**OFFICER DECISION REPORT – TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER (TRO)**

2

**INFORMAL CONSULTATION WARD MEMBERS / POLICE**

PREPARED BY: Traffic Management Team, Highways and Traffic Group

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TITLE OF REPORT:**  **PROPOSAL:**  **SCHEME REF No:**  **REPORT AUTHOR:** | **Pixash Lane / World’s End Lane, Keynsham Speed Limit & Restricted Movements**  **20mph Speed Limit, 30mph Speed Limit, No Left Turn**  **23-003**  **Lewis Cox** |

**1. DELEGATION**

The delegation to be exercised in this report is contained within **Part 3**, **Section 4** of the Constitution under the **Delegation of Functions to Officers,** as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section A** | The Chief Executive, Strategic Directors, Divisional 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 his/her area of responsibility. |
| **Section D9** | 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 purpose of this report, the Director of Place Management holds 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, |  |
| (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 & 30 mph speed limit in the lengths of World’s End Lane, Keynsham as indicated in the plan. To introduce a ‘No Left Turn’ from World’s End Lane onto Pixash Lane, Keynsham.

**4. BACKGROUND**

TRO of highway improvements required as part of planning decision notice ref: 21/00435/EREG03 for the consolidated waste facility at Pixash Lane. This includes improvements to the existing pedestrian and cycle network. Extending the improved walking and cycling infrastructure further east along World's End Lane. The highway improvements allow improved access to the new facility and surrounding properties and support the promotion of public transport, walking and cycling.

# 5. SOURCE OF FINANCE

This proposal is being funded by the development.

**6. CONSULTATION REQUIREMENT**

Theproposal requires informal consultation with the Chief Constable, Ward Members and the Cabinet Members for Transport.

PROPOSALS APPROVED FOR INFORMAL CONSULTATION WITH THE CHIEF CONSTABLE AND WARD MEMBERS.

Signature: Date: 21st February 2023



Paul Garrod

Traffic Management and Network Manager

**7. INFORMAL CONSULTATION**

**Cllr Andy Wait:** I am generally in favour though I would prefer 20mph all the way along the blue part of World’s End Lane which is a bit of a track unless it is intended to be developed further then its currently state.

**Cllr Hal Macfie:** No comments received.

**Avon & Somerset Police:** It is understood from the TRO consultation document that the proposals are to “introduce a 20 & 30 mph speed limit in the lengths of World’s End Lane, Keynsham as indicated in the plan. To introduce a ‘No Right Turn’ restriction from Pixash Lane onto the A4 Bath Road, Keynsham, and a ‘No Left Turn’ from World’s End Lane onto Pixash Lane, Keynsham.”

With regard to the prohibition of movement : ‘No Right Turn’ restriction from Pixash Lane onto the A4 Bath Road, Keynsham, and a ‘No Left Turn’ from World’s End Lane onto Pixash Lane, Keynsham

The proposals should meet the aspirations behind their introduction. However, unfortunately, we are unable to dedicate an enforcement presence to the proposed revised restriction, and any enforcement would be targeted, and intelligence led. It is therefore of importance that the proposed prohibition of movements are clearly signed and physically restricted if possible.

With regard to the proposed 20mph and 30mph speed limits, as previously discussed, we have a Force stance regarding the introduction of speed limits, which has been written to reflect the current speed environment. I copy this below for your information.

“Speed limits are only one element of speed management and local speed limits should not be set in isolation. They should be part of a package with other measures to manage speeds, which include engineering, visible interventions and landscaping standards that respect the needs of all road users and raise the driver’s awareness of their environment, together with education, driver information, training and publicity.

The police service has to ensure all resources are used effectively in responding to community priorities. Avon and Somerset Constabulary will support all appropriate speed limits, including 20mph roads, where;

The limit looks and feels like the limit, giving visiting motorists who wish to conform that chance; the desired outcome has to be speeds at the limit chosen so as to achieve safe roads for other and vulnerable users, not high speeds and high enforcement;

the limit is self-enforcing ( with reducing features) not requiring large scale enforcement;

the limit is only introduced where mean speeds are already close to the limit to be imposed, (24mph in a 20mph limit) or with interventions that make the limit clear to visiting motorists; speeding problems identified in an area must have the engineering, site clarity and need re-assessed, not simply a call for more enforcement.

Enforcement will be considered in all clearly posted limits, given other priorities, and this will be by:

Targeted enforcement where there is deliberate offending and the limits are clear; Where limits are not clear ( that is they don’t feel like or look like the limit or are on inappropriate roads), they will not be routinely enforced, only targeted where there is intelligence of obvious deliberate disregard which may result in increased threat, harm or risk to other road users.

Deliberate high harm offenders will always be targeted and prosecuted whereas enforcement against drivers who simply misread the road may not be appropriate. None of the above should in anyway leave the impression that we will not enforce the law. As with all speed limits, and other enforcement work, we will use evidence to ensure that our resources are allocated in the most appropriate way using appropriate tactics.

Enforcement of limits that do not comply with the above representations could lead to mistaken offending and could risk the loss of public support. Enforcement cannot and must not take the place of proper engineering and or clear signing.”

We do not, as part of our response on behalf of the Chief Constable to formal consultation, check the accuracy or validity of what is being proposed but we do consider implications for road safety and enforcement.

We always expect that:

a) the powers being exercised are available to you as traffic authority, are valid and are appropriate for the proposals;

b) the descriptions of the lengths of road, the road names, the road numbers and any directional descriptions are correct and accurate;

c) where any proposals replace existing restrictions or prohibitions, that the previous orders are adequately revoked or varied;

d) the mandatory traffic signs giving legal effect to the order will be fully TSRGD compliant, will give drivers adequate guidance and will placed to accord to the descriptions in the order.

We have worked on the assumption that, by submitting this TRO for consultation, you are also confirming the above points and that subject to consultation process, the order will be made. Any enforcement action taken by the Police will be based on this and, should this transpire not to be the case, Avon & Somerset Constabulary will not accept any liability – financial or otherwise – arising as a result.

Assistant Engineer response – The ‘No Right Turn’ proposal has now been removed from the proposal.

**Cabinet Member for Transport Cllr Rigby:** No comments received.

**8. RECOMMENDATION**

As no significant objections and/or comments have been received following the informal consultation described above, the formal Traffic Regulation Order process (the public advertisement of the proposals) should be progressed.



Paul Garrod Date: 16th March 2023

Traffic Management & Network Manager

**9.** **DECISION**

As the officer holding the above delegation, I approve the progression of this Traffic Regulation Order.

In taking this decision, I confirm that due regard has been given to the Council’s public sector equality duty, which requires it to consider and think about how its policies or decisions may affect people who are protected under the Equality Act.

Chris Major Date: 20/03/23



Director for Place Management