
**Corporate and Scrutiny Management Committee
(Calling – In)**

12 August 2013

Report of the Assistant Director, Governance and ICT

**Called-in Item: 20mph in the West of York – Speed Limit Order
Consultation and Petition Response**

Summary

1. This report sets out the reasons for the call-in of the decisions made by the Cabinet Member for Transport, Planning and Sustainability on 19 July 2013 in relation to the delivery of the 20mph speed limit for residential roads across the West of York urban area, as a Council priority. The report to the meeting set out details of the representations received following advertisement of the proposed order and to receipt of an e-petition entitled “Stop the 20mph Proposals” signed by 240 people.

This cover report sets out the powers and role of the Corporate and Scrutiny Management Committee in relation to dealing with the call-in.

Background

2. The Decision Sheet issued after the Cabinet Member Decision Session is attached as Annex A to this report. This sets out the decisions taken by the Cabinet Member on the called-in item. The original report to the Cabinet Member on the called-in item is attached as Annex B to this report.
3. The Cabinet Members decision has been called in by Cllrs Reid, Jeffries and Ayre for review by the Corporate and Scrutiny Management Committee (CSMC) (Calling-In), in accordance with the constitutional requirements for call-in. The following are the reasons given for the call-in:
 - This policy does not enjoy public support – the report confirms that out of 13,000 residents consulted, only 7 responded in

favour. This is abysmally low for a project that will cost £600,000 of taxpayers' money in total.

- Average speeds on many of the roads proposed for the new limit are already below 20mph and additional signage would make no practical difference, except to increase street 'clutter' and maintenance costs. As an example, over the last 5 years Moorcroft Road has a record of 1 slight accident, an 85th percentile speed of 19mph, and a highest recorded speed of 25mph.
- This scheme does not target roads with safety problems – figures provided to us by officers show that of the 338 accidents recorded in West York over the last 5 years only 48 (13%) occurred on roads where it is now proposed to reduce the speed limit. In response to this point, the report claims that “The scheme has never been primarily focussed on casualty reduction” (paragraph 36). However, on paragraph 26 the report justifies the costs of implementation against the costs of accidents.
- Evidence from elsewhere in the country with blanket schemes undermines the recommendation. In Portsmouth casualty levels are higher than before the scheme was implemented and in Oxford “a similar pattern is emerging”. In Bristol residents do not feel that the roads are safer or that speeding has reduced. And returning to Portsmouth, the scheme has not encouraged a ‘modal shift’ away from car use or encouraged cycling and walking with analysis concluding that the scheme “made little difference to the majority of respondents in the amount they travelled by their chosen mode”.
- The evidence is that locally and nationally the police do not have the resources or inclination to enforce all new 20mphs, with the Association of Chief Police Officers telling Parliament in March that “We are not enforcing 20mph speed limits at this moment in time”.
- The decision to take Option 3 in this report and exclude Trenchard Road and Portal Road is baffling. There will be other roads in the area where “residents are against the idea” so it is unclear why these roads have been singled out.

- KSI (Killed or seriously injured) figures have steadily reduced in York over the last 10 years by taking an evidence-based approach and targeting resources on areas with accident records and/or high pedestrian footfall - targeted 20mph limits have played an important part in this. This report does not provide a convincing case that this targeted and evidence-based approach should change.
- If the Cabinet Member is not prepared to abandon the scheme completely, then he should delay implementation for at least 18 months so that the impact of the 20mph limit – introduced earlier in the year in South Bank – can be assessed and more evidence can be produced from other schemes across the country.

Consultation

4. In accordance with the requirements of the Constitution, the calling-in Members have been invited to attend and/or speak at the Call-In meeting, as appropriate.

Options

5. The following options are available to CSMC (Calling-In) Members in relation to dealing with this call-in, in accordance with the constitutional and legal requirements under the Local Government Act 2000:
 - a. To decide that there are no grounds to make specific recommendations to the Cabinet Member in respect of the report. If this option is chosen, the original decisions taken on the item by the Cabinet Member on 19 July 2013 will be confirmed and will take effect from the date of the CSMC (Calling-In) meeting; or
 - b. To make specific recommendations to the Cabinet Member on the report, in light of the reasons given for the call-in. If this option is chosen, the matter will be reconsidered by Cabinet at a meeting of Cabinet (Calling-In) to be held on 20 August 2013.

Analysis

6. Members need to consider the reasons for call-in and the report to Cabinet and form a view on whether there is a basis to make specific recommendations to Cabinet in respect of the report.

Council Plan

7. There are no direct implications for this call-in in relation to the delivery of the Council Plan and its priorities for 2011-15.

Implications

8. There are no known Financial, HR, Legal, Property, Equalities, or Crime and Disorder implications in relation to the following in terms of dealing with the specific matter before Members; namely, to determine and handle the call-in.

Risk Management

9. There are no risk management implications associated with the call in of this matter.

Recommendations:

10. Members are asked to consider the call-in and reasons for it and decide whether they wish to confirm the decisions made by the Cabinet Member or refer the matter back for reconsideration and make specific recommendations on the report to Cabinet.

Reason: To enable the called-in matter to be dealt with efficiently and in accordance with the requirements of the Council's Constitution.

Contact details:

Author:

Dawn Steel
Head of Civic &
Democratic Services
01904 551030

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Andrew Docherty
Assistant Director, Governance and ICT

**Report
Approved**



Date 31 July 2013

Specialist Implications Officer(s) None

Wards Affected:

All



For further information please contact the author of the report

Annexes

Annex A – Copy of the Decision Sheet produced following the Cabinet Member Decision Session on the called-in item.

Annex B – Report of the Director of City and Environmental Services to the Decision Session on 19 July 2013.

Background Papers

None