
Decision Session
Executive Member for City Strategy

2nd November 2010

Report of the Director of City Strategy

20mph speed limit petition for Fulford Cross and Danesmead

Summary

1. To advise the Executive Member of the proposed response to the receipt of the petition requesting a 20mph speed limit for Fulford Cross and Danesmead near the Steiner School, the Danesgate and Bridge Centre. The petition has been considered under the criteria set out and agreed at the Executive Member Decision Session (EMDS) in December 2009 and the report includes an updated prioritisation table.

Recommendations

2. The Executive Member for City Strategy is recommended to:
 - a) Note the relative priority of the petition set out in the table (Annex A) in relation to other petitions and requests received.
 - b) Agree that no further action should be taken at the current time in relation to Fulford Cross and Danesmead.

Reason: To progress requests and petitions against the agreed criteria and in priority order and to enable those requests that do not comply with key elements of the criteria to be considered through other processes.

Background

3. In December 2009 a report was presented to the EMDS setting out a set of criteria for prioritising the petitions and requests for 20mph speed limits on residential roads in York.
4. The prioritisation is to be considered against the following criteria. The road must be a 'residential' or 'mixed priority' road within the context of the speed management plan, the occurrence of an injury accident during the previous three years, of any severity or road user, the presence of a school, shopping area or play area, at least 50% of households within the street have signed the petition and average speed on the road must be 24mph or below.

5. A petition for a 20mph speed limit (without traffic calming) on Fulford Cross and Danesmead (roads surrounding Steiner School, the Danesgate and The Bridge Centre) presented at Council on 15th July 2010 and was signed by 39 residents, from 30 households. It was presented on the basis that 20mph speed limits improve road safety and survival rates, enhance community, boost traffic reduction, cut noise and pollution, encourage walking, cycling and independent child travel.

Prioritising petitions and requests

6. The prioritised list is intended to be a working document and as such will change over time as other petitions and requests are assessed. Not all the requests and petitions received so far have been assessed. The December 2009 report to EMDS agreed that petitions would be included in the list of schemes to be prioritised against the agreed criteria rather than dealt with separately. The list of petitions received and requests made to the Council is contained in Annex A.
7. A petition containing the signatures of 50 per cent or more households gains priority in an evaluation and response to, an initial approach if everything else is equal i.e. accidents, proximity to schools etc. When the Council formally consults on the petition or request the support of 50 per cent of respondents to the survey is required before a new speed limit would be introduced.

Petitions

8. The petition request a reduced speed limit and a speed survey carried out on Danesmead returned the following data

	Average speed (mph)	85 th percentile (mph)	Highest speed (mph)
From Broadway	18	22	44
To Broadway	17	21	29

9. The speed survey carried out on Fulford Cross returned the following data

	Average speed (mph)	85 th percentile (mph)	Highest speed (mph)
From Fulford Road	15	18	26
To Fulford Road	13	16	27

10. The speed data meets the criteria for implementing a signed only 20mph speed limit, the roads are identified as residential roads within the speed management plan and there are schools on the roads in question. The only criteria that are not met are that there have been no recorded injury accidents within the last three years and fewer than 50% of households have signed the

petition. Whilst it is not disqualified by the criteria there are other locations within the table (Annex A) which currently have greater priority for implementation. When the remaining data for the other locations has been collected, it's position in the table may alter.

11. The funding provision for implementing 20mph speed limits is fully allocated for 2010/2011 to schemes located higher within the prioritised list.
12. It was agreed at the EMDS in April 2010 that further implementation of individual 20mph speed limits should be delayed until public consultation on city-wide implementation has been undertaken as part of the Local Transport Plan (LTP3) development. The consultation on LTP3 is due to be substantially complete by late autumn/early winter 2010.

Consultation

16. Members commented as follows:
 - Councillor Potter advised that she would support the implementation of the 20mph speed limit as they are residential streets and have schools nearby.
 - Councillor Gillies had no comments to add.
17. North Yorkshire Police made the following comments. They consider that on the basis of the agreed criteria, 20mph speed limits should not be progressed at the location subject of the petition. The current position of North Yorkshire Police on 20 mph restrictions is as follows:-

The imposition of any 20mph speed limit on any highway by the relevant authority, is not objected to on the following understanding:-

- The relevant traffic authority for the highway concerned is responsible for the management of that highway.
- The imposition of any 20 mph speed limit is made with due regard to the traffic authorities responsibility under the relevant legislation and will comply with DfT guidance.
- The assumption of North Yorkshire Police is that if correctly placed, the speed limit will be self enforcing and the relevant traffic authority are fully responsible for ensuring that it meets those aims.
- With due regard to the obligations of the traffic authority, North Yorkshire Police will not undertake any routine speed enforcement on any highway that has a 20 mph limit imposed.
- It will be the duty of the relevant traffic authority to put into place corrective speed reduction measures if that limit fails.

Options

18. Option one – Agree the prioritisation position for the petition and delay implementation to a future year, subject to funding and await the outcome of the LTP3 consultation before undertaking any further implementation in relation to Fulford Cross and Danesmead.

19. Option two – Do not agree the current prioritisation but still await the outcome of the LTP3 consultation process.
20. Option three – Do not agree the current prioritisation and position the petition request higher up the table ahead of other schemes currently planned for delivery during 2010/2011.

Analysis

21. Option one – The introduction of the agreed criteria and process for responding to petitions and requests has provided a consistent approach, which is data led. It has identified a number of areas that would benefit from the introduction of a 20mph speed limit. These areas are currently prioritised ahead of Fulford Cross and Danesmead, primarily due to the occurrence of casualties. The process uses the agreed criteria but delays further action until later in the year when a response from residents about the wider context within which 20mph has been considered, understood and reported to EMDS. This may allow funding to be directed in another way to fit in with any longer term policy.
22. Option two – Many of the requests and petitions have similar assessments in terms of the criteria they meet. Fulford Cross and Danesmead could be moved higher up the table on the basis of data having been collected ahead of other requests but still would not fall within the top four schemes currently agreed for implementation within 2010/11. To discount the agreed criteria would undermine the process.
23. Option three - To discount the agreed criteria would undermine the process and a decision as to which scheme should not be implemented would be required and would require a decision as to which scheme in the prioritised list should be discontinued in 2010/11. The capital cost of the scheme (signing and Traffic Regulation Order) would be approximately £2,800.

Corporate Objectives

24. A data led approach of assessing road safety issues and prioritising scheme meets the Council's corporate priorities to create a Safer City. It also supports the aims and objectives of the Road Safety Strategy as part of the Second Local Transport Plan and contributes to A Safer City.

Implications

Financial

25. There are no financial implications from options one or two. If option three were pursued in year costs may rise depending on the scheme deferred. No further funding is available through the Local Transport Plan allocation without cutting other schemes.

Legal

26. A Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) will need to be in place in order to enable the speed limit on any road to be altered. The Council has powers under the

Highways Act and Road Traffic Regulation Act to undertake and implement TROs

HR

27. There are no impacts

Other

27. There are no impacts

Crime and Disorder

28. Speeding is a criminal offence and the Council has a responsibility to deliver an effective Speed Management Strategy.

Risk Management

29. In compliance with the Council's risk management strategy, no significant risks have been identified arising from the recommendations.

Contact Details

Author:

Ruth Stephenson
Head of Transport Planning
01904 551372

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Richard Wood
Assistant Director of City Strategy

Report Approved

Date 14.10.10

Specialist Implications Officer(s) *List information for all*

Financial

Patrick Looker

Finance Manager, City Strategy

Tel No.01904 551633

Wards Affected: Fulford

All

For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers:

Annex A – Prioritisation Table