

### Decision Session – Executive Member Planning and Transport

12 November 2015

Report of the Acting Director CES, Neil Ferris.

#### Part 2 - Review of Speed Management Engineering Programme

#### Summary

1. This report details a review of the speed management schemes which have been referred for an engineering solution and seeks approval of the detailed 15/16 speed management programme.

### Background

- 2. As part of the Speed Management process any requests to City of York Council (CYC) for speeding issues to be addressed are considered by the Road Safety Partnership team (a multi agency partnership comprising officers from City of York Council, North Yorkshire Police and North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue).
- 3. Depending on the outcome of each assessment, which takes casualty history and measured speeds into account, every request is prioritised and assigned a possible action. This could be enforcement, road safety or engineering interventions.

### **Existing Requests**

- There are currently 40 locations referred to CYC Transport Projects for engineering solutions to be developed and implemented. In the 2015/16 Capital Programme an overall budget of £90k has been allocated to be spent on speed management schemes.
- 5. None of the sites have a significant casualty history but it is recognised that speeding traffic is a concern for some residents and impinges on their quality of life. Therefore each of the sites have been reviewed

based on the existing speed data records and placed into one of three categories:

- a. 2015/16 schemes (21 sites)
  Sites where low cost measures are considered feasible to address the speeding problem.
- b. *Sites for further review* (16 sites) Sites where further data collection is required to r

Sites where further data collection is required to provide a solid basis for investigation.

c. **Sites with speed limit issues** (3 Sites) Sites where the speed records and road environment suggest the existing speed limit is inappropriate.

### 2015/16 Speed Management Schemes

- 6. Proposals for each of the 21 sites were developed and initial consultation carried out with relevant CYC officers, ward members, parish or town councils and North Yorkshire Police.
- 7. Following consideration of all the comments received 16 of the schemes are recommended for further consultation with residents and implementation. Any substantive objections to the schemes or associated Speed Limit Orders would be reported back to the Director.
- 8. These 16 schemes are listed below with estimated costs. A detailed breakdown of each site along with consultation feedback and analysis of the comments is provided, along with an plan showing the outline design of the scheme in Annex A P.

9. The schemes have been prioritised using three variables: Accident data / Percentage over the posted speed limit / Proximity to schools and shops

Sites (in priority order) Recommended Action		Estimate	
Danebury Drive, South	Alterations to traffic calming	£24k	A
Main St, Wheldrake	Improved gateway signing / carriageway narrowing	£8k	В
Chaloners Rd, Dringhouses, North of the 20mph Zone	Introduction of on-road cycle lanes	£2k	С
Eason View, Dringhouses	Alterations to traffic calming	£16k	D
Bishopthorpe Rd, Crematorium to Palace	Improved gateway signing	£1.5k	E
Usher Lane, Haxby	Improved gateway signing	£2k	F
York Road, Strensall	Introduction of on-road cycle lanes	£5k	G
Stockton Lane / Sandy Lane, Stockton on the Forest	Improved gateway signing & 40mph buffer limit	£3k	Н
Naburn Lane, Fulford, rear of designer outlet	Improved gateway signing	£1.5k	1
Common Rd, Dunnington	Relocation of speed limit gateway & improved signing	£4k	J
Sim Balk Lane, Bishopthorpe	Improved gateway signing	£1.5k	K
Moorlands Rd, Skelton, Village Entry	Improved gateway signing & lining	£2.5k	L
Main St, Askham Richard	Relocation of speed limit gateway & improved signing	£5k	М
B1224 Wetherby Road, West of Beckfield Lane junction	Introduction of on-road cycle lanes	£4k	N
Green Lane, Clifton	Improve deflection at mini-roundabouts	£10k	0
Church Lane, Wheldrake	Improved gateway signing	£2k	Р
TOTAL		£92k	

10. The remaining five sites have been omitted from the 2015/16 programme due to concerns and objections raised by the Parish Council / Ward Councillor and the Police. Details of these schemes including consultation feedback and reasons for the schemes omission are provided in Annex Q. These will be reviewed again as part of the development of the 2016/17 programme.

## Sites for further study (Annex R)

11.Sixteen sites reviewed would benefit from being revisited with new data required to get a better idea as to what is currently happening at these locations. It is recommended that speed surveys are commissioned for each of these sites this year and that they will form the basis of the 2016/17 programme along with any carry over from the 2015/16 programme. The estimated cost of this work is £2k.

## Sites with speed limit issues (Annex S)

- 12. Three of the sites reviewed are considered to have speed limits which are unrealistic for the road environment. Most drivers assess what is a safe speed to travel for a given environment this is usually reflected by the speed limit. In these instances the limit is considered to be lower than appropriate leading to poor compliance.
- 13. To improve driver compliance with these limits significant alterations to the road environment would be required with potential costs way in excess of the current speed management budget. In order to assess these sites, a more detailed investigation of what can be done to bring speeds down to a more appropriate level is required. The estimated cost of this work is £3k.
- 14. This could be undertaken this financial year to determine the likely cost of any engineering measures. It is recommended that the outcome of the feasibility studies should be considered for a future years capital programme, alongside other priorities at that time.

## Options

15. Option (i) -

- Approve the proposed programme of schemes (Annex A-P sites) and authorise officers to undertake further consultation and advertisement of speed limit orders as necessary, and to implement the measures if no objections are received. Any measures which receive objections will be reported back to the Director for a decision.
- To approve the carrying out of additional speed surveys (Annex Q and R sites) and to carry forward these sites for further assessment in the 2016/17 programme.
- Approve the inclusion of further feasibility work for the three sites with speed limit issues (Annex S) in the ongoing programme of speed management schemes.

Option (ii) –

• As Option (i) but with revisions as the Executive Member deems appropriate.

Option (iii) - Do nothing, reallocate spend elsewhere.

• Do nothing, and reallocate the funding to other programmes of work.

## Analysis

16. Option (i)

The review of the speed management schemes has been carried out utilising a data based approach and prioritised using the framework set out by the Road Safety Partnership. Preliminary consultation has been undertaken to gauge views on the proposals and responses have been considered. Where appropriate, scheme proposals have been revised to reflect the comments or have been omitted from this year's programme. This option aims to spend the full budget allocation by addressing the sites in a prioritised order. It also provides a solid base of work for the 2016/17 speed management programme and provides a suggestion for dealing with sites where the speed limit is considered to be unrealistic.

17. Option ii)

This option offers the Executive Member the opportunity to review the prioritisation of the works if deemed appropriate. The original ranking was based on a data led process and to reprioritise the programme could be questioned by residents or members of other parties so is not recommended.

## 18. Option iii)

Requests to review speeds at the sites under consideration were received from local residents and have been through the appropriate procedure as laid out in the Council's speed management policy. Doing nothing would be an inappropriate response to the request and will have no affect on the current vehicle speeds.

# **Council Plan**

19. The potential implications for the priorities in the Council Plan are:

## • A Council That Listens To Residents –

The schemes are all based on reports of speeding traffic from local residents, by responding to these requests for action the council is demonstrating that it is listening to residents. Preliminary consultations have included Parish and Town Councils and also the Police.

## Implications

20. Financial –

The estimated total cost to deliver the programme is £97k. The Current Speed Management Allocation for 15/16 is £90k, with £9k already spent during the initial investigations.

- 21. The 2015/16 programme is currently estimated to be £16k overprogrammed, which is considered manageable. Schemes will be tackled in priority order and any scheme which is not completed within 2015/16 could be carried forward to the 2016/17 programme, to be implemented early in the 2016/17 year, taking into account other priorities at that time. An increase to this year's budget is not proposed.
- 22. Human Resources None.
- 23. Equalities None.
- 24. Legal None
- 25. Crime and Disorder Speeding is a criminal offence and the council has a responsibility to deliver an effective Speed Management Strategy. It is the responsibility of North Yorkshire Police to enforce the appropriate speed limit.
- 26. Information Technology (IT) None
- 27. Property None.

#### **Risk Management**

- 28. In compliance with the Council's risk management strategy, the following risks associated with the recommendations in this report have been identified and described in the following points, and set out in the table below:
- 29. Authority reputation this risk is in connection with public perception of the Council if work is not undertaken following the review of a site passed through the Road Safety Partnership and is assessed at 10.

Risk Category	Impact	Likelihood	Score
Organisation/ Reputation	Minor	Probable	10

30. This risk score, falls into the 6-10 category and means the risk has been assessed as being "Low". This level of risk requires regular monitoring. This is already undertaken by the Partnership and reported to the Executive Member as part of the regular review report.

#### Recommendation

- 31. It is recommended that the Executive Member approves Option (i), which comprises:
  - Approval of the proposed programme of schemes (Annex A-P sites) and authorisation for officers to undertake further consultation and advertisement of speed limit orders as necessary, and to implement the measures if no objections are received. Any measures which receive objections should be reported back to the Director for a decision.
  - Approval to carry out additional speed surveys (Annex Q and R sites) and to carry forward these sites for further assessment in the 2016/17 programme.
  - Approval to include further feasibility work for the three sites with speed limit issues (Annex S) in the ongoing programme of speed management schemes.
- Reason: To deliver measures to address speed complaints raised by local residents.

Contact Details Author:

Ben Potter Engineer Transport Projects Tel: 01904 553523 Chief Officer responsible for the report:

**Neil Ferris, Acting Director** 

Report✓Date 27/10/15Approved

Specialist Implication Officer(s)

Wards Affected:

All	✓
-----	---

For further information please contact the author of the report.

#### Annexes

Annex A - P, 15/16 Speed Management Scheme Outline Designs

Annex Q, Sites referred back into 16/17 development

Annex R, Sites for further study

Annex S, Sites with speed limit issues