



Amendments

Date: 24 November 2021

Agenda Item No. 10: Notice of Motion – Environment Bill

Amendment Proposer: Councillor Martin Tett

Amendment Seconder: Councillor Peter Strachan

Amendment wording: (to add additional wording, in **BOLD**)

The wording of the first two introductory paragraphs is unchanged.

“This Council calls on the Leader and Cabinet Member for Climate Change and Environment to:

1. Write to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, and to all Buckinghamshire Members of Parliament, ~~expressing our grave concern about the weakened legislation that fails to markedly restrict the discharge of raw sewage into our rivers and streams; and to~~ **making known the concerns of this Council and emphasising the importance of the Government bringing forward a clear strategy for ceasing this environmentally damaging practice as a matter of priority**
2. Write to the Chief Executive(s) of those water companies with sewage treatment works discharging raw sewage into the Thames, Ouse, Wye and other waterways across Buckinghamshire to seek assurance that they will pursue a programme of capital investment that will “demonstrate improvements in the sewerage systems and progressive reductions in the harm caused by untreated sewage discharges” per the Lords’ Amendment.”

Original Wording (Council agenda):

Buckinghamshire Council is a riparian owner of large sections of river within the County, it has two of the UK’s major rivers, the River Thames and the River Ouse, and also highly sensitive chalk streams within South Buckinghamshire. As a Council we want to do everything we can to maintain the ecology contained within those areas alongside protecting public health.

Recently the Government voted for more moderate measures in the Environment Bill than those proposed by the House of Lords which would have restricted the discharge of

raw sewage into our water courses and place a legal duty on water companies to invest in the necessary infrastructure to protect and improve our waterways.

“This Council calls on the Leader and Cabinet Member for Climate Change and Environment to:

1. Write to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, and to all Buckinghamshire Members of Parliament, expressing our grave concern about the weakened legislation that fails to markedly restrict the discharge of raw sewage into our rivers and streams; and to
2. Write to the Chief Executive(s) of those water companies with sewage treatment works discharging raw sewage into the Thames, Ouse, Wye and other waterways across Buckinghamshire to seek assurance that they will pursue a programme of capital investment that will “demonstrate improvements in the sewerage systems and progressive reductions in the harm caused by untreated sewage discharges” per the Lords’ Amendment.”

Agenda Item No. 10: Notice of Motion – Speed Limits

Amendment Proposer: Councillor Peter Cooper

Amendment Seconder: Councillor Stuart Wilson

Amendment wording: (to add additional wording, in **BOLD**)

“This council notes that Thames Valley Police have changed their previous stance of opposing the implementation of 20mph speed limits, although TVP will not currently be pro-actively enforcing them. ~~Thames Valley Police, whilst now supportive in principle of 20mph, do so on the basis that to be effective it must be in the ‘right location’ and have a suitable physical environment to ensure 20mph is adhered to i.e. they are self-enforcing. Thames Valley Police are clear that they will not currently be pro-actively enforcing revised limits.~~

This council also notes that ~~whilst~~ 20mph speed limits are initially popular with **Town and Parish Councils and their many residents**, ~~research by the Department for Transport shows that there has only been a small reduction in median speed (less than 1mph) where these have been introduced.~~ **and that there is strong evidence from organisations such as ROSPA to conclude that pedestrian fatalities reduce from 8% with vehicle speed of 30mph, to 1.5% at 20mph.** ~~There is also insufficient evidence to conclude that~~ There has been a significant **change reduction** in collisions and casualties following the introduction of 20mph limits. ~~in residential areas.~~ **It is also noted that 20mph limits in residential areas contribute positively to quieter, safer and cleaner neighbourhoods and help promote healthy environmentally friendly forms of transport, such as walking and cycling.** ~~Evidence~~

~~suggests that average speeds tend to fall to compliant levels only on roads where previous average speeds were already low, i.e., around 24 mph~~

Furthermore, many UK local authorities including neighbouring Oxfordshire County Council, **now have a county-wide 20mph speed limit policy for residential areas.**

~~Oxfordshire estimate that to replace the majority of 30mph limits with 20mph, investing in signage only, in line with their new policy and approach, will require a capital programme investment in the region of £8M spread over the whole period of its implementation. By means of its policy SLP1, Oxfordshire County Council will promote 20mph as the default limit for residential, villages and retail areas to ensure speeds are appropriate to the nature of the environment and location. It also notes that without physical changes to the road, speed compliance may be poor.~~

~~“This Council therefore resolves that any proposed reductions in speed limits to 20mph to support the principle of 20mph speed limits on the understanding that schemes promoted by Town or Parish Councils should be assessed and supported by the Buckinghamshire Council’s Road Safety team and all relevant local members, and should be funded by the applicant(s). It also requires that all schemes should meet the DfT’s criteria for 20mph limits and be largely self-enforcing. No expectation should be generated that the Thames Valley Police or the Buckinghamshire Council will enforce these schemes.~~

In view of the potential cost of eligible schemes the council will normally only implement them where/when resources are available and when the requesting parish, town council or Committee contributes towards the cost of implementation.”

Original Wording (Council agenda):

This council notes that Thames Valley Police have changed their previous stance of opposing reductions in speed limits. Thames Valley Police, whilst now supportive in principle of 20mph, do so on the basis that to be effective it must be in the ‘right location’ and have a suitable physical environment to ensure 20mph is adhered to i.e. they are self-enforcing. Thames Valley Police are clear that they will not currently be pro-actively enforcing revised limits.

This council also notes that whilst 20mph speed limits are initially popular with many residents, research by the Department for Transport shows that there has only been a small reduction in median speed (less than 1mph) where these have been introduced. There is also insufficient evidence to conclude that there has been a significant change in collisions and casualties following the introduction of 20mph limits in residential areas. Evidence suggests that average speeds tend to fall to compliant levels only on roads where previous average speeds were already low, i.e., around 24 mph

Neighbouring Oxfordshire County Council estimate that to replace the majority of 30mph limits with 20mph, investing in signage only, in line with their new policy and approach, will require a capital programme in the region of £8M. It also notes that without physical changes to the road, speed compliance may be poor.

“This Council therefore resolves that any proposed reductions in speed limits to 20mph should be funded by the applicant(s), and be assessed by and supported by the Council’s Road Safety team and all local members. It also requires that all schemes should meet the DfT’s criteria for 20mph limits and be self-enforcing. No expectation should be generated that the Thames Valley Police or the Buckinghamshire Council will enforce these schemes.

In view of the potential cost of eligible schemes the council will normally only implement them where/when resources are available and when the requesting parish, town council or Committee contributes towards the cost of implementation.”

