

Our Ref: RPU-N/GC/445-10-51  
Your Ref: KB/91012184



**SURREY  
POLICE**  
*With you, making  
Surrey safer*

**Graham Cannon**  
Police Constable 40

31<sup>st</sup> October 2007

Mr Banisaied  
Surrey County Council  
South West Area Office  
3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Grosvenor House  
London Square  
Cross Lanes  
Guildford  
GU1 1FA

Dear Mr Banisaied,

**Re: Effingham Common Road- Proposed 40mph Speed Limit.**

Thank you for your letter dated 18<sup>th</sup> October, which was in response to my reply to the formal consultation on the above proposed speed limit change.

I have now had a chance to consider the method and reasoning behind your decision to apply for a 40mph speed limit in Effingham Common Road and would make the following comments:-

You state that the assessment should fall within the second tier of the policy shown in table two. However this section of the policy states that a 40mph limit may be applied as a 'buffer' on the outskirts of villages where roadside development is not dense. In my experience a 'buffer zone' is a short stretch of road of no more than 200-300meters and certainly not the length of road, of approximately one and half miles, that this review is subject to. As I pointed out in my previous correspondence, my view is that this length of road falls within table three of the policy, which gives a possible preferred speed limit of 40 or 50mph, dependant upon the number of collisions. As there have been so few injury collisions in the last three years the preferred limit should be 50mph.


You also refer to paragraph 36 of the Dft guidelines concerning the common method of recording the characteristics of speed and the use of mean and 85<sup>th</sup> percentiles and I fully agree with the comment that 'they reflect what the majority of drivers perceive as an appropriate speed to be driven for the road'. To this end the Dft guidance indicates that the mean speed driven on the road should be at or below the new proposed limit. Your surveys have indicated

that the mean speed of vehicles is 42/43mph and it is for this reason I am of the opinion it would be inappropriate to reduce the limit to 40mph.

In addition, section 21 of the Dft guidance indicates that speed limits are only one element of speed management and should not be set in isolation. They should be part of a package with other measures, such as engineering and landscaping, to manage speed and raise the driver's awareness of their environment. Section 22 goes on to say 'Indeed, if a speed limit is set in isolation, or is unrealistically low, it is likely to be ineffective and lead to disrespect for the limit, as well as requiring significant and avoidable enforcement costs'. On the same theme the SCC document 'Determining and Applying Speed Limits' also states that lowering a speed limit alone might not be effective in reducing actual speeds without other measures. Within your consultation you make no mention of any accompanying speed reducing measures and I am therefore assuming that in your opinion the change of speed limit alone will achieve the desired result. However, as can be seen from both the Dft and SCC guidance on the matter, this is not the case and should be avoided.

After considering all of the above I can only reaffirm my opposition to the new limit and ask that the speed limit remain at 50mph. I consider it to be totally appropriate for the nature of the road, the current speeds driven on it and meet's with all guidance given by Dft and your own policy.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Graham Cannon', written in dark ink.

Graham Cannon  
Road Safety & Traffic Management Officer

Tel: 08456 009 009  
Fax: 01483 517506

Graham Cannon  
Police Constable 40  
Roads Policing Unit Northern  
Bretlands Road  
Chertsey  
Surrey  
KT16 9QN

**Surrey Highways  
Local Highways Team  
Guildford**

South West Area Office  
Grosvenor House  
London Square  
Cross Lanes  
Guildford  
GU1 1FA

Your ref:  
Our ref: KB/91012184

18 October 2007

Dear PC Cannon,

**EFFINGHAM COMMON ROAD, EFFINGHAM  
PROPOSED 40MPH SPEED LIMIT**

I refer to your letter dated 10 August and subsequent discussions with Mr Bahram Assadi, regarding the above mentioned.

My understanding is that you had discussion with Bahram regarding the proposed limit and still wish to object to the proposals.

I have now had the opportunity to review the proposals and would clarify some of the issues raised in your letter.

As you are aware, the speed limits are assessed on the basis of County Council Speed Limit Policy, which is based on DfT Guidelines adapted to accommodate local needs and aspirations. The speed limit therefore was assessed as 40mph on the ground that it falls within second tier of the policy as shown in table 2 which indicates that:

*"Roads with parish development similar, though not enough to be defined as a village. This speed limit may be applied as a "buffer" on the outskirts of villages where roadside development is not dense."*

Furthermore may I also draw your attention to the Department of Transport, Setting Local Speed Limits Circular 01/2006, Section 5.3 Paragraph 88 which states that:

*"Roads Suitable for 40mph are generally higher quality suburban roads or on the outskirts of urban areas where there is little development. ...."*

I have checked personal injury accidents records for the previous three years and there have been 3 incidents. These were 2 in 2007 and one in 2004. For your information the incident numbers were, GU97645/07, GU98058/07 and GU53367/04.

The final but not least the question of mean speed, you are correct to say that the proposed speed to



be at or below the mean speed (page 11 Paragraph 37), however I would suggest that this statement should be considered in conjunction with previous paragraph 36, which indicates that:

*“Mean speeds and 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds (the speed at or below which 85% of the traffic is travelling) are the most commonly recorded characteristics of speed. Traffic authorities should continue to.....they also reflect what the majority of drivers perceive as an appropriate speed to be driven for the road, and are felt to be easier for road users themselves too understand”*

Considering the County Policy and also the Dft guideline, in conjunction with your comments, I am of opinion that the proposed speed limit is the best suited for the road.

I would appreciate it if you would reconsider the situation in the light of my comments and let me know if wish to continue to object to the proposals.

Yours sincerely



Kaz Banisaied  
Principal Engineer  
Local Highways Team - Guildford

Our Ref: RPU-N/GC/445-10-51  
Your Ref: BF/LEGAL/MISC/GLD/AK

91012184  
RECEIVED  
15 AUG 2007  
AKAZ



SURREY  
POLICE  
*With you, making  
Surrey safer*

Graham Cannon  
Police Constable 40

10<sup>th</sup> August 2007

Mr A Kazantzis  
Surrey County Council  
South West Area Office  
3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Grosvenor House  
London Square  
Cross Lanes  
Guildford  
GU1 1FA

Closed  
this Alec

Dear Mr Kazantzis,

**Re-; Proposed 40mph speed limit, Effingham Common Road, Effingham.**

Thank you for your correspondence regarding the proposal to reduce the speed limit along Effingham Common Road to 40mph.

This was subject of an initial consultation by your engineer Mr Assadi to Surrey Police in March 2007. This initial consultation was dealt with by PC Bashford and his response should be on your file. In essence it stated that PC Bashford had concerns that the new proposed limit did not meet the agreed Surrey County Council/ Surrey Police Speed Policy and that the new limit was inappropriate. As PC Bashford has since retired, this formal consultation has been passed to me to deal. I have again assessed the proposals and make the following comments.

Referring back to the original consultation in March 2007, I disagree with the SCC Engineers assessment that the new limit meets the criteria set out in the speed limit policy. My assessment is that Effingham Common Road should be classified as a rural road, in tier 2. This gives a possible preferred speed limit of 40 or 50 mph dependent on the number of collisions. As there has only been 1 injury collision along this length of road in the last 3 years, my opinion is that it should fall within the 50mph speed limit banding. In addition, Mr Assadi states that the speed surveys that have been carried out show the mean speed of vehicles to be 42/ 43mph. It is then suggested that this also indicates that the speed limit should be lowered to 40mph. I have checked the Dft guidelines set out in the document Setting Local Speed Limits (circular 01/2006). This states that the mean speed driven on the road should be at or below the new posted speed limit. This would also indicate the correct speed limit to be 50mph, not the 40mph currently being suggested.

Also I can only reiterate previous comments made by PC Bashford in that a 40mph limit along this part of Effingham Common Road would be inappropriate, given the nature of the road and surrounding and consequently not adhered to by many drivers. As I am sure you are aware police resources are limited and any enforcement has to be prioritised to areas/ roads that have a high collision rate. I am pleased to say that this is certainly not the case in Effingham Common Road and consequently we could not give any guarantee that enforcement would take place.

Therefore taking into consideration the fact that the new speed limit does not meet the Dft or SCC speed limit criteria, I have to inform you that I object to this proposal.

Should you wish to discuss the matter further please contact me at the address shown.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Graham Cannon', written in a cursive style.

Graham Cannon  
Road Safety & Traffic Management.