction in the physical capacity of the road if the proposed 20mph speed limit is introduced.

The Council has also discharged its duty under Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and considered its network management responsibilities under the Traffic Management Act 2004 when promoting the proposals. It concluded that the proposed speed limits are consistent with maintaining the safe and expeditious movement of traffic whilst addressing wider safety and amenity considerations.

The importance of maintaining reliable access to the Royal United Hospital is recognised, along with the concerns raised regarding staff commuting, patient access, ambulance movements and bus service reliability.

However, the proposed 20mph speed limit would not materially affect access to the hospital. Existing delays experienced on the corridor are primarily associated

with junction operation, parking activity, peak-period demand and general network congestion.


Similarly, delays affecting bus services are generally influenced by overall traffic conditions, passenger boarding times and network congestion. It is considered that the proposed 20mph speed limit would not significantly affect bus journey reliability beyond existing constraints.

Emergency service organisations have been consulted as part of the statutory process and have had the opportunity to comment on the proposals. Also, the speed of emergency vehicles in the normal course of their duties (under emergency conditions) would not be influenced by a lower speed limit.

10. APPROVED FOR CIRCULATION TO WARD MEMBERS AND CABINET MEMBER FOR SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT DELIVERY

Please note that this report has been circulated to provide you with an opportunity to consider any comments and/or objections which have been received in response to the public advertisement of the proposal(s), along with the officer response to each.

Any comments which you may have will be added to the report to be considered by the Director for Place Management, Chris Major, prior to his decision regarding the sealing, or otherwise, of this TRO.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Neil Terry', with a large, stylized flourish at the end.

Neil Terry
Traffic Management and Network Manager

Date: 06/07/2026