



Cambridge City Council

Project Appraisal and Scrutiny Committee Recommendation

Project Name: Cambridge 20mph Project - Phase 2 and Victoria Rd Implementation and Phase 3 Consultation

To: Cllr Kevin Blencowe, Executive Councillor for Planning, Policy & Transport

Report by: Simon Payne – Director of Environment

Scrutiny committee: ENVIRONMENT 8th July 2014

Wards affected: Arbury, West Chesterton, Coleridge, Abbey, Petersfield, Romsey, Trumpington, Queen Ediths, Cherry Hinton, Newnham, Castle, Market

Recommendations

Financial recommendations –

- The Executive Councillor is asked to approve the commencement of the implementation of phase 2 and Victoria Rd and consultation for phase 3 of this scheme, which is already included in the Council's Capital & Revenue Project Plan
- The total cost is estimated to be £222,200 funded from the 20mph project capital allocation SC532.
- There are no on-going revenue costs for the project.

Procurement recommendations:

- The Executive Councillor is asked to approve the carrying out and completion of the procurement of:
 - Phase 2 traffic order making process including street notices - £8000
 - Implementation of Phase 2 (in line with the roads recommended for inclusion by East Area Committee on 10/04/14, see below, but limiting implementation on Cherry Hinton Rd to section 1 at this stage) - £125,000

- **Procurement recommendations (continued):**
 - Commuted sum maintenance contribution to Cambridgeshire County Council for Phase 2 - £20,700
 - Implementation of Victoria Rd (in line with the recommendation from North Area Committee on 08/05/14) - £8,500
 - Phase 2 post implementation automatic traffic count (ATC) monitoring - £4000
 - Phase 3 pre-consultation ATC monitoring - £8000
 - Phase 3 consultation and public engagement including exhibitions - £12,000

- Subject to:
 - The permission of the Director of Business Transformation being sought prior to proceeding if the quotation or tender sum exceeds the estimated contract.
 - The permission from the Executive Councillor being sought before proceeding if the value exceeds the estimated contract by more than 15%.

Recommendations from East Area Committee:

- Inclusion of all unclassified roads in the east phase area
- *Inclusion of the following 'C' class roads:*
 - Cherry Hinton Rd Section 1: Clifton Rd to Perne Rd
 - Cherry Hinton Rd Section 2: Perne Rd to Walpole Rd
 - Remaining section of Mill Rd
 - Brookfields.
- ***Exclusion of the following C class roads:***
 - Both sections of Coldham's Lane.

**Project Name: Cambridge 20mph Project –
Phase 2 Implementation and Phase 3
Consultation**

1 Summary

1.1 The project

To provide infrastructure (signs and lines) for a new 20mph speed limit on the public highway across the city. The new 20mph infrastructure would include repeater signs mounted on existing lamp columns, and white coloured 20mph roundel road markings. Entry into new 20mph limits would be via entry points highlighted by larger 20mph terminal signs, roundel road markings and on more main roads, patches of coloured road surface material.

Phase 2 Implementation Target Dates:

Start of procurement	July 2014
Award of Contract	December 2015
Start of project delivery	January 2015
Completion of phase 2	March 2015

1.2 Anticipated Cost

Total Cost	£ £222,200
------------	------------

Cost Funded from:

Funding:	Amount:	Details:
Reserves	£222,200	SC532-39149
Repairs & Renewals	£	
Developer Contributions	£	
Climate Change Fund	£	
Other	£	

1.3 Procurement process

- 1.3.1 Procurement for the implementation of Phase 2 and Victoria Rd will be through a competitive tendering exercise, in accordance with the requirements of the City Council's Contract Procedure Rules.
- 1.3.2 Following receipt of tenders, the winning tender will be identified following assessment by a skilled officer panel.
- 1.3.3 Other elements (ATCs, consultation printing etc. will be procured through consideration of quotations from a minimum of three service suppliers and identified following considerations by a skilled officer panel.

2.0 Project Appraisal & Procurement Report

2.1 Project Background

- 2.1.1 In July 2011, a motion to Council was agreed that requested the evaluation of existing 20mph schemes in Cambridge and where appropriate, consult on expansion of schemes. Support and commitment from Cambridgeshire County Council was secured, and potential project scope and resourcing were investigated, which culminated in Council Budget funding bids for 'the Cambridge City 20mph Zones Project'. A capital bid for £400,000 to cover works was agreed in February 2012. A further revenue Priority Policy Fund bid for £59,800 to cover initial staffing costs was also approved.
- 2.1.2 Both funding bids stipulate that the project should have a citywide approach. As such the project considers all appropriate roads within the Cambridge City Boundary where it is appropriate/feasible to introduce a self-enforcing 20mph limit. Works will be subject to agreement with the Highway Authority (Cambridgeshire County Council).
- 2.1.3 Due to the size of the project, it has been divided into four separate phases, reflecting existing area committee boundaries. Each phase is being progressed separately and brought to the relevant area committee for recommendation. Further information is available on the project web page: <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/20mph-speed-limit>

2.1.4 Following further development of the project and the request from Cambridgeshire County Council for a commuted sum for maintenance, a further bid to increase the project budget to £600,000 was approved at Council in February 2014.

2.2 **Project aims:**

- provide conditions that are conducive to an increase in active travel modes such as walking and cycling and encourage a modal shift towards these modes
- reduce the severity of personal injury accidents (PIAs) that occur on the city's road network
- reduce noise and air pollution levels
- reduce traffic congestion
- rationalise the existing number of isolated 20mph zones
- create clarity for motorists with regard to speed limits in residential areas.

2.3 **Phase 2 Consultation**

2.3.3 Public consultation for phase two took place between 24/02/14 and 30/03/14 (5 weeks).

2.3.4 The consultation was undertaken through the delivery of a consultation pack containing an explanatory leaflet and freepost return questionnaire to all addresses located within the Phase 2 area along with statutory consultees (17,974 addresses).

2.3.5 Consultees were provided with two options to respond. Either via an on-line questionnaire hosted via the City Council website, or by filling in the questionnaire delivered in the pack and returning it via the freepost address.

2.3.6 In order to identify any consultation responses that were returned by respondees from outside the consultation area, each questionnaire included a unique code, which also needed to be quoted when filling in the on-line questionnaire. As such it has been possible to identify responses received from those outside the consultation area, as well as responses from individual residents.

2.3.7 During the consultation period two exhibitions were set up which provided additional information about the project. These were located at the Ross St Community Centre and at the Customer Service Centre in Mandela House. Both exhibitions were in place from the 24/02/14 to 30/03/14.

2.3.8 Two public drop-in sessions also took place at Ross St Community Centre during the consultation period, at which council officers were present to answer questions. One during the day on Saturday 1st March 2014 and the other in the evening of Wednesday 6th March 2014.

2.3.9 PDF copies of the exhibition materials and the consultation leaflet are available on the project web page, and were also distributed in hard copy format to schools, libraries, and community centres within the phase area. The consultation was further publicised via a press release, tweets and an article in Cambridge matters.

2.4 **Phase 2 Consultation Outcome**

2.4.1 Following the closure of the Phase 2 public consultation, the results were presented to East Area Committee where it made the recommendations that are included in this report.

2.4.2 A total of 3014 responses to the consultation were received. Of these 2850 (94.6%) were received from addresses within the consultation area, and 164 were received from outside the consultation area. Of those from within the consultation area 2822 were from different addresses. This provides an overall response rate of: 15.7%

2.4.4 Overall the consultation results indicate that the majority of respondees:

- are **in favour** of the 20mph limit on residential and shopping roads in the Phase 2 area **(72%)**
- are **in favour** of 20mph on roads coloured in with solid blue lines **(69%)**
- are **in favour** of 20mph on the remaining section of Mill Road **(63%)**.

The number of respondees in favour of a 20mph limit on Coldham's Lane (both sections) and Cherry Hinton Road (both sections) is neither strongly positive nor negative.

2.4.5 Responses received from statutory consultees are set out in table 1 overleaf. The question numbers refer to those on the Consultation Questionnaire.

Consultee	Do you agree with 20mph speed limits on residential and shopping roads?	Do you agree with installing 20mph limit on roads coloured solid blue?	Do you agree with installing 20mph limit on main roads coloured with red dashed lines?					Further Comments
			Coldham's Lane (Section 1)	Coldham's Lane (Section 2)	Mill Road (remaining section)	Cherry Hinton Road (Section 1)	Cherry Hinton Road (Section 2)	
Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No objections to proposals.
Cam Sight	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Mencap	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
East of England Ambulance	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	
Cambridgeshire Chambers of Commerce	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	The present road restrictions and traffic calming measure keep speeds down on these roads and the viability of taking enforcement action is questionable. Slowing the traffic to 20mph will add to traffic congestion and delay buses. Will cyclists have to comply? Finally, we think it is confusing for drivers when the speed limit changes between different sections of the same road.
Stagecoach	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	I object in the strongest possible terms that the consultation shouldn't include any 'A' or 'B' roads in Cambridge including Victoria Road.

Table 1: Responses from Statutory Consultees

2.4.6 An analysis of the responses from residents living on Mill Road, Coldham's Lane and Cherry Hinton Road has been undertaken. Of those who responded:

- 70% of Mill Road residents **agreed** with the remaining section being limited to 20mph
- 59% of Coldham's Lane residents **disagreed** with either section being limited to 20mph
- 55% of Cherry Hinton Road residents **agreed** with either section being limited to 20mph.

2.4.7 Following analysis of the responses, the following commonly occurring themes have been identified:

- The 20mph limit needs to be enforced (this comment was made by those both agreeing and disagreeing to the implementation of a lower speed limit).
- It is a waste of tax payers' money (and should be spent repairing potholes).
- Driving at 20mph will not reduce congestion and will lead to increased journey times – including for buses, fuel consumption and pollution.
- Coldham's Lane and Cherry Hinton Road are main arteries in the city and should stay at 30mph.

A number of other general themes (in no particular order) have been identified from the comments received:

- The existing 30mph limit (and in parts 20mph limits) need enforcing first. 20mph is too slow. 30mph is slow enough
- The existing 20mph limit in the city centre is ineffective.
- The proposals will result in too much sign/line clutter.
- Any red surfacing should be minimised
- It would be good if sign clutter could be addressed/reduced as part of the project
- The project needs to be clearly signed.
- The project will result in cycles overtaking vehicles, could be dangerous.
- It would be difficult to pass cyclists at 20mph/take longer to do so which will be more dangerous.
- All roads in the city should be included. This would reduce potential confusion/improve clarity, reduce sign clutter and prevent potential traffic migration onto these roads.

- 20mph limits should be in place outside schools.
- 20mph should be timed to only be in force during the day/the limit should revert to 30mph at quiet times such as overnight.
- 20mph would provide pedestrian or cyclists with a false sense of security.
- At 20mph drivers would have to concentrate on their speed and signs rather than the road.
- 20mph could result in increased 'road rage' with dangerous overtaking.
- Pedestrians, cyclists, school pupils should pay more attention/be provided with training on the road.
- It is not possible to exceed 20mph on many of the unclassified roads/other roads at peak times anyway, so why bother making them 20mph?
- The consultation should have included details of potential negative impacts of the project
- 20mph will be bad for bus services – making journey times longer and reliability poorer.
- The limit is not required where traffic calming is in place.
- Good to remove existing traffic calming if 20mph limit is introduced.
- This is an 'anti-car' proposal. Looks like a project to increase revenue and a precursor to introducing a congestion charge.
- The project will go ahead whatever the results of the consultation are.
- It would be good to introduce speed cameras to enforce the 20mph limit

2.4.8 Other e.g. Trade Associations, National Bodies - As part of project governance, a project board has been convened on which local police, bus and taxi operators, local cycle and 20mph campaigns and the local Health service are represented. The views of these groups are being taken into account throughout the project development. The project has also been taken to the Cambridge disability consultative panel which has commented: 'Providing the signage is clear and there is sufficient awareness over a wide enough area, then the Panel welcome this proposal and hope it achieves its objectives'.

2.5 Phase 2 Implementation

- 2.5.1 The outcomes of officer investigation into the suitability of specific 'C' class roads in the east area for a new 20mph limit are broadly in line with consultation outcomes.
- 2.5.2 The possible exception is the section of Cherry Hinton Road, between Perne Road and Walpole Road, where average speeds are generally higher, at or around 27mph and the road environment less conducive to a 20mph speed limit.
- 2.5.3 Implementation of a new limit along Cherry Hinton Road, based on the East Area Committee boundary, is also not recommended at this stage.
- 2.5.4 Full consideration of the section between Perne Road and the Cherry Hinton High St/Queen Ediths Way junction is recommended to be considered following the phase 3 consultation, as in highway terms, the committee boundary is an arbitrary point to introduce a new limit.
- 2.5.5 The first section of Cherry Hinton Road, between Clifton Road and Perne Road has a road environment that includes on street parking and shopping precincts, with property close to the highway boundary, an environment which is more suited to a 20mph limit.
- 2.5.6 The average speed of vehicles using this section was also at or below the 24mph average speed recommended by the Department for Transport (DfT) for introducing signs only 20mph speed limits.
- 2.5.7 However, the existence of a GATSO safety camera close to the junction with Coleridge Road and Hartingdon Grove, indicates a potential problem with speed limit compliance, potentially during the late evening and early morning.
- 2.5.8 A poor accident history must also exist for this camera to exist at this location.
- 2.5.9 The GATSO safety camera is not type approved for 20mph speed limits. Solutions to this issue are currently under review.

2.6 **Victoria Road Consultation**

- 2.6.1 Public consultation took place throughout March 2014. The consultation was undertaken via the delivery of a consultation pack containing an explanatory leaflet and freepost return questionnaire to all addresses located within the consultation area.
- 2.6.2 Consultees were provided with two options to respond. Either via an on-line questionnaire hosted via the City Council website, or by filling in the questionnaire delivered in the pack and returning it using the freepost address.
- 2.6.3 In order to identify any consultation responses that were returned by respondees from outside the consultation area, each questionnaire included a unique code, which also needed to be quoted when filling in the on-line questionnaire. As such it has been possible to identify responses received from those outside the consultation area, as well as those from Victoria Road itself.

2.7 **Victoria Road Consultation Outcome**

- 2.7.1 A total of 540 responses to the consultation were received. Of these 214 (40%) were received from addresses within the consultation area, and 321 (59%) were received from outside the consultation area.

Responses from residents of Victoria Road itself totalled 51 (9%).

- 2.7.3 The consultation results can be summarised as follows:

Overall support for a 20mph limit on Victoria Rd [56%] 540 responses

71% of respondents within the consultation area support the limit

69% of respondents from Victoria Rd itself support the limit.

54% of respondents from outside of the consultation area support the limit.

- 2.7.4 Responses to question 5, which asks for the main reason that respondents use the road, shows that 79% of all responses were from residents, with 15% classing themselves as commuters only.
- 2.7.5 Specific responses were received from two key stakeholders, Cam Sight and Age UK Cambridgeshire, both of supported the proposed new limit.
- 2.8.5 A specific response was also received from Stagecoach, a key stakeholder as a major public transport provider. Stagecoach is not in favour of reducing the limit on this or any of the A and B roads and questioned the change to the original approach, which had already been presented to the public.
- 2.8.6 Following analysis of the comments section of the responses, the Following general themes (in no particular order) have been identified from the comments received:

13 responses (all negative) from people identifying as taxi drivers.

56 responses (all in favour) all mentioning "narrow pavements"

27 responses (18 positive, 9 negative) mentioning "enforcement"

9 responses (all negative) mentioning "increased congestion"

27 responses (25 positive, 2 negative) mentioning effects on "schools"/"the school run"

19 responses (all negative) that say 20mph is "too slow".

2.9 Speed Survey Results

- 2.91 Two locations were used to establish the average speed of vehicles using Victoria Road, 24 hours a day over a 2 week period.

Site Average Speeds

Victoria Road: East of Primrose Street (Eastbound) 24.6mph

Victoria Road: East of Primrose Street (WestBound) 24.3mph

Victoria Road: West of Arthur Street (Eastbound) 25.1mph

Victoria Road: West of Arthur Street (Westbound) 23.5mph

- 2.92 The results are very close to being in line with Department for Transport Guidance for the introduction of 20mph speed limits. This guidance suggests that existing average speeds should be at or below 24mph for a signs only solution to be appropriate.

3.0 Victoria Road Implementation

- 3.01 The reason this road was not included in the North Phase of this project, was its classification as an 'A' road, a strategic part of the city's road network across the north of the city.
- 3.02 Cambridgeshire County Council's Speed Limit Policy clearly states that 20mph limits should not be introduced on the A and B road network.
- 3.03 Responses to the North Phase consultation questioned its exclusion, based on its road environment incorporating narrow pavements with property built directly on the edge of the highway boundary in the majority of instances.
- 3.04 There are also a considerable number of desire lines across the road for local commuters and school children.
- 3.05 It was ultimately the nature of the road environment that led Cambridgeshire County Council to agree to the request for further consultation on a potential reduction in the speed limit.

- 3.06 County Council officer feedback following the result of the consultation, indicates that implementing a 20mph limit for Victoria Road will not be recommended for approval.
- 3.07 This decision is based on the lack of an overwhelming majority in support of the proposal, particularly as it involves a departure from policy, as well as the existence of a strong objection from a major public transport provider.
- 3.08 The official decision will be taken at Cambridgeshire County Council's Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee on 23rd September 2014, should the City Council's Executive Councillor for Planning, Policy and Transport agree to move forward with the implementation of a reduced limit.

3.1 Phase 3 Consultation

- 3.1.1 In order to speed up the delivery of the project and potentially deliver minor savings at the engagement stage, it is proposed that phase 3 will become the final phase of the project.
- 3.1.2 Phase 3 will therefore consist of the rest of the city, i.e. South and West/Central Area Committee Areas.
- 3.1.3 The project's engagement and decision making procedures will remain unaltered.

3.2 Major issues for stakeholders & other departments

- 3.2.1 Impact on police – The local police have highlighted that the project may result in additional pressure/requests from the public for enforcement activities. The police have stated that they will enforce 20mph limits in the same way as they currently enforce 30mph limits across the city.
- 3.2.2 Impact on Cambridgeshire County Council – The infrastructure placed on the public highway will become property of the county council once it is installed. As such the responsibility for maintenance of the new infrastructure will pass to the County Council, for which a commuted sum is being provided for each phase, to contribute to the ongoing maintenance cost of the additional infrastructure.

3.3 Summarise key risks associated with the project

- 3.3.1 Should the project be implemented, the risk of severe personal injury resulting from traffic collisions, where these occur, is reduced. This reduced level of risk is particularly relevant to more vulnerable road users such as the young or elderly and those using sustainable and active transport modes such as walking or cycling.
- 3.3.2 Due to a predicted 10% growth in the population Cambridge over the next decade, there is going to be increased pressure on the local road network. With greater numbers of motor vehicles using the roads, increased delay to traffic and wear to highway infrastructure, resulting in potential negative economic impacts. The provision of 20mph limits would help to mitigate this by providing conditions under which an increased proportion of the population feel comfortable adopting active and sustainable modes of transport such as walking or cycling. These modes provide economic, health, and wellbeing benefits.
- 3.3.3 As the local traffic authority, Cambridgeshire County Council's Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee will determine whether to approve the commencement of a statutory legal traffic regulation order (TRO) process, as well as determine any objections that are subsequently received. Approval of a departure from its speed limit policy for Victoria Road would also need to be secured before it can be included in the legal TRO process.
- 3.3.4 The traffic order making process will be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council prior to implementation in order for the speed limit to be legal. This process will require further consultation with various statutory consultees including public service operators. It is possible objections to the project will be raised at this stage, which could impact on the outcome of this project.

3.4 Financial implications

3.4.1 Appraisal prepared on the following price base: 2014/15

3.4.2 Specific grant funding conditions are:

- None

3.5 Net revenue implications (costs or savings)

Revenue	£	Comments
Maintenance	0	Once implemented maintenance of the infrastructure will be the responsibility of the County Council as the traffic authority
R&R Contribution	0	
Developer Contributions	0	
Energy savings	(0)	To the highway authority - See below
Income / Savings	(0)	
Net Revenue effect	0	Cost/(Saving)

3.6 VAT implications

There are no VAT Implications.

3.7 Climate Change Impact

Positive Impact		No effect	Negative Impact	
	+L			

3.7.1 The implementation of a 20mph limit would provide a safer and more attractive environment for active sustainable transport modes such as walking and cycling. As such it would help to increase the number of road users opting to use these modes, and potentially reduce the number of journeys undertaken in by private car. In addition where motor vehicles are used, research has found that at lower, smoother speeds, PM10 particulate emissions from brake and tire wear can be reduced. A 20mph limit can also help to reduce the level of traffic noise pollution.

3.7.2 In addition the project would allow for a number of illuminated signs to be disconnected and removed which will provide an energy saving to the highway authority.

3.8 Other implications

An Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) has been prepared for this project and is attached at **Appendix B**

3.9 Staff required to deliver the project

Service	Skills	Total Hours
<i>Streets and Open Spaces, Project Delivery team</i>	<i>Project management Procurement Traffic scheme design Contract management Project Quality Control</i>	<i>Project Officer - 4200 (0.8 of full time until project is complete) Project Leader – 100 Project Delivery and Environment Manager - 75</i>

3.10 List of Appendices

APPENDIX A

Capital Project Appraisal - Capital costs & funding profile

APPENDIX B

Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)

3.11 Background Papers

- Responses to Cambridge 20mph Project, East Phase Public Consultation
- Responses to Cambridge 20mph Project, Victoria Rd Public Consultation
- Department for Transport Local Transport Note 1/07 – Traffic Calming
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/3811/ltn-1-07.pdf
- Department for Transport Draft Speed Limit Circular July 2012 – Setting Local Speed Limits –
<http://assets.dft.gov.uk/consultations/dft-2012-32/setting-local-speed-limits.pdf>

3.12 Inspection of papers

Author's Name	Andrew Preston
Author's phone No.	01223 458234
Author's e-mail:	andrew.preston@cambridge.gov.uk
Date prepared:	10.06.14

Capital Project Appraisal - Capital costs & funding - Profiling

Appendix A

	2014/15	2016/17	2017/18	2019/20	Comments
	£	£	£	£	
Capital Costs					
Building contractor / works	133,500				Construction Costs
Purchase of vehicles, plant & equipment					
Professional / Consultants fees	27,000	9,000			Officer Costs
Other capital expenditure:					
<i>Phase 3 Consultation costs</i>	12,000				
<i>Legal traffic order process</i>	8,000				
<i>Phs 2 post implementation Auto. Traffic Counts</i>		4,000			
<i>Phs 3 pre consultation Auto .Traffic Counts</i>	8,000				
<i>Commuted Sum for Maintenance</i>	20,700				
Total Capital cost	209,200	13,000	0	0	
Capital Income / Funding					
Government Grant					
Developer Contributions					
R&R funding					
Earmarked Funds					
Existing capital programme funding	209,200	13,000			SC532-39149
Revenue contributions					
Total Income	209,200	13,000	0	0	
Net Capital Bid	0	0	0	0	

Cambridge City Council Equality Impact Assessment

Completing an Equality Impact Assessment will help you to think about what impact your strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service may have on people that live in, work in or visit Cambridge, as well as on City Council staff.



The template is easy to use. You do not need to have specialist equalities knowledge to complete it. It asks you to make judgements based on evidence and experience. There are guidance notes on the intranet to help you. You can also get advice from David Kidston, Strategy and Partnerships Manager on 01223 457043 or email david.kidston@cambridge.gov.uk, or from any member of the Joint Equalities Group.

1. Title of strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service:

Cambridge 20mph Project

2. What is the objective or purpose of your strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service?

To reduce the speed of traffic on non-classified roads and some classified roads within the city of Cambridge to 20mph in order to provide a safer, greener and less threatening road environment for all road users.

3. Who will be affected by this strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service? (Please tick those that apply)

- Residents
- Visitors
- Staff

A specific client group or groups (please state):

4. What type of strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service is this? (Please tick)

- New
- Revised
- Existing

5. Responsible directorate and service

Directorate: Environment
Service: Streets and Open Spaces

6. Are other departments or partners involved in delivering this strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service?

- No
 Yes (please give details):

Cambridgeshire County Council (as traffic authority)
Cambridge City Web Team
Local Police (enforcement)
Local public transport providers

7. Potential impact

Please list and explain how this strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service could **positively** or **negatively** affect individuals from the following equalities groups.

(a) Age (any group of people of a particular age, including younger and older people)

The project should have a positive impact on the more vulnerable younger and older road users, by providing a less threatening road environment. In addition, at 20mph the number of Personal Injury Accidents (PIAs) is reduced and where they do occur they result in less severe injury, which is of particular importance to more vulnerable road users.

(b) Disability (including people with a physical impairment, sensory impairment, learning disability, mental health problem or other condition which has an impact on their daily life)

In certain cases road users with a disability such as sensory or physical impairment would be classed as vulnerable road users. As such the scheme will provide a positive impact by providing a safer road environment.

(c) Gender

No specific impact

(d) Pregnancy and maternity

No specific impact

(e) Transgender (including gender re-assignment)

No specific impact

(f) Marriage and Civil Partnership

No specific impact

(g) Race or ethnicity

Studies suggest that minority groups are underrepresented as users of active travel modes. Through providing a less threatening road environment, the project is likely to have a positive impact by reducing the barriers to walking and cycling that these groups encounter.

(h) Religion or belief

No specific impact

(i) Sexual orientation

No specific impact

(j) Other factor that may lead to inequality – in particular – please consider the impact of any changes on low income groups or those experiencing the impacts of poverty (please state):

This scheme will promote a safer road environment for all road users, particularly for the most sustainable and cost effective modes such as cycling and walking. Those experiencing the impacts of poverty may now have the opportunity to reconsider these modes and therefore benefit from this project.

8. If you have any additional comments please add them here

None

9. Conclusions and Next Steps

- If you have not identified any negative impacts, please sign off this form.

10. Sign off

Name and job title of assessment lead officer:

Andrew Preston, Project Delivery & Environment Manager

Names and job titles of other assessment team members and people consulted: N/A

Date of completion: 08.10.12

Date of last review: 08.10.13

Date of next review of the assessment: 08.10.14