

## **BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET**

### **MINUTES OF COMMUNITIES, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY PANEL MEETING**

Monday, 17th July, 2017

Present:- **Councillors** John Bull, Brian Simmons, Neil Butters, Samuel, Peter Turner, Lizzie Gladwyn, Rob Appleyard (in place of Ian Gilchrist), Patrick Anketell-Jones (in place of Alan Hale) and Michael Evans

#### **13 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting.

#### **14 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE**

The Chairman drew attention to the emergency evacuation procedure.

#### **15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS**

Councillor Ian Gilchrist gave his apologies and was substituted by Councillor Rob Appleyard.

Councillor Alan Hale gave his apologies and was substituted by Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones.

The Cabinet Member for Community Services, Councillor Martin Veal gave his apologies.

#### **16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were none.

#### **17 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIRMAN**

There was none.

#### **18 ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC OR COUNCILLORS - TO RECEIVE DEPUTATIONS, STATEMENTS, PETITIONS OR QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE BUSINESS OF THIS MEETING**

The following people made statements to the Panel:

Jackie Withers, Shoscombe Parish Council made a statement to the Panel regarding 20mph limits. *A copy of this statement is attached to these minutes and kept on the minute book for this Panel.*

Following a question, Ms Withers stated that there was a need for a 20mph limit in all areas of the village, not just outside the school.

Councillor Appleyard asked if there is a register of requests for 20mph limits. Paul Garrod, Traffic Management and Network Manager, confirmed that there is a register *(and confirmed after the meeting that Shoscombe's request is on the register)*

Adam Reynolds made a statement regarding 20mph limits. He stated that the report on this only looks at speed in terms of accidents and does not look at the health benefits of walking and cycling.

David Redgewell made a statement regarding transport, bus and rail issues. *A copy of this statement is attached to these minutes and kept on the minute book for this Panel.*

Following a question, Mr Redgewell explained that RTI (real time information) is being renewed as there are faults across the network.

Francis King made a statement to the Panel regarding 20mph limits. *A copy of this statement is attached to these minutes and kept on the minute book for this Panel.*

Andy Halliday made a statement to the Panel regarding Bath Library. He asked that the Council return the valuable resource of the exhibition room to the community for use for events such as the summer reading challenge.

Councillor Bull asked Mr Halliday to feed this into the consultation on libraries and stated that the Panel will consider the consultation responses at their September meeting.

Nicolette Boater made a statement regarding 20mph limits. *A copy of this statement is attached to these minutes and kept on the minute book for this Panel.*

Councillor Sarah Bevan made a statement on 20mph limits, regarding the Carlingcott region of Peasedown St John. She stated that, due to an administrative error, the signage at Carlingcott junction and Hillside view is missing and asked for it to be put in place. She stated that there had been 47 incidents and asked that the Cabinet Member give this his urgent attention. *(Paul Garrod, Traffic Management and Network Manager, confirmed after the meeting that there is a register of requests and Carlingcott is on the register.)*

Councillor Clarke made a statement on 20mph limits and urged caution with a blanket roll out as there are some drawbacks such as the 20mph limit outside Hayesfield School preventing the installation of a zebra crossing.

## **19 MINUTES**

The Panel confirmed the minutes of the previous meeting as a true record and they were duly signed by the Chairman.

## **20 20MPH ZONES - REVIEW**

Paul Garrod, Traffic Management and Network Manager, gave a presentation to the Panel on 'Setting Local Speed Limits – A review of recent installations of 20mph area schemes (signage only)' which covered the following:

- Background
- DfT Guidance
- Types of roads and speed limits
- Change in average traffic speed
- Change in accident rate
- Change in casualty rate and severity
- Conclusions

The officer informed the Panel that the Department for Transport is conducting a study into the subject - outcomes are expected this year.

Panel members made the following points and asked the following questions:

Councillor Samuel asked how the 1.3mph is calculated. The officer replied that he will report back on this point.

*(This was reported after the meeting: "Page 7 of the report included a green and blue bar chart which illustrated changes in traffic speed since the 20mph limits were introduced. It also stated there has been an overall reduction of 1.3mph. Speed surveys were undertaken in 179 of the 1,499 streets where 20mph limits were introduced. They were undertaken before the speed limits came into effect and afterwards. In each of these streets, we were able to determine a mean 'before' speed and a mean 'after' speed, enabling us to calculate the change in mean speed. In most streets, this was a reduction in speed. We've totalled the average change in mean speeds and then divided that figure by 179 which produces the mean across all the sample streets of 1.3mph reduction").*

Councillor Turner asked if the officer could make a recommendation. The officer stated that the purpose of the report is for review and discussion and he felt the outcome of the DfT study was needed.

Councillor Butters asked if changing driver attitudes is taken into account. The officer responded that there has been no survey of driver behaviour/attitudes but the DfT research will have that type of analysis.

Councillor Anketell-Jones asked if sound recommendations can be made with such limited information. The officer stated that the information on vehicle speed is sound but 1 more year (3 in total) is needed for accident data.

Councillor Appleyard stated that schemes should be implemented if the community feels empowered and comforted, the cost is not high. The officer responded that the DfT research will be based on much more information so conclusions can be more informed.

Councillor Bull asked about police involvement in enforcement. The officer explained that some areas are self-enforcing but some are reliant on enforcement; police

respond to complaints. Councillor Butters asked if there was a police view; the officer explained that the police are a consultee for transport proposals.

Councillor Samuel asked what the cost would be if the 20mph limits were reversed. The officer stated that the cost would be similar (slightly less) than the cost of the original 20mph initiative.

Councillor Samuel asked why RoSPA (Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents) was not used to review the BANES scheme. The officer stated that there was no need to use an external review process. Councillor Samuel stated that higher pollution due to slower cars was an urban myth. He stated that the DEFRA (Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs) proposals on air pollution would be available soon.

Councillor Evans asked if there were any inappropriate 20mph limits in BANES which may reduce the impact of the appropriate ones. The officer said this can be a risk and the limit on some roads may not feel right – the DfT guidance should be followed.

Councillor Gladwyn asked if there was enough data to tailor the approach to urban and rural roads. The officer agreed that this can be done.

Councillor Butters stated that it is cheaper if schemes are put in areas rather than street by street. The officer agreed.

Councillor Anketell-Jones explained that 20mph limits have many benefits for residents and have local support.

The Panel **RESOLVED** to:

- Note the report;
- Accept that more data over a three year period for all schemes is needed to provide evidence for any future changes to the scheme;
- Note that capital budget provision will be required to implement any future changes;
- Await the outcome of the Department for Transport review and request a report on this to a future panel;
- Continue to consider specific applications for 20 mph schemes especially where these relate to safety around schools;
- Recommend to the Cabinet Member that 20mph signage be removed where it is illogical.

## **21 GETTING FROM A TO B - STRATEGIC TRANSPORT REVIEW UPDATE**

Chris Major, Group Manager Transport and Parking, gave a presentation to the Panel on 'Getting from A to B – Strategic Transport Review' which covered the following:

- Outline of briefing
- Overview

- Review – Changes to application processes
- HTST pass scanning pilot
- HTST – Hazardous routes review
- On-line self-assessment tool
- Review of current hazardous classifications
- Hazardous Routes improvements
- School Travel Planning
- SEND Personal budgets
- Review – Fleet utilisation and back office
- Review – Partnership working
- Next Steps

Panel members made the following points and asked the following questions:

Councillor Butters gave an example in Shoscombe where there was a proposal for a footpath. He asked if there is a compulsory power where child safety is concerned. The officer stated that work with the community is needed and sometimes alternative routes can be used. The officer confirmed that he is happy to look at the scheme in Shoscombe and will be in contact with Councillor Butters.

Councillor Samuel asked that, where transport is withdrawn, do parents switch to using cars. The officer stated that the changes are only being made now but it may happen that some use cars, it is about a package and if routes can be improved, other children will benefit.

Councillor Butters stated that there had been a huge mark up in the travel costs from Wellow to Ralph Allen School and that some people were now driving students to school. The officer stated that the fee may have risen in line with other authorities. In response to a query from Councillor Appleyard, the officer explained that he tries to use the least amount of vehicles and does sell empty seats.

Councillor Evans stated that excellent work had been done and asks where savings accrue. The officer explained that savings are recorded as part of the Strategic Review budget.

The Chairman thanked the officer and asked for another report back to the Panel in January 2018.

## **22 CABINET MEMBER UPDATE**

The Cabinet Member for Community Services, Councillor Martin Veal sent his apologies for the meeting and provided a briefing note on his portfolio area. *A copy of this briefing note is attached to these minutes and on the minute book for this Panel.*

The Cabinet Member for Transport and Highways, Councillor Mark Shelford, answered questions and noted comments from the Panel on the following:

- Regarding Widcombe Subway, the Cabinet Member responded to Councillor Butters query and stated he was still being briefed on this and would report back to the next meeting of the Panel.
- Councillor Appleyard thanked the Cabinet members for agreeing to raise the 6/7 bus route with the new Metro Mayor.
- Councillor Turner mentioned that Laura Place has become a designated drop off point for coaches and residents had not been informed and communication is very important. The Cabinet Member stated that he had referred this to the relevant officer.
- Councillor Samuel asked when the Tram Feasibility Study was confirmed. Martin Shields, Divisional Director for Environmental Services explained that this was funded by the Highways budget so there was no single member decision.

## 23 PANEL WORKPLAN

The Panel noted the workplan and the following requests:

- September – Air Quality Plan
- January/March – Waste, review of changes to collection post implementation
- Tram Feasibility Study – Terms of Reference
- Litter
- Strategic Transport Review – report back

The meeting ended at 7.25 pm

Chair(person) .....

Date Confirmed and Signed .....

**Prepared by Democratic Services**

Communities, Transport and Environment Panel – 17<sup>th</sup> July 2017  
Public & Councillors Speaking List

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Subject</b>	
1	Shoscombe Parish Council – Jackie Withers (Chair)	20mph limits	
2	Adam Reynolds	20mph limits	
3	David Redgewell	Bus and rail issues	
4	Francis King	20mph limits	
5	Nicolette Boater	Strategic Transport Review	
6	Andy Halliday	Library	
7	Cllr Sarah Bevan	20mph limits	
8	Cllr Anthony Clarke	20mph limits	

This page is intentionally left blank



**RE: Request for statutory 20MPH limits**

- We are Shoscombe Parish Councillors requesting statutory 20mph limits on the approaches to the village school. The school has 105 pupils, 76% of whom are not from the Parish. There is no school bus and no possibility of having one in the future, given the 3 mile policy.
- Therefore, the majority of those travelling to and from the school arrive by private transport and there is no off-road parking available. The 1.2 miles from the main road to the school is along narrow single track lanes without pavements
- Three mornings a week the school operates a walking bus from the Village Hall to the school to help alleviate the parking issue near the school. On these mornings thirty children are walked the half mile to the school down a single-track road, again without pavements.
- During the school day children leaving or entering the school gates are at risk from vehicles speeding past the school.
- Our request for statutory 20mph limits within the school environs is supported by 86% of Parish Plan questionnaire respondents. Requests were also made by some respondents that this limit should extend to the whole Parish. The lanes which connect the five dispersed hamlets which make up the Parish of Shoscombe are also used by heavy farm machinery, delivery vans and cyclists following the 2 mile on road section of the Collier's way cycle route from Shoscombe Vale, past the school and on through Stony Littleton to Wellow. At times, due to inadequate road signage, large HGV lorries also attempt to negotiate our narrow single track roads where there is a weight restriction.

**Our question to the panel:** How will the Council help us to ensure the safety of Shoscombe school children?

Jackie Withers  
Chair Shoscombe Parish Council

This page is intentionally left blank

David Redgewell statement

SWTN, Railfuture and Bus Users UK are very concerned about cutbacks to the electrification programme to Chippenham with no date for completion to Bristol via Bath or Filton Bank. The lack of investment in Temple Meads apart from 2 platforms for alteration within the IEP programme, the stopping of works at Lawrence Hill bridge and station, the lack of progress on platform extensions at Bath Spa, lack of a step free access programme at Stapleton Road, Lawrence Hill, Nailsea and Weston-Super-Mare (on hold until 2019).

It is very important that we continue with the MetroWest project

The lack of progress on funding of East Junction, lack of scope for rolling stock from the Thames Valley and the loss of 9 units to Centro in May 2017 we need a clear rolling stock policy for the Greater Bristol area including the 11-15 HST's. The interface with South West Trains and how these projects fit in with MetroWest phases 1 & 2.

The new station site does not provide a transport interchange as supported by Railfuture, TFGBA and Friends of Bristol Suburban Railways and the four rail unions.

We ask the Council to reconsider the Filton North station site as this was rebuilt only a few years ago. Clearly the plan needs to link with the rail service through Henbury North to Avonmouth and Severn Beach and the new Cribbs Causeway development whatever that plan may be following the planning inspectors report.

We expect the plan to be fully designed with bus stops, shelters and raised kerbs and mobility impaired pavements and services including the public realm strategy included in interchanges.

We are very concerned that MetroWest Phase 2 Henbury loop and Gloucester line are progressed as a top priority for the Bristol Mayor and Metro Mayor including Ashley Down, Charfield, Stonehouse and Gloucester.

The Henbury loop should also be included with Filton North, Henbury for Cribbs Causeway, Avonmouth and Portway Park and Ride. Our top priority is to see the Portishead railway line reopened for 100 million pounds including stations at Portishead and Pill protecting the site at Ashton Gate.

We need value engineering at Network Rail and these projects must be submitted for CP6. Salford, St Annes and Corsham should be looked at as part of the study by Bristol City Council. The Metro Mayor needs to make a submission to Government for extra funding.

It should be noted that Lawrence Hill, Stapleton Road, Patchway, Pilning, Nailsea and Backwell and Parson Street are not disabled accessible nor is Weston Super Mare and Cheltenham without lifts.

On integration, we are very concerned after discussions with Transport Focus and First Group (RAIL and BUS DIVISIONS), Network Rail about bus/rail ferry integration at Temple Meads within the Temple Quarter Enterprise Zone scheme. We note that Cambridge North station is fully integrated with local and MetroBus unlike Bedminster at present.

Integration should be at the heart of what WECA does.

The project has the support of Chris Grayling and Jeremy Corbyn nationally.

*David Redgewell South West Transport Network, TSSA and Director of Bus Users (UK)*

This page is intentionally left blank

# Witness Statement – 20mph speed limits

CTE panel, 17<sup>th</sup> July 2017, 4:30 PM, Guildhall, Bath.

## **Introduction**

I am Mr. Francis King, MA (Physics) MSc (Transport Planning and Engineering, with distinction). I am a member of the Chartered Institute of Highways and Transport, the Transport Planning Society, and the (US) Institute of Transportation Engineers. As a transport planner, I model transport flows on highway networks, and through road junctions, sometimes involving toll modelling. I have been doing transport planning for 11 years. Before that, I was a research scientist working for the British government.

## **1. 85<sup>th</sup> percentile**

A key concept is the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile. You go to a road, and measure the speeds of all of the vehicles. You order these speed measurements from lowest to highest. You go from the bottom through 85% of the measurements (or go 15% of the way from the top). The speed which you've reached is the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed.

Because only 15% of people exceed this speed, they can be knocked into line by setting this speed as the speed limit (rounded up or down). The vehicles go nose-to-tail down the road, with a minimum of overtaking. Because overtaking is more dangerous than just driving the vehicle behind the vehicle in front, this is the safest thing to do.

It also follows that just putting up 20 mph speed roundels will have little effect, and may prove to be dangerous. I would expect a 1 mph reduction in average speed, and this is what the council engineers have found. This is a waste of money.

## **2. The need for a 20 mph speed limit**

However, bicycles are a bit different. They have limited speed and power, and they cannot do 30 mph. Consequently, you can set up the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed on the motor vehicles, which is about 30 mph, and still have a lot of dangerous overtaking and undertaking.

Setting a 20 mph speed limit for both cars AND bicycles would make cycling a lot safer. The bicycles (two wheels or four) would be in the centre of the lane, where they could see and be seen properly, and where they could turn left or right equally easily. Much of the 'cleverness' with cycle lanes and 'facilities' can be swept away.

A 20 mph speed limit will make it a bit safer for pedestrians, but better crossing facilities would do more.

## **3. Technical requirements**

Since we are now attempting a speed of 20 mph, which is below the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile, some sort of speed restriction in the motorised vehicles is required. This is something that central government will have to mandate.

Equally, the bicycles have to do 20 mph\*. Unfortunately, the current law requires electric motors to cut out at 15 mph, which is too slow. Again, this is something that central government will have to mandate.

It would also be nice if the non-existent crash protection on bicycles could be increased to a vestigial level.

## **4. Other issues**

An objection is the increase in travel times when going from 30 mph to 20 mph. In fact, the difference on the scale of Bath is at worst a few minutes. At lower speeds, give-way and roundabout junctions work better, with lower delays.

Going from a heavy car (1000 or 2000 kg) to a bicycles (10 or 20 kg) means that grade separation is now much cheaper.

Going from 30 mph to 20 mph reduces the capacity of signalised junctions. A shift from cars to bicycles may help (because bicycles take up less space in the junction). It may be necessary to remove some of the safety protocols (called 'intergreens').

A shift from cars to bicycles will reduce parking revenue.

**Notes:**

If you attempt to use a faster electric motor at the moment, you will break a lot of laws. The vehicle would not have type approval, it would be an unregistered and untaxed moped, with no insurance, etc.

<http://www.pedelecs.co.uk/forum/threads/when-15-mph-isnt-enough.3424/>

## Statement to the 17.7.17 meeting of B&NES Council CTE PDS Panel

Thank you Chair.

I am no longer speaking to the Transport Strategy item, as I don't want to steal the thunder of the statement I will be making to Wednesday's Cabinet meeting. However, I do wish to take this opportunity to comment on 20mph speed limits and in particular on the evidence and reasoning on which their continued funding is being considered. (I do so primarily as an economist and policy development professional, but am also informed by my pedestrian, cycling and driving experience in Lyncombe and Combe Down.)

My concerns are that:

1. The data is too aggregated  
Although the report acknowledges that the imposition of speed limits needs to be informed by "character and usage of a particular road", the data presented in the tables on pages 6 and 7 is silent as to the type of roads falling within each ward, and the variation in speed across streets or wards, albeit it is this sort of information rather than the rather than an undefined measure of average speed reduction that is most relevant to the issues you are being asked to consider.
2. The sample size is too small and over too short a time period to draw robust inferences  
Note in this regard that the report does not specify how the street sample was selected nor if and how any adjustments were made for other contributory factors, that many of the schemes have not yet been in place for 3 years, and that the 12 month accident rate per area is, statistically speaking, very small.
3. The cost benefit analysis is inadequate  
The report concludes that 1.3mph average speed reduction is "not persuasive in terms of money". However in so doing it makes no distinction between sunk costs (namely the £871k of capital investment prior to 2015) and the future costs associated with retaining, ending or particular changes to the scheme. Nor is there a convincing statement of the benefits associated with these options and their diverse impacts on community wellbeing as well as that of the safety of road users.
4. The multi-causal nature of the problem demands a more bespoke response.  
To the report's credit, it cites DfT guidance that "the reasons for the non-compliance should be examined before a solution is sought" (page 5), acknowledges that "accidents are random, multi-factored events" for which there are "no simple explanations", and that "changing the road environment across all streets in the same way" may not be the best way forward (page 8).

So, in conclusion, rather than make a decision based solely on the evidence and analysis contained in this report, I urge you to

- assemble more, and more road-specific, evidence
- consult a wider cross-section of the public so as to develop a more detailed and locally based understanding of causes and impacts
- await the results of DfT study. (Note however, that whilst useful for its analytical approach and its conclusions as regards national policy, the DfT study won't mitigate need for B&NES specific evidence and context appropriate analysis.)

*Nicolette Boater, B.A.(Oxon.), M.Phil.  
Strategist, Economist and Policy Analyst  
adding lasting value at the public private interface*

This page is intentionally left blank