

Rural 50 mph speed limits – Objection Report

Date:

Report of: Traffic Engineering

Report to: Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation)

Will the decision be open for call in? Yes No

Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? Yes No

What is this report about?

Including how it contributes to the city's and council's ambitions.

- The scheme that this report relates to Leeds City Council's intention to reduce the speed limit on several high-speed rural roads which have recorded a high number of killed or seriously injured, in an effort to reduce both the number and severity of these occurring on those lengths, in line with the Councils Vision Zero ambitions.
- Following approval of a report to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) in June 2023, the City Region Sustainable Transport Settlement (CRSTS) road casualty reduction report was approved, which included the approval to reduce speed limits to 50mph on several high-speed rural roads to 50mph.
- These speed limit changes were designed, consulted upon, and advertised from 26th October 2023 to 16th November 2023, during which time two objections were raised to the order and a summary of these objections can be found in Appendix B.
- This report seeks approval of the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) to consider and over-rule the reported objections.

Recommendations

The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to:

1. Note the content of this report;

Consider and over-rule the objections to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order "Leeds City Council (Traffic Regulation) (Waiting Restriction) (No.14) Order 2023 and Leeds City Council (Speed Limit) (No.21) Order 2023".

2. Request the City Solicitor to make, seal and implement the above order.

Why is the proposal being put forward?

- Leeds City Council as Highway Authority has a duty to undertake measures on the public highway to reduce the overall severity and number of collisions on the road network that they are responsible for. As such Leeds City Council routinely review Police injury collision data on the road network within Leeds, identifying collision trends, numbers etc and identifying those streets with the poorest record with respect to collisions within the district.
- As part of this in-depth injury collision analysis identified lengths of road in rural locations that at the present time has a speed limit designation of derestricted or 60mph speed limit. The conclusion of this work identified locations suitable for a pilot study into the effects on collisions and actual vehicle speeds if the speed limit were lowered to 50mph.
- This work identified several routes where a reduced speed limit would have the greatest impact in reducing both the number and severity of KSI's; These are,
 - A61 Harrogate Road from the Eccup road to Harewood Village,
 - A659 Harewood Avenue/Harewood Road from Harewood to Collingham,
 - A659 Otley Road/Arthington Lane from its junction with the A61 to Rawden Hill,
 - A642 Wakefield Road from the A63 roundabout to the former Swillington brickworks site,
 - A656 Ridge Road from the M1 J47 to the A63 Selby Rd and,
 - A63 Selby Road from the Strikes Garden centre to Great North Road
- The City Region Sustainable Transport Settlement (CRSTS) Casualty Reduction Programme includes an allocation of funds for these measures to reduce the KSIs on the high-speed rural roads, which have been identified for intervention.
- Through this order, reductions in speed limits from National Speed Limit (60mph) to 50mph along with Police bays to allow camera enforcement are proposed. A plan of these can be seen in the attached drawing (Appendix C) "CRSTS 2023/LCC/12/XX/DR/TM/50MPH MASTER".
- The objections that have been raised relate to the proposed restrictions on as a whole.

Wards Affected: Adel & Wharfedale, Garforth & Swillington, Harewood and Kippax & Methley

Have ward members been consulted?

Yes

No

What impact will this proposal have?

- 1 Introduction of a lower speed limit on these roads will help to reduce the number and severity of Killed or Seriously injured on the identified high speed rural roads, in line with Leeds City Council's Vision Zero ambitions to make Leeds roads safer for all.

What consultation and engagement has taken place?

- 2 The various Ward Members across the affected wards (Adel & Wharfedale, Harewood and Garforth & Swillington) were consulted and briefed on the scheme upon its initial proposal. As a result of this, the Ward Members are in support of the scheme.
- 3 Emergency Services and the bus operators have been consulted on the scheme, and no adverse comments were received in response to the consultation.
- 4 Parish Councils and stakeholders were consulted directly at the same time as the legal advertisement of the Traffic Regulation Order. No response was received directly from the parish councils, however one of the objections is from a member of Harewood Parish Council who wished to object personally on the proposals, as his views differed from the Parish Council, whom he said supported this.
- 5 The draft Traffic Regulation Order was advertised between 26th October 2023 to 16th November 2023, where notices were placed in the Yorkshire Post and attached to street lighting columns in the location of the restrictions.
- 6 As a result of this advertisement, two objections were received to the overall proposals of reducing speed limits, the content of which is listed in Appendix B alongside the officers response/recommendation.

What are the resource implications?

- 7 These works were approved in a previous report dated 15/06/2023 and there are no further resource implications above and beyond those highlighted there.

What are the legal implications?

- 8 The schemes implementation is subject to resolving the objection and it is anticipated to be completed early in the calendar year of 2024.
- 9 The recommendations set out in this report require the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) to consider the objection received during the statutory consultation period before considering whether the Order may be made. This will enable the Council to comply with the requirement of the Road Traffic Act 1984, as well as the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996/2489.

- 10 This report is not eligible for call-in, as it does not require a decision to be made on the spending of LCC funds.

What are the key risks and how are they being managed?

- 11 Failure to approve the recommendations detailed within this report will prevent the Traffic Regulation Order from being implemented and therefore the benefits outlined above would not be attained.

Does this proposal support the council's 3 Key Pillars?

Inclusive Growth Health and Wellbeing Climate Emergency

- 12 The scheme will assist in avoiding danger to persons and traffic using these roads and aid in facilitating the safe passage and access of traffic for businesses and residents, assist in the health and wellbeing of those in the area.

Options, timescales and measuring success

a) What other options were considered?

- 13 Typically to reduce the number and severity of injury collisions, local authorities would normally consider reducing speed limits, traffic calming and recommendations for enforcement camera control of a length/site. However, guidance provided by central government on traffic calming measures states they can only be introduced on roads where speed limits are below 30mph, and a system of street lighting is present. Given the nature of these roads, where they are national speed limit and predominantly unlit, this prohibits traffic calming use.
- 14 With Traffic calming not a viable option the only considerations left to viably assist in the reduction in both mean speeds and KSIs would be through a reduction in speed limit and that of enforcement. Numerous government and independent bodies have undertaken research into the effect of vehicle speed on the number and severity of road traffic collisions, that through evidence show this is a proven technique to adopt.

b) How will success be measured?

- 15 An improvement will result in both a reduction in the number and severity of injury collisions recorded along the route.

c) What is the timetable for implementation?

- 16 Subject to resolving the objections, it is anticipated to be completed early in the calendar year of 2024.

Appendices

- 17 Appendix A – EDCI screening
18 Appendix B – Objection table
19 Appendix C – Visual representation of data referenced in response to objectors.

Appendix A:

Equality, Diversity, Cohesion, and Integration Screening



As a public authority we need to ensure that all our strategies, policies, service and functions, both current and proposed have given proper consideration to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

A **screening** process can help judge relevance and provides a record of both the **process** and **decision**. Screening should be a short, sharp exercise that determines relevance for all new and revised strategies, policies, services and functions. Completed at the earliest opportunity it will help to determine:

- the relevance of proposals and decisions to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.
- whether or not equality, diversity, cohesion and integration is being/has already been considered, and
- whether or not it is necessary to carry out an impact assessment.

Directorate: Development	Service area: Traffic Management
Lead person: Chris Procter	Contact number: 0113 378 9192

1. Title: Rural 50mph speed limits – objection report
Is this a: <input type="checkbox"/> Strategy / Policy <input type="checkbox"/> Service / Function Other <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If other, please specify

2. Please provide a brief description of what you are screening

The screening focuses on a report to the Highways and Transportation Board requesting authority to introduce reduction in high-speed rural roads within the following wards to 50mph to reduce the number and severity of road traffic collisions the Adel & Wharfedale, Garforth & Swillington and Harewood.

3. Relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

All the council's strategies/policies, services/functions affect service users, employees or the wider community – city wide or more local. These will also have a greater/lesser relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

The following questions will help you to identify how relevant your proposals are.

When considering these questions think about age, carers, disability, gender reassignment, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation and any other relevant characteristics (for example socio-economic status, social class, income, unemployment, residential location or family background and education or skills levels).

Questions	Yes	No
Is there an existing or likely differential impact for the different equality characteristics?		X
Have there been or likely to be any public concerns about the policy or proposal?	X	
Could the proposal affect how our services, commissioning or procurement activities are organised, provided, located and by whom?		X
Could the proposal affect our workforce or employment practices?		X
Does the proposal involve or will it have an impact on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminating unlawful discrimination, victimisation and harassment • Advancing equality of opportunity • Fostering good relations 		X

If you have answered **no** to the questions above, please complete **sections 6 and 7**

If you have answered **yes** to any of the above and;

- Believe you have already considered the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 4**.

- Are not already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 5**.

<p>4. Considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration</p>
<p>If you can demonstrate you have considered how your proposals impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you have carried out an impact assessment.</p> <p>Please provide specific details for all three areas below (use the prompts for guidance).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How have you considered equality, diversity, cohesion and integration? (Think about the scope of the proposal, who is likely to be affected, equality related information, gaps in information and plans to address, consultation and engagement activities (taken place or planned) with those likely to be affected) <p>Consultation on the proposals has also taken place with the following stakeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Ward Members • Emergency Services (Police, West Yorkshire Fire and Ambulances Services) • West Yorkshire Combined Authority • Local Residents and businesses <p>The Local Ward Members support the proposals.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key findings (Think about any potential positive and negative impact on different equality characteristics, potential to promote strong and positive relationships between groups, potential to bring groups/communities into increased contact with each other, perception that the proposal could benefit one group at the expense of another) <p>Scheme features:</p> <p>The positive impacts of the scheme have been identified as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduction in speed of traffic on these roads, many of which have public rights of way which see pedestrian/rambler use. - Reduction in the number and severity of road traffic collisions. - Reduction in vehicle emissions. <p>The negative impacts of the scheme have been identified as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposals will likely see a rise in motorists being given advice/enforcement action by Police through their enforcement action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actions

(Think about how you will promote positive impact and remove/ reduce negative impact)

The parking restrictions have been kept to the minimum length possible, whilst still achieving the benefits outlined above.

5. If you are not already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you will need to carry out an impact assessment.

Date to scope and plan your impact assessment:	N/A
------------------------------------------------	-----

Date to complete your impact assessment	N/A
-----------------------------------------	-----

Lead person for your impact assessment (Include name and job title)	N/A
------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

6. Governance, ownership and approval

Please state here who has approved the actions and outcomes of the screening

Name	Job title	Date
Nick Hunt	Traffic Engineering Manager	

7. Publishing

This screening document will act as evidence that due regard to equality and diversity has been given. If you are not carrying out an independent impact assessment the screening document will need to be published.

Please send a copy to the Equality Team for publishing

Date screening completed	
Date sent to Equality Team	
Date published (To be completed by the Equality Team)	

Appendix B:

List of objections to the Morley South Ward Traffic Regulation Order:

Details of the Objection	Highways Response	Recommendation
<p>Objectors (2)</p> <p>1. The objectors were unaware that approval had been given for such overarching changes to speed limits in their area.</p> <p>2. The objectors would like to see details of the road traffic collisions that led to the proposed change, including details of location, cause and whether vehicles were exceeding the current speed limit.</p> <p>3. The objectors would like to see evidence that reducing the speed limit on these roads would reduce the accident rate</p>	<p>1. Please find included on the following link a copy of the City Region Sustainable Transport Settlement report, which approved this initiative. https://democracy.leeds.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=56464.</p> <p>2. Due to the confidential nature of the Police reports surrounding the specifics of each Road traffic Collision we cannot provide details of each individual collision. However, as part of the analysis into the collisions the below table was produced that summarised, they number and severity of collisions along the assessed rural roads within the Leeds District and compared them to Published National rates of collisions on A class rural roads (https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/reported-road-casualties-great-britain-annual-report-2022) <i>(See Appendix C & D BELOW)</i></p> <p>3. Over the years numerous government and independent bodies have undertaken research into the effect of vehicle speed on the number and severity of Road Traffic Collision. The memorandum by the Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents (RTS 16) on the provided link details one such publications provided by Parliament. https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200102/cmselect/cmtlgr/557/557ap21.htm</p> <p>Further information on Rural Road collisions can also be found on the following document produced by the Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents. Of note it is detailed that In Lincolnshire, reductions from the National Speed Limit to 50mph on certain high-risk routes resulted in a 76% reduction in KSI collisions and an overall 35% reduction in collisions. In 2015, 63% of all fatal accidents occurred on rural roads (RRCGB, DfT, 2016.</p>	<p>Overrule the objection and introduce the proposed 50mph speed limits in line with the evidence presented.</p>

	<p>The proportion of accidents and fatalities occurring on rural roads was fairly consistent for different vehicle types in 2015 (e.g. 31% of all motorcycling accidents and 66% of fatal motorcycling accident occurred on rural roads; 35% of all car accidents and 68% of fatal car accidents occurred on rural road; 40% of accidents involving vans and LGVs and 65% of all fatal accidents involving this vehicle type occurred on rural roads) (RRCGB, DfT, 2016).</p>	
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

<https://www.rospe.com/media/documents/road-safety/road-observatory/Roads-Rural-roads.pdf>

<p>4. Under what guidance/rules for local authorities are the justifications for the change</p>	<p>4. Government guidance on local speed limits can be found in the Setting Local Speed Limits documentation found here - https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/setting-local-speed-limits/setting-local-speed-limits</p>	
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

5. An explanation of why these roads cannot remain national speed limit.

5. Leeds City Council has implemented its Vision Zero Policy, aiming to achieve by 2040 no one will be killed or suffer serious injuries on roads in Leeds. As such in line with this policy, various reviews of where injury collision savings can be made on our highway network have been undertaken, one such being that of high-speed rural roads identified concerns. This review identified the advertised A class rural roads are having a higher rate of Road Traffic Collisions (RTCs) for the region or nationally. In an effort to reduce the number and severity of collisions we have proposed to reduce the speed limit from National Speed Limit to that of 50mph, in line with the Setting Local Speed Limits documentation, current mean speed data and the aforementioned studies.

Appendix C: Collision history raw collisions at sites 2011-2020

Ref	No	Location	L (km)	Severity/Year	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	L(m)	
1	A659	Harewood Av/Rd	3.7	Fatal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	3716	
				Serious	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1			
				Slight	0	1	1	2	3	0	0	1	1	0	1	2		
				TOTAL	1	2	1	3	3	0	1	2	1	2	2	3		
2	A61	Harrogate Rd	3.7	Fatal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3732	
				Serious	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	2	0	1		
				Slight	1	3	1	1	6	1	2	1	1	0	0	2		
				TOTAL	1	3	2	1	7	1	2	2	4	2	0	3		
3	A659	Otley Rd/Arthington Ln	3.4	Fatal	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3445	
				Serious	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2		
				Slight	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	0		
				TOTAL	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	2	0	1	2		
4	A642	Wakefield Rd	1.3	Fatal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1264	
				Serious	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	2		
				Slight	2	2	3	4	1	1	5	1	2	0	1	1		
				TOTAL	3	2	4	5	2	1	5	1	2	0	3	3		
5	A656	Ridge Road	3.1	Fatal	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3132	
				Serious	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
				Slight	1	1	2	2	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	2		
				TOTAL	3	1	2	3	1	1	2	0	0	1	0	2		
7	A63	Selby Rd	3.6	Fatal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3614
				Serious	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	3		
				Slight	5	1	1	2	2	4	4	2	0	0	2	3		
				TOTAL	8	1	1	2	2	4	5	3	2	0	3	6		

Appendix D Comparison of Leeds A road Collisions to National Statistics

Road type	Road class	Severity	Rate unit	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	LCC 5 year average
Rural roads	A roads	Fatal	Per billion vehicle miles	7	7	7	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	
Rural roads	A roads	FSC (unadjusted)	Per billion vehicle miles	54	56	52	54	49	50	49	51	50	51	
Rural roads	A roads	FSC (adjusted)	Per billion vehicle miles	73	74	69	65	57	58	55	56	55	56	56.0
Rural roads	A roads	All collisions	Per billion vehicle miles	279	279	261	243	206	195	183	180	177	170	181.0

Background papers

20 None.