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**OUTCOME OF TRO PROCESS**

PREPARED BY: Traffic Management Team, Highways and Traffic Group

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TITLE OF REPORT:**  **PROPOSAL:**  **SCHEME REF No:**  **REPORT AUTHOR:** | **Lansdown Road, Bath (south of Richmond Road)**  **20mph speed limit**  **23-006**  **Neil Terry / Lewis Cox** |

**1. DELEGATION**

The delegation to be exercised in this report is contained within **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 20mph speed limit on Lansdown Road, Bath, between its junction with Richmond Road and the existing 20mph speed limit at its junction with The Paragon.

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

**4. BACKGROUND**

Lansdown Road, to the south of Richmond Road, is predominantly residential in nature, with activity associated with walking, cycling, wheeling and public transport along its length. There are also shops, restaurants, and hotels along the lower section of the road, and the route is used by school children and parents heading to and from local schools, in particular St. Stephens Primary School.

Representations have been received from the local Ward Members and residents requesting that the speed limit is reviewed, citing road safety concerns and difficulties negotiating the road, but also in response to several loss-of-control collisions along the lower section.

The Traffic Management Team is currently working with our Partner Consultants, AECOM, on a Corridor Study for the same length of Lansdown Road. This study will identify potential walking, wheeling and public transport infrastructure improvements, although these will only be concept at this stage. Future funding opportunities will be pursued.

The proposed 20mph speed limit would be beneficial for the development and design of any future proposed infrastructure improvements. It should also be noted that the residential areas to each side of Lansdown Road are already subject to a 20mph speed limit, so this proposal would present an opportunity to rationalise the existing 20/30mph terminal speed limit signing at each side road junction.

# 5. SOURCE OF FINANCE

The scheme is funded through the 2022/23 Transport Improvement Programme.

**6. INFORMAL CONSULTATION REQUIREMENT**

Informal consultation was carried out with the Chief Constable, Ward Members, and the Cabinet Members for Transport. The responses to the informal consultation can be found in TRO Reports 2 and 3.

**7.** **OBJECTIONS, COMMENTS AND SUPPORT RECEIVED (following the public advertisement of the proposal(s)**

The objections and expressions of support received during the public advertisement of the proposal are tabulated in **Appendix A**. In total, there were 6 objections and 36 expressions of support (some with additional comments).

**8. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FOLLOWING THE PUBLIC ADVERTISEMENT OF THE PROPOSAL**

Councillor Lucy Hodge:

I am pleased to support this TRO for the proposed 20 mph speed limit on Lansdown Road. I note the report and the significant level of support for a 20mph speed limit in this location and also the many comments requesting an extension of the 20mph speed limit to upper Lansdown Road or city wide.

Councillor Mark Elliott:

I strongly support this TRO, and I'm pleased to see the large amount of public support expressed for it. A number of these public comments request that the 20mph limit be extended further up Lansdown Road past the school sites, and I support and agree with those also.

Councillor Manda Rigby (Cabinet Member for Transport):

No further comments.

**9. RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Traffic Regulation Order as advertised is sealed.



Paul Garrod Date: 29th March 2023

Traffic Management & Network Manager

**10. DECISION**

As the Officer holding the above delegation, I have decided that the objections should not be acceded to, and the Order as advertised be sealed.

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.

The Council’s policy framework has been used as the basis to develop the scheme with full engagement with stakeholders across the area.

I further note that the issue of deciding whether to implement any scheme is a matter of broad judgement, taking into account the wider transport and climate aims of the Council rather than a purely mathematical analysis on the numbers of positive or negative responses.

The arguments both for and against the scheme were clearly identified and were considered fully as part of the decision-making process before I made the final decision as set out above.
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Chris Major Date: 05/05/23

Director of Place Management