

**To:                      Audit, Scrutiny & Petitions Board**

**On:                      6 June 2016**

---

**Report by:            Director of Finance and Resources**

---

**Heading:              Petition: Inchinnan Junction, A8, Greenock Road**

---

## **1.      Summary**

- 1.1.    At the meeting of the Board held on 25 January 2016 consideration was given to a petition from Martin Rollo, Secretary, Inchinnan Community Council, in the following terms:

“To reduce the speed limit at Inchinnan Junction A8 Greenock Road, currently 50mph. ICC are promoting a petition to reduce the speed limit on approximately 500 metres of two carriageways of the Greenock Road A8 Inchinnan Junction at Old Greenock Road. This is a dangerous and badly sited intersection with massive traffic at peak times displaying complicated and confusing rights of way and is an area of frequent accidents. The road is bounded by a very busy bus depot, a Post Office/supermarket and a public house which have non-controlled exits joining on to a 50mph A road. Vehicle parking also contributes to the overall confusion of lane use. A junction improvement plan promised by Renfrewshire Council this year has again been delayed for budgetary reasons leaving the public and the village with no near-term safety improvement for users. We consider that the speed limit of this road is too fast and would like to have it lowered and by doing so would help alleviate accidents.

Action requested from Council: Renfrewshire Council Roads are requested to pursue the reduction of the petitioned speed, communicate and engage with appropriate government departments to make this change and to install the appropriate signage and structures”.

- 1.2.    The Board heard that the Head of Amenity Services had indicated that in line with the guidelines for setting speed limits, and in consultation with the Police, the Council reduced the speed limit to 50mph. Whilst the Council desired a lower limit the guidelines and the position taken by the then Strathclyde Police did not support this. For the Council to pursue a lower limit it would be necessary to gain the support of Police Scotland and promote a traffic order.

- 1.3. The Board also heard that plans for a re-designed junction to include traffic lights at the location had been approved and an application had been made to Strathclyde Partnership for Transport (SPT) for funding of £510,000 to deliver this project.
  - 1.4. The Board agreed to recommend that as the outcome of the bid for funds from SPT could not be guaranteed, discussions be arranged between the petitioner, Council representatives and Police Scotland to promote the appropriate traffic order to reduce the speed limit in the event that the application was not successful.
  - 1.5. It was further agreed that the outcome of the application to SPT for funding to deliver a re-designed road layout at the junction and the outcome of the discussions to promote a traffic order to reduce the speed limit in the event that the application to SPT was not successful, be reported to a future meeting of the Board at which consideration of the petition would be resumed.
  - 1.6. The Head of Amenity Services has intimated that the Transportation Manager met with Police Scotland and Inchinnan Community Council. Following some accident investigation work and speed measurement, Police Scotland has indicated that they will not support a reduction to the speed limit. Funding is in place for £510,000 from SPT and arrangements are being made in relation to the tendering process for the junction improvement.
  - 1.7. The principal petitioner has been asked to return to this meeting of the Board in order that the Board may resume consideration of his petition.
  - 1.8. The role of the Board is to consider the petition, hear and ask questions of the petitioner and take the appropriate action in respect of the petition which will be one of the following:
    - (a) that no action is taken, in which case the reasons will be specified and intimated to the petitioner;
    - (b) that the petition be referred to the relevant director and/or policy board for further investigation, with or without any specific recommendation; or
    - (c) refer the petition to another organisation if the petition relates to that organisation.
- 

## **2. Recommendation**

- 2.1 That the Board resumes consideration of the petition.
- 

## **Implications of this report**

- 1. Financial Implications – none**
- 2. HR and Organisational Development Implications – none**
- 3. Community Plan/Council Plan Implications – none**

4. **Legal Implications – none**
5. **Property/Assets Implications – none**
6. **Information Technology Implications – none**
7. **Equality and Human Rights Implications**
  - (a) The Recommendations contained within this report have been assessed in relation to their impact on equalities and human rights. No negative impacts on equality groups or potential for infringement of individuals' human rights have been identified arising from the recommendations contained in the report because for example it is for noting only. If required following implementation, the actual impact of the recommendations and the mitigating actions will be reviewed and monitored, and the results of the assessment will be published on the Council's website.
8. **Health and Safety Implications – none**
9. **Procurement Implications – none**
10. **Risk Implications – none**
11. **Privacy Impact – none**

---

#### **List of Background Papers –**

- (a) none
- 

**Author:** Lilian Belshaw, Democratic Services Manager, 0141 618 7112