

Scrutiny review of setting local speed limits in rural East Sussex

Report by the Project Board:

Councillor Chris Dowling (Chairman)
Councillor Martin Kenward
Councillor Stephen Shing

March 2005



Scrutiny Review of setting local speed limits in rural East Sussex

Contents:

1	Recommendations.....	3
2	Findings	4
	Introduction.....	4
	The development criteria	5
	Junctions and planning issues.....	5
	The mean speed criteria.....	6
	Excessive speeding and police enforcement.....	7
	Speed reduction measures.....	8
	Implementation delays.....	9
	Long term campaigns to reduce local speed limits.....	10
	Budget and financial issues.....	10
3	Objectives and scope of this review.....	12
4	Membership and background to the review	12
5	Appendix 1: Summary of the views of parish council representatives ..	15
6	Appendix 2: Site visit findings by the Board.....	16
7	Appendix 3: Local speed limits – route assessment criteria	19
8	Appendix 4: Costs of various speed reduction methods	20

Scrutiny Review of setting speed limits in rural East Sussex

1 Recommendations

	Recommendation	Page	Timescale
R1	The development criteria for speed limits should be clear and be defined along the lines of "20 property frontages within a 600m length of road" to meet the development criteria for a 30mph limit in a village.	Error ! Book mark not defined.	March 2005
R2	a) The County Council should continue to cooperate with districts, boroughs and developers in seeking planning contributions towards speed limit measures that arise in relation to new housing. b) The Council should seek to investigate ways to ensure that planning contributions are obtained from small developments that individually may have little impact but potentially have a significant cumulative impact on the road environment leading to a requirement for speed reduction measures.	6	6 months report back to scrutiny with position statement
R3	Mean speeds should be used by East Sussex in preference to 85th percentile speeds in determining local speed limits.	7	March 2005
R4	The criteria for introducing vehicle activated signs (VAS) which support compliance with speed limits should be the same as for traffic calming schemes which take into account a wide range of factors including casualty levels (especially vulnerable road users), traffic volume, traffic flow, pedestrian and cycling activity, schools and development levels.	9	March 2005 or following review of the policy after consultation.
R5	a) A guidance document should be produced alongside or within the speed management strategy to detail the costs associated with the various speed-reducing measures compared to the budget available in any one year. b) The complete list of requests for speed reduction measures should be published and regularly updated to show in some detail how the criteria have been applied together with the resulting priority order.	9	6 months
R6	a) Parish representatives experiencing significant delays in implementation of approved speed reducing schemes should be advised to contact the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment to discuss the issues further. b) The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment is requested to monitor future delays in implementation in speed reduction schemes and to take appropriate action after consulting local representatives.	10	Immediate

2 Findings

Introduction

- 2.1 The Council's speed management policy (November 2000) is based upon national guidance on setting local speed limits (Roads Circular 1/93) but has been adapted by means of a local policy (PS4/2) to make it easier for lower speed limits to be set. The current strategy is jointly agreed with Sussex Police, West Sussex County Council and Brighton & Hove City Council.
- 2.2 The relationship between speed and accidents has been well documented. There is overwhelming evidence from national and international research that higher speeds result in more collisions of greater severity. Furthermore, national evidence (1999) shows that the majority of car drivers regularly break speed limits on all classes of roads, at all times of day and all days of the week.
- 2.3 A key purpose of the Council's strategy is to provide a more effective response to the concerns of the public in relation to speed and encourage a change in driver attitude which recognises the detrimental effect of speeding traffic on local communities. The strategy takes account of the effects of speed on the environment, the economy, quality of life and casualty reduction. Its key objective is to improve community safety by reducing average speeds across the network through education & publicity, engineering and enforcement.
- 2.4 Evidence from Oxfordshire and elsewhere indicates that lowering speed limits alone will not necessarily reduce vehicle speeds very much. National guidance and the local speed management policy both recognise that badly set or inappropriate speed limits are often ignored unless the character of the road or environment indicate they are necessary. Inappropriate limits also make drivers less willing to comply with limits generally.
- 2.5 The RAC, in responding to this scrutiny, commented that it has called for a UK review of speed limits and associated signage. Such a review needs, in their view, to address misunderstandings or frustrations that result in potential infringement of the law.
- 2.6 There are too few police resources to provide effective continuous enforcement at all the locations where speed limits are being ignored. These facts are balanced against a desire in East Sussex to see sensible speed limits that are appropriate to the function of the road and the safety of all road users, and that are effectively enforced.
- 2.7 East Sussex's current speed management strategy is considered to be clearly expressed and understandable by those who have been involved in campaigning for lower speed limits. However, some elements of the strategy in respect of local speed limits appear nonsensical and unacceptable to some members of the public and some parish councils believe that its implementation lacks transparency. Appendix 1 summarises the views of parish council representatives surveyed during the course of this scrutiny.

- 2.8 The County Council officers working in this area have, without exception, demonstrated the highest levels of professionalism and commitment to resolving, within the available resources, what are often difficult problems. The helpfulness and willingness of officers to engage in the detail at a local level was observed not just by the Project Board, but was overwhelmingly appreciated by the parish representatives who have worked with them.

The development criteria

- 2.9 The first step in determining a preferred speed limit following a request for a lower limit is to make a route assessment. This assessment takes account of the character of the environment, the character of the road and traffic composition (appendix 3).
- 2.10 One element of the route assessment is the development criteria. For example, the current criteria for a 30 mph limit requires a minimum of 50% of properties with “frontage access”. What constitutes “frontage access” has sometimes been found to be ambiguous by some parishes as well as council officers. The Project Board (the Board) therefore supports a simplified definition (recommendation 1) for these criteria to help make the process of agreeing appropriate speed limits more transparent.
- 2.11 However, there will be further implications of such a change. There are currently 24 villages in East Sussex campaigning for a reduced speed limit where the current development criteria supports the reduction. 40 more may need to be included following the change in definition.
- 2.12 Whilst many of these villages will request lower speed limits, not all the lower limits can automatically be introduced. For those where the route assessment points to a lower limit, a further reassessment against the mean speeds criteria (see below) would then need to be undertaken. Many villages are on main roads and it is likely that a combination of speed reducing methods, including significant engineering works, would be required in order to reduce mean speeds to the point where the reduced speed limit could be introduced effectively.
- 2.13 Unless additional resources are made available, or casualty numbers support the prioritisation of the works, many of these requests will not be supported. This, understandably, leads to frustration amongst those affected. Clear evidence demonstrating the assessments of all requests for lower speed limits needs to be made more accessible (recommendation 5).

Recommendation 1

The development criteria for speed limits should be clear and be defined along the lines of “20 property frontages within a 600m length of road” to meet the development criteria for a 30mph limit in a village.

Junctions and planning issues

- 2.14 New housing or commercial developments often lead to local requests for lower speed limits where their access roads join existing roads. It would depend on local circumstances whether a reduced speed limit or other

measures are deemed appropriate. A junction accessing a new development is usually treated as an access issue separately from the speed limits on local roads. This is appropriate in many cases as it leaves the speed limit to be determined using the speed management policy.

- 2.15 The County Council vigorously seeks planning contributions, through planning authorities, from developers wherever practicable to fund transport infrastructure. Whilst there are examples of large developments that have supported speed reducing measures on their adjoining roads, small developments, with their smaller contributions, have not.
- 2.16 Where a number of smaller developments are constructed on or adjoining the same stretch of road gradually over a period of time, it is possible that speed reducing measures may at some point be needed to take account of the changed environment of the road. However, the planning contributions from all the small developments would amount to very little. The Board wish to ensure that the possibility of development contributions supporting speed reducing measures is always explored particularly where a number of small developments have an cumulative impact.

Recommendation 2

a) The County Council should continue to cooperate with districts, boroughs and developers in seeking planning contributions towards speed limit measures that arise in relation to new housing.

b) The Council should seek to investigate ways to ensure that planning contributions are obtained from small developments that individually may have little impact but potentially have a significant cumulative impact on the road environment leading to a requirement for speed reduction measures.

The mean speed criteria

- 2.17 After determining the preferred speed limit for a stretch of road using the route assessment, an assessment of existing vehicle speeds is then made. Traffic speeds in both directions are measured and several surveys may be necessary where speeds could vary over a longer stretch of road. A new lower limit will only be introduced on its own if the existing 85th percentile speed (the measured speed at or below which 85 out of 100 vehicles travel) is at or below a certain threshold for each proposed speed limit.
- 2.18 The government is proposing using “mean speed” instead of “85th percentile speed” in setting speed limits in future. East Sussex has found a consistent relationship between 85th percentile speeds and mean speeds and, therefore, the Board supports the use of mean speeds, not least because it is simpler to explain and understand by all (recommendation 3).
- 2.19 In practice this means that a reduced speed limit can only be introduced on its own if existing mean traffic speeds are at or below the thresholds in the following table:

Speed limit requested (mph)	Measured mean speed must not be greater than (mph)	Equivalent 85th percentile speed (mph)
20	21	25
30	32	39
40	41	49
50	51	61
60	61	73

- 2.20 The mean speeds criteria, in the view of many parish council representatives, is nonsensical. They argue that where a route assessment points to a reduced speed limit, the fact that mean speeds are significantly higher than the requested limit indicates that urgent action *should* be taken to reduce speeds in order to prevent future casualties. They perceive that the mean speed criteria is being used by the Council and police to block the introduction of the desired speed limit because of a lack of resources.
- 2.21 However, the mean speed criteria is supported firmly by national government, the police and council officers on the basis that speed limits must appear logical and reasonable to motorists and be applied consistently across the country. Otherwise, limits will simply be ignored by many drivers. The Board noted at one of the sites visited that the risk of overtaking accidents was shown to increase if the speed limit was set too low.
- 2.22 The Board, therefore, concurs with the current policy that reduced speed limits must, if indicated by the mean speed criteria, be accompanied by speed reduction methods before lower limits are introduced.

Recommendation 3

Mean speeds should be used by East Sussex in preference to 85th percentile speeds in determining local speed limits.

Excessive speeding and police enforcement

- 2.23 The Board considered an argument that by moving away from using 85th percentile speeds, the County Council and police would lose track of the problem of the small percentage of drivers that determinedly break whatever speed limits or other restrictions that are in place (argued to be 15% of motorists). The Board concluded that it is not the role of the County Council's speed management policy to deal with the small proportion of bad or irresponsible drivers, but that this responsibility lies primarily with the police.
- 2.24 Sussex Police maintain that they have too few resources to provide effective continuous enforcement for all the locations where speed limits are being ignored. They state that

"Police enforcement is one tactic in the range of measures available but we will continue to target our resource priorities at sites where there can be a positive effect on casualty reduction, together with other priorities listed in the local policing plan. Enforcement cannot be an alternative to an appropriate permanent engineering measure."

- 2.25 The *other priorities* referred to here include tackling a range of crimes that are often linked to excessive speeding or bad driving such as driving without a driving licence or insurance, and crimes such as burglary. The police argue that by addressing these other crimes directly, they are also helping to reduce the proportion of bad and irresponsible drivers on the roads.

Speed reduction measures

- 2.26 Where a requested lower speed limit is deemed appropriate under the route assessment but cannot be introduced alone because the measured mean speeds are too high, consideration is then given to what speed reduction measures are necessary to reduce mean speeds to enable the reduced limit to be implemented.
- 2.27 The extent and cost of permanent speed reduction measures vary hugely depending on local factors and the difference between the measured mean speed and the reduced speed limit being sought (see appendix 4). A traffic calming scheme designed to reduce mean speeds by 10 or 12 mph can typically cost £50,000 - £100,000.
- 2.28 Vehicle activated signs (VAS) reduce vehicle speeds by 4 or 5mph and can be installed in a village for £12,000. The use of VAS is being extended in East Sussex following their effectiveness in pilot projects here and elsewhere and also because of their popularity with parishes.
- 2.29 The Board observed during its site visits that the presence of a group of people in official-looking bright fluorescent jackets dramatically reduced vehicle speeds as drivers may have thought they were being watched by the police.
- 2.30 Police speeding enforcement costs are difficult to estimate but recent research in Essex (see appendix 4) showed that a police unit comprising two officers, a car plus equipment costs of the order of £80,000 per year including overheads. Sussex Police are firmly of the view that police enforcement is therefore not a viable alternative to permanent speed reduction measures. The Board suggests that the County Council seeks every means possible to extend and improve cooperation with the police on speed limit enforcement.
- 2.31 All schemes requiring traffic calming are prioritised using a comprehensive points system that counts and weights a range of factors including the number and severity of officially recorded road casualties. Other factors taken into account include the proximity of schools, the speed and volume of traffic and the width of the road. But, traffic calming will not be considered unless there has been a history of associated casualties. The results of the points system assessment are not currently published.
- 2.32 VAS schemes are currently prioritised only using casualty statistics and do not take into account the comprehensive range of factors associated with other traffic calming schemes. The Board recommends a common and transparent approach to the assessment of schemes for both VAS and traffic calming measures where they are applied to support compliance with a speed limit (recommendation 4).

- 2.33 There is significant scope to improve transparency of the process of assessing which schemes will be implemented and which will not. Publication of a guidance document within or alongside the speed management strategy could spell out the costs associated with the various speed-reducing measures compared to the budget available in any one year. The publication and regular updating of the complete list of requests for speed reduction measures, showing in some detail how the criteria have been applied, would help parishes and local councillors better determine the relative strength of their request (recommendation 5).

Recommendation 4

The criteria for introducing vehicle activated signs (VAS) which support compliance with speed limits should be the same as for traffic calming schemes which take into account a wide range of factors including casualty levels (especially vulnerable road users), traffic volume, traffic flow, pedestrian and cycling activity, schools and development levels.

Recommendation 5

- a) A guidance document should be produced alongside or within the speed management strategy to detail the costs associated with the various speed-reducing measures compared to the budget available in any one year.***
- b) The complete list of requests for speed reduction measures should be published and regularly updated to show in some detail how the criteria have been applied together with the resulting priority order.***

Implementation delays

- 2.34 There are reported delays in implementation once speed reduction schemes have been approved. In one case the reported delay was two years. Resources and staff shortages have been highlighted by way of explanation by officers. The restructuring of the Transport and Environment Department and the bringing back in-house of much transport related design and consultancy work should improve the situation from September 2005 when the new arrangements take effect.
- 2.35 Delays of more than two years clearly require further investigation and parishes experiencing this level of delay should be advised to contact the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment directly to discuss the problem further.

Recommendation 6

a) Parish representatives experiencing significant delays in implementation of approved speed reducing schemes should be advised to contact the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment to discuss the issues further.

b) The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment is requested to monitor future delays in implementation in speed reduction schemes and to take appropriate action after consulting local representatives.

Long term campaigns to reduce local speed limits

- 2.36 Parish councils and individual members of the public often undertake long term campaigns to lower local speed limits. They spend significant amounts of time and effort in lobbying and petitioning the County Council and have successfully involved county councillors in this process. Indeed, parish representatives have commented on the helpfulness and willingness of council officers and county councillors to engage with them in discussions, although the outcomes have not always been welcomed locally.
- 2.37 Officers have highlighted the often time-consuming negotiations they undertake with parishes and individuals about local speed limits. In many cases they consider that the request falls so far short of the criteria that they are placed in a position of delivering bad news which is not readily accepted. This often leads to further requests for explanations and ongoing negotiations.
- 2.38 Recommendation 5 is designed to help provide a better picture to all parties as to the strengths and weaknesses of each case compared to others across the County. Whilst it will take some time to set up such a system, it is hoped that this will save time in the long run for all parties – parish representatives, council officers and county councillors who find themselves engaged in such discussions.
- 2.39 Parish councils also frequently complain that local road issues are often dealt with by the County Council sequentially over a long period of time rather than as an integrated, logical whole. The Board has no easy answer to this one and recognises that resource limitations mean that schemes have to be prioritised in, hopefully, as fair and open a way as possible. This results in a process of dealing with local traffic issues in an unavoidably sequential way as each type of scheme is prioritised in turn against similar schemes across the County.

Budget and financial issues

- 2.40 Appendix 4 details the costs and numbers of the various measures used to reduce speeds. Figures are based on 2004 costs.
- 2.41 The County Council budget is £100,000 for traffic management measures to support lower speed limits in villages. Additional funding was made available in 2003/04 and 2004/05 of £70,000 and £342,000 respectively from the Community Safety Fear of Crime Fund.

- 2.42 In addition to the base budget a further one-off allocation has been approved by the County Council in 2005/06 to continue to support speeding initiatives. The precise sum has yet to be determined by the Lead Member for Transport & Environment but is likely to bring the total available for 2005/06 to between £150,000 and £200,000.
- 2.43 Over the three year period 2003/04 to 2005/06 the County Council will therefore have invested some £712,000 in these measures.
- 2.44 The County Council's revenue budget for road safety education will also be supporting the SID operation in villages in 2005/06 with a contribution of £20,000 to the Sussex Safety Camera Partnership who manage the SID operation in the County. This will be augmented by charging parish councils a nominal fee of £50 per visit by the SID team.

3 Objectives and scope of this review

- 3.1 The Transport and Environment Scrutiny Committee on 3 December 2004 established this scrutiny review board with the following scope and terms of reference.
- 3.2 To consider and make recommendations on whether the County Council's speed strategy is of appropriate complexity and worded to enable a lay person to check its application and the extent to which the strategy takes account of exceptional local circumstances when setting speed limits. To be achieved by:
- examining the current policy and its application to specific sites where there have been local objections to proposed speed limits
 - visiting a selection of sites where speed limits have raised concerns, particularly those where requests for lower speed limits have not been supported.
 - examining and commenting on alternative policies to setting speed limits such as the approach taken in Oxfordshire (30mph limits introduced in all villages)
 - taking account of the possible impact of the new government consultation on revisions to the national policy (deadline for responses to government is 18 February 2005) where relevant.
- 3.3 To review and make recommendations on the processes of involving stakeholders in decisions on setting speed limits. To be achieved by:
- contacting people who have experienced the process and by considering submissions by stakeholders
 - obtaining the motorists' perspective by obtaining the views of motoring organisations.
- 3.4 To report to the Scrutiny Committee for Transport and Environment in March 2005.
- 3.5 The Board focussed its work on the setting of speed limits in rural areas reflecting the source of greatest pressure on the Transport and Environment department for changes to speed limits. The timescale for the scrutiny review did not allow for the issues around urban speed limits to be explored.

4 Membership and background to the review

- 4.1 The review Board comprised Councillors Chris Dowling (Chairman), Martin Kenward and Stephen Shing. The Project Manager was Paul Dean (Scrutiny Lead Officer) with logistics and support being provided by Sam White (Scrutiny Support Officer).
- 4.2 The Board considered the following documents:
- Project Initiation Document dated 9 December 2004 outlining the background to the review and its scope.
 - A summary of the issues surrounding the setting of a local speed limit on the A22 near Hailsham

- The East Sussex County Council Speed Management Strategy document (November 2003)
 - Local Speed Limits Policy Summary (PS4/2) – East Sussex County Council (revised November 2000) which includes the speed limit criteria.
 - A report by the Director of Transport and Environment on the outcome of a review of local speed limits carried out in September 2004
 - Department of Transport Circular Roads 1/93 (setting local speed limits)
 - Draft update of Circular Roads 1/93 (setting local speed limits) dated November 2004 together with suggested response; comments on the draft update by various individuals.
 - Miscellaneous newspaper cuttings illustrating the nature of public concern for local speed issues
 - Summary of the findings of a telephone survey of parish council representatives who have been directly involved in campaigning for lower speed limits
 - Selected correspondence between the Council and parish council representatives
 - Report of the scrutiny review of 30mph speed limits in South Oxfordshire.
- 4.3 On 31 January 2005, the Board, together with council officers, and a police representative visited a number of sites in East Sussex where lower speed limits have been requested. Appendix 2 lists the sites with key findings and conclusions on each.
- 4.4 The following council officers provided evidence during this review:
- Colin Clarke, Group Manager, Traffic & Safety Group
 - Paul Smart, Senior Engineer – Speed Management
 - Ian Johnson, Traffic Manager (West)
 - Brian Banks, Traffic Manager (East)
- 4.5 The following police representatives provided evidence during this review:
- Chief Inspector Jim Read, Sussex Police
 - Mark Dunn, Traffic Management Officer, Sussex Police.
- 4.6 The Board met with and took evidence from Councillor Matthew Lock, Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment, East Sussex County Council.
- 4.7 The Board would like to thank the following for their help and participation in this review:
- Councillor Bill Bentley, East Sussex County Council
 - Councillor Matthew Lock, East Sussex County Council
 - Councillor Doreen Goodchild, Arlington Parish Council
 - Councillor Peter Coxton, Vice Chairman, Buxted Parish Council
 - Councillor Michael Ridding, Catsfield Parish Council
 - Councillor Mark Evans, Chailey Parish Council
 - Councillor Douglas Edworthy, Chairman, Dallington Parish Council
 - Councillor Peter Hobbs, Chairman, East Dean Parish Council

- Marion Jones, Clerk, Hamsey Parish Council
- Councillor Dr D Goldman, Chairman, Herstmonceux Parish Council
- Councillor Linda McConalogue, Chairman, Newick Parish Council
- Geoffrey Eysenck, Blackboys resident
- David Bradley, School Crossing Patrol and Driver Training Supervisor, East Sussex County Council

4.8 The Board and review officers would especially like to thank Councillor Goodchild for providing a working breakfast at the start of the site tour.

Contact officer:

Paul Dean

Scrutiny Lead Officer

Telephone number: 01273 481751

E-mail: paul.dean@eastsussex.gov.uk




Background papers are available in the Members' Room from Sam White, Scrutiny Support. Telephone: (01273) 481581 or e-mail: scrutiny@eastsussex.gov.uk




5 Appendix 1: Summary of the views of parish council representatives




(Taken by a telephone survey on local speed limits in January 2005)

- Campaigns to reduce speed limits often continue for a long time, as much as 20 years in some cases, and cause frustration in many cases because of the sequential approach to dealing with traffic issues.
- The County Council's speed management policy is, on the whole, clear and understandable.
- Certain aspects of the policy are unacceptable or appear nonsensical. Of particular concern is that average speeds must be at or below the proposed reduced speed limit before the lower limit can be introduced. If measured environmental factors (such as percentage development etc) point to a reduced limit, the fact that current average speeds are too high demonstrates the need for a lower speed limit.
- It seems reasonable that if a reduced speed limit is introduced by way of signs, this will lead to some motorists reducing their speeds and making the roads safer by reducing overall speeds. Therefore, there was widespread support for the Oxfordshire experiment of 30mph limits in all villages, regardless of higher pre-existing average speeds. The County Council has not adequately answered why this cannot be done.
- Officers sometimes appear unable or unwilling to take full account of exceptional local factors such as tricky bends, horse users, church, pub, schools etc, when deciding on speed limits; "the County Council tows the police line too much".
- The decision making process is not always transparent. Information received is sometimes contradictory. Site visits by county councillors and officers and close partnership working is appreciated and works well.
- Council officers and county councillors are universally very helpful and sympathetic, although not always able to deliver what is wanted locally (until in one case there had been a number of accidents).
- The County Council is clearly trying to involve parishes more effectively and improve communications.
- It would be helpful to have a single point of contact for all dealings with the County Council on village speed and traffic issues.
- The lengthy times are caused by: the time taken to reach a decision with a "dribble approach" to releasing information (immediate responses to query followed by delays in dealing with specific points); providing contradictory information; delays in implementation with lack of resources cited in some cases once agreement has been reached.

6 Appendix 2: Site visit findings by the Board

Site	Speeds	Observations
<p>C39 Upper Dicker</p> 	<p>Current 40 mph Requested 30mph Mean 41.5 mph</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frontage development of 30% does not support a 30 mph limit; but this may change with revised government guidelines. • Puffin crossing was introduced to address a specific accident danger. Vehicle Activated Signs (VAS) scheduled to be installed to help enforce the current 40 mph limit. • Further significant engineering measures would be needed to reduce the mean speed to support a 30 mph limit; the accident record following the introduction of the puffin crossing is so far good and so such works would be low on the priority list unless the accident situation changes. • Higher traffic volume occurs during two main periods around the schools' start and finish times; traffic speed is naturally reduced at these points. • Visitors to Michelham Priory add to the general traffic volume. • Site to be reviewed (within 6 months) to assess the impact of the current measures before considering further action.
<p>C40 Wannock</p> 	<p>Current 60 mph Requested 30 mph Mean 38.1 mph</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a short section of 60 mph sandwiched between existing 30 mph limits. • Policy allows for a 40mph under these circumstances – to be introduced in 2004/05. • The Police consider that the development criteria supports the current 60 mph limit.
<p>A259 East Dean</p> 	<p>Current 40 mph Requested 30 mph Mean 35.7 mph</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frontage development of only 11% means the road fails development criteria for a 30mph limit. • Local safety scheme introduced to tackle poor crash record at junction with Gilberts Drive; works are 'impressive'; 70% of residents are reported to be satisfied with the measures installed. • The accident issue was treated as a separate junction problem with the speed limit set according to the correct criteria.

Site	Speeds	Observations
<p>B2204 Catsfield</p> 	<p>Previous 40 mph</p> <p>Introduced 30 mph limit in August 2004</p> <p>Mean: Previous 36 mph/ current 32 mph.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frontage development of 55% fits the development criteria for a 30 mph limit. • Good example of integrated approach to speed management using a variety of measures to reduce mean speed to support the lower limit. • Vehicle activated signs observed to good effect.
<p>B2204 Catsfield Stream</p> 	<p>Current 50 mph</p> <p>Requested 30 mph</p> <p>Mean 44.3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frontage development of 50% points to a 30 mph limit. • However, being a long straight stretch with a very high mean speed, means significant engineering and other measures would be needed to support a lower limit; such works are very low comparative priority because of the current (good) accident record. • Reducing the speed limit to 40 mph would create increased dangers from overtaking accidents without engineering measures and so this option has not been taken forward.
<p>B2192 Blackboys</p> 	<p>Current 60 mph</p> <p>Requested 40 mph</p> <p>Mean: 48 mph</p> <p>50 mph to be introduced shortly</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measured frontage development does not support a 40 mph limit but this is disputed by individuals locally; 50 mph limit is consistent with the policy. • The local accident spot is viewed by officers as a junction problem rather than speed limit issue; junction works have not been prioritised over other sites elsewhere because of the relatively low number of reported accidents. • Residents argue that the site should be prioritised because of a large number of unreported accidents. • This site highlighted delays in implementation of agreed schemes; continuing objections from residents are being investigated but appear to be further delaying implementation of the 50 mph limit. • Residents are frustrated with what they perceive to be a lack of up to date information from and poor communication with the County Council as to its implementation plans.

Site	Speeds	Observations
<p>B2102 High Street, Blackboys</p> 	<p>Current: 40 mph Requested 30 mph Mean 38.8 mph</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frontage development of 49% almost supports a 30 mph limit (50% required) but traffic calming would be required to reduce mean speeds • This site is likely to comply with the new development criteria for 30 mph; however the site is low priority for works because of its good accident record.
<p>A272 Buxted</p> 	<p>Current 40 mph Requested 30 mph Mean 35 mph</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frontage development supports a 30 mph limit to be introduced during 2005/06. • Limit to be supported by a variety of engineering measures and VAS.
<p>C26 Eastbourne Road, Uckfield</p> 	<p>Current 40 mph Requested 30 mph Mean: not measured</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frontage development of just 18% does not support a 30 mph limit. • Feeder roads from housing estates and other private developments do not currently contribute to the development criteria. • Officers argue that this is a correct approach because feeder roads and junctions, including private roads, should be seen separately as access issues, rather than factors that affect speed limits. • The County Council does seek to maximise planning contributions from developers to be used for transport infrastructure; this includes provision of appropriate junction links although little evidence was available to the Board on this point.

7 Appendix 3: Local speed limits – route assessment criteria

Local Speed Limits – PS 4/2

Appendix A

Proposed Speed Limit Criteria – Route Assessment

<i>Character of environment</i>	<i>Character of road</i>	<i>Traffic composition</i>
20 mph Speed Limit (not part of the 1993 criteria, new legislation enacted in 1999)		
Access and local distributor roads. Residential, housing estates, shopping streets or routes near schools may be considered.	Either engineering measures have been undertaken to ensure that the average speed will be below 20 mph or the existing conditions control speed sufficiently.	High proportion of vulnerable road users.
30 mph Speed Limit		
Built up areas. Properties with frontage access, e.g. schools, private and commercial premises, usually exceeding 50% of frontages.	i) Urban streets ii) Roads through villages and identified rural settlements.	Significant numbers of vulnerable road users.
40 mph Speed Limit		
Built up/partially built up areas. Some properties with frontage access, e.g. schools, private and commercial premises, usually exceeding 30% of frontages. May include undeveloped lengths between 30 and/or 40 limits are too short for a higher limit.	i) Urban distributor roads ii) Roads through villages and identified rural settlements	A noticeable presence of vulnerable road users.
50 mph Speed Limit		
Limited development and frontage access.	i) Suburban or rural single carriageways. ii) Suburban dual carriageways with frequent junctions, or frontage/development access.	Few vulnerable road users, or segregated crossing facilities, or controlled crossing facilities with appropriate speed management measures.
60 mph Speed Limit		
Limited development and frontage access.	i) Urban distributor roads ii) Roads through villages and identified rural settlements	Few vulnerable road users, or segregated crossing facilities

NB

1 Vulnerable road users include pedestrians (particularly children, the elderly and disabled) and cyclists.

2 A Local Distributor Road is a through road linking a residential area to the wider road network.

8 Appendix 4: Costs of various speed reduction methods

Item	Typical unit cost (2004)	Number undertaken per year in East Sussex / total annual cost	Total number currently in place/achieved in East Sussex	Number awaiting implementation at December 2004	Speed reduction typically obtained
Speed limit signs (non reactive)	£1,500	6 / £9,000		30	1 mph
Speed reactive signs	£6,000	6 / £36,000	17	42	3 – 4 mph
Traffic calming schemes	£100,000	4 / £400,000	105	7	Scheme Dependent
Mobile Speed Indicator Devices (SIDs)	£20,000**	5 / £100,000**	1,230 site visits	Ongoing	3 – 9mph
Fixed safety cameras	£53,000**	2 / £106,000**	13	2	Varies
Police enforcement units	£80,000*				
Driver improvement training courses	Self Funding	12	84 Courses/ 900 drivers	Ongoing	N/A
Anti speeding campaign	£1,000	5 / £5,000	20	Ongoing	3 – 9mph

* Roger Tym & Partners: *Costing the Infrastructure Needs of the South East Counties*, November 2004. This figure derives from cost estimates from Essex County Council and is based on 2 officers + 1 car and equipment.

** Mobile SIDs and Fixed Safety Cameras are funded by fine revenue received from speeding offences. Therefore, there is no direct cost to the County Council. Their implementation and management is undertaken on behalf of the County Council by the Sussex Safety Camera Partnership.