

Report to	Norwich Joint Highways Agency Committee	Item
	28 November 2013	
Joint Report of	Interim Director of environment, transport and development (county) and Head of city development services (city)	8
Subject	Review of Speed Management Strategy for Norfolk	

Purpose

To seek the comments of this committee on the planned revisions to the speed management strategy for Norfolk.

Recommendation

To endorse the proposals in Section 2 and Appendix A for the review of speed management strategy in Norfolk and subsequent adoption of the strategy to support speed management in Norwich City.

Corporate and service priorities

The report helps to meet the corporate priority a safe and clean city and the service plan priority of reducing road casualties and encouraging modal shift

Financial implications

The adoption of the revised speed management strategy will have no direct effect on existing highway budgets

Ward/s: All wards

Cabinet member:

City Cllr Stonard – Environment, development and transport

County: Cllr David Harrison – Environment, transport, development and waste

Contact officers

City: Joanne Deverick Transportation & network manager 01603 212461

County: Dave Stephens Team Manager Network Management (Analysis & Safety) 01603 222311

Background documents

None

References

[Norfolk County Council - 3rd Local Transport Plan 2011 - 2026](#)

[Norfolk County Council - Transport Asset Management Plan](#)

[Norfolk County Council - Operational Network Management Plan](#)

[Strategies / Action Plans / Guidelines - Member Approved - The Highway Corridor](#)

[Publications and guidance for developers](#)

Report

1. In January 2013 the Department for Transport issued revised guidance on setting local speed limits. Officers from the County and City councils in association with Norfolk Police have reviewed the existing speed management strategy for Norfolk in light of this new guidance and a number of changes to the strategy are suggested.
2. Members of the Norfolk County Council Environment, Transport and Scrutiny Panel considered the revisions at it's' meeting on 26 September. A copy of their report which sets out in detail the planned revisions is attached as appendix 1.
3. With regard to the Norwich City area the primary issue in terms of speed management is the use of 20mph restrictions, be it signed only 20mph limits, 20mph zones and part time 20mph restrictions outside schools. These are discussed fully in paragraphs 2.12 to 2.27 of the Panel report.
4. In summary it is suggested that the focus for local transport plan funding should be in areas where there is a history of collisions resulting from inappropriate speed. This does not preclude 20mph restrictions being introduced in other areas where funding from non-highway sources is available. The strategy also calls for all new residential estates to have a design speed of 20mph.
5. Members are invited to comment on the proposed changes. Subject to the views expressed, the county's Cabinet will be asked to approve any formal changes required to the Council's 'A Speed Management Strategy for Norfolk'.

Report to ETD Overview and Scrutiny Panel 26 September 2013: Review of the Speed Management Strategy for Norfolk

1. Background

- 1.1. Norfolk County Council, as the local traffic authority, is responsible for determining local speed limits on the local network. Speed limits on the trunk roads in Norfolk, A11, A12 and A47, are the responsibility of the Highways Agency.
- 1.2. In March 2001 “A Speed Management Strategy For Norfolk” was published in association with Norfolk Police. Following new guidance on setting local speed limits issued in 2006 the Strategy was re-approved by Cabinet in September 2007 without any significant changes being made.
- 1.3. New guidance was issued by the Department for Transport (DfT) in January 2013 in Circular 01/2013 Setting Local Speed Limits. Officers have carried out a review of the current strategy in association with Norfolk Constabulary.
- 1.4. The new guidance emphasises that ‘the full range of speed management measures should always be considered before a new speed limit is introduced’ and sets out the principles and factors which should be taken into account.
- 1.5. Circular 01/2013 states:

‘The aim of speed management policies should be to achieve a safe distribution of speeds consistent with the speed limit that reflects the function of the road and the road environment. This should imply a mean speed appropriate to the prevailing road environment, and all vehicles moving at speeds below or at the posted speed limit, while having regard to the traffic conditions.’

‘A principal aim in determining appropriate limits should, therefore, be to provide a consistent message between speed limit and what the road looks like.’

‘Speed limits should be evidence-led and self-explaining and seek to reinforce peoples’s assessment of what is a safe speed to travel. They should encourage self-compliance. Speed limits should be seen by drivers as the maximum rather than a target speed.’
- 1.6. The new guidance issued by Government, as set out in Circular 01/2013 is consistent with the Council’s current approach as set out in ‘A Speed Management Strategy for Norfolk’, and presents no immediate requirement to change our approach other than to give consideration, going forward, to additional speed limits, with associated speed management actions.
- 1.7. Appendix A contains a schedule of the suggested changes to the wording used in ‘A Speed Management Strategy for Norfolk’. These changes include:
 - Removal of references and terms which are now superseded or out of date
 - Additions to and subtractions from the text to meet the requirements of the new government guidance
- 1.8. The full wording of the recommended document is contained in Appendix B. Subject to the views of Panel and the subsequent approval of Cabinet this wording will be

used to develop a web-based publication, including photographic and graphic aids.

2. **Implications of the new DfT guidance**

2.1. **Introduction**

This section sets out the implications of potential changes to the Strategy in response to the new guidance. Each issue is described and the level of impact on the Council's liabilities and resources is assessed as High, Moderate or Low. An officer comment on the implications for services in Norfolk is provided, followed by recommendations on the course to be followed.

- 2.2. **Priorities for action:** In the introduction section of Circular 01/2013, traffic authorities are asked to '*keep their speed limits under review with changing circumstances and to consider the introduction of more 20mph speed limits and zones, over time, in urban areas and built-up village streets that are primarily residential, to ensure greater safety for pedestrians and cyclists, using the criteria in Section 6*' of the Circular..

- 2.3. **Potential Impacts:** Could have a High impact on the Council's ability to retain its excellent record of reducing road casualties, in particular if resources are diverted from schemes with higher casualty reduction benefits.

- 2.4. **Officer Comment:** The Council's current strategy is consistent with the guidance, aims and principles of Circular 01/2013. Some traffic authorities in the UK are adopting policies which extend local 20mph speed restrictions over wide areas on urban residential streets. The Council has a proven successful track record, in partnership with other agencies, of reducing the severity and number of people hurt on roads in Norfolk, and in supporting and responding to communities that are worried about road safety. While the Council receives numerous requests to lower speed limits as a means of slowing traffic down within local communities across Norfolk. We do receive good feedback from those that we explain our current approach to. The Council has received requests to introduce area-wide 20mph speed restrictions in part no doubt as a response to the national '20s Plenty' campaign, which seeks for local authorities to implement a default 20mph speed limit in built up areas (further assessment of 20mph area wide restrictions is included later in this report).

- 2.5. The current strategy allows new speed limits to be considered where existing conditions are appropriate or where there is a history of road casualties which can be addressed with a balance of speed management measures, and funding is available. In other locations there are likely to be significant costs to the Council to assess and implement new schemes. Resources are currently being targeted to achieve reductions in reported road casualties.

2.6. **Recommendations:**

- 1) The Council should continue to prioritise schemes which target reductions in killed and serious injuries (KSI) and should not therefore divert resources to area-wide 20mph speed restrictions which offer little benefit in this regard.
- 2) Where funding is available to promote area-wide 20mph schemes, the current approach includes for this. The wording of the Strategy should be amended to include the wider benefits of such schemes as given in Circular

01/2013.

- 2.7. **Speed limit assessment framework:** A recommendation to use the previous framework (Circular 01/2006) for the assessment of speed limit options on rural single carriageway roads is now withdrawn. A new speed limit appraisal tool is provided by Government to help Local Authorities assess the full costs and benefits of any proposed schemes and to satisfy themselves that the expected benefits exceed the costs.
- 2.8. Many of the costs and benefits do not have monetary values associated with them, but the guidance recommends traffic authorities should include an assessment of the following:
- collision and casualty savings
 - conditions and facilities for vulnerable road users
 - impacts on walking and cycling and other modal shift
 - congestion and journey time reliability
 - environmental, community and quality of life impact, such as emissions, severance, visual impact, and noise/vibration.
 - costs of engineering and other physical measures including signing, maintenance and cost of enforcement.
- 2.9. **Potential Impact:** Moderate, both in terms of diversion of resources and the Council's ability to reduce road casualties.
- 2.10. **Officer Comment:** Application of the new appraisal tool could increase costs in terms of data collection and officer time, which could mean fewer speed limit schemes can be programmed. Tests carried out using the new Speed Limit Appraisal Tool have indicated that the results would generally concur with the Council's current approach.
- 2.11. **Recommendation:**
- 3) The Council should continue with its current approach to setting intervention levels, and use the Speed Limit Appraisal Tool only in more specific circumstances where a more detailed assessment is required.
- 2.12. **Urban Speed Limits:** The guidance is for traffic authorities to give more consideration to wider benefits such as quality of life, community benefits, modal shift and environment alongside safety and casualty reduction.
- 2.13. Traffic Authorities are able to use their powers to introduce 20mph limits or zones on major streets and residential streets, and the guidance remains to give case by case consideration of the full range of options for 20mph schemes.
- 2.14. There is support for 20mph limits over larger numbers of roads if current speeds are appropriate, but support for City-wide schemes is more muted.
- 2.15. There remains the requirement for urban 20mph schemes to be made self-enforcing. Alongside physical traffic calming measures there is an added roundel marking which is now approved for use in a 20mph zones.
- 2.16. **Potential Impact:** Could have a High impact on the Council's ability to retain its excellent record of reducing road casualties, in particular if resources are diverted

from schemes with higher casualty reduction benefits.

- 2.17. **Officer Comment:** Current practice seeks to maintain compliance with posted urban speed limits. The requirement that 20mph restrictions are made self-enforcing and that they are supported with an appropriate character and appearance of the road environment is likely to make such schemes costly to implement and to maintain.
- 2.18. The national '20s Plenty' campaign advocates that local authorities implement a blanket approach to lower speeds in built up area to 20mph. The Council's current speed management strategy does not support the use of 'blanket' speed restrictions. If, over time, the use of such restrictions should become a norm elsewhere, particularly in large built-up areas, then Norfolk could be considered out of step with other parts of country. However this would not have a major impact in Norfolk due to:
- 1) Many urban and other built-up areas in Norfolk can be treated for 20mph restrictions under the Council's current approach.
 - 2) The extent of urban area is relatively low in Norfolk, and it therefore has a different character to other parts of England.
 - 3) As general driver behaviour develops, more areas could become suited to 20mph limits based on lower actual speeds being recorded.

Within Norfolk at present, the commitment of funds to implementation of 'blanket' 20mph schemes would not offer good value for money compared to other targeted measures to reduce casualties. However the Council's current strategy supports the use of incremental changes which can impact on compliance over time, as funding opportunities allow.

2.19. **Recommendations:**

- 4) The Council should continue with its current approach which considers the full range of speed management measures as set out in the document at Appendix B
- 5) Where funding is identified the Council should consider schemes with wider benefits than casualty reduction or reductions in through traffic, particularly in existing residential areas.

Note – a good example of this is the recent successful Cycle City Ambition Grant application

- 2.20. **20mph speed restrictions outside schools:** The new guidance introduces a new power for Local Authorities to introduce Variable 20mph speed limits. It states that "*These variable limits may be particularly relevant where for example a school is located on a road that is not suitable for a full time 20mph zone or limit*". Part time mandatory speed limits may be introduced with Variable Message Signs (VMS) and associated Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO). A lower cost alternative is an advisory part-time 20mph sign with flashing school warning lights.
- 2.21. **Potential Impact:** High both in terms of resources and casualty reduction benefits – if a 'blanket' approach to provision of 20mph restrictions outside all schools in Norfolk is adopted.
- 2.22. **Officer Comment:** An assessment has been done of the scope to provide 20mph restrictions outside schools in Norfolk. This is seen as an important move to

address the concerns of residents and schools about the safety of children, and to encourage more walking and cycling to and from school.

- 2.23. It would cost in the region of £3.75 million to treat all schools in Norfolk. This is unaffordable within current budget of a £2 million per annum Highways Capital Programme. In addition there will be on-going revenue cost increases, although these have not been quantified.
- 2.24. The previous Cabinet Member for Planning and Transportation approved funding to provide 20mph restrictions for 5 schools in 2013-14 at a cost of £50,000. Appendix C includes an assessment of sites and factors used to determine priorities for spending this money.
- 2.25. Road traffic incidents outside schools in Norfolk are uncommon and do not generally meet the criteria for prioritised interventions to target casualty reduction. Nevertheless there is a perception that speed and congestion can be a barrier to walking and cycling to school, as well as preventing people from feeling safe.
- 2.26. Norfolk County Council carried out a trial of providing advisory 20mph speed limits with flashing school signs in 2008/9. These generally met with a favourable community response, and some moderate reductions in average speeds were observed during peak times. However, whilst Members were happy with the outcome of the trial they decided that a roll-out to all schools was unaffordable.
- 2.27. **Recommendations:**
- 6) The Council should allocate the £50,000 approved funding for 2013-14 based on the information provided in Appendix C.
 - 7) Further allocations of funding should be determined on the basis of evidence that the measures would address known casualty cluster or risk sites, and should consider the full range of speed management measures.
- 2.28. **The use of average speed cameras for urban speed limits:** Circular 01/2013 states:
- ‘Traffic authorities are already free to use additional measures in 20 mph limits to achieve compliance, such as some traffic calming measures and vehicle activated signs, or safety cameras. Average speed cameras may provide a useful tool for enforcing compliance with urban speed limits’.*
- 2.29. The guidance gives no further steer as to whether average speed camera enforcement should be adopted, which suggests that each local traffic authority can take its own view on this matter.
- 2.30. **Potential Impact:** Moderate impact on the Council’s ability to retain its excellent record of reducing road casualties, in particular if resources are diverted from schemes with higher casualty reduction benefits.
- 2.31. **Officer comment:** Enforcement of speed limits is a matter for the police. In Norfolk the use of enforcement cameras is managed via a Safety Camera Partnership involving Council staff alongside police. Whilst it is possible that a business model

for use of average speed cameras in urban areas could be developed under the SCP, or through other arrangements, this has not been identified as a priority at this time.

- 2.32. Whilst some would point to the highly effective performance of average speed cameras in managing speeds, the majority of motorists who would be detected as committing offences are likely to be from within the community whose roads would be managed. This raises an issue of what kind of council we wish to be perceived as:
- One which intervenes heavily on the side of the community to address the behaviour of individual road users, or
 - One that encourages positive actions and attitudes without being over-bearing in its dealings with individual members of the community.
- 2.33. The police have given a view that use of average speed cameras could be supported if the circumstances are considered to warrant their use. They are likely to involve high capital costs and might be expected to cover maintenance costs through the revenues generated from Fixed Penalty Notices (FPN).
- 2.34. The benefits in terms of casualty reduction are unlikely to be significant; however they could offer significant community reassurance and support the wider benefits of urban speed limits.
- 2.35. **Recommendations:**
- 8) The Council should consider the use of average speed cameras, supported by the police within the Norfolk Safety Camera Partnership, as part of use of the full range of speed management measures in urban areas.
 - 9) In taking forward any scheme which envisages the deployment of average speed cameras in urban 20mph or 30mph speed limits, there should be a full public and stakeholder consultation which allows the community and Members to consider in full the issues associated with their use.
- 2.36. **Quiet Lanes and Home Zones:** Specific reference to these has been removed from the Circular 01/2013, although the guidance remains in the form of Traffic Advisory Leaflets (TAL). These are TAL 8/02. Home Zones – Public Participation and TAL 3/04. Quiet Lanes.
- 2.37. Circular 01/2013 invites applications for zonal rural speed limits. These would usually be 40mph zones in national parks or Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), or on other networks of minor rural roads where speeds are already in line with such a limit. Such zones would include entry treatment and painted repeater roundels, as a potential means to reduce speeds and signing requirements.
- 2.38. **Potential Impact:** Low, both in terms of resources and casualty reduction benefits.
- 2.39. **Officer Comment:**
- Home Zones are principally an issue for new development and are covered in the Council's guidance to developers.
- 2.40. Quiet Lanes are a special treatment for quiet roads in rural areas which mainly serve the local communities and are used for recreational as well as travel purposes. Two

areas of Quiet Lanes are established in Norfolk. No further requests to consider new areas or extensions to exiting areas of Quiet Lanes have been made to the Council.

- 2.41. The Council has achieved high recognition for its pursuit of innovative safety improvements, including Quiet Lanes and the Rural Demonstration Project. There is scope within Norfolk to identify a rural zonal speed limit trial area. The most suitable area from an initial review is in the North Norfolk coastal area. Initially a study would be required to determine the extents, costs and benefits of this.

2.42. **Recommendations:**

- 10) References to Home Zones and Quiet Lanes can be removed from the Strategy, as per Appendix A.
- 11) Where there may be significant benefits in terms of reduced speeds, reduced signing or casualty reductions, and funding can be identified, the Council should apply to the DfT to trial rural zonal speed limits.

3. **Resource Implications**

- 3.1. **Finance:** The Council's current speed management strategy is delivered within existing resources. Any changes, in particular those advocating a 'blanket' approach to the introduction of 20mph speed restrictions, would require additional capital and revenue funding commensurate with the nature of the schemes that would arise.

- 3.2. **Staff** : None

- 3.3. **Property** : None

- 3.4. **IT** : None

4. **Other Implications**

- 4.1. **Legal Implications:** Any change to a speed limit requires a statutory process of which public consultation plays a strong part however, the final decision will be made by Norfolk County Council as the Highway Authority.

There are no particular legal implications arising as a result of the new guidance.

- 4.2. **Human Rights** : None

- 4.3. **Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA):** The recommendations in this report do not introduce worse conditions for vulnerable road users or those with impairments.

- 4.4. **Communications:** Information on the Council's current approach is widely available, mainly via the NCC web-site. This will be maintained. Specific changes which may come forward involve statutory Traffic Regulation Order processes which include consultation with stakeholders and the public.

- 4.5. **Health and Safety Implications:** Our campaigns, such as 'Keep Your Mind on The Road' re-inforce the shared responsibilities we all have for road safety.

- 4.6. **Environmental Implications:** Effective speed management can enhance an area. Residential areas can be more accessible to the vulnerable road user and more suited to walking and cycling. Town centres can thrive with speed managed to reduce the priority of motorised vehicles and help pedestrians feel comfortable and

safer. The emissions of both carbon dioxide and nitrogen oxide increase with the speed of traffic along with noise and vibration. At lower speeds, drivers are less likely to vigorously accelerate and if vehicles are more constant in their speed, pollutants such as particulates are lowered.

- 4.7. **Any other implications:** Officers have considered all the implications which members should be aware of. Apart from those listed in the report (above), there are no other implications to take into account.

5. **Section 17 – Crime and Disorder Act**

- 5.1. Driving in excess of the legal speed limit is a criminal offence. The Council's current approach is to maximise the levels of compliance with posted speed limits thereby minimising reliance on police enforcement and use of the criminal justice system, whilst targeting road casualty reductions and addressing community concerns about speeding traffic. The Council's current approach is supported by the police and Norfolk Constabulary were involved in the review findings detailed in this report.

Recommendation / Action Required

- | | |
|-----|---|
| (i) | Members are invited to comment on the review findings and recommendations as set out in Appendix A and in Section 2 |
|-----|---|

APPENDIX A

Schedule of Amendments to 'A Speed Management Strategy for Norfolk', 2001

Amendment	Comment
Format	The text has been re-written to suit publication via the website rather than in paper format.
Speed and Safety Issues.	Changes to wording of the strategy document to reflect that this is now an established basis for setting speed limits and supporting speed management.
The Norfolk Strategy	Addition of Transport Asset Management Plan and Operational Network management Plan as key reference documents. Explanation of relevant factors included in the text.
Setting Appropriate Speed Limits	<p>Section title amended to 'Setting Local Speed Limits'</p> <p>Explanation of Principal and Main Distributor Routes with ref to TAMP included.</p> <p>Ref to business viewpoint removed. Economic and environmental effects substituted.</p> <p>Minor changes to update wording.</p>
Part-time 20mph Speed Limits – Outside Schools	<p>No prior approval required for mandatory part-time limits.</p> <p>Reference to Safer and Healthier Routes to School removed.</p>
Other Roads in Residential Areas	Replace 'improve safety/reduce through traffic outside schools' with 'support the

	local economy, encourage sustainable local travel, improve the quality of life in our communities and contribute to wider public health outcomes’.
Home Zones	Removed – no longer included in Circular 01/2013
Quiet Lanes	Removed – no longer included in Circular 01/2013
ACTION AND INTERVENTION LEVELS	Significant re-write to reflect actual practice. COMPLIANCE/ACCIDENTS removed.
DESIGNING FOR SPEED MANAGEMENT MEASURES	Title amended to SPEED MANAGEMENT MEASURES Reference to community delivery eg Community Speedwatch included
Speed Reactive Signs (SRS)	Updated Permanent SRS and temporary SRS included.
Enforcement Cameras	Updated
Speed Limits	‘Policy’ replaced with ‘framework’ Additional words on isolated hazards and

	need to consider full range of measures before a new speed limit.
Speed Limit Warning Signs	This measure is moved up to Persuasion Measures.
Gateway Schemes	<p>This measure is moved up to Persuasion Measures.</p> <p>Measure retained as a useful additional feature, provided maintenance liability is met by parish. Allows enhancement through planting etc.</p>
On Street Parking	No changes
Pinch Point/Chicanes	No changes
Contrasting Colour Surfacing	No changes
Ramps, Humps and Cushions	No changes
The Self-Explaining Road (SER)	<p>Moved to end of Persuasion Measures.</p> <p>Ref to Safe Systems included.</p> <p>Ref to urban centres as well as villages.</p>
20mph Zones	<p>New section added.</p> <p>Includes updated guidance on use of signing/road markings alongside physical measures.</p>
Education, Training and Publicity (ETP)	Updated information provided with link to current web-pages for this part of the service.
Speed Enforcement	Updated information provided by Norfolk Constabulary

APPENDIX B

NORFOLK SPEED MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

Norfolk County Council

(in association with Norfolk Constabulary)

DRAFT

August 2013

Officer contact: Dave Stephens, 222311

CONTENTS – To be published as web-pages

Speed Management Issues

The Norfolk Speed Management Strategy

Setting Local Speed Limits

Action and Intervention Levels

Speed Management Measures

Education, Training and Publicity

Speed Enforcement

SPEED MANAGEMENT ISSUES

Introduction

Norfolk County Council as local traffic authority is responsible for setting speed limits on local roads. The Norfolk road network needs to support a local transport system that promotes economic growth, is safe for all road users and improves the quality of life in our communities. Since the introduction of “A speed management strategy for Norfolk 2001” many improvements to roads and junctions have been carried out to promote these aims.

Road Safety

The relationship between speed and road casualties is complex, but there is overwhelming evidence that lower speeds result in fewer collisions and less severe injuries.

Speed management has contributed to a considerable reduction of road collisions in Norfolk with a reduction in killed and seriously injured (KSI) from 862 to 353 over the period 2000 to 2010. This represents a 59% reduction over that 10 year period. Whilst national targets for road safety were withdrawn in 2011, the Council chose to retain a strong focus on casualty reduction and adopted the following Key Performance Indicators in the Service Plan:

Aims: Reduce the number and severity of road traffic casualties on roads in Norfolk. Increase public confidence that journeys by foot, cycle or vehicular means will be safe.

Targets – By December 2020 to:-

- 1) Reduce the number of killed or seriously injured on Norfolk roads to 310 or fewer
- 2) Reduce the number of motorcyclists killed or seriously injured on Norfolk roads to 74 or fewer

- 3) Reduce the number of children killed or seriously injured on Norfolk roads to 22 or fewer

In addition Norfolk Constabulary have targets which relate to the numbers of collisions on the roads which result in KSI casualties.

The new guidelines from the Department for Transport (DfT) on “Setting local Speed Limits” (Circular 01/2013) reinforces our own approach to date, with a new emphasis given to consideration of the full range of options to enhance the environment and quality of life.

Speed limits form one distinct element of speed management. They should be considered alongside other speed management measures including engineering, enforcement and education. Roads in residential areas and urban centres need to be designed for all road users and raise the driver’s awareness of their environment.

Traffic speed interacts strongly with the local environment and the public perception of road safety. With the correct environment, sustainable forms of transport such as walking and cycling are encouraged.

Economic Considerations

Efficient transport systems are essential to the economy and vibrancy of Norfolk. Road traffic is essential to move people and goods for business, pleasure and work,. The economic health of the county relies on the reliability and effectiveness of the road network, and correct speed management helps to address this.

Traffic collisions and injuries are expensive to the county, not only in monetary terms but in human suffering and social impacts. Following the publication of the Strategic Framework for Road Safety (DfT, February 2011), local highway authorities can report on the cost of road casualties and this will be included in the new Highway Network Annual Operational Performance Report.

Evidence suggests that when traffic is travelling at constant speeds, even at a lower level, it may result in shorter and more reliable overall journey times, and that journey time savings from higher speed are often overestimated.

At present when resources for road improvements are limited, the value of proposed improvements must be assessed. However many of the benefits of speed management such as environmental, community and quality of life impact do not have monetary values, but still need to be considered.

Effective speed management is part of creating a safe road environment and helps ensure the road is suited to the functions it supports

The Environment

Effective speed management can enhance an area. Residential areas can be more accessible to the vulnerable road user and more suited to walking and cycling. Town centres can thrive with speed managed to reduce the priority of motorised vehicles and help pedestrians feel comfortable and safer.

The emissions of both carbon dioxide and nitrogen oxide increase with the speed of traffic along with noise and vibration. At lower speeds, drivers are less likely to vigorously accelerate and if vehicles are more constant in their speed, pollutants such as particulates are lowered.

THE NORFOLK SPEED MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

This strategy has been developed taking the following County Council policies and strategies into consideration:

- The Local Transport Plan (LTP3)
- Transport Asset Management Plan (TAMP)
- Operational Network Management Plan (ONMP)
- The Highway Corridor
- The Norfolk Residential Design Guide.

The strategy remains a 'living document' and this updated version takes account of the new guidance issued by the DfT in Circular 01/2013, as well as changes in technology and society over the period since the last review. This period has seen significant progress in reducing road casualties on Norfolk roads, as well as changes in way national and local government, the police, and other stakeholders are now engaging with each other and the wider community to continue this progress.

This strategy therefore must be able to support an on-going delivery of actions by a range of stakeholders, based on a shared approach to the provision of:

- Speed limits
- Measures to reduce speed
- Education and publicity
- Speed Enforcement

This strategy offers a framework for the setting of local speed limits and deciding how and under what circumstances action should be taken to reduce speeds. Some aspects of roads policy which are of particular relevance to the setting of local speed limits include:

- Road Types – rural/urban, built-up/ non built-up
- Route Hierarchy – A-roads, B-roads, C- and U-roads
- Function (uses) – Movement, Access and Place, or mixed uses
- Standard – improved/unimproved
- Environment – schools, shops, vulnerable road users, etc
- Collision and Casualty History – numbers, rates and densities of KSI casualties
- Compliance – existing mean and 85th percentile speeds

Going forward the assessments of any new speed limits will be able to make use of the new Speed Limit Appraisal Tool to help us to assess the full costs and benefits of any proposed schemes.

In association with the police, Norfolk County Council, remains committed to keeping speed management and speed limits under review in order to:

- Maintain good levels of understanding, acceptance and compliance with speed restrictions in Norfolk
- Develop route management strategies which meet the needs of road users, and improve quality of life for local communities
- Encourage self-compliance, with speed limits seen by drivers as the maximum rather than a target speed
- Improve road safety

Over time, there is also an aim to provide a consistent message between the speed limit and what the road looks like.

Whilst it is believed that this strategy goes a long way to achieving this aim, improvement is always possible and your views in respect of this strategy are always most welcome.

SETTING LOCAL SPEED LIMITS

Introduction

The framework for setting local speed limits in Norfolk is set out below. This framework has been used to set speed limits depending on the road purpose and environment, in accordance with the Norfolk Speed Management Strategy. Targeted action is taken through publicity, enforcement and engineering/ environmental measures, to achieve improved levels of compliance, reduce collisions and casualties, and also to respond to public concerns about speed issues.

Principal Roads and Main Distributor Routes

These are typically the A and B roads in Norfolk which carry traffic between the larger settlements, or are major urban network links for short – medium distance traffic. Some C roads are also included in these categories as described in the Transport Asset Management Plan (TAMP)

Not passing through settlements

Drivers on routes that link larger settlements will expect to be able to make progress at reasonable speeds within the national speed limits. Restrictions on speed should therefore be considered carefully, with the economic and environmental effects taken into account. In some circumstances a reduction from the national limit would be appropriate such as where the collision rate is above the average for the type of road and specific measures to address the problems cannot be identified. Such limits should be set at a level appropriate to the geometric standard of the road and so that the need for it is self-evident to motorists, or signing is used indicating that it is for accident reduction purposes.

Passing through settlements

The risk of collision increases within settlements and the selected speed limit should be appropriate to the potential dangers. Likely areas of concern within settlements

will include junctions, private accesses, local facilities (shops, post office, schools, PHs, etc.), pedestrian activity (crossing the road, walking on footways, walking on the carriageways). In general, as the size of the settlement increases so too do the numbers of potential hazards. The need for a lower speed limit is therefore self-evident and reducing speed accordingly is accepted by motorists.

Moving traffic, particular at higher speeds, gives rise to severance and affects the quality of life in communities. A balance has to be struck between the needs of the community and the needs of motorists, particularly where roads are the main traffic routes in the County.

In order not to confront drivers with too many changes in speed limits it is suggested that they should be of at least 800m in length, with reductions to

400m as buffer zones or if the settlement is too small and provided the exit terminal signs are not visible at the entry point.

Suggested criteria for speed limits on Principal and Main Distributor Roads

In deciding upon a speed limit the issues to be considered should include the following:

National Speed Limit Roads (60mph)

- no facilities - shops, schools etc.
- only limited frontage development
- individual houses/small group(s) not exceeding 400m overall length
- roads of suitable standard

50mph Speed Limit

- few facilities - shops, filling station, PH, etc.
- almost entirely frontage development exceeding 400m overall length

- few junctions
- limited pedestrian/cycle activity
- limited reasons to cross the road
- roads of suitable standard for 50mph, particularly forward visibility

40 mph Speed Limit

- settlement has shop(s), school(s), PH, filling station etc.
- significant development on both sides of road, but not necessarily continuous, with some development in depth, overall frontage exceeds 400m in length
- junctions
- some pedestrian/cycle activity throughout the day with possible peaks associated with schools etc.
- some provision for pedestrians/cyclists or acknowledged need and possible warning signs
- lengths of road that more closely fit the conditions for a 50 mph limit but where the standard of road/forward visibility is more appropriate to 40 mph

30 mph Speed Limit

- settlement has a clearly defined core - town centre shopping area, village green, etc.
- numerous facilities generating pedestrian/cycle activity - schools, shops, PH, play areas, etc.
- almost continuous frontage development exceeding 400m in length
- significant development in depth
- numerous junctions
- significant pedestrian activity throughout the day with provision of footways and or crossings
- refer to the Norfolk Residential Design Guide (7.0 Design Details) for application

20 mph Speed Limit

- these limits would be appropriate in areas of high concentrations of vulnerable road users, such as in busy shopping areas or some village centres and residential areas
- the Norfolk Residential Design Guide sets out the approach which aims at 20mph for Feeder and Access Roads. These design speeds should be an integral part of housing estate layouts (see below and Chapter 7 of the Design Guide for more details)

Part-time 20 mph Speed Limits - Outside Schools

- consideration should be given to imposing 20mph restrictions at periods of high activity to avoid motorists being unnecessarily restricted.
- mandatory part-time limits can be implemented with timed variable message signs. This makes such schemes expensive compared to advisory part-time 20 mph limits which can use static signing
- such advisory speed limits would be appropriate in school zone areas in conjunction with other measures to support safety for school journeys.

HGV Access Routes, Access Routes

Not passing through settlements

While the speed limit on these routes should normally be the national speed limit (60mph), there may be circumstances where a lower limit would be appropriate such as where the collision rate is above the average for the type of road and no specific measures to address the problems can be identified or where special policies apply (e.g. Norfolk Coast Transport Strategy). Where such a lower limit is introduced the limit should be appropriate to the geometric standard of the road so that the need for it is self evident to motorists, or signing is used to explain that it is for accident reduction purposes.

Passing through settlements

The issues here are similar to those for settlements on the Principal Roads and Main Distributor Routes network. However, in most cases the traffic flows are much lower and it is possible to give more priority to protecting local communities. The norm should be that these settlements are covered by a 30 mph limit; with the possibility of 20 mph limits in the immediate vicinity of schools or areas with concentrations of vulnerable road users.

Town/City centre roads

The aim of any traffic management system in a town centre should be ensure that pedestrians can move about with relative ease and safety and hence facilitate a vibrant town centre. In this context a Town Centre refers to street(s) which contain a predominance of commercial/retail premises with significant numbers of vulnerable road users. Measures must not be detrimental to the visual environment and where possible should make a positive contribution to it. It is suggested that the existing national standard of 30 mph should be the norm with provision of sufficient pedestrian crossing facilities. 20 mph zones may also be considered for implementation in Town Centres. This means that Town Centres containing a Main Distributor or Access Road would be restricted by the 20 mph zone if one was present.

New Roads in Residential Areas

Current County Council guidance to potential developers (in the Norfolk Residential Design Guide) recommends that residential roads other than residential link roads within large developments be designed to 20 mph or lower speeds.

Existing Roads in Residential Areas

- **Spine Roads in Residential Areas**

These should be restricted to 30 mph, with a 20 mph limit considered outside schools or shopping parades and pedestrian crossings to local facilities or on routes to schools to address specific hazards.

- **Cul-de-sacs in Residential Areas**

The Norfolk Residential Design Guide suggests that such roads be designed to 12 mph though since no Traffic Order can be drafted to provide such a speed limit such roads should certainly be restricted to 20 mph.

- **Other Roads in Residential Areas**

While these are included within the blanket 30 mph limit covering residential areas there are likely to be limited safety benefits arising from the introduction of a 20 mph limit. However, such limits should be promoted as part of an area wide scheme to support the local economy, encourage sustainable local travel, improve the quality of life in our communities and contribute to wider public health outcomes.

ACTION AND INTERVENTION LEVELS

Introduction

The basis of the Norfolk Speed Management Strategy is to both set appropriate speed limits and achieve a reasonable level of driver compliance with those limits. Each of the two aspects are relevant in deciding what action may be needed.

Potential or proposed changes to speed limits should be based on the following assessments:

1. What is the function of the highway corridor and the surrounding environment? A balance needs to be struck between 'movement', 'access' and 'place' functions. Where the former predominates, the economic benefits of continued progress at a reasonable speed are priorities and a higher speed limit is likely to be more appropriate. Where ease of access or a sense of place are of greater importance, quality of life and social interaction may benefit from a lower speed limit.
2. Casualty numbers. Are the accident rate and/or severity pattern higher than expected?. Lower standard rural routes and mixed use urban and village streets are typical areas where this may be the case. A lower speed limit or interventions to improve existing speed limit compliance may be appropriate.
3. The need to increase walking and/or cycling and whether a lower speed limit would help encourage this. Whilst likely to apply in urban areas and in the vicinity of schools this may also warrant consideration in tourism-based or National Park areas.

The aim of all speed limits should be to achieve good compliance. Where a speed limit is set too low and is 'out of kilter' with a drivers' perceptions' of a reasonable, safe speed compliance is likely to be poor. If unrealistic low speed limits are widespread, this leads to a lack of respect and poor compliance with speed limits in general.

However, there will also be locations where a drivers' speeds are too high for the prevailing local environment and further intervention is required to achieve good compliance with the existing or a lower speed limit.

In many cases the decision to introduce a new speed limit can be supported using the assessment principles above. For cases where the decision may be harder to evidence or may be subject to challenge from other stakeholders, the Department for Transport has issued a [Speed Limit Appraisal Tool](#) which can be used to provide a more detailed assessment.

SPEED MANAGEMENT MEASURES

Introduction

The management of speed on the highway falls generally into two types of measure. They are:

- **Persuasion Measures** - Techniques which seek to influence the driver's perception indirectly to bring about a reduction in speed.
- **Physical Measures** - Techniques which directly influence the driver's behaviour to bring about a reduction in speed.

The full range of speed management measures should be considered within the design of the highway and implemented through programmed improvements. In addition, some persuasion measures can be delivered by others, including the communities themselves, working under the supervision of the police or Council staff.

All signing on the highway must comply with the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions (TSRGD) 2002 but the dimensions and frequency of signs should be designed to suit the location.

This section describes the range of measures used in Norfolk, which help to manage speeds through a combination of persuasion and physical control.

Speed Limit Warning Signs

Where existing speed limits are ignored by motorists there may be some merit in experimenting with temporary 'reminder signs' which could be erected in parishes if justified concerns about non-compliance were raised.

Yellow rectangular backing boards are often used to give added emphasis, or to address road safety concerns. However, they can be very intrusive and should only be used as a last resort. If there are problems with the visibility of a sign to drivers, the first step is to consider if the sign is in the right place and is the right size. A less intrusive way of increasing visibility might be to use a sign that is one size larger, rather than adding a backing board, however research has shown that larger speed limit signs are unlikely to have a lasting impact on drivers if the speed limit is inappropriate for the road.

Unnecessary use of backing boards can also negate the feature of a sign that makes it stand out and if too many signs have yellow backing boards, the highlighting effect is lost.

The existing County Council policy document 'The Highway Corridor' recommends that sign proliferation (including speed limit signs) in rural areas must be minimised at all times to prevent urbanisation. In rural areas,

DfT will now consider allowing trials of 40mph zones with reduced signing requirements. This could benefit sensitive areas such as national parks. DfT will consider issuing site specific authorisations in response to requests from local authorities.

Gateway Schemes

Monitoring of gateway schemes to date suggests that these schemes have only a minimal impact in speed management terms when used in isolation.

Where the speed limit commences at the village boundary, the village nameplate sign and speed limit roundel may be mounted together. The combined sign should be located at the point where the speed limit starts, and it may be helpful if drivers can see housing at the same time as the signs, reinforcing the visual message for reduced speed.

In combination with other speed management measures the gateway features provide a useful element in toolbox of persuasion measures. However they are a liability, and will be supported only where a parish council is willing to maintain them. Support is available via the Parish Rangers and the Council will maintain the speed roundels which are legal requirement.

This measure provides parishes with a means to buy-in to speed management in their village, and an opportunity to enhance the impact of persuasion effects through the addition of planting etc.

Speed Reactive Signs

In Norfolk there are currently around 500 signs across the county and warn of specific hazards such as bends or are implemented as part of a speed limit to provide further

reinforcement. Advances in technology have enabled these signs to be more compact, brighter and efficient. They can be linked to vehicle detection radar to tackle very specific issues as part of a package of speed management tools.

While such signs should only be used where they will be effective, ie, where a reduction in speed can be expected, in Norfolk the signs perform very well and can assist in achieving better compliance with speed limits or to influence speeds at hazards such as bends and junctions. The signs are also particularly useful in environmentally sensitive areas and can be self-sufficient in generating the power they need, thereby avoiding intrusive and costly excavation.

Further applications have now been introduced in school safety zones as we now have powers to introduce 20 mph speed limits that apply only at certain times of day. These variable limits are particularly relevant where for example a school is located on a road that is not suitable for a full-time 20 mph zone or limit, such as a major through road.

Permanent speed reactive signs are seen as an effective measure in Norfolk, and we have expanded their use through such initiatives as the Parish Partnerships programme. However there is a concern that over-use of this measure could lead to diminishing effectiveness over time and we are keeping this under review.

Temporary speed reactive equipment is also deployed in Norfolk in response to community safety concerns. The SAM and SAM2 systems provide a temporary Speed Activated Message (SAM) system which can be moved from location to location to provide enhanced persuasion for drivers at problem sites. SAM2 is also used by Community Speed Watch volunteer groups under the direction of police.

The 'Self-Explaining' Road (SER)

Some of the physical measures described in the following section force the road user to reduce speed - but they may also reinforce the idea of priority for motorists. Another approach is to re-design the road environment in order that drivers are persuaded to reduce speed voluntarily. This technique is called the 'Self Explaining' Road. In essence the 'Self Explaining' Roads (SERs) concept advocates a traffic environment that elicits safe behaviour simply by its design. By designing a road environment that accords with the actual speed limit drivers could be persuaded to choose that

appropriate driving speed more or less automatically.

This approach to speed reduction and traffic management is informed by the Safe Systems approach to road safety, which refers to the four components of the System as:

- Road Users
- Vehicles
- Roads and roadsides
- Speed Limits

The Self-Explaining Road approach involves looking at the last two of the components in combination to achieve a consistent message between speed limit and what the road looks like.

The SER approach should be employed particularly within the villages and urban centre environments by influencing driver behaviour through 'softer' engineering options such as changing road surfacing and the removal of visually intrusive signs and lines.

Such schemes are significantly cheaper than schemes employing 'harder' engineering measures such as ramps, speed humps, and tables.

Such measures are incorporated into the design of new housing developments where possible as the principle of self-enforcing driver behaviour as a result of an appropriately designed environment is an important aim of speed management policy.

Speed Limits

Speed limits will be set in accordance with the framework detailed in Chapter 1 of this document. Speed Limits should not be used to attempt to solve the problem of isolated hazards, for example a single road junction or reduced forward visibility such as at a bend, since speed limits are difficult to enforce over such a short length. The full range of speed management measures should be considered before a new speed limit is introduced.

On Street Parking

When considering the need for waiting restrictions it is necessary to assess the potential impact on vehicle speeds, and managed parking could assist in speed reduction in streets. It is considered, therefore, that waiting restrictions should not be introduced where there is a likelihood that vehicle speeds would increase significantly or where the perceived traffic calming benefits would be out-weighted by the increase in traffic speed creating a consequential reduction in the overall safety of vulnerable road users.

Pinch Points/Chicanes

Many motorists appear to find pinch points/ priority working/chicanes to be confusing. The pinch points often appear to look like 'after thoughts' to the design process. They are prone to vandalism and if not well maintained can look untidy. For these reasons it is considered that, in general, these measures should be avoided. Where they are necessary, however, they should be designed to complement the streetscape or surroundings in which they will be placed by the use of appropriate materials which are robust and generally vandal resistant.

Contrasting Colour Surfacing

In view of the very high environmental impact of this measure and subsequent maintenance costs it is considered that coloured surface treatment should not generally be used for traffic schemes except when:

- other accident remedial measures have been considered or tried or been unsuccessful;
- used as part of a larger more comprehensive traffic management scheme;
- on restricted sections of traffic lanes which require stronger visual designation/
- separation for specific purposes i.e. cycle lanes, advance stop areas or bus lanes;

- or
- in significant vehicle/vehicle conflict zones at junctions.

If, after further consideration and deliberation, a colour is considered necessary, for example to emphasise School Zones, Village Zones (as in the Self-Explaining Road) then only coloured aggregate will be considered.

Coloured surface screeds will not be considered acceptable due to their poor performance, high initial cost and poor maintenance record. In environmentally sensitive areas consideration must be given to their visual impact and the use of other materials may be permitted to achieve the change of colour.

Ramps, Humps and Cushions

Because of their physical presence on the highway these measures have proved very successful in reducing vehicle speeds and accidents for vulnerable road users. There are, however, a number of significant disbenefits that include:

- increased maintenance costs;
- possible increase in vehicular noise particularly HGVs'.
- can lead to an increase emissions if drivers use inappropriate gears
- can be uncomfortable to bus passengers
- 'urbanising' effect on villages

Whilst it is accepted that the above disbenefits will not affect all residential roads it is considered that the general presumption will be that these physical measures should not be used unless all other options and measures have been considered and are believed to be inappropriate.

If such measures are considered appropriate then the type chosen will depend largely on the needs of vulnerable road users and the type of traffic using the road in question. For example:

- Flat top road humps should only be used at locations where there are concentrations of vulnerable road users needing to cross the road. The road hump should provide a flush crossing thus offering benefits to the disabled. These will be at crossing points highlighted by residents or at intersections with Strategic Walking/Cycling Networks.

- On bus routes cushions should be used, except as indicated above, where pedestrians and cyclists to be given priority over other modes.
- In all other locations where road humps are considered appropriate they should be of a round top profile with tapered edges. When considering construction of the above, the hierarchy of construction materials is as shown in the Highway Corridor document.

20mph Zones and Limits

Successful 20mph zones and 20 mph speed limits are generally self-enforcing, i.e. the existing conditions of the road together with measures such as traffic calming or signing, publicity and information as part of the scheme, lead to a mean traffic speed compliant with the speed limit. To achieve compliance there should be no expectation on the police to provide additional enforcement beyond their routine activity.

It is important to consider the full range of options and their benefits, both road safety and wider community and environmental benefits and costs, before making a decision as to the most appropriate method of introducing a 20mph scheme to meet the local objectives and the road conditions.

20mph zones are predominantly used in urban areas, both town centres and residential areas, and in the vicinity of schools. They should also be used around shops, markets, playgrounds and other areas with high pedestrian or cyclist traffic, though they should not include roads where motor vehicle movement is the primary function.

Under the new guidance in Circular 01/2013, we can now place any of the following measures to support 20mph speeds:

- Repeater speed sign
- A speed roundel road marking
- Or a combination of both these signs
- Traffic calming features

Only where speeds are already constrained to near the limit do we consider placing the speed limit sign or roundel marking, in addition to physical features within a zone. The vast majority of traffic calming measures in use are speed humps, tables, cushions or rumble devices (so called vertical deflections). We will keep the use of

all measures under review as road user behaviour and speed management outcomes develop over time.

Speed Enforcement

Speed limit and traffic light enforcement cameras are an effective method of encouraging better compliance with speed limits their use in Norfolk is detailed in Speed Enforcement.

The County Council is very supportive of camera enforcement at the appropriate locations and works closely with the police under a Safety Camera Partnership (SCP). An aim of the SCP is to offer educational courses as an alternative to prosecution for some speeding offences, and these courses generally receive positive feedback from those attending.

Education, Training and Publicity

A Strategy for the delivery of education and training to key target groups in Norfolk, and the deployment of campaigns, is described under Education, Training and Publicity.

EDUCATION, TRAINING AND PUBLICITY

Introduction

Norfolk County Council's Casualty Reduction Section delivers Road Safety Education and Training in school and community settings. There are 4 Road Safety Officers, around 20 Road Safety Assistants and countless volunteer instructors, all of whom deliver the highest quality schemes throughout the year.

All of these schemes are free at the point of delivery and provide an essential introduction to safe road use; an introduction that will serve to establish patterns of positive behaviour. These educational sessions make reference to the speed of vehicles, in the context of pedestrian or cycle use and the need to wear seat belts as passengers. During Year 11 the next generation of drivers take part in an interactive discussion covering the choices and behaviours made by drivers and passengers, again reference is made to the thinking behind choices of speed when driving or rising a vehicle.

For more details of the Road Safety schemes delivered by the team, please have a look at the team's web pages, at

http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/Travel_and_transport/Road_safety/Road_safety_education/index.htm

For the road users of Norfolk who hold full licences in any category there is a wide range of courses available to enhance safety and economy whilst reducing emissions; these are delivered by the Driver & Rider Development Team, part of the Casualty Reduction Section of Norfolk County Council. The team comprises of 7 full time staff, over 20 sessionally employed DSA Fleet Trained Approved Driving Instructors (ADI's) and 4 Registered Motorcycle Instructors.

The Instructors have been carefully selected and trained to deliver a variety of schemes; many of them have their own specialities and the team as a whole has a wealth of qualifications and experience. Norfolk County Council invests time and resources in training the Instructors, this helps us to maintain a motivated, skilled and focused team who deliver to a consistently high standard.

One intervention delivered by the team on behalf of Norfolk Constabulary is the National Speed Awareness Course. This four hour course covers a range of subjects from speed management to hazard perception to driving more fuel efficiently and is offered as an alternative to prosecution. All of the courses delivered by the team will feature speed management, both in the context of speed limits and management of hazards. For more details of the Road Safety schemes delivered by the team, please have a look at the team's web pages, at

http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/Travel_and_transport/Road_safety/Driver_and_Rider_Development/index.htm

Casualty Reduction Publicity is managed by the Road Casualty Reduction Group, our very successful partnership organisation. Think! Norfolk is the brand name used

by the partnership of agencies committed to reducing the number and severity of casualties on Norfolk's roads.

The title makes a deliberate connection with the Government's own Think! advertising, with the inclusion of Norfolk because it is in our County that we focus our work. The partnership is made up of representatives from Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service, Norfolk Constabulary, East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust, Safety Camera Partnership, Highways Agency and Norfolk County Council.

The collective work of the partners provides the following:

- Re-engineering the roads and pavements to improve safety.
- Publicity campaigns to change the attitudes that lead to risk taking behaviour on the roads.
- Education and advice on how to reduce road risk
- Training to improve the skills of road users.
- Targeted enforcement.
- Effective emergency response to road traffic collisions

Our research shows that key road users for casualty reduction are motorcyclists, older drivers, younger drivers and vulnerable road users. Much of the work of Think! Norfolk is therefore aimed at these three groups, but without losing sight of the fact that tomorrow's drivers are today's children. If you would like to know more about the working arrangements of the partnership please see the web site at <http://www.think.norfolk.gov.uk/>

SPEED ENFORCEMENT

Introduction

Norfolk Constabulary supports the principles outlined in this document as part of their approach to collision and casualty reduction. Many studies have indicated speed is a factor in up to 1/3rd of injury collisions. The findings have many similarities but their interpretation and any proposals vary.

Whilst there is no single solution and no simple solution we need to, as far as possible, avoid complexities. Speed enforcement depends upon continued development of effective partnerships with the County Council, Magistrate's courts, schools and other partners. This approach must ensure that all avenues for speed compliance are fully exploited and that there is not a sole reliance on sanctions.

What is excess speed?

'Speeding' is not just exceeding a speed limit, but more commonly inappropriate speed. That is riding/driving within a legal limit but too fast for the prevailing conditions and circumstances, for example not allowing for the volume of traffic on the roads or adverse road and weather conditions. Collisions involving excessive or inappropriate speed can often be attributed to a poor standard of driving.

Police approach

Our prime commitment is towards casualty reduction. Our strategy is focused upon:-

- specific Cluster Sites (where focus is upon manoeuvres and time/day)
- Core Routes (which change quarterly and are generally the main roads)
- Target Routes (small sections of road identified as a short-term site of interest).

Our approach is not to maximize the number of offenders we catch but to target collision locations with a balance of advice and education and as a final measure, enforcement. The level at which a prosecution will be initiated is dependent on the circumstances at the time. The Police Officer dealing with the offence will use his/her

discretion and judgement and the Constabulary's Speed Enforcement Guidelines as to the most appropriate course of action.

Targeting

The number of drivers/riders prosecuted is, in itself, meaningless. We must all be satisfied that we are dealing with speeding where it really matters: where lives are being saved. There is a need to gather management information on collisions, identify hotspots, and target speed reduction resources accordingly. In other words, it is quality, not quantity that counts.

Targeting means making sure that enforcement action is directed primarily on those whose behaviour gives rise to the most serious risks, often at identifiable locations or identifiable circumstances. Like all other speed management measures enforcement action must be focused and prioritised.

Speed Detection

Prosecution of drivers for speeding is no longer solely reliant upon Road Policing officers providing the evidence. The boom in technology has now not only enabled easier detection of speeding offences, but also the remote detection of them. Camera enforcement is simple, but expensive. Officers have a plethora of equipment at their disposal, hand-held laser radar guns, vascar and other mobile detection devices, including mobile cameras.

Speeding is one of the main 'Fatal Four' contributory factors in Killed or Serious Injury Collisions (KSIs). The other 3 are not wearing a seatbelt, driving and using a mobile phone and drink/drug driving. Norfolk Constabulary uses various methods of speed enforcement; all have the simple aim of slowing vehicles down and therefore reducing the level of injuries in the event of a collision.

There are a number of fixed and mobile sites where safety cameras are used. All of the fixed sites and the vast majority of the mobile sites are locations where there is a history of KSIs. The remainder of the mobile sites are locations that have been identified in response to speeding complaints and safety concerns from concerned communities.

Police officers from Safer Neighbourhood teams and Roads Policing also visit complaint sites with hand-held speed detection devices. This provides an opportunity to engage with motorists, to discuss road safety issues and voice the concerns of communities. Roads Policing officers are also tasked daily to visit locations that have had recent or current KSI collisions to present high visibility reassurance and to conduct fatal four enforcement, including speed (the others are drink driving, seat belt and mobile phone use).

An important direction for Norfolk Constabulary, working closely with Norfolk County Council, is the diversion from prosecution for driving offences to an educational course as an alternative to issuing a fixed-penalty notice. The Driver Improvement Scheme is run by NCC and covers a variety of offences, including speeding.

Speeding Complaints

The police will focus their visits on sites with a casualty history. When we receive a complaint in relation to excess speed at a particular location, it will be acknowledged and fully investigated. The accident database for the site and surrounding area will be searched and further information gleaned by the use of data gathering equipment and/or site visits. Depending upon this analysis then officers may conduct speed checks. In all cases the complainant will be kept informed of our activities and findings.

Child Casualties

Studies of the conflicts between children and moving motor vehicles have shown

inappropriate speed and social deprivation as particular features. We will support child education initiatives, particularly those within schools. We will support road engineering schemes and 20mph limits near to schools although we acknowledge that only approximately 20% of child casualties occur on the journey to or from school.

National Speed Awareness Course

This is a four hour course delivered by The Driver and Rider Development Team of Norfolk County Council. This course covers a range of subjects from speed management to hazard perception to driving more fuel efficiently. Drivers/riders are referred as a diversion from attending court under certain circumstances. Attendance on the course benefits in many ways including an opportunity to educate drivers/riders on road safety issues.

Conclusion

Norfolk Constabulary is committed to work in partnership with the County Council and all partners towards reducing casualties on our roads. We fully support the use of traffic management techniques and calming measures to reduce vehicle speeds.

APPENDIX C

School 20mph Limit Assessment Matrix														
School	Parish	Type	5yr PIAs	no. of pupils	Walking/Cycling catchment	Traffic Flow	Existing Ped Crossing Facilities	Other factors (eg. No footway, existing traffic calming, VAS etc)	TOTAL	Comment				
Reffley Community School	Kings Lynn	Junior school	4	425	high 3	moderate 2	no 2	Traffic calming but speed concerns 1	76.5	Reffley lane access preferred				
St Williams Primary	Thorpe St Andrew	primary school	3	414	high 3	high 3	yes 1	cul de sac off A1042 2	74.6	Need to clarify if treating A1042 is appropriate				
Heacham Junior School	Heacham	Junior school	3	140	high 3	low 1	no 2	cul de sac off residential road 1	19.6	Treat pedestrian access on through route				
Holt Community Primary School	Holt	primary school	0	184	moderate 2	high 3	yes 1	subway + pelican 1	18.4					
Scarning Primary school	Scarning	primary school	0	253	low 1	moderate 2	no 2	40mph limit 2	15.2					
Docking Junior school	Docking	Junior school	2	120	moderate 2	moderate 2	no 2	B road 2	14.4					
Necton VA Primary School	Necton	primary school	1	173	moderate 2	low 1	no 2	1	13.9					
Gresham's School	Holt	Prep & Pre-Prep	0	200	low 1	moderate 2	yes 1	low local catchment 1	12.0					
Buxton Primary School	Buxton	primary school	0	136	moderate 2	moderate 2	no 2	on sweeping bend/junction 2	10.9					
West Lynn Junior	West Lynn	Junior school	1	126	moderate 2	low 1	no 2	congested at peak times 1	10.1					
Redgate Junior School	Hunstanton	Junior school	0	105	high 3	low 1	no 2	cul de sac 1	8.4	Cul de sac but ped access off through route				
Hempnall Primary School	Hempnall	primary school	0	93	moderate 2	moderate 2	no 2	limited footways 2	7.5	Parish/School funded?				
Alpington and Bergh Apton VC	Alpington	Primary School	0	95	moderate 2	low 1	no 2	1	5.7					
Scole C of E VC Primary School	Scole	primary school	0	91	moderate 2	low 1	no 2	former A140 2	5.5					
St Andrews School	North Lopham	primary school	0	52	moderate 2	moderate 2	no 2	90 degree bend. Narrow footways 2	4.2					
Reedham Primary	Reedham	Primary school	0	57	moderate 2	low 1	no 2	village lane 1	3.5					
Gresham Primary School	Gresham	primary school	0	81	low 1	low 1	no 2	1	3.3					
Hainford Primary	Hainford	primary school	0	75	low 1	low 1	no 2	no footways 2	3.0					
Hapton Primary School	Hapton	primary school	1	32	low 1	moderate 2	no 2	B1135 2	2.6					
Harpley CE Primary School	Harpley	primary school	0	48	low 1	low 1	no 2	cul de sac 0	0.0	Cul de sac not appropriate				
Gaywood Community Primary	Kings Lynn	primary school	0	210	high 3	low 1	no 2	cul de sac and existing 20mph 0	0.0	Existing 20 limits not appropriate				
Kelling Village Primary School	Kelling	primary school	0	40	low 1	high 3	no 2	Existing 20mph speed limit 0	0.0	Existing 20 limits not appropriate				

The assessment matrix aims to prioritise requests for School Advisory Part Time 20mph Speed Limits based on the following criteria:

- 1) Number of personal injury accidents (not just pedestrian) occurring within 100m radius of the school.
- 2) Number of pupils on school roll
- 3) Whether there is potentially a large number of children walking or cycling to school rather than being transported by car/bus.
- 4) Traffic flow – a high traffic flow means a higher risk for pedestrians and gives a higher weighting.
- 5) Are existing crossing facilities (e.g. pelican crossing) present?
- 6) Is there existing traffic calming or Vehicle Activated signing nearby.
- 7) Is the school located on a cul-de-sac?

The number of pupils at a school carries the greatest weighting, followed by the number of injury accidents. Traffic flow and potential for walking/cycling also increase the score for a particular school but to a lesser extent. If the school has existing crossing facilities or traffic

calming this decreases the score, although there is an allowance for other risk factors such as limited footways to increase it. If the school is on a cul-de-sac, this defaults to giving the school a low priority although this is given a 'reality check' to see if there are other pedestrian accesses on through routes.