A286 Chichester to Cocking - Route Safety Scheme
2010/11 Programme

Report by Director of Operations – Infrastructure and
Divisional Manager – Safety & Traffic Management

Executive Summary

A key element of the County Council’s approach to road safety and speed management strategies is the development of route safety speed management schemes. This report is to advise the Committee of the speed management measures that are proposed along the A286 between Chichester and Cocking.

Extensive consultation has been carried out and included Parishes, District Council, Members, Sussex Association of Local Councils, South Downs Joint Committee, West Sussex Fire and Rescue, Sussex Ambulance Service, West Dean (The Edward James Foundation), Summersdale Residents Association and Sussex Police.

The proposals include improvements to signing and road markings, high friction surfacing, trimming back vegetation to improve visibility and alterations to various speed limits on the route as shown on the key plan, including:

1. Broyle Road Chichester - extending the 30mph limit to north of Brandy Hole Lane and The Broadway a distance of approximately 500m,
2. Lavant - reducing the existing 40mph speed limit to 30mph between West End Cottages and north of Lavant Down Road a distance of approximately 600m.
3. Singleton - moving the 30mph limit terminal nearer to the built up area just north of The Old Rectory and introducing a 40mph buffer for a distance of approximately 475m.

Approval is sought to implement these measures and formally advertise the Traffic Regulation Order for a change in the speed limits.

Recommendation

That the Committee gives approval for the Head of Legal Services to be authorised to advertise the proposed Traffic Regulation Orders and, subject to there being no unresolved objections, the orders be made.

1. Background

1.1 A number of route safety speed management schemes have been introduced on the County’s strategic road network as part of the current speed management strategy. These schemes have been successful in reducing both traffic speeds and road casualties, with an initial reduction of over 80% in the annual rate of killed and seriously injured casualties.
1.2 The evaluation of these schemes has shown that a package of measures along a route where high rates of casualties are occurring can be very successful in reducing vehicle speeds and the number and severity of accidents. A programme of route safety management schemes has been developed for implementation in 2010/11 to assist with the progress in meeting national casualty reduction targets. The A286 between Chichester and Cocking has been included in the Integrated Works Programme for 2010/11.

1.3 The suitability of the proposed changes in speed limit has been assessed against the current West Sussex County Council (WSCC) speed limit criteria, as outlined in Appendix A.

- Chichester Broyle Road - frontage meets criteria, existing average speeds are 34.7 mph northbound and 34.1 mph southbound, it is considered that when the speed limit is reduced from 40mph to 30mph and a gateway feature introduced the speed criteria will be met.

- Lavant – frontage meets criteria, existing average speeds are 35.7 mph northbound and 35.0 mph southbound it is considered that when the speed limit is reduced from 40mph to 30mph and a 30mph Vehicle Activated Sign (VAS) erected the speed criteria will be met.

- Singleton – the existing 30mph speed limit north of The Old Rectory does not meet the criteria for frontage development or average speeds. Positioning the 30mph speed limit at the start of the development will enable drivers to recognise why they need to drive within the speed limit. The 40mph buffer along with gateway features will help to slow vehicles before they reach the 30mph limit.

1.4 West Dean - there have been strong representations for a reduction of the 40mph limit to 30mph through West Dean. This section of road does not meet the West Sussex County Council Criteria for a 30mph limit therefore this section will be considered separately so that the rest of the scheme is not delayed. This will be the subject of a separate CLC report.

2. Discussion

2.1 The programme of route schemes is prioritised from an analysis based on the number of weighted casualties per km of road. The fatal and serious casualties are given a higher weighting giving emphasis to routes where there are more serious casualties occurring in line with national and local casualty reduction targets.

2.2 The section of the A286 between Chichester and Cocking is 13.2 kilometres long. During the 5 years to June 2009 there have been 71 injury accidents resulting in 2 fatal, 22 serious and 91 slight injury casualties.

2.3 Chichester - the existing position of the 30mph speed limit terminal is not ideal as it is adjacent to a lay-by and a wide section of carriageway with a cycle lane, a total width of over 12m. The initial proposal was to move the terminal approximately 125 metres to just north of the lay-by. The consensus was that this small alteration was not a good use of resource as
the development of Roussillon Barracks could instigate a further alteration. It is now proposed to extend the 30mph speed limit to north of the junction with The Broadway, the road at this point is narrower and it is where the character of the road changes; this will enable a ‘gateway’ to be formed making the speed limit change more obvious. The future development of the Barracks would not necessitate altering this new extent of the speed limit.

2.4 Lavant – The reduction of the 40mph speed limit to 30mph to the north of Lavant and the introduction of a new VAS nearer to the terminal sign has had full support.

2.5 Singleton – Moving the 30mph limit nearer to the development and introducing a 40mph buffer is supported by the Parish, the police would have preferred to have countdown markers rather than a buffer speed limit but legally we are unable to erect these.

3. Proposals

3.1 The package of measures proposed for the A296 between Chichester and Cocking is outlined as follows:

- Extension of the existing 30 mph speed limit to north of The Broadway a distance of 500m.
- Reducing the 40mph speed limit in Lavant to 30mph a distance of 600m.
- Moving the 30mph limit north of Singleton to the northern edge of the village and introducing a 475m 40mph buffer.
- Improvements to signing and roadmarkings.
- High friction surfacing on the A286 at the junction with the B2141.
- ‘Gateway’ treatments at speed limit terminals.
- Trimming back vegetation to improve visibility.
- Vehicle Activated Signs (VAS) in Lavant and Cocking, and subject to identifying suitable locations at West Dean and Singleton. These signs will be erected as part of the VAS programme.
- Improved pedestrian crossing point adjacent to West Dean School.

3.2 The proposed changes to the speed limits along the A286 will require a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) which will need to be formally advertised. This change is shown in magenta on the key plan. Subject to approval, it is anticipated that the order will be advertised during autumn 2009 and subject to there being no unresolved objections, it is proposed that the Head of Legal Services be authorised to make the order and bring it into operation thereafter. If there are unresolved objections to the order then a report will be tabled at the next available South Chichester County Local Committee.

4. Consultation

4.1 The proposals have been the subject of informal consultation. The full list of consultees, their comments and responses have been summarised in Appendix B. Where possible any comments have been incorporated within the preliminary design. Copies of consultation responses are available on request.
4.2 Sussex Police have been involved in the development of the scheme and have no objections to the proposals.

4.3 Derek Whittington Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Transport and the Deputy Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport matters has been consulted and has no objections.

5. **Resources Implications and Value for Money**

The estimated preliminary cost of this scheme is £95,000, for which funding is included in the 2010/11 route safety budget provisionally agreed by the County Council, a final estimate will be prepared by May Gurney when the Detailed Design is complete. That allocation is subject to final approval as part of the 2010/11 budget process. Although the funding will not be secured until then, by advertising the traffic regulation order now, work on the scheme will be in a position to commence early in the new financial year. As outlined in section 1 the programme has been successful in reducing the number of casualties and speeds and is viewed as a positive contribution to accident prevention. There will be an implication for ongoing maintenance of signs and road markings, which will be absorbed within the revenue works programmes.

6. **Risk Management Implications**

6.1 The scheme has been devised taking into account the local highway conditions and evidence from road traffic accidents. The proposals contain features that are commonly used on the highway and are designed to achieve a reduction in injury accidents. The County Council will struggle to meet these targets if safety engineering schemes are not implemented.

6.2 Funding is dependent on approval of the 2010/11 capital programme. Work on the scheme will not be committed until this is confirmed.

7. **Customer Focus Appraisal**

The screening process has been undertaken and it has been decided that a Customer Focus Appraisal is not required for this decision. The response to the screening process flowchart can be viewed as part of the background papers to this report.

8. **Crime and Disorder Act Implications**

There are no identifiable Crime and Disorder Act implications. The police have been consulted during the development of the scheme and are supportive of schemes of this nature. Their response is summarised in Appendix C.

9. **Human Rights Act Implications**

9.1 It is unlawful for a public authority to act in a way that is incompatible with a convention right. The three major rights that should be considered before making a decision to make a speed limit order are Article 2 (Right to Life),
Article 8 (Right to private and family life) and Article 1 of the first protocol (Right to enjoyment of property).

9.2 Article 2 imposes a positive obligation on local authorities to avoid individuals having their rights breached by others. Article 8 and Article 1 of the first protocol are qualified by permissible interference broadly based on public policy considerations. The rights of those living near to the road have been considered in the development of the speed limit and considered against the needs of road users.

Tony Toynton  Peter Bradley  
Director Operations – Divisional Manager –  
Infrastructure  Safety and Traffic Management
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1. Introduction

1.1 The speed management strategy was adopted in August 2000 and amended in February 2002. The strategy included revised speed limit criteria, supported by Sussex Police, which modified the previous criteria adopted in 1993. Recent guidance from DfT in 2006 has been taken into account in updating the criteria to reflect current views on the setting and evaluation of speed limits. A key objective is to achieve compliance such that average (mean) speeds are within or close to the set limit.

1.2 Speed limit criteria are used for setting speed limits aimed at responding to speed limit violation and public concern about traffic speed, and contributing towards the overall strategy for speed management as part of the Road Safety Strategy within the West Sussex Transport Plan. The aim is to encourage consistency of setting speed limits throughout the County, to encourage understanding and compliance by drivers. The speed limit criteria incorporate two principal factors for assessment:

- traffic speed (speed assessment); and,
- character of the route (route assessment)

1.3 Other factors to be taken into account are:

- the length of the route for the speed limit,
- the rate of injury accidents along the route; and,
- other means of intervention to improve safety.

1.4 The impact of the revised criteria will be to enable more appropriate speed limits where people live, particularly in rural villages, and where there are significant numbers of vulnerable road users, such as outside schools.

1.5 Speed limits should not be used to attempt to solve the problem of isolated hazards, such as a single road junction or reduced forward visibility such as a bend. The setting of speed limits should avoid departure from evidence-based proposals leading to the introduction of inappropriate speed limits which are unlikely to be understood or complied with by drivers. This would result in increased numbers of drivers exceeding the posted speed limits, thereby breaking the law, and causing excessive resource implications for enforcement.

2. Revised Criteria- Assessment

\[1\] Vulnerable road users include pedestrians (particularly children, the elderly and disabled), cyclists and equestrians.
2.1 Speed Assessment.

The average (mean\(^2\)) speeds appropriate for each speed limit are shown in Table 1. Note that the measurement of the existing average speed is rounded down to the nearest whole number before applying the specific criteria. (For example an average speed of 41.9 mph or less would qualify for a 40 mph limit).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speed Limit</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Speed to be below</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Route Assessment

The route assessment is attached as Table 2 below. Key features are:

- For a 20mph limit, existing average speeds should be within the criteria, or measures should be provided to ensure that the criteria are met for the new limit.
- For a 30mph limit there should be at least 30% of the route length with frontage development on both sides of the road, or 50% of the route length with frontage development on one side of the road. In villages this may be interpreted as at least 20 properties having direct, individual access along the route (within a length of 600m or 400m, see Route Length Assessment below).
- For a 40mph limit there should be some frontage and/or frequent bends, junctions or accesses with regular daily use indicating a degree of potential conflict along the route.
- For a 50 mph limit there is no specific requirement for frontage access. Routes would be of a rural or suburban nature with few vulnerable road users present.

2.3 Route Length Assessment

The recommended minimum route length for a speed limit is 600m. In exceptional circumstances this may be reduced to 400m, for example when considering a compact village location along a route, or where appropriate as a “buffer” length to provide a transition to a much lower limit. If a buffer length of intermediate limit is provided, the maximum recommended length is 800m. Where multiple changes of speed limit occur along a route, intermediate lengths should not be less than 600m. The objective should be to achieve a balance between providing reasonable consistency of speed limit along the route and the need to encourage awareness of lower speed limits appropriate for key sections of the route where risks are higher.

2.4 Injury Accident Rate

\(^2\) The term “mean speed” is a statistical reference and to avoid being over technical the term “average speed” is used instead
Routes with persistently high numbers of injury accidents will continue to be assessed for speed management including lower speed limits where other measures alone are insufficient to improve road safety. The existing weighting system (3 for fatal, 2 for serious, and 1 for slight injury) will continue to be used in assessing the “weighted casualty rate per kilometre”. Route lengths with the highest weighted casualty rates per kilometre will be given priority for consideration of lower speed limits. In addition the “risk rating”, measured as the number of fatal and serious accidents per billion vehicle kilometres, will also be considered when assessing priorities for intervention.

3. **Intervention and Application of the Criteria**

3.1 If the assessment criteria are not directly met the following factors may be taken into account:

- When the frontage aspect of the route assessment criteria is not met, but the area is of a sensitive or special nature or where there is significant risk to vulnerable road users, and the speed assessment criterion is met, then a lower limit may be considered.
- When the speed assessment criterion has not been met, but the route assessment criteria are met, if associated engineering or other speed reducing measures can be implemented to bring down average speeds sufficient so that the speed assessment criterion is met then a lower limit can be implemented.

3.2A site would meet the criteria for a speed limit if:

- the speed assessment criterion (Para. 2.1) is met; or
- any necessary additional measures can be funded and implemented to ensure that the speed assessment criterion is met; and
- the route assessment criterion (Para. 2.2) is met; and
- the route length assessment criterion (Para. 2.3) is met.

3.3 Subject also to 3.2 above, a high casualty rate (see 2.4 above) would contribute to the justification of a lower limit of 50 mph, or exceptionally 40 mph, on rural roads.

4. **Advisory Limits**

4.1 Advisory limits will only be used where formal (legal and enforceable) speed limits are not appropriate, or as part of a trial package of measures for speed management purposes. All advisory limits will require specific Cabinet Member approval, and will usually be limited to the following:

- Temporary speed limits implemented for safety reasons in advance of a permanent formal speed limit;
- School safety zones, where advisory limits of 20mph or 30mph may be applied in association with appropriate safety zone signing;
- When used as warning signs for specific hazards, used in accordance with national guidance and as part of a road safety scheme.

4.2 Where advisory limits are applied the speed limit criteria may be relaxed from the values in Table 1 by the addition of 3mph to the normal values. (For example, an average speed of 26.9 would be the maximum for the assessment and application of a 20mph advisory limit.)
Table 2  ROUTE ASSESSMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPEED LIMIT / CHARACTER OF ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>TYPE AND CHARACTER OF ROAD AND TRAFFIC COMPOSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 mph Speed Limit or Zone</td>
<td>Access and local distributor roads. Residential, housing estates, shopping streets or routes near schools may be considered. Either engineering measures have been undertaken to ensure that the average speed will be below 24 mph or the existing conditions control speed sufficiently. High proportion of vulnerable road users*.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 mph Speed Limit</td>
<td>Built up / partially built up areas. Properties with frontage access, e.g. schools, private and commercial premises. Proportion of route length with frontage / access usually exceeding 30% on both sides of the road, or 50% on one side of the road. May include less developed lengths between 30 limits which are too short for a higher limit. (i) Urban streets. (ii) Roads through villages and identified rural settlements. Significant numbers of vulnerable road users*.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 mph Speed Limit</td>
<td>Partially built up areas with limited frontage access, or route lengths with frequent bends, junctions or accesses. May include undeveloped lengths between existing speed limits of 30 and 40, 40 and 40, or 40 and 50mph which are too short for a higher limit. (i) Urban distributor roads. (ii) Roads through villages and identified rural settlements. (iii) Lengths of rural road identified as high risk and/or having high accident rates. A noticeable presence of vulnerable road users*.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 mph Speed Limit</td>
<td>Limited development and frontage access. (i) Suburban or rural single carriageways. (ii) Suburban dual carriageways with frequent junctions, or frontage / development access. (iii) Lengths of strategic rural roads identified as having high accident rates. Few vulnerable road users*, or segregated crossing facilities, or controlled crossing facilities with appropriate speed management measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 mph Speed Limit</td>
<td>Limited development and frontage access. (i) Suburban or rural single carriageways. (ii) Suburban dual carriageways with frequent junctions, or frontage / development access. Few vulnerable road users*, or segregated crossing facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * Vulnerable road users include pedestrians (particularly children, the elderly and disabled), cyclists and equestrians.
## Appendix B

### Summary of Comments Raised in Response to Informal Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultees</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miss Hendon North Chichester CLC Chairman</td>
<td>No objections received</td>
<td>The consultation took place prior to the last County Council Election. The new member for Fernhurst is in the process of being consulted about the works to take place in Cocking. These works are of a very minor nature and fall within the boundary of North Chichester County Local Committee and therefore do not affect this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Hall South Chichester CLC Chairman and Member for Chichester North</td>
<td>Supports West Dean’s request for a reduction in the speed limit from 40mph to 30mph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Col. Pemberton Former Member for Fernhurst which includes Cocking which covers the North Chichester County Local Committee.</td>
<td>No objections received</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester District Council</td>
<td>Concerned about the development at Meadow Lodge Lavant</td>
<td>Planning is outside our remit, but 106 money will be made available for two Vehicle Activated Signs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Derek James District Councillor</td>
<td>Considered the position of the 30mph speed limit in Chichester should not be altered until the extent of the development at the Barracks is confirmed, only wanted it moved if there was an accident problem.</td>
<td>Initially the proposal was to move the terminal 125m north just after the lay-by so that it was in a more visible location, after consideration it was decided to locate the terminal north of The Broadway as this would eliminate the need to relocate the terminal signs when the Barracks is developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavant PC</td>
<td>The Parish supports the reduction of the speed limit from 40mph to 30mph to the north of the village and the erection of a new Vehicle Activated Sign. Consideration to be given to lowering the speed limit to 50mph between Lavant and Chichester. Several queries about the position of SLOW roadmarkings and the accuracy of the base map.</td>
<td>Support for the 30mph speed limit and the VAS noted. The average speeds between Chichester and Lavant are low (approximately 40mph), if this was signed as a 50mph limit the probability is that average speeds would increase. All speed limits on ‘A’ and ‘B’ routes within West Sussex are being reviewed and the section between Chichester and Lavant will be looked at as part of this review. The position of the SLOW road markings will be reviewed. We use the Ordinance Survey as a base map but we are aware of changes as we commission a video of the route prior to design starting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Dean PC</td>
<td>The Parish want the existing 40mph limit reduced to 30mph. The school has organised a petition and the school children have written letters supporting the request for a 30mph limit. Providence Oil would be willing to contribute money towards a VAS. Would like to see the speed limit between West Dean and Singleton reduced.</td>
<td>Improvements to signing in the vicinity of the school have been made in advance of the scheme. As part of the scheme it is proposed to improve the crossing point for pedestrians adjacent to the school. West Dean does not meet the West Sussex County Council Speed Limit Criteria for a 30mph limit. This would have to go to the Cabinet Member for an exception to be made. A suitable location for a VAS is being investigated. A permanent speed monitor has been installed between West Dean and Singleton. The speed limit between these two villages will be assessed as part of the County wide ‘A’ and ‘B’ speed limit review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singleton PC</td>
<td>The Parish support the relocation of the 30mph terminal and the introduction of a 40mph buffer. Would like to see the speed limit between West Dean and Singleton reduced. Request for a VAS on the southbound approach to Singleton.</td>
<td>Support for speed limit alteration noted. A permanent speed monitor has been installed between West Dean and Singleton. The speed limit between these two villages will be assessed as part of the County wide ‘A’ and ‘B’ speed limit review. A suitable location for a VAS is being investigated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocking PC</td>
<td>Supported the replacement of the stolen VAS at the southern border of Cocking. Requested that the existing VAS in Cocking be replaced. Concerns about the signing for the Southdowns Way</td>
<td>The replacement of the stolen VAS will take place in advance of the scheme implementation. The existing VAS will be added to our VAS list for inclusion in a future Programme. Signing for the Southdowns Way has been revised to give a consistent approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex Association of Local Councils</td>
<td>Concerned about the development at Meadow Lodge Lavant</td>
<td>Planning is outside our remit, but as a result of the development 106 money will be made available for two Vehicle Activated Signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Downs Joint Committee</td>
<td>Ensure that all Highway designs are sympathetic to their rural location and the historic environment</td>
<td>The route is an existing road with a poor alignment which has been selected to be treated because of its casualty accident rate, however we will endeavour to minimise the visual impact of our proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Chichester - The position of the 30mph speed limit in Chichester should not be altered until the extent of the development at the Barracks is confirmed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lavant - Supports the reduction of the 40mph speed limit to 30mph with the introduction of a VAS. Concerned about the number of SLOW roadmarkings highlighted with high friction surfacing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Dean – considers that the existing 40mph limit is the most appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singleton – supports the proposal to relocate the 30mph speed limit north of Singleton to just north of The Rectory, but queries the need for a 40mph buffer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sussex Fire &amp; Rescue</td>
<td>No objections received</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex Ambulance Service</td>
<td>No objections received</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southdowns Joint Committee</td>
<td>Concerns raised: Highway design should be sympathetic to its rural location. Vegetation clearance. Prefer 30 roundels to repeaters Too many SLOWs with high friction surfacing. Excessive signing and verge marker posts. Support for a 30mph limit in West Dean. Preference for the speed limit to the north of Singleton to be 30mph rather than a 40mph buffer. Against formalising the lay-by to the north of Singleton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The route is an existing road with a poor alignment which has been selected to be treated because of its casualty accident rate and this can sometime necessitate elements that are visually intrusive however we will endeavour to minimise the visual impact of our proposals As an example, the yellow backed signs adjacent to West Dean School were requested by the School and the Parish for the safety of the children. Vegetation clearance refers to trimming back of vegetation to improve visibility. To enable a speed limit to be enforced repeaters have to erected. We are reducing the number of SLOW roadmarkings and the high friction surfacing surrounds. A number of signs are replacing existing signs but we will look at minimising the number of signs. The lay-by is an official lay-by.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| West Dean  
The Edward James Foundation | Welcome any improvements that are designed to manage traffic speed through the village. Would like a 30mph limit through West Dean. Do not want the area urbanised. | As West Dean does not meet the West Sussex Criteria for a 30mph speed limit this is going to be considered independently with minimal work done in West Dean until this is resolved |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summersdale Residents Association</td>
<td>Requested that the 30mph speed limit be extended to the Garage and the existing derestricted speed limit between Chichester and Lavant should be reduced to 40mph.</td>
<td>Initially the proposal was to move the terminal 125m north just after the lay-by so that it was in a more visible location, after consideration it was decided to locate the terminal north of The Broadway as this is where the character of the road changes. The average speeds between Chichester and Lavant are low (40mph). All speed limits on 'A' and 'B' routes within West Sussex are being reviewed and the section between Chichester and Lavant will be looked at as part of this review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>