



Imogen Whitaker - Clerk & RFO to the Council  
T: 01243 575094/E: [clerk@birdhamparishcouncil.gov.uk](mailto:clerk@birdhamparishcouncil.gov.uk)  
[www.birdham.org.uk](http://www.birdham.org.uk)

---

Minutes of the of the Extraordinary Parish Council Meeting  
held on Wednesday 17<sup>th</sup> November 2021  
at 7pm

**Present:** Cllr Timothy Firmston (Chairman,) Cllr Graham Campbell, Cllr Laurie Pocock  
Cllr Gordon Churchill, Cllr Elizabeth Hamilton (Vice-Chair)  
WSCC Pieter Montyn CDC Susan Taylor  
4 Members of public  
3 Members of public (zoom attendee)  
Clerk (zoom attendee)

---

**1. Apologies**

Cllrs Glover and Bush

**2. Declarations of interest**

- i. There were no declarations of interest for matters on the agenda
- ii. There were no dispensation requests

**3. Minutes – to agree and sign the minutes of 20<sup>th</sup> October 2021 meeting**

With the following amendments the minutes were proposed by Cllr Hamilton, seconded by Cllr Churchill and unanimously **AGREED** to be a true and accurate record and were duly signed by the Chairman. P2 Item 7 iv application 21/02818/FUL “projected number of pitches” (not “bays”); P4 Item 9 “new trees 2 bundles of 20 trees” not “220 trees”.

**4. To discuss the application for a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to reduce speed to 30mph for A286 through Birdham and 20mph within Birdham village. (Proposal attached). To include parlous state of cycle lanes and footpaths along A286.**

Cllr Churchill said that with the further development near the harbour there has been a considerable increase in speeds along Crooked Lane and Church Lane, as well as Church Lane consistently being used as a cut-through when there are traffic queues on the A286.

A member of the public (who lives on A286) said that he fully supported the Council’s proposals but thought that an amendment should be made. He said that it was completely illogical that the speed limit in front of Crouchers is increased to 50mph from 40mph on the dangerous bend. The speed limit here should stay at 40mph. A woman had been killed recently at the exit of Wophams Lane. He said he also fully supported the move to improve the condition of the cycle lane which was completely unsafe due to the verge creep. He said it was safer not to have a cycle lane than one in that condition. He said that he takes his grandchildren the short distance to primary school by car, because walking along the road is too dangerous.

He added that anyone wishing to take a bus along this section of the road had to walk along the road to reach the bus stop as the pavement was impassable or non-existent.

Another member of the public endorsed the comments above and that the vegetation forced people into the road alongside fast-moving cars and lorries which was so dangerous. He said that the occasional police presence would help and clearing that vegetation from the path would make it so much safer – to include removing the over-hanging branches of the trees.

Another member of the public said that she had written to WSCC in July concerning the vegetation along the pavement. She said that it was so narrow that vehicles passing at speed could suck pedestrians into the road. WSCC had told her that a 1m footway was sufficient – but unfortunately with the vegetation creep it is far less than that. She said that she had told them that it was extremely dangerous and that a serious accident could happen. Very sadly that had now happened.

Cllr Montyn said that we would support the proposals for the speed reduction but that the two proposals would have to be the subject of separate applications. He suggested that the Council bring this up at the Community Forum on 24<sup>th</sup> November at 6pm (virtual meeting). He said that he would talk to officers at WSCC on how to phrase the application. He said that it would be necessary to talk to WSCC to get the applications right. Cllr Campbell said that they would like information on how to proceed with these applications.

He said that the clearance of the cycle path from vegetation and overhanging branches was scheduled to take place in week commencing 29<sup>th</sup> November. Work was also continuing on the Salterns Way cycle path, and was scheduled to finish around 22<sup>nd</sup> December.

The Chairman said that two years ago the Clerk had asked for the vegetation to be cleared back from the pavements and asked why had it taken two years to implement? Cllr Montyn said that he was only glad that it was now being done.

Cllr Campbell proposed, and Cllr Pocock seconded that the council formally accept the two proposals for speed reduction within Birdham.

Proposal 1: for 30mph along the length of A286 in Birdham

Proposal 2: 20mph along Crooked Lane, Church Lane.

This was unanimously **AGREED**.

Action	Clerk
--------	-------

Cllr Montyn reported back on the online A27 meeting with National Highways (formally Highways England) with district and county councillors. He said that many made comments about residents on the southern side and that without the inclusion of a northern bypass any consultation would not be acceptable to residents. Cllr Montyn asked for the date of the first Stakeholders' Consultation meeting. He also made it clear that privilege shouldn't trump the proper process. A participant asked for Minutes to be distributed.

With regard to Local Plan mitigation for the A27 County Council/District Council and NH have a good idea of what can be achieved with the funds that will be available. They are working on what will become the tipping point – safety will come first.

**(Cllr Montyn left the meeting at 7.39pm)**

**5. Public Question time from residents of Birdham in accordance with Standing Orders 1d – 11** – there were no questions from members of the public.

**6. To receive a report from WSCC member for Birdham Cllr Montyn** – already covered above

**7. To receive reports from CDC members for Birdham**

**Cllr Taylor CDC**

Cllr Taylor talked about the continuing work on achieving “water neutrality” north of the district which has halted development in Horsham. Cllr Taylor had written to the 4 MPs concerned to exert pressure on the Statutory Authorities to resolve the problem. She is visiting the parishes north of the district to explain the effects of the current situation and what it means for them. She said that it didn't affect Birdham as such but that it could affect the CDC Local Plan, possibly in the short term.

Cllr Campbell said that it had been known for a long time what was happening but only now was something being done about it – meanwhile houses keep being built with no roads, no sewage facilities and no infrastructure. Cllr Taylor said that the scale of the mitigation required was so huge that the situation wouldn't be resolved overnight. If Natural England continue to say no, no more houses would be built unless the development is water neutral.

Cllr Campbell asked if there was any further information on housing allocations. Cllr Taylor said that they were waiting to hear from National Highways on how many houses could be delivered with the constraints at Stockbridge and the link road no longer feasible. The Chairman said that the Council had written to Toby Ayling asking for a meeting 6 weeks ago, with a recent follow-up email but to date no response had been received.

The Chairman asked whether there was any response to the Parish Council question that had been asked at the last meeting. What were the criteria used by Andrew Frost which determined whether a letter would be sent out to neighbours of a proposed planning application? Currently only one notice is posted on the proposed application which could easily be missed by neighbours – and frequently is. Cllr Hamilton said that she had received many complaints from residents on this subject and at the informal meeting with officers next week she will bring this up. Cllr Taylor said that CDC no longer had to inform neighbours. Cllr Firmston said that in the letter which Andrew Frost sends out to notify the Parish Council of an application, he says that a letter will be sent to neighbours “if necessary.” The Parish Council was trying to establish what the criteria were for making it “necessary”. Not everyone has access to the internet so how are they to find out? Cllr Taylor said that the notice is put outside the property and that this notice is an obligation. CDC do check that the notice is posted correctly.

A member of the public said that CDC should put their policy on this issue on the internet for all to see.

Cllr Taylor will investigate this.

**Action**

**Cllr Taylor**

(Cllr Taylor left the meeting at 7.55pm).

#### **Cllr Hamilton CDC**

- Cllr Hamilton had attended an Eco Festival. There were 40 stalls suggesting ways to live more sustainably. In the evening there was a Q&A session which was particularly useful.
- On Monday 29<sup>th</sup> 2 – 4pm at Chichester College there is a talk on energy efficiency.
- In future Initiatives Magazine will have articles on how to be more eco-friendly.
- There is a full-council meeting at CDC and one item will be sewerage being poured into rivers. Southern Water will not be present. Cllr Pocock said that the Parish Council needed to find out what was happening at Sidlesham plant. Cllr Montyn is making notes of when the tankers arrive at Pinks Lane. Cllr Hamilton said that people are now saying what is happening to them with regards to sewage and this will be important when the Koolbergen application is discussed again.

End of report.

#### **8. Planning matters including appeals, applications and CDC delegated decisions.**

- i. Notifications of new Planning Enforcement Notices – there were none received**
- ii. Notifications of Planning Appeals – an appeal has been made against enforcement notice 20/00379/CONCOU Plot 13 Land NW Premier Business Park, Birdham Road.**
- iii. Updates on Planning Enforcements – CDC are working hard to enforce the situation with regard to the travellers.**
- iv. Planning applications to be decided:**

Planning application number	Address	Details	Comment
BI/21/03127/TPA	Beechway Martin's Lane	Crown reduce by 25% (back to old would points) on 1 no. Hornbeam tree (T1) subject to BI/01/00039/TPO	<b>NO COMMENT - refer to Tree Office CDC</b>
BI/21/03007/FUL	Pict Fenn Court Barn Road	Replacement of the existing single family dwelling house with attached garage and separate outbuildings with a new single family dwelling house with separate outbuildings and associated landscaping works.	<b>Birdham Parish Council OBJECTS to this application on the grounds of the 83% increase in footprint. The Birdham Neighbourhood Plan restricts this increase to 30%. The extensive use of glass should be subject to Harbour Conservancy rules but any north and harbour-facing windows should have automatic blinds.</b>

BI/21/02960/DOM	Cambridge House Bell Lane Birdham PO20 7HY	Proposed rear single storey extension to provide enlarged family accommodation.	<b>NO OBJECTION</b>
BI/21/02818/FUL	Land North Of Cowdry Nursery Sidlesham Lane Birdham PO20 7QW	Change of use of land to a campsite with erection of 1 no. shepherd hut	<b>NO OBJECTION to one Shepherd Hut on condition that it is used for holiday accommodation only for no more than 10 months of the year; and that no further pitches or camping will be allowed. The use of the term 'campsite' is inappropriate for the planning application given the information confirmed by the applicant.</b>
BI/21/03037/FUL	Houseboat Karibuni, Chichester Marina, Birdham, Chichester, West Sussex, PO20 7EJ	Replacement of Berth 30 Houseboat Karibuni with a Bluefield Houseboat and installation of H column cored and grouted anchoring system.	<b>STRONGLY OBJECT – for full objection please see below</b>

### **OBJECTION BI/21/03037/FUL**

Birdham Parish Council **STRONGLY OBJECTS** to this application on the grounds of the mass and the scale of the building being inappropriate and not in keeping with the surrounding area and the AONB. It is not a boat, but a featureless container and does not in any way conserve or enhance the AONB. There is no change from the previous application BI/21/00189 apart from the removal of skylights.

Chichester Marina is one of the key heritage sites within Birdham Parish and is headlined in Birdham's made Neighbourhood Plan 2016 and is particularly mentioned in the Birdham vision: "to maintain the AONB, ecology and CHARACTER OF THE HARBOUR, CANAL and its rural and agricultural surroundings."

There have been a number of similar structures approved over the last few years. BPC has objected to all of them, on the same grounds as this application, but all have been approved.

These structures are not boats by any reasonable definition. They have a significant volume, are completely rectangular, fill every centimetre of the berth space, and are of a significant height. They are far more intrusive into the countryside than any boat could be. The colour scheme is black and / or dark grey for most of these structures. They do not meet the requirement to conserve or enhance the AONB, nor the requirement for 'houseboats' to be sympathetically designed and in keeping with the AONB. Structures such as these are destroying the heritage asset of Birdham.

Not long ago the canal was an attractive area, lined with what were quite obviously boats. However, continued approval of this design of structure, the "floating shed", is resulting in a significant massing of buildings on the canal and in the Marina. Continued approval of these structures will lead to complete obstruction of the view of the far side of the bank, thus detracting from the rural nature of both the marina and canal.

BPC had tried previously to meet with Premier Marinas to discuss but did not have any reply to their emails.

Birdham Parish Council asks that this application be refused, thereby contributing to the safeguarding of the area as a haven for boats. If not the characters of the marina and canal will be steadily eroded, until they are completely lost.

#### **v. Delegated decisions to be noted**

Planning application number	Address	Details	Decision
BI/21/00980/FUL	Strathmore, Main Road Birdham	Construction of a two storey 3 bed detached self-build dwelling.	<b>PERMIT</b>
BI/21/01851/DOM -	The Little House Westlands Lane Birdham PO20 7HH	Single storey extension and roof alterations. Including 4 no. rooflights.	<b>PERMIT</b>

BI/21/01456/DOM	Gayfere Cottage Court Barn Road Birdham PO20 7BQ	proposed extensions and alterations	PERMIT
BI/21/02539/FUL	Wheelhouse 16 Greenacres Birdham PO20 7HL	Demolition of existing 1 no. dwelling, garage and construction 1 no. dwelling, garage and swimming pool. (Variation of 2 from planning permission BI/19/03050/FUL - Substitution of amended plans).	PERMIT

### 9. To report back from A27 National Highways Meeting on 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2021

Cllr Pocock reported that an agenda had not been issued before the attendees arrived. He had put together a short statement beforehand and when all the attendees arrived, they quickly made it clear that a presentation wasn't going to be of any use, but an exchange of views was needed. Cllr Pocock put excerpts of his statement into the chat box at the appropriate moments which were appreciated. They put the message across that this must be a proper consultation with all options on the table. The consultations will not start until 2023 with possible implementation in 2025 – 29.

Cllr Churchill said that this whole issue was a hotbed of contention and that did not consider any of the social implications of the plans.

No proposals were presented at the meeting, but their objective is to speed up through traffic. Keith Martin from Earnley made his points extremely firmly.

The MPAG meeting on this subject is on Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2021 at 6.30pm. Location tbc.

### 10. Birdham Neighbourhood Plan Review 2020 – 2035

- Cllr Campbell said that the plan was being worked on and that shortly every household in Birdham will receive a paper copy of a questionnaire (also available on the website). The distribution will be complete by 3<sup>rd</sup> December and responses are requested by 24<sup>th</sup> December. The team will analyse the responses.
- The group is still awaiting responses from the solicitors with regard to the bequeathed land.
- The Housing Allocation will be the next big item for the team. An article in the Daily Telegraph quoted Michael Gove as saying, “it is ridiculous to build houses close to AONBs where there is no infrastructure”.
- Design Codes: on 26<sup>th</sup> November there will be a site meeting with the consultants and a walk-around to talk about what needs to be included in the Birdham Design code – and the 30% limit of increased footprint should be included in that.

### 11. Queen's Green Canopy and planting of trees in Birdham

Cllr Hamilton had received a map of the recreation ground with potential site for allotments on Farne Lane side, and the possible football pitch on the other. The trees will be planted in clumps around existing trees. This should take place on 2<sup>nd</sup> December. Volunteers urgently required! The trees are indigenous to the area.

### 12. To approve the 2022 – 23 precept request for Birdham Parish.

A draft had previously been circulated to the council. Cllr Campbell said that there were some heavy price increases coming shortly and that these should be reflected in the budget.

It was agreed to increase amounts for Village, Triangle and Kingfisher ponds maintenance, the tree fund and the Neighbourhood plan. The added figures should not exceed a 3% overall increase.

Action

Clerk

### 13. Clerk's report

#### i) Correspondence

- o CDC Cllr Sharp has created a “noise” group with the aim of reducing traffic noise – particularly of motorbikes across the Chichester District. Cllr Campbell will attend the first meeting
- o WSCC Fire and Rescue services consultation – forwarded to Councillors. On December agenda to consider response
- o WSCC Local Forum meetings – to replace the old South Chichester County Local Committee meetings. Will be more informal, and questions should be sent in advance. BPC to ask about speed reduction procedures (copy to resident asking for support).
- o Cllrs are required to give a reason for absences from Parish Council meetings which should be approved by the council. Any unapproved absence will count towards the “six-month rule”.



- ii) **To approve the Payments for consideration** – with the addition of a payment for grass cutting of £255.30 the payments for consideration were proposed by Cllr Churchill and seconded by Cllr Pocock. These were unanimously **RESOLVED**.
- iii) **Expenditure to date and Bank reconciliation**  
The clerk had circulated the documents before the meeting. The expenditure to date was examined and barring any unforeseen expenditure the council should remain on budget.

#### 14. Councillor Reports:

- i. **Play area and playing field** the clerk has contacted CDC re suppliers for goal posts and will investigate cost and installation. All the repairs on the playground have been completed.
- ii. **Village green and pond/condition of Village Drain/Ditch network**  
There is a working group at Triangle pond on Friday 19<sup>th</sup> November from 10am – 2pm if anyone would like to join in.
- iii. **Communication working group**  
Newsletter will come out in the Spring
- iv. **Community resilience**  
The 2022 update will be completed early in the new year.
- v. **Manhood Peninsula Action Group**

#### 15. Reports of meetings attended by Councillors

- Cllr Pocock had found a copy of the CDC sewerage plan 2016 – 17 in which it stated that there was no problem with the Sidlesham wastewater treatment works as all the sewerage goes northwards. He would like to check that this erroneous information does not still figure in their latest version. To be reviewed early next year once any news from Local Plan is received.
- Cllr Firmston had attended the West Sussex Association of Local Councils' AGM. It was a short meeting with the current Directors re-elected for the coming year. The new WSALC is being efficiently run by Trevor Leggo. Compared to last year's fiasco it was good to know that it was now on a stable footing.

#### 16. Items for inclusion on the next agenda

#### 17. Date of next meeting

**Wednesday 15<sup>th</sup> December 2021 at 7pm**

Cllr Campbell asked that a check be requested on Planning application 20/00489. It would appear that the roof height is in excess of that indicated on the plans.

<b>Action</b>	<b>Clerk</b>
---------------	--------------

There being no further business to discuss the meeting closed at 9.26pm

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_  
Tim Firmston - Chairman

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

### Birdham Parish Council Payments for Consideration Meeting November 17th 2021

#### Balances on accounts:

Current account	124445.06
Deposit account	100007.78
NS account	7092.54
	<b>231545.38</b>

#### Received since last meeting

0.00

**Paid since last meeting**

betty geary	litter picking	70.00
i whitaker	Clerk's salary incl back pay	1014.53
nest	pension	52.50
nest	pension back pay	76.58
hmrc	contributions	5.31
adrian dover	grass cutting/bus stop clearance	212.00
british legion	poppy wreath	19.25
moore	external audit	480.00
t firmston	soil to repair playground	20.00
chris milford handyman	repair village pump bench	37.00
chris milford handyman	parts for playarea repair	28.38
access by design	website hosting	180.00
mh kennedy	grass mowing	697.50
sussex wildlife trust	biodiversity report	120.00
g campbell	software	14.49
SLCC and LCR	subscriptions	142.50
chris milford handyman	d shackles play area	52.80
sse	street lighting	101.40
zoom	3 months	43.17
council running costs	3 months	209.85
ringcentral	telephone	35.97

3613.23

**Payments for consideration**

betty geary	litter picking	70.00
I whitaker	clerk's salary	719.84
d thompson	soil analysis	30.00
genesis	neighbourhood plan	1200.00
mulberry and co	training T Firmston	48.00
wsalc	parish online sub	84.00
adrian dover	grass cutting and bus stop	110.00
g campbell	software for np	103.29
sse	street lighting	104.46
mh kennedy	grass cutting	255.30

2724.89

---

**Proposals to Reduce Speed Limit in Birdham**  
November 2021

## **Proposal 1.**

This proposal requests the County Local Council to reduce the speed limit through Birdham from the current 40mph to 30mph. The route covered would be from the start of the 40mph zone adjacent to Sidlesham Lane, splitting at the roundabout at the Shell garage, along Bell Lane to Hundredsteddle Lane, and along the B2179 to the end of the current 40mph zone.

The A286 through Birdham is an extremely busy road, with an annual average daily flow of 17,542 vehicles in 2020, up from 14,840 in 2019 (see Appendix 1). Additionally, many more houses are due to be completed in areas which will further increase the traffic through Birdham. This means that the road is extremely unpleasant to walk or cycle on, at a time when we wish to encourage both walking and cycling. This is evidenced by the shocking safety record of the A286 through Birdham village. In the last 5 years there have been 18 recorded traffic accidents in Birdham, of which 6 were serious, 3 of them fatal (1 fatality occurred within the last month, so is not included on the source map, Appendix 2).

At the County Council meeting on 12 February, 2010, Councillors voted to amend the speed limit policy. The decision was to:-

- promote the aim to have 30mph in all villages
- remove the requirement to link the decision to actual speeds
- give County Local Committee's (CLC) more scope and opportunities to recommend lower limits, and
- give priority to villages with an existing 40mph limit.

The decision referred to above gives CLC the option to over-ride the national guidance in order to promote a 30mph limit (Appendix 3)

When judged against the national guidance, it appears that

1. The route does not meet the speed assessment, in that the average speed along the route is close to 40mph
2. The length of the proposed limit is 2.2 km, of which 1.3km is developed on 1 side, of which .5km is developed on both sides. This clearly meets the requirement of 50% laid out in the policy.
3. The route length assessment is greater than the 600m required by the policy.

Due to the CLC decision, referred to above, CLCs may promote a change from 40mph to 30mph in villages without associated engineering measures, which would otherwise fall outside of these criteria.

An additional benefit of a speed reduction would be a considerable reduction in noise and air pollution, desirable aims in themselves.

Given that journey times on the road are unpredictable, as the road is often congested, and quite often gridlocked, an increase in journey time of about 40 seconds is unlikely to be significant, against the safety and health benefits that would ensue.

Given the accident record, the vulnerability of road users, including pedestrians (particularly children, the elderly and disabled), cyclists and equestrians, and the sheer volume of traffic, we request the CLC to authorise the reduction of the speed limit through Birdham from 40mph to 30mph.

## **Proposal 2.**

This proposal seeks to reduce the speed limit along Church Lane, Crooked Lane and Westlands Lane from 30mph to 20mph, along with the infrastructure necessary to enforce it.

Both Church Lane and Westlands Lane have no sidewalks. Crooked Lane has a sidewalk on 1 side and has the village school on it. Church Lane and Crooked Lane are built up on both sides, with side



roads leading off. Westlands Lane is very narrow. Parts of Church Lane, including the extremely dangerous, narrow bend close to the Church, and all of Westlands Lane form part of the Salterns Way, a significant cycle route between Chichester and West Wittering.

The annual average daily flow in 2019, the last year for which measurements are available, was 1682 vehicles (Source: <https://roadtraffic.dft.gov.uk/manualcountpoints/946507>), which is a considerable number.

Additionally, the anecdotal evidence is that many drivers drive at or above the 30mph, without due consideration to more vulnerable road users

Many pedestrians use these roads, including children walking to school, as well as cyclists and wheelchair users. It is the walking route to the bus stop on the route to Chichester.

Following the announcement that “active travel can make us become more resilient” (Grant Shapps, Secretary of State for Transport, 9 May 2020) the government has published direction under the Traffic Management Act 2004: network management in response to Covid-19 recommending that “local authorities make significant changes to their road layouts to give more space to cyclists and pedestrians”. It clearly states that measures should be taken as swiftly as possible to ensure that travel habits do not revert to pre pandemic behaviour.

The new guidance urges local authorities to adjust speed limits to enable walking and cycling. It states that “reducing the speed limit can provide a more attractive and safer environment for walking and cycling”. Forward thinking councils around the UK (Lambeth, Manchester, and Waltham Forest) are redesigning road layouts and creating more space for cyclists and pedestrians and it is hoped that similar forward thinking will be evident in West Sussex.

The lockdown has forced changes of behaviour which have proved beneficial in terms of exercise and health, improvements in air quality, reduction in carbon emissions and noise and an improvement in the quality of life.

Part of the drive to mitigate climate change, which is relevant to low lying areas such as Birdham, must be to encourage more walking and cycling, and therefore to redress the balance between car users and other road users.

We therefore request the CLC to authorise the reduction of the speed limit along Church Lane, Crooked Lane and Westlands Lane from 30mph to 20mph.

## Appendix 1.

Source: <https://roadtraffic.dft.gov.uk/manualcountpoints/26880>

A286

### Annual Average daily flow

Year	Count method	Pedal cycles	Two wheeled motor vehicles	Cars and taxis	Buses and coaches	Light goods vehicles	Heavy goods vehicles	All motor vehicles
2020	Manual count	154	111	14379	70	2703	279	17542
2019	Estimated using previous year's AADF on this link	77	97	11709	100	2621	314	14840
2018	Estimated using previous year's AADF on this link	63	90	11683	101	2629	311	14815
2017	Estimated using previous year's AADF on this link	65	92	11739	107	2511	304	14753
2016	Manual count	64	95	11753	110	2373	295	14625
2015	Estimated using previous year's AADF on this link	69	73	10758	134	2753	281	13998
2014	Estimated using previous year's AADF on this link	69	76	10887	131	2571	274	13939



## Appendix 3

### West Sussex County Council SPEED LIMIT POLICY (2010) 1.

#### Introduction

- 1.1 The speed management strategy was adopted in August 2000 and amended in February 2002. The strategy included revised speed limit criteria, supported by Sussex Police, which modified the previous criteria adopted in 1993. Recent guidance from DfT in 2006 has been taken into account in updating the criteria to reflect current views on the setting and evaluation of speed limits. This policy includes criteria for the setting of speed limits. A key objective in the national document is to achieve compliance such that average (mean) speeds are within or close to the set limit.
- 1.2 Speed limit criteria are used for setting speed limits aimed at responding to speed limit violation and public concern about traffic speed and contributing towards the overall strategy for speed management as part of the Road Safety Strategy within the West Sussex Transport Plan. The aim is to encourage consistency of setting speed limits throughout the County, to encourage understanding and compliance by drivers. The speed limit criteria incorporate two principal factors for assessment:
- traffic speed (speed assessment)
  - character of the route (route assessment)
- 1.3 Other factors to be taken into account are:
- the length of the route for the speed limit,
  - the rate of injury accidents along the route, • other means of intervention to improve safety.
- 1.4 The impact of the revised criteria will be to enable more appropriate speed limits where people live, particularly in rural villages, and where there are significant numbers of vulnerable road users\*, such as outside schools.
- 1.5 Speed limits should not be used to attempt to solve the problem of isolated hazards, such as a single road junction or reduced forward visibility such as a bend. The setting of speed limits should avoid departure from evidence-based proposals leading to the introduction of inappropriate speed limits which are unlikely to be understood or complied with by drivers. This would result in increased numbers of drivers exceeding the posted speed limits, thereby breaking the law, and causing excessive resource implications for enforcement.
- \*Note: Vulnerable road users include pedestrians (particularly children, the elderly and disabled), cyclists and equestrians.
- 1.6 However, County Councillors consider that not enough is being done to address the concerns of residents in villages. Therefore, at the County Council meeting on 12 February, 2010, Councillors voted to amend the policy. The decision was to:-
- promote the aim to have 30mph in all villages
  - remove the requirement to link the decision to actual speeds
  - give CLCs more scope and opportunities to recommend lower limits, and

- give priority to villages with an existing 40mph.

1.7 The following policy and criteria reflects the national guidance, except relating to villages with 40mph limits where the decision referred to in 1.6 above gives CLC the option to over-ride it to promote a 30mph limit.

### Revised Criteria- Assessment

#### 2.1 Speed Assessment.

The average (mean\*\*) speeds appropriate for each speed limit are shown in Table 1. Note that the measurement of the existing average speed is rounded down to the nearest whole number before applying the specific criteria. (For example, an average speed of 41.9 mph or less would qualify for a 40 mph limit).

Table 1 SPEED ASSESSMENT

Speed Limit	60	50	40	30	20
Average Speed to be below	62	52	42	33	24

\*\*Note: The term “mean speed” is a statistical reference and to avoid being over technical the term “average speed” is used instead.

#### 2.2 Route Assessment

The route assessment is attached as Table 2 below. Key features are:

- For a 20mph limit, existing average speeds should be within the criteria, or measures should be provided to ensure that the criteria are met for the new limit.
- For a 30mph limit there should be at least 30% of the route length with frontage development on both sides of the road, or 50% of the route length with frontage development on one side of the road. In villages this may be interpreted as at least 20 properties having direct, individual access along the route (within a length of 600m or 400m, see Route Length Assessment below).
- For a 40mph limit there should be some frontage and/or frequent bends, junctions or accesses with regular daily use indicating a degree of potential conflict along the route.
- For a 50 mph limit there is no specific requirement for frontage access. Routes would be of a rural or suburban nature with few vulnerable road users present.

#### 2.3 Route Length Assessment

The recommended minimum route length for a speed limit is 600m. In exceptional circumstances this may be reduced to 400m, for example when considering a compact village location along a route, or where appropriate as a “buffer” length to provide a transition to a much lower limit. If a buffer length of intermediate limit is provided, the maximum recommended length is 800m. Where multiple changes of speed limit occur along a route, intermediate lengths should not be less than 600m. The objective should be to achieve a balance between providing reasonable consistency of speed limit along the route and the need to encourage awareness of lower speed limits appropriate for key sections of the route where risks are higher.



## 2.4 Injury Accident Rate

Routes with persistently high numbers of injury accidents will continue to be assessed for speed management including lower speed limits where other measures alone are insufficient to improve road safety. The existing weighting system (3 for fatal, 2 for serious, and 1 for slight injury) will continue to be used in assessing the “weighted casualty rate per kilometre”. Route lengths with the highest weighted casualty rates per kilometre will be given priority for consideration of lower speed limits. In addition, the “risk rating”, measured as the number of fatal and serious accidents per billion vehicle kilometres, will also be considered when assessing priorities for intervention.

### Intervention and Application of the Criteria

3.1 If the assessment criteria are not directly met the following factors may be taken into account:

- When the frontage aspect of the route assessment criteria is not met, but the area is of a sensitive or special nature or where there is significant risk to vulnerable road users, and the speed assessment criterion is met, then a lower limit may be considered.
- When the speed assessment criterion has not been met, but the route assessment criteria are met, if associated engineering or other speed reducing measures can be implemented to bring down average speeds sufficient so that the speed assessment criterion is met then a lower limit can be implemented.

3.2 A site would meet the criteria for a speed limit if:

- the speed assessment criterion (Para. 2.1) is met; or
- any necessary additional measures can be funded and implemented to ensure that the speed assessment criterion is met; and
- the route assessment criterion (Para. 2.2) is met; and
- the route length assessment criterion (Para. 2.3) is met.

3.3 Subject also to 3.2 above, a high casualty rate (see 2.4 above) would contribute to the justification of a lower limit of 50 mph, or exceptionally 40 mph, on rural roads.

3.4 Due to the decision, referred to in 1.6 above, CLCs may promote a change from 40mph to 30mph in villages without associated engineering measures which would otherwise fall outside of these criteria.

March 2010 Table 2 ROUTE ASSESSMENT

SPEED LIMIT / CHARACTER OF ENVIRONMENT	TYPE AND CHARACTER OF ROAD AND TRAFFIC COMPOSITION
20 mph Speed Limit or Zone	

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 24 mph or the existing conditions control speed sufficiently. High proportion of vulnerable road users*.
30 mph Speed Limit	
Built up / partially built-up areas. Properties with frontage access, e.g., schools, private and commercial premises. Proportion of route length with frontage / access usually exceeding 30% on both sides of the road, or 50% on one side of the road. May include less developed lengths between 30 limits which are too short for a higher limit.	(i) Urban streets. (ii) Roads through villages and identified rural settlements. Significant numbers of vulnerable road users*.
40 mph Speed Limit	
Partially built-up areas with limited frontage access, or route lengths with frequent bends, junctions or accesses. May include undeveloped lengths between existing speed limits of 30 and 40, 40 and 40, or 40 and 50mph which are too short for a higher limit.	(i) Urban distributor roads. (ii) Roads through villages and identified rural settlements. (iii) Lengths of rural road identified as high risk and/or having high accident rates. A noticeable presence of vulnerable road users*.