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

3

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

PREPARED BY: Traffic Management Team, Highways and Traffic Group

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TITLE OF REPORT:**  **PROPOSAL:**  **SCHEME REF No:**  **REPORT AUTHOR:** | **Farrington Gurney**  **20mph speed limit**  **23-024 / LC**  **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 purposes of this report, the Director of Place Management holds the delegated power to make, amend or revoke any Traffic Regulation 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 | X |
| (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 20mph speed limits into the vicinity of Farrington Gurney primary school and the surrounding neighbourhood.

The extent of the proposed 20mph speed limit is shown on the attached drawing.

The built-up sections of Ham Lane, Chapel Close, Pitway Lane and Hill View are also included for consistency across the parish.

The point where the school crossing patrol is located will also be improved as part of this scheme together with signage to deter HGVs from using Church Lane.

**4. BACKGROUND**

The speed limit changes have been requested by the school as the speed of traffic on Church Lane can sometimes be inappropriate. There is an existing advisory 20mph in place, but the school would like this to become a mandatory 20mph speed limit so that enforcement is possible.

Farrington Parish Council have also requested that the speed limit on the inner village roads be reduced to 20mph, linking to the proposed 20mph in Church Lane, but also to consolidate the whole village into a wider 20 mph scheme.

# 5. SOURCE OF FINANCE

The scheme will be funded through the 2023/24 Transport Improvement Programme.

**6. CONSULTATION REQUIREMENT**

Theproposal requires informal consultation with the Chief Constable, Ward Members, the Parish Council, and the Cabinet Member for Highways.

PROPOSAL(S) APPROVED FOR INFORMAL CONSULTATION WITH THE CHIEF CONSTABLE AND WARD MEMBERS.



Paul Garrod Date: 6th September 2023

Traffic Management and Network Manager

6. INFORMAL CONSULTATION

**Avon & Somerset Police:** 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.”

Please note that we are unable to dedicate enforcement to the proposed restriction and any enforcement will be targeted and intelligence led.

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 place 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.

**CLLR ANN MORGAN:** No comments received.

**FARRINGTON GURNEY PARISH COUNCIL:** No comments received.

**CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS – CLLR MANDA 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: 2nd January 2024

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: 02/01/24



Director for Place Management

10. PUBLIC CONSULTATION 3 Approvals – 0 Objections

1. I refer to the Notice pinned to a telegraph pole in Meadow Close, Farrington Gurney.

The proposal is excellent. I just draw your attention to the dark line drawn within Meadow Close. I live at 15 Meadow Close in a cul de sac with Nos. 12, 14 and 15. That section of the road is not adopted highway. The majority of the road is owned and on the title deed of No. 15 and the remainder up to the road is half on No. 12 and the other half No. 14. That is the road from the cobbles to the wall. I just wished to make you aware, not that we drive over 20mph in our little cul de sac.

1. In addition to the proposed restrictions, please consider extending the 20 MPH restrictions to include the section of the A37 that passes through Farrington Gurney. There is a well-used nursery (open five days a week and used by many families in the village) on this section of road, and the pavements are very narrow and the crossing unsafe. Although this is currently a 30 MPH zone it is not monitored / there is no speed camera. Safety would be greatly improved by reducing this section through the village to a 20 MPH zone in line with the roads included in the proposed TRO23-024/LC.
2. BANES has posted notice of the change of speed limit around the village. As per emails and conversations regarding this proposal, Marsh Lane has been missed completely which is extremely important to include. The reference number is TRO 23-024/LC. Please could you make sure this is included?