

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF NORTH HORSHAM PARISH COUNCIL  
PLANNING, ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE  
HELD ON THURSDAY 20<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2018 AT 7.30pm  
AT ROFFEY MILLENNIUM HALL, CRAWLEY ROAD, HORSHAM**

**Present:** Committee Members

Holbrook East:- Cllr. Mrs R. Ginn, Cllr. Mrs F. Haigh, Cllr T. Rickett BEM\*.

Holbrook West:- Cllr. R. Knight, Cllr. R. Millington, Cllr. I. Wassell\*.

Roffey North:- Cllr. J. Davidson, Cllr M. Loates (Vice Chairman), Cllr D. Searle.

Roffey South:- Cllr Mrs J. Gough, Cllr. R Turner (Chairman), Cllr. Mrs S. Wilton.

\*denotes absence

**In attendance:** Ross McCartney, Committee Clerk.

**PET/548/18 Public Forum**

Three members of the public were present.

Two residents attended to speak regarding parking issues in Gateford Drive (PET/555/18). They observed that the parking requirement for Littlehaven Railway Station exceeds the capacity of the area. Some commuters who use the station travel from outside of Horsham to park on local residential streets free of charge and in the process they park inconsiderately, obstruct driveways and use laybys intended for resident parking. There were also concerns regarding unsafe parking along Rusper Road and speeding in Gateford Drive. The residents left the meeting after the item had been discussed.

One member of the public attended during the Chairman's announcements only and did not speak.

**PET/549/18 Apologies for absence**

The Committee received apologies and reasons for absence from Cllr T. Rickett BEM and Cllr I. Wassell.

**PET/550/18 Declarations of Interest**

Cllr R. Turner and M. Loates declared a personal interest on a site in the draft Strategic Housing, Economic and Land Availability Assessment Housing Land Report (PET/555/18).

**PET/551/18 Minutes**

The Minutes of the Committee Meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2018 were agreed and signed by the Chairman as a true record.

*With agreement of the Committee, agenda item 8 "Gateford Drive Parking issues" was moved forward to this point in the meeting.*

**PET/552/18 Gateford Drive Parking Issues.**

Residents of Gateford Drive are experiencing issues caused by inconsiderate parking, especially in passing places and laybys. Whilst there are yellow lines along Gateford Drive, these do not extend into the passing places and laybys. The Clerk had suggested that residents get in contact with their West Sussex County Councillor and that whilst one option could

be applying for a Traffic Restriction Order (TRO), very few schemes qualify and very few (only 3 per year in North Horsham) are adopted by West Sussex County Council (WSCC).

**As so few TROs are awarded by WSCC, it was RESOLVED to offer an alternative solution. The Clerk would write to WSCC Highway Officers and the local County Councillor to raise the concerns expressed by residents and to suggest a possible solution of a temporary park and ride scheme on the development north of Horsham.**

#### **PET/553/18 Chairman's Announcements**

1. Three Parish Council Tree Wardens are booked on the 1 Day Lantra Awards Basic Tree Survey and Inspection Course on Friday 25<sup>th</sup> January 2019.
2. The resident who had raised the issue regarding speeding and inconsiderate driving on Rusper Road and who had received a response following information given at the November 2018 Planning, Environment and Transport Committee Meeting has responded to the e-mail sent to him. He wished to understand why road markings with 'Keep Clear' and white lines either side of their entrance to be left clear had been installed in Quarry Close, how WSCC will monitor the concerns that have been raised by the Parish Council and to whom they will report the results. The Clerk has raised this with WSCC. Sussex Police has forwarded concerns to West Sussex Fire and Rescue who leads on the Road Safety Action Group for Horsham and to PCSO Baxter who found a few places to display 'slow down' notices with a 30mph slip attached on both the approach to Littlehaven Station from the A264 and from Horsham. The intention of these notices is to reduce the non-intentional speeding by those who were simply not focussed enough to notice the 30mph sign when they left the roundabout leading off the A264.
3. Horsham District Council (HDC) has responded to North Horsham Parish Council's letter dated 26<sup>th</sup> November 2018 regarding erection of fences on open plan estates. The response is attached. This matter will be raised at the January 2019 Planning, Environment and Transport Committee Meeting as an agenda item.
4. A Community Land Trust (CLT) working party meeting held on the 17<sup>th</sup> December 2019 was attended by 3 Parish councillors and 2 residents. The purpose of the meeting was to gather information regarding setting up a CLT. To set up a CLT costs between £4,000 and £5,000, drawing up plans for a proposed housing scheme can go from £30,000 to £50,000 and there could be some capital investment required. If a CLT was set up it would be a legal entity in its own right and there are

sources of outside funding including the Local Authority, Homes England and loans from the Charity Bank. The matter will be put before the Parish Council at their next meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> January 2019.

5. The Parish Council had been notified that Britaniacrest Recycling Ltd have submitted an appeal regarding WSCC/015/18/NH - Recycling, Recovery and Renewable Energy Facility and Ancillary Infrastructure - Former Wealden Brickworks (Site HB), Langhurstwood Road. The appeal will be raised at the Parish Council meeting to be held on the 10<sup>th</sup> January 2019.

#### **PET/554/18 Community Speedwatch Initiative**

'Community Speedwatch is a national initiative where active members of local communities join with the support of the Police to monitor speeds of vehicles using speed monitoring devices.' Community Speedwatch website <http://www.communityspeedwatch.org> (10.12.18).

To buy the Speedwatch equipment (hand held device), a tablet for recording information and yellow vests would cost around £1,000. It had been thought that this could be a resource shared with the neighbouring Neighbourhood Councils (NC), but not all of the NCs wish to get involved with this initiative, and to date it is not clear how the NCs intend to proceed. Should the Parish Council decide to set up a Community Speedwatch Group they will need to go through a registration process which involves nominating a named leader. Groups can nominate sites where they wish to monitor speed, but the sites have to be risk assessed and given approval. The 'Frequently Asked Questions' section of the Community Speedwatch website gives details of the criteria a new site must adhere to and the criteria which disqualifies a site. A copy had been sent separately to Councillors.

**It was RESOLVED not to proceed with a Community Speedwatch initiative as there are limited areas in the Parish in which it could be used, a similar scheme in the past did not yield any reduction in speed and it would not be an effective use of the councils' limited resources.**

*With agreement of the Committee the Press and Public were excluded from the meeting during PET/555/18 in accordance with the Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960, s1, as it has been requested by HDC that the Draft Strategic Housing, Economic and Land Availability Assessment Housing Land Report remain confidential at this stage.*

#### **PET/555/18 Draft Strategic Housing, Economic and Land Availability Assessment Housing Land Report.**

Draft report had been circulated to Councillors.

**The Committee considered the report and RESOLVED to make representations to HDC on several sites – See page 353.**

**PET/556/18 Footpath from Coney Croft to Crawley Road.**

The Planning Inspectorate (Rights of Way) has sent a letter (dated 6<sup>th</sup> December 2018) regarding an application for a right of way between Coney Croft and the footpath leading from Crawley Road alongside All Saints Church which had been submitted to the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs in September 2018. Due to an error in the application the Secretary of State has decided not to exercise his power of confirmation. WSCC will need to decide if they wish to start the process again. The access between Coney Croft and the footpath leading from Crawley Road has been stopped up by the landowner and some residents have expressed their disappointment as the route was widely available for several years. Copies of the paperwork are available at the Parish Council office.

**It was RESOLVED to request West Sussex County Council to pursue/restart the application process again to obtain a right of way between Coney Croft and the footpath leading from Crawley Road alongside All Saints Church.**

**PET/557/18 Rejected Traffic Restriction Order for Lambs Farm Road.**

Following WSCC's refusal of an application for a Traffic Restriction Order (TRO) submitted by the Parish Council to introduce a reduced speed limit on Lambs Farm Road and Hawkesbourne Road of 20mph, the Parish Council requested that data be collected again as when the first speed loops were installed, there were gas works which closed Crawley Road. The WSCC Traffic Officer for Horsham Area, reviewed the request but was unable to establish how road works on Crawley Road would affect the data gathered on Lambs Farm Road and Hawkesbourne Road in a way which would make it less likely that the average speeds would conform to the WSCC Speed Policy. It could have been possible that the increase in traffic would have slowed the averages down, but if this were the case it would make it more likely that the data would match policy, not less. If speed loops were installed again when the road closure on Crawley Road has ended, then the average speeds would almost certainly be higher and therefore even further away from conforming with the speed policy. The speed policy makes it clear that speed limits can only be imposed where there is a realistic prospect that traffic will abide by the new limit. When data is collected speeds close to the proposed new limit are required. It is a common misapprehension that WSCC installs lower speed limits where traffic speeds are in excess of the existing speed limit, but this is not the case. For instance, where a 20mph zone is proposed, the average speed of traffic has to be **less than** 24mph. The Traffic Officer attached a copy of the WSCC Speed Limit policy which goes into greater

detail on this point and which had been attached to the agenda.

**It was RESOLVED to investigate the issues further with WSCC's local Councillor and to continue to pursue a reduction in speed in that area.**

**PET/558/18 Consultations**

**Gatwick Master Plan** –Cllr Rickett B.E. M. was unable to attend the Gatwick Airport Noise Management Board meeting held on 5<sup>th</sup> December 2018 due to pressing work commitments and sent his apologies.

**Due to the impact that Gatwick Airport has on the local area, the Committee RESOLVED that the consultation would be put before the next meeting of the full Council on 10<sup>th</sup> January 2019 to allow all members of the Council to comment. The Committee were in favour of development at Gatwick Airport as it provides opportunities for local employment, however, there was concern regarding the impact of changes to flight paths and serious concern regarding the lack of supporting infrastructure. The Committee would also like to see an improvement to public transport links.**

**PET/559/18 Planning Appeals**

**DC/17/1704 41 Pondtail Road** – Change of use from Public House (Class A4) to Children's Day Nursery (Class D1); Single storey and first floor rear extensions; changes to elevations including addition of 2 x front and 1 x rear dormer windows; car and cycle parking; siting of external plant on rear elevation and surfacing of garden area.

Letter of objection circulated separately by Horsham District Councillor P. Burgess (Holbrook West)

**It was RESOLVED to make no further comments on the appeal.**

**DC/18/0971 14 Pondtail Road** – Erection of a first floor side extension. – Appeal dismissed.

**It was RESOLVED to note the planning appeal decision.**

**PET/560/18 Planning Applications**

Members noted receipt of the schedule of Planning Applications received under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 from HDC since 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2018 and considered each application in turn.

**It was RESOLVED that the Committee's comments on each planning application be forwarded to HDC (appended as part of the minutes).**

**PET/561/18 Planning Decisions**

An ongoing schedule of planning decisions made by HDC had been circulated to members of the Committee.

**It was RESOLVED to note the schedule of planning decisions.**

**PET/562/18 Date of next Meeting**

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday 24<sup>th</sup> January 2019 at 7.30pm.

There being no other business, the Chairman closed the meeting at 9.32 p.m.

.....Chairman

.....Date

**NORTH HORSHAM PARISH COUNCIL**  
**SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION**  
**20<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2018**

<b>DC/18/2283</b>	<b>Roffey North</b>
<b>Site Address:</b> 8 School Close	
<b>Proposal:</b> Surgery 1 x Oak	
<b>Parish Council Comment</b>	
No objection subject to the comments of HDC's Tree Officer.	
<b>HDC Decision</b>	

<b>DC/18/2291</b>	<b>Roffey South</b>
<b>Site Address:</b> 3 Roffeyhurst, Forest Road	
<b>Proposal:</b> Erection of a workshop/storage outbuilding.	
<b>Parish Council Comment</b>	
No objection.	
<b>HDC Decision</b>	

<b>DC/18/2309</b>	<b>Roffey North</b>
<b>Site Address:</b> 26 Searles View	
<b>Proposal:</b> Surgery to 1 x Oak	Deferred from previous meeting- Clarification on the proposed works was requested by the Parish Council
<b>Parish Council Comment</b>	
No objection subject to the comments of HDC's Tree Officer.	
<b>HDC Decision</b>	

<b>DC/18/2315</b>	<b>Roffey South</b>
<b>Site Address:</b> Woodlands Framing Yard, Woodlands Farm, Old Crawley Road, Faygate	Deferred from previous meeting – additional information requested.
<b>Proposal:</b> Demolition of existing barn, change of use of industrial building into D1 use, erection of two buildings, associated access and car parking.	
<b>Parish Council Comment</b>	
No objection.	
<b>HDC Decision</b>	

<b>DC/18/2403</b>	<b>Roffey South</b>
<b>Site Address:</b> Roffey Road Level Crossing, Wimland Road, Roffey	
<b>Proposal:</b> Installation of two red light violation cameras at Roffey Road level crossing, together with ancillary signage.	
<b>Parish Council Comment</b>	
No objection. The Committee fully supports this application.	
<b>HDC Decision</b>	

<b>DC/18/2500</b>	<b>Holbrook West</b>
<b>Site Address:</b> 7 Chaffinch Close	
<b>Proposal:</b> Erection of a single storey rear extension (Certificate of Lawful Development - Proposed)	
<b>Parish Council Comment</b> No objection.	
<b>HDC Decision</b>	

<b>DC/18/2515</b>	<b>Roffey North</b>
<b>Site Address:</b> 41 Hawkesbourne Road	
<b>Proposal:</b> Fell 1 x Oak	
<b>Parish Council Comment</b> The Parish Council supported the view of the Parish Council Tree Wardens that a crown reduction and removal of dead wood would be more appropriate, subject to the clarification of the overall health of the tree by HDC's Tree Officer as an infestation of honey fungus has been suggested by a neighbour, rather than the felling of the oak tree.	
<b>HDC Decision</b>	

<b>DC/18/2522</b>	<b>Roffey South</b>
<b>Site Address:</b> 2 Shellys Court, Manor Fields	
<b>Proposal:</b> Conversion of garage into habitable living space and erection of a first floor extension over existing garage.	
<b>Parish Council Comment</b> No objection.	
<b>HDC Decision</b>	

<b>DC/18/2541</b>	<b>Roffey North</b>
<b>Site Address:</b> 35 Greenfields Way	
<b>Proposal:</b> Surgery to 7 x oak trees	
<b>Parish Council Comment</b> No objection subject to the comments of HDC's Tree Officer.	
<b>HDC Decision</b>	

<b>DC/18/2542</b>	<b>Holbrook West</b>
<b>Site Address:</b> 11 Millers Gate	
<b>Proposal:</b> Surgery to 1 x beech	
<b>Parish Council Comment</b> No objection subject to the comments of HDC's Tree Officer.	
<b>HDC Decision</b>	

<b>DC/18/2547</b>	<b>Roffey North</b>
<b>Site Address:</b> 28 Shepherds Way	
<b>Proposal:</b> Demolition of existing garage and erection of a two storey side extension.	
<b>Parish Council Comment</b>	
No objection.	
<b>HDC Decision</b>	

<b>DC/18/2574</b>	<b>Holbrook West</b>
<b>Site Address:</b> Fisher Clinical Services UK Ltd.	
<b>Proposal:</b> Variation to Condition 1 to previously approved Application Reference Number DC/18/1215 (Erection of a side extension to existing warehouse). Relating to substitute drawings.	
<b>Parish Council Comment</b>	
No objection.	
<b>HDC Decision</b>	

<b>DC/18/2625</b>	<b>Holbrook West</b>
<b>Site Address:</b> Holmwood House Broadlands Business Campus Langhurst Wood Road	
<b>Proposal:</b> Non material amendment to previously approved application DC/18/1625 (Replacement of windows, entrances and installation of louvres.) Revisions to approved doors / windows.	
<b>Parish Council Comment</b>	
No objection.	
<b>HDC Decision</b>	

<b>DC/18/2628</b>	<b>Holbrook East</b>
<b>Site Address:</b> 8 Bartholomew Way	
<b>Proposal:</b> Erection of a front porch.	
<b>Parish Council Comment</b>	
No objection.	
<b>HDC Decision</b>	

<b>DC/18/2647</b>	<b>Holbrook East</b>
<b>Site Address:</b> Novartis Development Site Parsonage Road	
<b>Proposal:</b> Removal of Condition 21 (Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3) of planning application DC/14/1624 (Demolition of existing social club and redevelopment of site to accommodate 160 dwellings)	
<b>Parish Council Comment</b>	
No objection.	
<b>HDC Decision</b>	

<b>DC/18/2651</b>	<b>Holbrook West</b>
<b>Site Address:</b> 5 Park Farm Road	
<b>Proposal:</b> Surgery to 1 x Oak	
<b>Parish Council Comment</b>	
No objection subject to the comments of HDC's Tree Officer.	
<b>HDC Decision</b>	

<b>DC/18/2665</b>	<b>Roffey North</b>
<b>Site Address:</b> 4 Coniston Close	
<b>Proposal:</b> Surgery to 2 x Lime Trees	
<b>Parish Council Comment</b>	
No objection subject to the comments of HDC's Tree Officer.	
<b>HDC Decision</b>	

<b>DC/18/2687</b>	<b>Holbrook East</b>
<b>Site Address:</b> Former Novartis Site Parsonage Road	
<b>Proposal:</b> Outline planning application for the erection of up to 300 dwellings (C3) including the conversion of existing offices (buildings 3 and 36) up to 25,000sqm of employment (B1) floorspaces and provision of 618sqm of flexible commercial/community space (A1 A2 A3 D1 (Creche) use classes) within the ground floor of converted building 36. Improvements to existing pedestrian and vehicular accesses from Parsonage Road and Wimblehurst Road, new cycle and pedestrian accesses from Parsonage Road, together with associated parking and landscaping. All matters reserved except for access.	
<b>Parish Council Comment</b> This application is deferred to North Horsham Parish Council's Full Council meeting on the 10 <sup>th</sup> January 2019. The Planning, Environment and Transport Committee passes on its initial findings to be taken further: a. See a solution for traffic movements in the area. b. To see the avenue of trees on Parsonage Road being protected. c. For there to be a foot-link bridge over the railway line. d. To raise the site as an employment area first before housing, as it is believed the site was initially allocated for training and employment rather than housing.	
<b>HDC Decision</b>	

<b>DC/18/2691</b>	<b>Roffey North</b>
<b>Site Address:</b> 6 School Close	
<b>Proposal:</b> Erection of a rear conservatory.	
<b>Parish Council Comment</b> No objection.	
<b>HDC Decision</b>	

S106/18/0026	Holbrook East
<p><b>Site Address:</b> The Holbrook Club North Heath Lane</p> <p><b>Proposal:</b> Paragraph 1 (d) of Schedule 4 (stating not to allow or cause to be allowed more than 50% of the Open Market Units to be occupied at the Holbrook Development site until the new pitches at Horsham Football Club facility are ready for use) of the Original Section 106 (as varied) attached to DC/16/2855 to be deleted.</p>	
<p><b>Parish Council Comment</b></p> <p>Objection. The Parish Council considers there is a need for football pitches to be built and that HDC should have some control to enable them to press for them to be released.</p>	
<p><b>HDC Decision</b></p>	

**Confidential comments on the Draft Strategic Housing, Economic and Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) Housing Land Report (PET/555/18)**

To be declassified once the HDC SHELAA Housing Land Report has been made public.

<b>The Fountain Inn (SA533)</b>	– Seek removal of site from the SHELAA as the work has been completed.
<b>Scout HQ Site, Peary Close (SA605)</b>	– Seek removal of site from the SHELAA as the work has been completed.
<b>Roffey Sports and Social Club (SA145)</b>	– Oppose the inclusion of this site and seek its removal from the SHELAA
<b>Old pumping station (SA285)</b>	– Support as employment site
<b>Parsonage Farm (SA144)</b>	– Believe this site should not be currently developable.
<b>Rising Sun (SA530)</b>	– If the site is not approved for use as a Nursery the Parish Council would agree for it to be used for sustainable housing.
<b>Land at Holbrook School Lane (SA604)</b>	– Object to the inclusion of the site, the site should be retained for community use. The Parish Council seek removal of this site from the SHELAA.
<b>Land East of 4 Ramsey Close (SA241)</b>	– Seek the land is kept as a playground.
<b>Graylands Estate (SA363) and Land at Planet House (SA736)</b>	– It's believed both these sites should be listed as employment areas and not for housing development.
<b>The Star Public House (SA388)</b>	– The Parish Council do not want this site listed as developable solely for housing. The Parish Council has an aspiration to develop the area around Godwin Way with opportunities to enhance the Roffey centre area.
<b>All sites marked as red north of the Liberty development (SA363, SA750, SA751)</b>	– Strongly object to their inclusion and seek removal of the sites from the SHELAA.
<b>Land at Newhouse Farm, Old Crawley Road (SA127)</b>	– Strongly object to its inclusion and seek removal of the site from the SHELAA.
<b>Langhurstwood Road (SA444)</b>	– Seek removal of the site from the SHELAA.



North Horsham Parish Council

[Parish.clerk@northhorsham-pc.gov.uk](mailto:Parish.clerk@northhorsham-pc.gov.uk)

Our ref:

Your ref:

E-mail: [Emma.parkes@horsham.gov.uk](mailto:Emma.parkes@horsham.gov.uk)

Direct  
line: 01403 215528

Date: 13 December 2018

Dear Pauline

**Re: Open Plan Estates and proposals for new fencing**

Thank you for your letter dated 26<sup>th</sup> November and for the issues you have raised. Clearly it is very important to us to ensure our decision making is of a high quality and is also consistent so I do appreciate you taking the time to raise this matter with me.

Without the provision of specific examples (site addresses or planning references) it is difficult to address any potential individual inconsistencies but if you are willing to provide further details relating to specific sites I will be happy to look into them for you.

With regards to proposals for new fencing on open plan estates, our general approach is to consider the character and appearance of the area along with the specific site circumstances of any proposal and consider it on its own merits. As you are no doubt aware we need to consider what is already existing within the individual street-scene and the outcomes of any appeal decisions as well as all other material considerations for new development.

From briefly reviewing a number of recent cases I am confident our approach is consistent. If an estate has an open plan character we are unlikely to allow or permit any new fencing or walls that would have a detrimental effect on the open character of the estate, particularly where the proposal is further forward than the front elevation or it would enclose a front garden. We do seek to retain the open plan character of such an area and resist proposals which would harm the overall aesthetic or appearance unless there are good reasons to do so. Good reasons to do so might include the provision of identical (and lawful) development in close proximity or where an inspector has made comments, and amendments have been incorporated within a revised proposal. As you may also be aware the provision of a fence or wall up to 1m in height adjacent to the public highway more often than not does not require planning permission and therefore the authority would have little or no control where permitted development rights have been exercised in this way.

Where planning permission is required and new fencing has been recently approved by this department this appears to mostly relate to properties situated on a corner plot where the proposal is to secure the side and rear boundaries of the property. Where a new enclosure is being created we would seek to ensure that sites and properties are secured with green planting as much as possible, however, in some instances this is not possible or feasible. As I have noted in cases such as the recently approved, 8 Downsview Road (DC/18/1231), the proposed fencing does not protrude further forward than the front elevation of the building and has included the provision of planting/vegetation

in-front of the fencing in order to soften its impact. Whilst it may not always be possible to secure planting in such a location I am pleased that this approach has been taken in this case.

In general therefore I am confident that we are taking an approach which does seek to retain the open plan character of the estates within the district where planning permission is required. As stated above there may be many instances where the provision of boundary treatments do not require planning permission. These may well have an impact on the character and appearance of the area but as they are lawful it is not a matter the Council can control. Furthermore I am aware many open plan estates may be subject to covenants relating to boundary treatments. It should be noted that covenants are not a planning matter and planning has no jurisdiction over their control.

If there are any specific examples you would like me to look into, please do not hesitate to raise them with me otherwise I thank you for bringing this matter to my attention and I have already spoken to the Applications Team Leader to ensure a good awareness of your concerns in the future.

I hope that the above is clear and informative but if you do require any further assistance or clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely



Mrs Emma Parkes  
Head of Development

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 in order to promote a 30mph limit.**

2. 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 <b>below</b>	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.

## 3. 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.**

## 4. Advisory Limits

- 4.1 Advisory limits will only be used where formal (legal and enforceable) speed limits are not appropriate, or as part of a trial package of measures for speed management purposes. All advisory limits will require specific Cabinet Member approval, and will usually be limited to the following:
  - Temporary speed limits implemented for safety reasons in advance of a permanent formal speed limit;
  - School safety zones, where advisory limits of 20mph or 30mph may be applied in association with appropriate safety zone signing;
  - When used as warning signs for specific hazards, used in accordance with national guidance and as part of a road safety scheme.

4.2 Where advisory limits are applied the speed limit criteria may be relaxed from the values in Table 1 by the addition of 3mph to the normal values. (For example, an average speed of 26.9 would be the maximum for the assessment and application of a 20mph advisory limit.)

**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*.
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. (iii) Lengths of strategic rural roads identified as having high accident rates. 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) Suburban or rural single carriageways. (ii) Suburban dual carriageways with frequent junctions, or frontage / development access. Few vulnerable road users*, or segregated crossing facilities.

Note: \* Vulnerable road users include pedestrians (particularly children, the elderly and disabled), cyclists and equestrians.