

TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS – REPRESENTATIONS REPORT

SECTION 1 – Cover Sheet	
Order Title:	THE WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (VARIOUS ROADS, LEAMINGTON SPA) (20 MPH SPEED LIMIT) ORDER 2026
Order Type:	Speed Limit Reduction 30mph to 20mph.
Location:	St Fremund Way, Leamington Spa
Consultation Start Date:	22 nd January 2026
Consultation End Date:	13 th February 2026
Officer/Team Name:	Ewen Milroy-Macleod – Engineering Technician – Minor Works
Legal ref no.:	

Classification (see Section 4 for definitions)	Minor	☐
	Non-Minor (2 or fewer objections)	☒
	Experimental	☐

n.b. If neither of the above Classifications apply objections should be presented to the Portfolio Holder for Transport & Planning for decision.

Background of Proposals
This Order originated as a proposed delegated budget scheme raised by Councillor Will Roberts, as part of highway safety improvements to an area within his constituency. The proposal was to reduce the speed limit along St Fremund Way, Leamington Spa and its surrounding residential streets from 30mph to 20mph. The Order was originally drafted and advertised in September 2025, which passed through consultation with no objections. As two residential streets (Withy Bank and Peacock Close) were not included in the original order, it was decided to advertise a modification to the proposals to include these roads within the 20mph speed limit order. The proposed modified order was drafted, alongside the public notice of the modifications, and advertised, inviting consultation responses on the modifications only. This is the consultation that has just passed dated 22nd January to the 13th February 2026, and received one objection.

Legal Services
Legal Services have confirmed via email that the proposed Order was subject to statutory advertisement on the dates reported (section 1) in the Leamington Spa Courier, as well as being on deposit at Shire Hall. Representations were received as noted below.

Risk Implications
The Corporate Risk Management Approach has been compiled with to identify and access the significant risks associated with this decision / project. This includes (but not limited to) political, legislation and reputational risks.

Overview of Representations		
Elements within the Order with <u>no objections</u> :		The original proposed Order
1		
2		
Elements within the Order with objections:		No. of Objections:
1	Modifications of proposals	1
2		

Documents Attached:

Public Notice ☒

Statement of Reasons ☒

Plan(s) ☒

Copies of Objection(s) ☐

Additional Documentation:
20 MPH Speed Limit Plan PTRO24 028 001B
Appendix A Public Notice of Modifications
Appendix B 20mph Speed Limit Order
Appendix C Statement of Reasons 20mph Speed Limit
Appendix D Speed Survey Data

SECTION 2 – Objections & Comments	
Order Element:	Modifications of proposals

Representations received	
Total no. objections	1
Total no. support	1

No.	Representations	Officer Response	Total number of responses containing the comment
1	OBJECTION I am writing as a local resident of the Warwick/Leamington area to submit a formal objection to the proposed (Various Roads, Leamington Spa) (20 mph Speed Limit) Order 2025. I strongly believe that the reduction of speed limits from 30mph to 20mph across the nineteen roads identified in the Schedule—including the entire length of St Fremund Way and Admiral Way—is an disproportionate intervention that lacks a robust empirical and policy-led justification. My objection is based on the following grounds: 1. Failure to Balance Statutory Duties under Section 122 of the RTRA 1984 Under Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the Council has a mandatory duty to "secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic". High Court precedent, specifically <i>Wilson & Anor v. Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority</i> (2009), establishes that an authority fails in its duty if it does not adequately balance the requirement for traffic movement against other factors. By	COMMENT It is important to note that the consultation advertised was as per the public notice, and only invited responses on the modification to include Peacock Close and Withy Bank within the previous proposed order advertised in September 2025. The September 2025 consultation included the other 20 sections of road and passed with no objections. RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATION 1.1 The objector raises concerns that the council has failed to provide a counter analysis on the impact a speed reduction may have on journey times and traffic flow. Whilst a speed reduction will result in vehicles taking more time to cover distance, the difference in travel time along the two sections of road advertised will be negligible. Both sections of road are short in length, with the approximate length of Peacock Close at 140m and Withy Bank at 80m. If we take the travel speeds of 30mph (13.4 metres per second) and 20mph (8.9 metres per second), we can calculate an approximate travel time. It would take 10.44 seconds to traverse Peacock	1

proposing a 33% reduction in permitted velocity across an entire estate without providing a counter-analysis on the impact to journey times and traffic flow, the Council has failed this balancing test. 2. Misalignment with the National "Plan for Drivers" (March 2024) The proposal directly contradicts the UK Government's "Plan for Drivers" and the subsequent March 2024 updates to DfT Circular 01/2013. National policy now explicitly restricts 20mph limits to where they are "sensible and appropriate" and mandates that they must "not be introduced as a blanket measure". Proposing a single Order for nineteen different roads is the definition of an indiscriminate blanket application. Furthermore, the 2024 guidance requires "demonstrated local support". The "Statement of Reasons" mentions political and police support but fails to evidence broad community consent among the residents actually affected. 3. Lack of Empirical Efficacy (The Atkins Report) The Council's safety justification is contradicted by the most comprehensive research available. The Atkins 20mph Research Study (2018), commissioned by the DfT, found that "signed-only" 20mph limits (those without physical traffic calming, as proposed here) resulted in a median speed reduction of just 0.7mph in residential areas. Crucially, the report concluded there was "not enough evidence to conclude that there has been a significant change in collisions and casualties" in residential contexts. Implementing an Order that research suggests will be ineffective is a poor use of public resources. 4. Negative Environmental Impacts and the "Dwell Time" Effect The claim that 20mph limits will reduce emissions is technically flawed. Real-world data from the introduction of 20mph zones in Edinburgh found "no evidence of	Close at 30mph, vs 15.7 seconds at 20mph. The same can be applied to Withy Bank, 5.97 seconds at 30mph vs 8.98 seconds at 20mph. Regarding the potential impact on traffic flow, both sections of road are cul-de-sac residential streets that are only likely to serve residents, visitors and service vehicles, and are therefore unlikely to see a significant amount of vehicle traffic. It is of our opinion that the reduction in the speed limit will not affect traffic flow as a result. 2. 1 We would not consider the proposal a blanket approach, as it simply aims to maintain consistency across a residential estate. The order contains 4 sections of road that could be considered access routes, with the other road sections included within the order primarily made up of residential cul-de-sac streets. Inconsistent speeds across the estate could create confusion for residents and impact enforcement. The two roads advertised (Peacock Close and Withy Bank) are both residential cul-de-sac streets, and if not included would require additional signage and create erratic changes in the speed limit. The objector raises concerns about lack of consent among residents actually affected, but the proposals have been advertised to residents and the local parishes, through local newspaper and notices posted on site. The scheme has also come forward as a delegated budget job, raised by the local Councillor Will Roberts, looking to improve the area for his constituents. Overall, the Order has widespread support with Members, Police and local community by virtue of no other objections received. 3.1 The objector notes findings in The Atkins 20mph Research Study (2018). The DfT 01/2013 Circular, as revised in	
--	---	--

	a statistically significant decrease in NO2 and PM10" and even some evidence of increases in measured pollution. Driving at 20mph often forces vehicles into lower gears (2nd or 3rd) at higher RPMs, increasing engine strain. Furthermore, because vehicles travel 33% slower, they spend significantly more "dwell time" on the road emitting exhaust gases per journey. 5. Violation of the Council's Own Speed Management Strategy Warwickshire County Council's own policy (based on DfT Circular 01/2006) states that 20mph limits are only suitable where mean speeds are "already at or below 24mph". The Council has not published the mean speed data for these nineteen roads. If existing speeds are higher than 24mph, the Council's own policy dictates that a signed-only limit is unsuitable as it will not be self-enforcing and will place an "unreasonable burden" on police resources. I urge Warwickshire County Council to withdraw this Order. A more proportionate, evidence-led approach would involve targeted safety engineering (such as improved crossing points) at high-risk locations, rather than an estate-wide blanket reduction that fails to comply with current national standards. Please acknowledge receipt of this objection and include it in the public record for the Cabinet Member's decision.	2024 remains the current guidance for setting road speed limits in England and clearly states the factors that should be taken into account such as composition of road users, road function and environment, including whether residential or not and history of collisions. When traveling through the roads within the estate, the bends and layout naturally lend to vehicles travelling at a lower speed, acting as a form of traffic calming. It is also common to find parked cars across this estate, which can act as a psychological form of traffic calming. As noted by TRL in 'Road design measures to reduce drivers' speed via 'psychological' processes: A literature review', under section 4.2.7, 'Research indicates that the presence of parked cars down the side of a road will have an effect on speed. Van de Kerkof and Berénos (1989), for example, found that parked cars on both sides of the road, or on the driver's side only, resulted in speed reductions compared with the same road with no parked cars present.' It also notes 'The addition of street parking with the vehicles parallel to the road was found to reduce estimated travelling speeds by 5 mile/h on average.' As part of the 20mph limit, we are also required to install repeater signage and supplement this with road marking speed roundels, highlighting of the speed limit further. 4.1 The proposed new 20mph Speed limit will assist drivers in driving within the speed limit, which would keep all vehicle speeds down, causing a decrease in pollution as there would be less, stopping and starting. As per response point 1.1, any increase in "dwell time" will be negligible on Peacock Close and Withy Bank due to the nature of the roads and their length. Also note within 1.1, traffic flow will not be affected by the speed	
--	---	--	--

		reduction and result in no increase in dwell time. Within the UK Parliament Post – 20 mph speed limits and zones: public health impacts, under section 5.2 notes evidence relating to 20 mph intervention and air quality. Key points include “Vehicles on 20 mph roads spend less time in the acceleration and deacceleration phase, which produces fewer particulate emissions” & “In residential areas, traffic flow (rather than speed limits) often determines speeds and journey times. Congestion can increase pollution. Some studies have found that 20 mph zones can reduce congestion, which may reduce pollution.” 5.1 Speed data was gathered for sections of the estate which raised concerns regarding speed, that demonstrated average vehicle speeds being at or under the 24mph mark. This was presented to the Traffic & Road Safety team for approval, alongside Warwickshire Police, with Traffic & Road Safety confirming their support and Warwickshire Police stating they would not object to the proposals. As noted in 3.1, the roads within the estate naturally lend to vehicles traveling at lower speeds, and Peacock Close and Withy Bank are short cul-de-sac residential streets where vehicles should be travelling at lower speeds, as they will typically be beginning or ending their journeys. To follow up on the objector’s concern that it will place an “unreasonable burden” on Police resources, Warwickshire Police were made aware of proposals prior to consultation and confirmed they had no objections to the proposals. They also provided a consultation response to confirm they have no objections.	
--	--	--	--

Note – Representations are redacted and show only the detail of the correspondence, not the correspondent or any identifying information.

Officer Recommendations

The reduction of the speed limit on Peacock Close and Withy Bank, has been requested by the local Councillor to be included as part of the wider speed limit order advertised in September 2025, to improve the area for his constituents' and maintain consistency across the estate following requests from residents for a safety improvement scheme. This safety scheme being a reduction in the existing speed limit with new signing/lining to improve safety for residents across the St Fremund Way residential estate.

Speed data was gathered to back the proposal and presented to both Traffic & Road Safety and Warwickshire Police for their approval, to which both were supportive.

It is therefore recommended to implement these proposals as advertised. The WCC Police, Councillor Will Roberts and Traffic & Road Safety fully support the change in Speed Limit on Peacock Close & Withy Bank to 20mph.

Members Comments

Councillor Will Roberts as the local members, and Jennifer Warren as the Portfolio Holder, were consulted at time of advertising. No representations have been received in response.

SECTION 3 – Recommendations & Approvals

Element	Recommendation	Recommendation upheld?
Modifications of proposals	To approve the making of the following element as advertised.	☒

Additional information

[illegible]

SECTION 4 – Constitutional Definitions of Minor Traffic Orders

Warwickshire County Council Constitution

Part 2(10), Appendix A, 10.5 Executive Director for Communities “Rights of Way, Traffic Regulation, Planning and Environment”

Rights of Way and Traffic Regulation			
	Powers and Duties	Statutory Reference	Function Type
5*	5.1 To make temporary traffic regulation orders and experimental traffic regulation orders; 5.2 To propose the making of Minor Traffic Orders (as defined in item 18 of this table below) and, subject to consideration of all objections duly made under the relevant Regulations and not withdrawn (if any), to make the Minor Traffic Orders; 5.3 To propose the making of orders (other than temporary orders and Minor Traffic Orders) relating to road traffic, parking places and speed limits and, in the event of no more than two objections being received (and not withdrawn) under the relevant Regulations, to make the orders.	Part I, II, IV and VI, Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984	Executive
18*	To propose and make minor road traffic orders provided that the local member does not object. A “minor traffic order” is one falling into one of the following categories: (i) no waiting at any time restrictions at junctions including waiting restrictions required for the safe and efficient operation of traffic signals. (ii) introduction or removal of waiting restrictions on one or both sides of a length of road extending no greater than 50 metres on a principal road or 100 metres on a non-principal road, when measured along the centreline of the road. (iii) introduction or removal of on-street parking places, on one or both sides of a length of road extending no greater than 50 metres on a principal road or 100 metres on a non-principal road, when measured along the centreline of the road. (iv) Amendments to hours of operation of existing on-street parking places. (v) Extension of an existing speed limit on a length of road extending no greater than 50 metres on a principal road or 100 metres on a non-principal road, when measured along the centre line of the road. (vi) Extension of an existing speed limit to encompass any new accesses to new development (vii) Waiting restrictions, moving traffic orders, speed limits as recommended by a Road Safety Audit (viii) Waiting restrictions, eligibility for residents parking permits, moving traffic orders, speed limits as an integral component of wider schemes. (ix) Structural weight limits as required by load capacity assessments. (x) Individual bays for Disabled Badge Holders Only within residential streets which already have on-street parking places. (xi) Any other traffic order designated by the Director of Environment, Planning and Transport as such following consultation with the Executive Director for Communities, the relevant Portfolio Holder and the Chair of the relevant Overview & Scrutiny Committee. The maximum lengths of roads which come within the definition of “Minor Traffic Order” apply to each separate proposal and not the total length of road covered by an order which may contain a number of proposals. The above definition of a “Minor Traffic Order” will apply to new orders and to amendments to existing orders.	Parts I and II, Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984	Executive