

Report Title:	Petition: Speed limit on London Road Ascot
Contains Confidential or Exempt Information	No - Part I
Cabinet Member:	Councillor Haseler, Cabinet Member for Planning, Parking, Highways and Transport
Meeting and Date:	Cabinet – 29 September 2022
Responsible Officer(s):	Chris Joyce, Head of Infrastructure, Sustainability and Economic Growth
Wards affected:	Sunningdale and Cheapside Ascot and Sunninghill

www.rbwm.gov.uk



REPORT SUMMARY

In October 2021 a petition with 174 signatures was submitted by local residents to request that the existing speed limit on the A329 London Road, Ascot was reduced from its current 40mph to 30mph between the junctions with Cheapside Road and Sunninghill Road. The petition stated:

We the undersigned ask for traffic-calming measures to be put in place to reduce the currently dangerous traffic speed on the London Rd between Cheapside Rd and the Sunninghill roundabout.

It is now designated as a 40 mph zone (which is too fast and often exceeded). The seven SLOW markings on the road are generally ignored. This part of the road is narrow and twisting with limited visibility, and it has a very narrow pavement on one side only. Fast traffic makes it very dangerous to exit or enter the houses and apartments. It is also very dangerous for anyone needing to visit, use the pavement, cross the road on foot, turn into Coombe Lane or Glen Close, or to access the children's play park at Victory Fields by car or on foot.

Upon receipt of the petition, investigations commenced and a speed survey was conducted and showed good adherence to the existing speed limit with the collision history shows that only one collision could potentially put down to speed, although there is no further information to substantiate this. In view of the safe record of the road and the compliance of drivers, it is considered that the road is safe at the current speed limit and that no further action is taken.

1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATION(S)

RECOMMENDATION: That Cabinet notes the report and:

- i) Recommends that the existing speed limit of 40mph is retained on the A329 London Road, Ascot.**

2. REASON(S) FOR RECOMMENDATION(S) AND OPTIONS CONSIDERED

Options

Table 1: Options arising from this report

Option	Comments
Decide that the current speed limit of 40mph is the correct option and should remain. No further action to be taken. This is the recommended option	The speed survey showed that the majority of drivers consider that the speed limit is correct for the road and remain below 40mph. The limited collision data indicates that speed isn't a major driver and that no change is required.
Reduce the current speed limit from 40mph to 30mph. This is not recommended.	The data indicates that no change is justified. Should we proceed with it, this would lead to an unnecessary burden on Thames Valley Police as they would face resident requests for enforcement of an unsuitable speed limit. Without regular enforcement there would be very limited behaviour change by drivers.

- 2.1 Following the submission of the petition, a meeting was arranged with the lead petitioner and the Head of Service and Lead Member for Transport. This then triggered the investigations to determine what action should be taken.
- 2.2 London Road, Ascot between the junction with Cheapside and Sunninghill Road, is rural in appearance with few houses and frontages. It is an A class road and carries between 6500 – 7000 vehicles in either direction each day, thereby providing through route options for a large number of residents and visitors.
- 2.3 The current speed limit of 40mph is well respected by motorists. Although there will always be a number of motorists that will exceed whatever speed limit is in force, a reduction of the limit to 30mph will undoubtedly increase this number and place a great and unnecessary burden of enforcement on the Police.
- 2.4 This speed limit provides a link to the newly reduced speed limit, from 50mph to 40mph, on the Virginia Water side of Sunninghill Road that now runs along the A329 London Road to the Surrey County Council boundary.
- 2.5 A speed survey was carried out in December 2021 which showed that 85% of the vehicles travelling east, towards Virginia Water, were travelling at a speed of 38mph or less. The corresponding speed for westbound, towards Ascot, traffic was 36.2mph or less. Although there were a number of vehicles that were exceeding the speed limit, this would indicate that the current 40mph speed limit is correctly set for the road and the majority of drivers are obeying it.

Collision history for the last 5 years between Cheapside and Sunninghill Road:

- 08.09.21: Slight injury. A329 London Road junction with Cheapside Road, Ascot. Drunk pedestrian stepped into road in front of car.

- 30.01.21: Slight injury. A329 London Road, Ascot. Exact location is not shown but would appear to be between Cheapside Road and Sunninghill Road. Vehicle travelling along London Road lost control on right hand bend and collided with vehicle travelling in opposite direction.
- 27.11.20: Slight injury. A329 London Road junction with Sunninghill Road, Ascot. Vehicle entering roundabout from Ascot collided with rear of cyclist travelling in same direction. Driver had medical issue of poor eyesight.
- 30.01.19: Slight injury. A329 London Road junction with Cheapside Road, Ascot. Elderly resident on a mobility chair left footpath into path of car on road.

2.6 The outcome of these investigations was reported back to the petitioner who challenged the decision to not take any action by requesting that this be reviewed at Cabinet as per the Council's Petition Scheme.

3. KEY IMPLICATIONS

3.1 Maintaining the existing speed limit will allow the status quo to be retained. Based on the evidence collected and analysed this is the appropriate solution for this location.

3.2 Police are unlikely to see a significant increase in complaints about speeding vehicles as a reduced limit is highly likely to see an increase in the number of drivers speeding. This would result in more people breaking the law though it would be up to the police and its capacity to enforce.

3.3 The accident record indicates that whilst some incidents have been observed, speed was not the single over-riding factor and therefore it is likely to retaining the speed limit at 40mph will result in a similar outcome in the future. A reduced speed limit is unlikely to result in a substantial reduction in accidents on this road.

4. FINANCIAL DETAILS / VALUE FOR MONEY

4.1 This recommendation has no financial impact as it is proposing retaining the status quo.

4.2 Should a different decision be taken, this will result in costs being incurred on rewriting the TRO for this location to make the speed limit reduction official and legal. Costs will depend on the number of road signs required but is likely to be between £5,000 and £10,000 and the funding for this would have to be identified.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Maintaining the existing speed limit has no legal implication and follows national guidance of roads of this nature.

6. RISK MANAGEMENT

- 6.1 Maintaining the status quo retains the current level of risk which is considered low.

7. POTENTIAL IMPACTS

- 7.1 Equalities. An Equality Impact Assessment is available as Appendix A.
- 7.2 Maintaining the status quo will not impact on protected characteristics with all users treated equally under current circumstances.
- 7.3 Climate change/sustainability. Maintaining the status quo will have no impact on climate change or sustainability.
- 7.4 Data Protection/GDPR. Not relevant as this relates to traffic road orders and does not require any personal data.

8. CONSULTATION

- 8.1 This Cabinet report is based on an petition made by local residents. The lead petitioner chose to raise this issue with the Head of Service and the Transport team completed the investigation and assessment summarised above. As part of the agreed process, the Transport team recommended that the existing speed limit be retained.
- 8.2 In line with council policies, the lead petitioner requested that this recommendation be *referred to the appropriate body for consideration and debate*, on the basis that they believe the change to the speed limit should be implemented. With guidance from our Governance team it was determined that Cabinet would be the appropriate body and invited the lead petitioner to speak at the meeting to be held in September.
- 8.3 No broader consultation was completed during this investigation.

9. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

- 9.1 Should the recommended action be approved, no implementation is required as this maintains the status quo.
- 9.2 Should Cabinet choose to request a change to speed limit in line with that requested in this petition then work will be required on the TRO and signage. This work would commence straight away though would take 4 to 6 months to complete including consultation with local and regional stakeholders in line with the TRO process. This is not the recommended option.

10. APPENDICES

10.1 This report is supported by 1 appendix:

- Appendix A – Equality Impact Assessment
Maintaining the status quo as per the recommendation of the report had no impact on protected characteristics. A full EQIA is not required as there is no change option being recommended.

11. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

11.1 No background documents are required.

12. CONSULTATION

Name of consultee	Post held	Date sent	Date returned
<i>Mandatory: Statutory Officers (or deputies)</i>			
Adele Taylor	Executive Director of Resources/S151 Officer	18/08/22	23/08/22
Emma Duncan	Director of Law, Strategy & Public Health/ Monitoring Officer		
<i>Deputies:</i>			
Andrew Vallance	Head of Finance (Deputy S151 Officer)		
Elaine Browne	Head of Law (Deputy Monitoring Officer)	18/08/22	22/08/22
Karen Shepherd	Head of Governance (Deputy Monitoring Officer)	18/8/22	18/8/22
<i>Mandatory: Procurement Manager (or deputy) - if report requests approval to go to tender or award a contract</i>			
Lyn Hitchinson	Procurement Manager		
<i>Mandatory: Data Protection Officer (or deputy) - if decision will result in processing of personal data; to advise on DPIA</i>			
Emma Young	Data Protection Officer		
<i>Mandatory: Equalities Officer – to advise on EQiA, or agree an EQiA is not required</i>			
Ellen McManus	Equalities & Engagement Officer	18/08/22	01/09/22
<i>Other consultees:</i>			
<i>Directors (where relevant)</i>			
Duncan Sharkey	Chief Executive/DASS		
Andrew Durrant	Executive Director of Place		
Kevin McDaniel	Executive Director of People Services		

<i>Heads of Service (where relevant)</i>			
<i>Insert as appropriate</i>	Head of		
	Head of		
	Head of		
<i>External (where relevant)</i>			
<i>Insert as appropriate or N/A</i>			

Confirmation relevant Cabinet Member(s) consulted	Cabinet Member for Planning, Parking, Highways and Transport	Yes/No <i>delete as appropriate</i>
---	--	-------------------------------------

REPORT HISTORY

Decision type:	Urgency item?	To follow item?
Non-key decision First entered into the Cabinet Forward Plan: 17/8/22	No	No

Report Author: Tim Golabek, Service Lead Transport, 07770934646

APPENDIX A - EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Essential information

Items to be assessed: (please mark 'x')

Strategy		Policy		Plan		Project	X	Service/Procedure	
----------	--	--------	--	------	--	---------	---	-------------------	--

Responsible officer	Tim Golabek, Service Lead Transport	Service area	Infrastructure, Sustainability & Economic Growth - Transport	Directorate	Place
---------------------	---	--------------	---	-------------	-------

Stage 1: EqIA Screening (mandatory)	Date created: 18/08/2022	Stage 2 : Full assessment (if applicable)	N/A
--	-----------------------------	--	-----

Approved by Head of Service / Overseeing group/body / Project Sponsor:

"I am satisfied that an equality impact has been undertaken adequately."

Signed by (print): Chris Joyce

Dated: 18/08/2022

Guidance notes

What is an EqIA and why do we need to do it?

The Equality Act 2010 places a 'General Duty' on all public bodies to have 'due regard' to:

- Eliminating discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act.
- Advancing equality of opportunity between those with 'protected characteristics' and those without them.
- Fostering good relations between those with 'protected characteristics' and those without them.

EqIAs are a systematic way of taking equal opportunities into consideration when making a decision, and should be conducted when there is a new or reviewed strategy, policy, plan, project, service or procedure in order to determine whether there will likely be a detrimental and/or disproportionate impact on particular groups, including those within the workforce and customer/public groups. All completed EqIA Screenings are required to be publicly available on the council's website once they have been signed off by the relevant Head of Service or Strategic/Policy/Operational Group or Project Sponsor.

What are the "protected characteristics" under the law?

The following are protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010: age; disability (including physical, learning and mental health conditions); gender reassignment; marriage and civil partnership; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; sexual orientation.

What's the process for conducting an EqIA?

The process for conducting an EqIA is set out at the end of this document. In brief, a Screening Assessment should be conducted for every new or reviewed strategy, policy, plan, project, service or procedure and the outcome of the Screening Assessment will indicate whether a Full Assessment should be undertaken.

Openness and transparency

RBWM has a 'Specific Duty' to publish information about people affected by our policies and practices. Your completed assessment should be sent to the Strategy & Performance Team for publication to the RBWM website once it has been signed off by the relevant manager, and/or Strategic, Policy, or Operational Group. If your proposals are being made to Cabinet or any other Committee, please append a copy of your completed Screening or Full Assessment to your report.

Enforcement

Judicial review of an authority can be taken by any person, including the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) or a group of people, with an interest, in respect of alleged failure to comply with the general equality duty. Only the EHRC can enforce the specific duties. A failure to comply with the specific duties may however be used as evidence of a failure to comply with the general duty.

Stage 1: Screening (Mandatory)

1.1 What is the overall aim of your proposed strategy/policy/project etc and what are its key objectives?

Following the receipt of an petition requesting the Borough reduces the speed limit on London Road in Ascot, an investigation was undertaken to determine the appropriate response. All users of this stretch of road were considered as part of this review, both of the road and the footpath, including access to local amenities.

The outcome of the investigation, based on traffic speed surveys and accident information, was to decline the petitioner's request and maintain the current speed limit in this location. As such no change plan was produced and this EQIA is about whether the investigation itself was conducted under EQIA guidance. As the investigation was based on traffic and accident data, there is no impact on protected characteristics.

1.2 What evidence is available to suggest that your proposal could have an impact on people (including staff and customers) with protected characteristics? Consider each of the protected characteristics in turn and identify whether your proposal is Relevant or Not Relevant to that characteristic. If Relevant, please assess the level of impact as either High / Medium / Low and whether the impact is Positive (i.e. contributes to promoting equality or improving relations within an equality group) or Negative (i.e. could disadvantage them). Please document your evidence for each assessment you make, including a justification of why you may have identified the proposal as "Not Relevant".

Protected characteristics	Relevance	Level	Positive/negative	Evidence
Age	Not relevant			
Disability	Not relevant			
Gender re-assignment	Not relevant			
Marriage/civil partnership	Not relevant			
Pregnancy and maternity	Not relevant			
Race	Not relevant			
Religion and belief	Not relevant			
Sex	Not relevant			
Sexual orientation	Not relevant			

Outcome, action and public reporting

Screening Assessment Outcome	Yes / No / Not at this stage	Further Action Required / Action to be taken	Responsible Officer and / or Lead Strategic Group	Timescale for Resolution of negative impact / Delivery of positive impact
Was a significant level of negative impact identified?	No	None		
Does the strategy, policy, plan etc require amendment to have a positive impact?	No	None		

If you answered **yes** to either / both of the questions above a Full Assessment is advisable and so please proceed to Stage 2. If you answered “No” or “Not at this Stage” to either / both of the questions above please consider any next steps that may be taken (e.g. monitor future impacts as part of implementation, re-screen the project at its next delivery milestone etc).

Stage 2 : Full assessment

2.1 : Scope and define

2.1.1 Who are the main beneficiaries of the proposed strategy / policy / plan / project / service / procedure? List the groups who the work is targeting/aimed at.

2.1.2 Who has been involved in the creation of the proposed strategy / policy / plan / project / service / procedure? List those groups who the work is targeting/aimed at.

2.2 : Information gathering/evidence

2.2.1 What secondary data have you used in this assessment? Common sources of secondary data include: censuses, organisational records.

2.2.2 What primary data have you used to inform this assessment? *Common sources of primary data include: consultation through interviews, focus groups, questionnaires.*

Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation

Protected Characteristic	Advancing the Equality Duty : Does the proposal advance the Equality Duty Statement in relation to the protected characteristic (Yes/No)	If yes, to what level? (High / Medium / Low)	Negative impact : Does the proposal disadvantage them (Yes / No)	If yes, to what level? (High / Medium / Low)	Please provide explanatory detail relating to your assessment and outline any key actions to (a) advance the Equality Duty and (b) reduce negative impact on each protected characteristic.
Age					
Disability					
Gender reassignment					
Marriage and civil partnership					
Pregnancy and maternity					
Race					
Religion and belief					
Sex					
Sexual orientation					

Advance equality of opportunity

Protected Characteristic	Advancing the Equality Duty : Does the proposal advance the Equality Duty Statement in relation to the protected characteristic (Yes/No)	If yes, to what level? (High / Medium / Low)	Negative impact : Does the proposal disadvantage them (Yes / No)	If yes, to what level? (High / Medium / Low)	Please provide explanatory detail relating to your assessment and outline any key actions to (a) advance the Equality Duty and (b) reduce negative impact on each protected characteristic.
Age					
Disability					
Gender reassignment					
Marriage and civil partnership					
Pregnancy and maternity					
Race					
Religion and belief					
Sex					
Sexual orientation					

Foster good relations

Protected Characteristic	Advancing the Equality Duty : Does the proposal advance the Equality Duty Statement in relation to the protected characteristic (Yes/No)	If yes, to what level? (High / Medium / Low)	Negative impact : Does the proposal disadvantage them (Yes / No)	If yes, to what level? (High / Medium / Low)	Please provide explanatory detail relating to your assessment and outline any key actions to (a) advance the Equality Duty and (b) reduce negative impact on each protected characteristic.
Age					
Disability					
Gender reassignment					
Marriage and civil partnership					
Pregnancy and maternity					
Race					
Religion and belief					
Sex					
Sexual orientation					

2.4 Has your delivery plan been updated to incorporate the activities identified in this assessment to mitigate any identified negative impacts? If so please summarise any updates.

These could be service, equality, project or other delivery plans. If you did not have sufficient data to complete a thorough impact assessment, then an action should be incorporated to collect this information in the future.

--