

Committee Name and Date of Committee Meeting

Cabinet – 12 February 2024

Report Title

20mph speed limits and pavement parking

Is this a Key Decision and has it been included on the Forward Plan?

Yes

Strategic Director Approving Submission of the Report

Paul Woodcock, Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment

Report Author(s)

Matt Reynolds, Head of Transportation Infrastructure Service
Matthew.Reynolds@rotherham.gov.uk

Ward(s) Affected

All Wards

Report Summary

This report outlines feedback received from the recent consultation on the Council's proposed policy in respect of 20mph speed limits. It provides details of the results of the consultation and recommends a version of the Policy for adoption to ensure a consistent approach to the implementation of 20mph speed limits in the Borough.

The report also provides an update on the Council's proposed position in respect of handling complaints or requests in respect of parking on footways.

Recommendations

That Cabinet:

1. Notes the findings of the consultation and approves the Policy for the Introduction of 20mph Speed Limits and Zones (Appendix 1.)
2. Approves the proposals in respect of handling complaints or requests in respect of parking on footways, set out in paragraphs 2.10 through 2.15.

List of Appendices Included

- Appendix 1 Policy for the Introduction of 20mph Speed Limits and Zones
- Appendix 2 Executive Summary
- Appendix 3 Draft text regarding parking on footways to be included on the website
- Appendix 4 Equalities Assessment
- Appendix 5 Carbon Impact Assessment

Background Papers

Consultation materials for the 20mph Policy

<https://www.rotherham.gov.uk/consultation-feedback/say-20mph-limits-zones-borough>

Current 20mph Policy adopted by Cabinet, 15th January 2014

<https://moderngov.rotherham.gov.uk/documents/s90779/Appendix%20A%20-%2020mph%20policy.pdf>

Technical paper on Level 4 devolution framework, November 2023

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/technical-paper-on-level-4-devolution-framework/technical-paper-on-level-4-devolution-framework>

Relationship between Speed and Risk of Fatal Injury: Pedestrians and Car Occupants

<https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ukgwa/20110615140649/http://www.dft.gov.uk/publications/rsrr-theme5-report-16/>

Consideration by any other Council Committee, Scrutiny or Advisory Panel

No

Council Approval Required

No

Exempt from the Press and Public

No

20mph speed limits and pavement parking

1. Background

- 1.1 Managing vehicle speeds is a tool for improving road safety, particularly for vulnerable road users. Used carefully along with broader speed and traffic management tools, it is also an important tool for managing how traffic is distributed in the Borough, by disincentivising the use of less suitable routes. Both of these are key considerations into the local and national approach to promoting walking and cycling. Furthermore, the Council receives requests for 20 mph speed limits from residents, Councillors, and community groups.
- 1.2 Consequently, the Council committed in the 2023-24 Year Ahead Delivery Plan to the adoption of a coherent approach to local 20 mph speed limits, ensuring that children and older people alike feel safe on small residential roads. Pursuant to this, a draft Policy was prepared, and was subject to public consultation. This report advises on the feedback from that consultation and recommends a Policy for approval.
- 1.3 The Council also committed to setting out its approach to the use of localised powers to address concerns regarding parking on footways. This report updates Cabinet in respect of this.

2. Key Issues

20mph Policy consultation

- 2.1 The consultation ran on-line between 24th November and 22nd December 2023. Although the stated closing date was 22nd December, the consultation was kept open until 2nd January to allow for any late responses to be considered. The public consultation was publicised by press releases which resulted in the publication of articles in the Rotherham Advertiser and the Sheffield Star, and resulted in 114 responses being received.
- 2.2 In summary:
 - 44.7% of respondents indicated support for the draft Policy;
 - 53.5% of respondents indicated disapproval of the draft Policy.
 - 1.8% of respondents did not know whether they support or disapproved.

2.3 Variation was noted between different user groups. A breakdown of responses is given in the table below –

User group	n	Strongly support	Support	Don't know	Don't support	Strongly disapproved	% supporting
Cyclist	7	3	1	0	0	3	57
Motorist	53	15	2	1	12	23	32
Resident	41	16	7	1	6	11	56
Pedestrian	8	4	2	0	0	2	75
Bus passenger	1	1	0	0	0	0	100
Business	2	0	0	0	0	2	0
Other	2	0	0	0	2	0	0
Total	114	39	12	2	20	41	
%	100	34	11	2	18	36	45

2.4 Amongst the 51 respondents supporting the draft Policy –

- 21 made generally supportive comments
- 11 raised concerns regarding compliance
- 3 comments supporting 20mph speed limits in villages
- 2 wanted 20mph speed limits implementing on busier roads

2.5 Amongst the 59 respondents disapproving of the draft Policy –

- 21 made general adverse comments, including those outside of the scope of the consultation
- 14 raised concern about compliance
- 13 raised concern about journey times and/or congestion
- 11 raised concern regarding vehicle emissions
- 7 indicated 20mph limits should be reserved for specific locations, in particular schools.

2.6 Amongst respondents, a majority of all groups other than motorists supported the draft Policy. Excluding motorists, 56% supported the Policy. This is perhaps not a surprising outcome, as motorists disproportionately bear the disbenefits of reduced speed limits relative to other groups. The main comments raised by motorists were –

- 12 raised concern about compliance (of others)
- 9 raised concern about journey times and/or congestion
- 8 raised concern regarding vehicle emissions
- 8 made general adverse comments
- 6 made generally supportive comments
- 6 indicated 20mph limits should be reserved for specific locations, in particular schools.

2.7 It is worth noting that, of the 14 objectors raising concerns of compliance, about two-thirds were of a nature where it might be inferred that there would be more support if respondents felt the limit would be effectively enforced. Conversely, two respondents advocating for much wider or blanket application of 20mph speed limits indicated support for

the Policy notwithstanding its express precluding of blanket application of 20mph. These discrepancies highlight the need for caution in interpreting the consultation response.

- 2.8 Note some respondents made comments on more than one matter, hence the totals adding to a greater number than the number of respondents.
- 2.9 Section 3 outlines six options that have been considered in detail to ensure that the 20mph policy takes into account the range of responses to the public consultation. These options include one option to retain the existing policy, one option to have no specific policy, and three options that attempt to address the main concerns that were raised during consultation, along with the reasons why these are not recommended.
- 2.10 In order to address some of the concerns raised, clarified and strengthened language is proposed to be introduced into the Policy, to emphasise restraint on the use of 20mph speed limits, and to emphasise the evidence available where there are specific concerns about potential implementation or impacts.
- 2.11 Specific clarifications included in the recommended Policy in response to the consultation include:
- Clarification and emphasis that 20mph speed limits require physical intervention as required to ensure compliance (paragraphs 2.5 and 3.1, to address 25 comments regarding compliance);
 - Clarification that neither main roads nor (in most cases) main bus routes would be subject to 20mph speed limits, and that it is possible for streets with lesser volumes to retain higher speeds where local conditions support this (paragraphs 6.1, to address 24 comments in respect of congestion and emissions impacts);
 - Emphasis of evidence base in respect of congestion and emissions impacts of 20mph speed limits, and further text to describe how the Policy mitigates risks around congestion and how this should be considered in scheme design (paragraphs 5.1, to address 24 comments in respect of congestion and emissions impacts);
 - Clarification that the Policy applies to villages as well as towns (paragraphs 1.4, to address 3 comments supporting inclusion of villages).
 - All schemes will be subject to public consultation, which will provide opportunity for residents and road users to express their concerns or support, opinions and suggestions. Local schemes will require ward member support and evidence of local consent before they can be implemented. There will be some 20mph

proposals that fall within specific Department for Transport Programmes and outside the scope of this Council policy, and their decision making that will be subject to National Government criteria for adoption rather than that of the Council.

- 2.12 The recommended option is therefore to adopt the 20mph Policy at Appendix 1, which is based on the consultation draft and includes the clarifying amendments which respond to the comments received.
- 2.13 The 20mph Policy is a technical document that will act as local guidance for the design of future schemes. As such, in order to help communicate and emphasise the approach and the key points of the policy, an additional non-technical executive summary is included at Appendix 2.

Parking on footways/Pavement Parking

- 2.14 The Department for Transport (DfT) consulted the public on options to address parking on footways nationally in 2020. The Department has not yet reported on findings of, nor have responded to, that consultation. Given the absence of this feedback or policy position nationally, it is not prudent to develop a boroughwide policy at this time.
- 2.15 In addition, through the technical paper on Level 4 devolution framework, pavement parking was highlighted as a specific power to draw down. It is assumed that this would mean that the overarching power would be granted to South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority, with practical application delivered in collaboration with constituent Councils. There is not enough detail currently, and the interdependencies within the wider devolution options needs to be understood.
- 2.16 Notwithstanding the above, the Council does retain powers under the Highways Act and Road Traffic Regulation Act to introduce physical obstructions and Traffic Regulation Orders to deter parking on footways. Moreover, the Council does receive complaints from the public regarding parking on footways, and requests for intervention to deal with this.
- 2.17 Unless and until the DfT update their position on parking on footways, it is proposed that the Council will continue to consider requests where prioritised through the Local Neighbourhood and Road Safety and Minor Schemes programmes, and where relevant as part of other projects. To inform these programmes, Officers will continue to log requests from the public and from Members, along with hotspot locations identified by the Council's Highways and Parking Services teams.
- 2.18 Through these programmes, localised interventions will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Broadly speaking, potential interventions fall into three categories:

- Education and information, including an update of the website to reflect RMBC position on footway parking, and production of printed flyers to be placed on offending vehicles;
- Physical obstruction (e.g. bollards); and,
- Introduction and enforcement of local Traffic Regulation Orders.

2.19 If approved the Council's website will be updated to set out this position, with the text included at Appendix 3.

3. Options considered and recommended proposal

3.1 *Options in respect of 20mph Policy*

Option 1 – retain existing 20mph Policy – Not Recommended

3.1.1 This option would abandon the consultation proposal, but would retain the Policy agreed by Cabinet on 15th January, 2014. This option would mean the Council's Policy is outdated, not reflecting either a decade's experience and evidence in respect of the impacts and limitations of 20mph speed limits, nor would it reflect the current transport Policy context nationally, regionally, or locally. Moreover, it is not considered this would address concerns raised in the public consultation:

- Concerns regarding compliance were the single most reported specific concern amongst both supporters and objectors. The 2014 Policy gives an unduly positive view of compliance with signed only limits and is not so specific on the need for physical measures to ensure compliance. This is reflected by specific concerns regarding non-compliance being raised with schemes introduced under that Policy;
- The 2014 Policy does not address concerns in respect of the air quality, congestion and journey time impacts of 20mph speed limits, and is over optimistic on the basis of benefits arising from modal shift in light of evidence presently available;
- The specification of streets deemed suitable for 20mph speed limits in the 2014 Policy is more open to interpretation than the current proposed Policy, and thus is of limited use in presenting a clear, evidenced position to justify the Council's position in respect of 20mph to both supporters and detractors of such limits;
- In particular, the 2014 Policy does not address the adverse impact of widespread 20mph speed limits on bus services raised by operators in consultation (see Section 5).

3.1.2 For these reasons, this option is not recommended.

3.2 **Option 2 – withdraw existing Policy and do not adopt a new 20mph Policy – Not Recommended**

3.2.1 This option would abandon the consultation proposal, and would also withdraw the 2014 Policy, leaving the Council without a local Policy. This would not preclude the introduction of 20mph speed limits under national Policy and guidance – however there would be no local Policy guardrails to ensure desirable outcomes are achieved, to address the concerns raised in the consultation nor to demonstrate how the Council has given these due consideration.

3.2.2 The principal material concerns regarding the draft Policy, regarding compliance, journey time and emissions would not in practice be addressed in absence of a Policy. Additionally, concerns raised by key stakeholders including the Police, fire service and bus operators may not be adequately considered in the absence of a Policy. For this reason, it is not considered this would be an approach that responds to feedback received and therefore this option is not recommended.

3.3 **Option 3 – adopt variant of consulted 20mph Policy with tighter definition of roads not to be subject to 20mph speed limit – Not Recommended**

3.3.1 This option would vary the Policy to exclude a greater proportion of roads used by significant volumes traffic (i.e. 'main roads'). The intention would be to reduce the amount of vehicle mileage driven on 20mph roads, so as to allay concerns regarding emissions and congestion.

3.3.2 This could include –

- Excluding roads based on classification e.g. excluding 'A' roads
- Setting a stricter maximum volume for 20mph speed limits (e.g. a value of 300 PCU/hr peak is often referred to for low speed and low traffic areas in Denmark, lower than the 450-600 PCU/hr maximum in the draft Policy).
- In an extreme case this could preclude the use of 20mph speed limits altogether.

- 3.3.3 The downsides of this approach would be –
- In lieu of other measures to restrain vehicle speeds to 20mph, a greater proportion of streets, including streets not carrying large volumes of traffic or having a strategic function, would be subject to speeds in excess of 20mph, increasing road safety risk in a context where there is little transport benefit in permitting higher speeds.
 - Such a Policy, when taken alongside national guidelines in provisions for cyclists as well as the Council's cycling strategy, might effectively require provision of separate cycling infrastructure on a greater proportion of the Borough's urban road network – at least in lieu of other measures to reduce traffic speeds to circa 20mph or less. Such an approach would come with adverse consequences, including reductions on space for on-street parking and loading, and increased costs and disruption associated with construction. These disbenefits may outweigh the minor adverse impacts of reduced vehicle speeds on many streets carrying modest levels of traffic.
- 3.3.4 It is also worth noting that whilst the Policy sets a maximum volume of traffic where 20mph speed limits are considered appropriate, it does not follow and it is not intended that the Policy requires all urban streets with traffic levels below those thresholds to have reduced speed limits, and the Policy does allow for consideration of streets on a case-by-case basis, for example, where there might be concerns about air quality or congestion impacts. Clarifying this may address some of the concerns raised, and additional wording has been included in the recommended Policy to this end.
- 3.3.5 Furthermore, the evidence review does not support the view that 20mph speed limits or associated traffic calming result in significant impacts (positive or negative) in respect of emissions, nor in respect of congestion outside of some specific circumstances.
- 3.3.6 For the reasons set out above, this option is not recommended.
- 3.4 **Option 4 – adopt a variant of the 20mph Policy to implement 20mph speed limits outside vulnerable locations only – Not Recommended**
- 3.4.1 This option would restrict the use of 20mph speed limits to the immediate vicinity of vulnerable locations, in particular schools, for a maximum length of (say) 200-300 metres. Support for this position was expressed by 7 respondents, all of whom indicated disapproval of the draft Policy.

- 3.4.2 This option is not recommended for two principal reasons –
- It does not respond to road safety risk. Whilst there may be particular issues at some school gates, there are broader consideration beyond these, including –
 - Children’s travel to school extends beyond the immediate school gates;
 - Children may have cause to travel to facilities other than schools; and,
 - Road safety risk is not borne only by (school) children. In fact some risk factors are more applicable to other age groups – for example, at an impact speed of 30 mph, the risk of fatality for child pedestrians (14 years or younger) is 4%, compared with 5% for adults and a much-greater 47% for elderly (60 years or older) pedestrians.
- 3.4.3 Such a policy, when taken alongside national guidelines in provisions for cyclists as well as the Council’s cycling strategy, might effectively require provision of separate cycling infrastructure on practically the entirety of the Borough’s urban road network – at least in lieu of other measures to reduce traffic speeds to circa 20mph or less. Such an approach would come with severe adverse consequences, including severe reductions on space for on-street parking and loading, and significantly increased costs and disruption associated with construction. These disbenefits would almost certainly outweigh the minor adverse impacts of reduced vehicle speeds on most, quieter, streets.
- 3.5 **Option 5 – set stricter requirements for ‘after’ speeds and/or supporting traffic calming interventions – Not Recommended**
- 3.5.1 This option would respond to the 25 of respondents, including 14 of those indicating disapproval of the Policy, who expressed concerns regarding the effectiveness of 20mph speed limits in respect of reducing vehicle speeds.
- 3.5.2 This option is not without merit, noting that limited 1-3mph impact of 20mph speed limits on real-world vehicle speeds, the significant increase in risk of death or serious injury for even small increases in speed above 20mph, and the significantly greater casualty reduction benefits of traffic calming schemes (40-60%) as compared with signed-only speed limits (only 10-20%).
- 3.5.3 The Policy could be strengthened, for example, to require physical traffic calming measures in all cases, or to require lower ‘after’ traffic speeds i.e. 20mph instead of 22mph. However, having regard for national Policy and guidance, and considerations of value for money and practicably, this option is not recommended. Requirements for additional traffic calming may have greater risk of unacceptable adverse impacts for the emergency services.

- 3.5.4 Many of the relevant options request more speed limit enforcement. The duty and responsibility to enforce speed limits sits wholly with South Yorkshire Police, who have limited enforcement capacity. The Policy addresses this by requiring physical interventions to ensure 20mph speed limits are self-enforcing – it is acknowledged this will not however deal with all instances of speeding, particularly extreme infractions.
- 3.5.5 For these reasons, this option is not the recommended option.
- 3.5.6 Note the draft Policy does not, and is not intended, to preclude additional traffic calming interventions in 20mph speed limits even if measured speeds are below 22mph, if there is local need or support for that, provided that this does not adversely impact on emergency services. Additional wording has been included in the version recommended for adoption (in Appendix 1) to clarify this.
- 3.6 **Option 6 – adopt 20mph Policy as consulted upon with clarifying amendments and additional ‘plain English’ executive summary – Recommended Option**
- 3.6.1 This option proposes to address the concerns raised by clarifying and strengthening the language in the Policy, to emphasise the proposed restraint in the use of 20mph speed limits, and to emphasise the current evidence where there are specific concerns about potential implementation or impacts.
- 3.6.2 An additional non-technical executive summary of the policy is proposed in order to help communicate and emphasise the approach and the key points of the policy.
- 3.6.3 This is the recommended option, and the recommended Policy is attached as Appendix 1, with an executive summary included at Appendix 2.

Options in respect of parking on footways

- 3.7 **Option 1 – do minimum – Not Recommended**
- 3.7.1 This option would see matters of footway parking considered on a case-by-case basis, where prioritised under Minor Schemes of Local Neighbourhood and Road Safety programmes, and/or where relevant to larger projects. This option is not recommended, as this would not address the Year Ahead Delivery Plan commitment and would not provide adequate information to the public in respect of the Council position on this issue.
- 3.8 **Option 2 – develop a new footway parking Policy – Not Recommended**

3.8.1 Due to ongoing uncertainty around the national and regional position and powers in respect of parking on footways, it is considered probable that any new policy may be rendered obsolete within a short period of time. For this reason, this option is not recommended.

3.9 **Option 3 – update the Council’s website to reflect the Council’s existing position - Recommended**

3.9.1 As with Option 1, but with additional information provided on the Council’s website to communicate the position. This is the recommended option.

4. Consultation on proposal

4.1 The online public consultation in respect of the 20mph Policy is covered in Section 2. In addition, key stakeholders were written to – the paragraphs below details the responses received.

4.2 South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service responded, advising that changes to speed limits do not usually affect their response times, but traffic calming features can do. This issue is ordinarily addressed through consultation in respect of traffic calming measures proposed.

4.2.1 Additional text has been included to –

- emphasise the need for engagement with the emergency services in developing traffic calming schemes,
- to clarify that 20mph speed limits should not be proposed where measures are required to ensure compliance cannot be agreed with the emergency services (paragraph 3.1 and Appendix 1).

4.3 Stagecoach South Yorkshire responded, indicating that a widespread 20mph speed limit (with that recently introduced in the Wales [the constituent Country] cited as an example) may result in increased running times for buses, resulting in reduced service frequencies and creating a cycle of decline for bus patronage and services. A meeting was held subsequently to explain that the draft Policy, in particular the requirement that streets carrying more than 6 buses per hour each way were excluded from 20mph speed limits is specifically intended to avoid adverse impacts on bus services – with the only exception being the defined town centres of Rotherham, Wath, Maltby and Dinnington. This appeared to address the concern raised – whilst operators were invited to provide subsequent comment on the bus threshold and the Policy more broadly, none was received. Additional text has been included, to emphasise this position (paragraph 6.1) and to highlight the need for engagement with bus operators and the Passenger Transport Executive to ensure proposals do not result in adverse impacts for public transport (paragraphs 5.1 & 6.1, and Appendix 1).

4.4 South Yorkshire Police indicated support for the proposal, but raised concerns that notwithstanding the Policy, limits may be introduced without adequate supporting measures leading to limited effectiveness, and an increase in enforcement burden for South Yorkshire Police. This

is consistent with one of the main themes fed back by the public – additional text is included in the Policy to clarify that 20mph speed limits will only be introduced with supporting measures as required to ensure a good level of compliance per paragraph 3.5 above.

- 4.5 Thorpe Salvin Parish Council provided a response, raising concerns about lack of investment in the parish, advocating for 20mph speed limit in the village, and expressing dissatisfaction that this had not been prioritised for Tranche 1 Local Neighbourhood and Road Safety Fund monies. This request does not appear to be in conflict with the draft Policy and no concern was raised that it might be. The request for the 20mph limit will be added to our list of requests for prioritisation should funding become available in future.
- 4.6 No local consultation has been undertaken in respect of the Footway Parking Policy.
- 4.7 Where 20mph speed limits or measures to address pavement parking are proposed, these are subject to public consultation as part of scheme development. All schemes will be subject to public consultation, which will provide opportunity for residents and road users to express their concerns, opinions, and suggestions. The Council will actively listen and consider feedback received when deciding how or if schemes should be progressed. Additional text has been included in the proposed 20mph Policy to draw attention to this (paragraph 1.5).

5. Timetable and Accountability for Implementing this Decision

- 5.1 If approved, the 20mph Policy will apply and can be considered for any new capital schemes entering the Transport Capital Programme after the Cabinet decision.
- 5.2 The action to update the Council website in respect of parking on footways will be implemented by the Transportation Infrastructure Service and web team within 1 month of the decision.
- 5.3 Delivery of interventions in respect of the 20mph Policy and in respect of parking on footways will be subject to entry of schemes into the Capital Programme and due statutory process. No scheme will be entered into the Capital Programme or delivered as a direct result of this decision.

6. Financial and Procurement Advice and Implications

- 6.1 There are no direct financial implications arising from the recommendations contained within this report.
- 6.2 There are no direct procurement implications arising from the recommendations detailed in this report.

7. Legal Advice and Implications

7.1 The Traffic Management Act 2004 states at section 16:

*It is the duty of a local traffic authority to manage their road network with a view to achieving, so far as may be reasonably practicable having regard to their other obligations, policies and objectives, the following objectives—
securing the expeditious movement of traffic on the authority's road network;*

The adoption of this Policy contributes to the Council's compliance with the above duty.

7.2 The consultation undertaken is consistent with the established case law principles (Gunning) and the consultation responses must be taken into account when deciding whether to adopt the Policy as recommended. The relevant consultation responses and the Councils comments/amendments consequent to those responses, are set out within the report and the relevant Appendices.

7.3 Further the Policy is consistent with DfT guidance and sets out the criteria to ensure that the Council adopts 20 mph zones on a consistent and fair basis and has a robust assessment procedure for doing so.

8. Human Resources Advice and Implications

8.1 There are no Human Resources implications arising from this report. The Policy will be implemented through existing staff resources within the Transportation and Highways Design Service within Planning, Regeneration and Transportation.

9. Implications for Children and Young People and Vulnerable Adults

9.1 The implications of the Policy will depend on the related schemes that will be delivered, which are unknown at this point. Typically, measures such as restricting speeds, reduce road traffic collisions and local transport improvements can be expected to improve conditions for children, young people and vulnerable adults – this will need to be confirmed by Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) (where proportionate to intervention) once schemes are identified.

10. Equalities and Human Rights Advice and Implications

10.1 An Equalities Screening Assessment is attached at Appendix 4 of this report. The implications of the Policy will depend on the schemes that will be delivered as a consequence of it, which are unknown at this point. Typically, measures such as lowered speeds reduce road traffic collisions and local transport improvements can be expected to improve equalities – this will need to be confirmed by Equalities Impact Assessment where proportionate and once schemes are identified.

- 10.2 Additionally, some equalities implications can be inferred from the 20mph consultation response –
- those who indicated being aged over 60 years (n=10) indicated significantly higher approval (80%) as opposed to the response generally (45%);
 - women (n=26) indicated higher approval for the proposed 20mph Policy (62%) as opposed to the response generally (45%); and,
 - people indicating non-heterosexual orientation (n=13) indicated less approval for the proposed 20mph Policy (31%) as opposed to the response generally (45%).

11. Implications for CO₂ Emissions and Climate Change

- 11.1 No direct impact on emissions is forecast as direct consequence of this decision i.e. the adoption of the Policy. Implementation of the Policy can be expected to have emissions impacts – these will be considered on a scheme-by-scheme basis and will be subject to their own Carbon Impact Assessment associated with the Traffic Regulation Order process.
- 11.2 Further detail can be found in the Carbon Impact Assessment at Appendix 5, as well as in the proposed Policy itself at Appendix 1.

12. Implications for Partners

- 12.1 The 20mph Policy carries implications for all road users – which in practice is everyone. In terms of partner agencies and organisations, key stakeholders are the emergency services, utility provider companies, transport operators (road & rail), road haulage associations and companies, key highway user groups such as motoring, cycling, walking and disability representation bodies. The exact nature of these implications will vary considerably between individual schemes developed as part of the Policy.
- 12.2 Where required engagement takes place with interested parties during 20 mph scheme development and at construction. Any implications that may arise through specific measures would be addressed as part the scheme design and / or Traffic Regulation Order process that governs the operation and use of the road network.

13. Risks and Mitigation

- 13.1 Projects related to the Policy will have risks are identified within scheme design, business case preparation and then at operational level during the construction process. These are managed using recognised risk register approaches and in accordance with the Council's contract procedure rules for the approval of any project or programme changes.

Accountable Officer(s)

Matt Reynolds, Head of Transportation Infrastructure Service
Email: Matthew.Reynolds@rotherham.gov.uk

Nat Porter, Service Manager, Transport Planning and Policy
Email: nat.porter@rotherham.gov.uk

Approvals obtained on behalf of:

	Name	Date
Chief Executive	Sharon Kemp	29/01/24
Strategic Director of Finance & Customer Services (S.151 Officer)	Judith Badger	24/01/24
Assistant Director of Legal Services (Monitoring Officer)	Phillip Horsfield	24/01/24

Report Author: Matt Reynolds, Head of Transportation Infrastructure Service
Matthew.Reynolds@rotherham.gov.uk

This report is published on the Council's [website](#).