

## Highways Committee

7<sup>th</sup> April 2022

### Daddry Shield and Bridge End

### Daddry Shield and Bridge End 30mph Speed Limit - Traffic Regulation Order 2022

Ordinary Decision/Key Decision No.

---



## Report of Corporate Management Team

**Amy Harhoff Corporate Director of Regeneration, Economy & Growth**

**Councillor Elizabeth Scott, Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Regeneration, Economy and Growth.**

### Electoral division(s) affected:

Weardale

### **1 Purpose of the Report**

- 1.1 To request approval to progress a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to introduce a 30mph speed limit throughout Daddry Shield and Bridge End.

### **2 Executive Summary**

- 2.1 Concerns have been raised by local residents regarding speeding problems and general road safety in Daddry Shield and Bridge End.

In response to those concerns it is proposed to introduce a 30mph speed limit, which will incorporate speed signage, a vehicle activated sign as well as enhanced road markings throughout Daddry Shield and Bridge End.

The responses from statutory consultees were favourable with Durham constabulary raising the only objection during the consultation period.

## 2.2 Consultation Period:

	From	To
Statutory Consultees	2/12/2021	24/12/2021
Informal Consultation	-	-
Formal Consultation	3/3/2022	3/03/2022

## 3 Recommendation(s)

### 3.1 Committee is recommended to:

Endorse the proposal, in principle, to proceed with the implementation of the 30mph TRO. With the final decision to be made by the Corporate Director under delegated powers.

## 4 Background

### 4.1 Daddy Shield and Bridge End

The A689 is the main route which runs east – west through Weardale. In Upper Weardale it runs through the villages of Daddy Shield and Bridge End and at this point the road is currently subject to a derestricted speed limit. Residents have raised concerns that this existing speed limit is excessive and they feel that a number of motorists currently travel through the villages at inappropriate speeds.

Location	Date	Average Speed (mph)
Western end of Daddy Shield	2021	37.1
Bridge (south)	2011	38.9
Bridge (north)	2011	35.9
Eastern end of Daddy Shield	2011	37.9

It is proposed to introduce a 30mph speed limit between the outer extents of Bridge end and Daddy Shield. To encourage a greater level of compliance with the proposed limit, additional engineering measures are proposed for installation to complement the 30mph signage. The additional measures will include enhanced speed limit signage, a vehicle activated sign and improved road markings. The aim of these measures will be to reduce vehicular speeds and maintain road safety.

## 5 Objections

### 5.1 Daddry Shield and Bridge End

#### 5.1.1 *Objection 1*

The objector notes that the proposal does not follow the guidance set out in the DfT document "Setting Local Speed Limits

They highlight Section 7.2 which deals with single carriageway rural roads. In this section a table sets out recommended speed limits for roads with a predominant motor traffic flow function. This section of the DfT guidance also states that if walking, cycling, horse riding, community or environmental factors are particularly important on any road section then consideration should be given to using the lower limit

The table describes the various criteria it would expect to be present for a 40mph, 50mph or 60mph speed limit to be introduced. These are noted below:

*- 60mph - recommended for most high quality strategic A & B roads with few bends, junctions or accesses*

*- 50mph - should be considered for lower quality A & B roads that may have a relatively high number of bends, junction or accesses. Can also be considered where mean speeds are below 50mph, so lower limit does not interfere with traffic flow*

*-40mph - should be considered where there are many bends, junctions or accesses, substantial development, a strong environmental or landscape reason or where there are considerable numbers of vulnerable road users*

Section 7.3 of the same document deals with 30mph limits within villages. Daddry Shield does meet the definition of a village although it is noted that the majority of houses are concentrated in a 200m stretch of the A689. The document goes on to state that "*In situations where the above criteria for a village are not met and there is lesser degree of development or where engineering measures are not practicable or cost effective to achieve a 30mph limit, but a reduction from the national 60mph speed limit is considered appropriate, traffic authorities should consider alternative lower limits or 40 or 50mph*".

The objector goes on to make the following points:

- Speed survey data shows an average speed of 37.2mph and an 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed of 45mph
- The speed data and above guidance outline that the lowest appropriate limit would be 40mph
- Research shows a limit that relies upon signage alone will only reduce speeds by 1mph
- A 30mph limit would be non-credible and result in high non-compliance. On current figures this would be 68%.
- Under DfT guidance the road cannot be traffic calmed so there are no engineering measures available to reduce speeds
- The proposed permanently located Speed Indication Device (SID) will have minimal impact upon speed as research shows, and the likely best-case scenario shows an average speed reduction of 1.4mph. There is often a “novelty” effect with the SID being effective in the first week of operation which tails off after three-week period and are therefore only effective at reducing speeds if deployed for a short period of time
- The National Police Chief Council states a new speed limit needs to be credible and should not rely upon additional enforcement to achieve compliance.
- Without any means of influencing driver behaviour, it would lead to demands for enforcement activities and enforcement alone will never achieve an acceptable level of compliance for a non-credible speed limit
- The location may not, due to the horizontal and vertical alignment, allow roadside enforcement activities to be conducted
- A check from 1 January 2017 shows no collision history along this section of the A689
- The introduction of a non-credible speed limit with poor compliance may increase the risk to road safety as users make decisions based upon the expected speed as opposed to the actual speeds

[The full objection can be viewed in Appendix .3](#)

### 5.1.2 *Response to Objection 1*

The Department for Transport circular 01/2013 states that fear of traffic can affect people's quality of life in villages and it is self-evident that villages should have comparable speed limits to similar roads in urban areas. It is therefore government policy that a 30 mph speed limit should be the norm through villages.

The Department for Transport Traffic Advisory Leaflet 2004 suggests that the definition of a village should be based on simple criteria relating to frontage development and distance, namely

- 20 or more houses; and
- a minimum length of 600 metres;

The leaflet goes on to say that where the character of a village falls outside this definition, local authorities are encouraged to use their discretion in deciding whether a lower speed limit is appropriate. The County Council believe that this criteria is satisfied when considering the combined settlements of Daddry Shield and Bridge End.

Whilst 600m is the preferred minimum length of speed limit restriction, DfT circular 01/2013 goes on to say that this length may be lowered to 400 metres when the level of development density over this shorter length exceeds the 20 or more houses criterion.

The circular also notes that traffic authorities might also need to consider other speed management measures to support the message of the speed limit and help encourage compliance so that no enforcement difficulties are created for the local police force. Where appropriate, such measures might include a vehicle-activated sign, centre hatching or other measures that would have the effect of narrowing or changing the nature and appearance of the road. In this location, enhanced speed limit signage, a vehicle activated sign and improved road markings are all proposed.

Speed surveys have been undertaken at several locations throughout the villages between 2011 and 2021. The average speeds at the western and southern ends are 37.1mph and 37.9mph respectively. In the central section near the bridge, 2 surveys have been undertaken which yielded average speeds of 32mph and 35.9mph. The survey located at the western edge of Daddry Shield was undertaken in 2021. All other survey data was gathered in 2011.

Whilst it is accepted that visual traffic calming is less effective than physical measures in reducing vehicular speeds, we do anticipate that the measures proposed will have a positive effect in this regard. The SID will be calibrated so that it activates when vehicles are travelling in excess of the enforcement speed as directed by Durham Constabulary.

## **6 Conclusion**

- 6.1 Having considered the objection received, Officers remain of the view that it is necessary to introduce the proposals in order to address the concerns of residents regarding inappropriate speed. Accordingly, it is recommended that Members agree in principle to endorse the proposal to proceed with the implementation of the Daddry Shield and Bridge End 30mph Speed Limit - Traffic Regulation Order 2022 with the final decision to be made by the Corporate Director under delegated powers.

## **7 Background papers**

- 7.1 Correspondence and documentation in Traffic Office File:

L:\TRAFPROJ\07 TRAFFIC ASSETS\DAVE\Speed Limit TRO's\Daddry Shield

### **Author(s)**

[Ellis Dunn] Tel: 03000 265485

[Lee Mowbray] Tel: 03000 263693

[Kieron Moralee] Tel: 03000 263368

[Dave Lewin] Tel: 03000 263582

---

## **Appendix 1: Implications**

---

### **Legal Implications**

All orders have been advertised by the County Council as highway authority and will be made in accordance with legislative requirements.

### **Finance**

The consultation and advertising costs would be approx. £1000. The capital costs of road markings and road traffic signs would be met with the Department for Transport funding as part of the construction works.

### **Consultation**

Statutory Instrument 2489

### **Equality and Diversity / Public Sector Equality Duty**

It is considered that there are no Equality and Diversity issues to be addressed. Formal signalled crossing will provide betterment to vulnerable road users.

### **Climate Change**

The improvements should bring about lessened congestion and improved air quality, with new dedicated facilities for non-motorised users' improvement, encouraging mode shift away from the car.

### **Human Rights**

Any interference with human rights is considered to be necessary in accordance with the law and proportionate in order to address highway safety issues.

### **Crime and Disorder**

The existing TRO will be amended to introduce an enforceable speed limit TRO as well as associated signs and road markings.

### **Staffing**

Strategic Traffic to undertake consultation. Highway Operations to install required road traffic signs and road markings.

## **Accommodation**

Transport Infrastructure Projects to undertake consultation. Legal Services to advertise the TRO and Commercial Group to facilitate the procurement and installation of the required road markings and road traffic signs.

## **Risk**

Low risk – the informal consultation undertaken in March 2021 and October 2021 was widely well received.

Low risk – non-compliance with TRO: Mean speeds indicate drivers are averaging less than 40mph during the villages. Increased road signs and road traffic markings will look to reinforce the speed limit and encourage compliance. As part of the overarching project, a police bay will be introduced on the approach to Aycliffe Village crossroads at the request of Durham Constabulary to allow for effective speed monitoring.

## **Procurement**

Durham County Council frameworks for road markings and road traffic signs.





---

## Appendix 3: Objections

---

The following objection was received by Paul Emmerson of Durham Constabulary on 03/03/2022.

I wish to record a formal objection to this proposal based upon the rationale below

1. The proposal does not follow the guidance set out in the DfT document "Setting Local Speed Limits"
  1. Section 7.2 deals with rural roads. Table 2 of Paragraph 127 sets out recommended speed limits for roads with a predominate motor traffic flow function. If walking, cycling, horse riding, community or environmental factors are particularly important on any road consideration should be given to using the lower limit
    1. 60mph - recommended for most high quality strategic A & B roads with few bends, junctions or accesses
    2. 50mph - should be considered for lower quality A & B roads that may have a relatively high number of bends, junction or accesses. Can also be considered where mean speeds are below 50mph, so lower limit does not interfere with traffic flow
    3. 40mph - should be considered where there are many bends, junctions or accesses, substantial development, a strong environmental or landscape reason or where there are considerable numbers of vulnerable road users
  2. Section 7.3 deals with 30mph limits within villages. Daddry Shield meets the definition of a village albeit the majority of houses are concentrated in a 200m stretch of the A689. However Paragraph 139 states "In situations where the above criteria for a village are not met and there is lesser degree of development or **where engineering measures are not practicable or cost effective to achieve a 30mph limit but a reduction from the national 60mph speed limit is considered appropriate, traffic authorities should consider alternative lower limits or 40 or 50mph**

2. Speed survey data shows an average speed of 37.2mph, 85%ile speed of 45mph
3. The speed data and above guidance outlines the lowest appropriate limit would be 40mph
4. Research shows a limit that relies upon signage alone will only reduce speeds by 1mph
5. A 30mph limit would be non-credible and result in high non-compliance. On current figures this would be 68%.
6. Under DfT guidance the road cannot be traffic calmed so there are no engineering measures available to reduce speeds
7. The proposed permanently located speed indication device will have minimal impact upon speed as research shows
  1. The best case scenario shows an average reduction of 1.4mph
  2. There is a “novelty” effect with the SID being effective in the first week of operation which tails off after three week period and are therefore only effective at reducing speeds if deployed for a short period of time
8. The National Police Chief Council states a new speed limit needs to be credible and should not rely upon additional enforcement to achieve compliance.
9. Without any means of influencing driver behaviour it would lead to demands for enforcement activities and enforcement alone will never achieve an acceptable level of compliance for a non-credible speed limit
10. The location may not, due to the horizontal and vertical alignment, allow roadside enforcement activities to be conducted
11. A check from 1 January 2017 shows no collision history along this section of the A689
12. The introduction of a non-credible speed limit with poor compliance may increase the risk to road safety as users make decisions based upon the expected speed as opposed to the actual speeds

All the above highlight why a 30mph limit along this section of the A689 is not appropriate but a lower limit of 40mph or 50mph would be more applicable