

Appendix 1 – Consultation Report

<u>Proposed 20mph Speed Limit, Various Roads, Shenfield, Brentwood</u>		
<u>A Consultation was carried out between 30 March 2022 and 21 April 2022. Fourteen objections received as summarised as set out below</u>		
<u>Comment Type</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>
Objection 1	<p>Lower speeds mean you drive in lower gears, which creates more pollution and uses more petrol, so is worse for the environment and costs drivers more in fuel. Lowering the speed limit would directly contravene your ESG targets.</p> <p>Many elderlies and less able-bodied people cannot cycle or walk far, the public transport links to Brentwood are too infrequent, and if you are laden with shopping bags, the buses do not go down the side roads, so, therefore, you will need to use a car. Please do not prioritise cyclists above motorists.</p> <p>If you have been in any of these roads recently you will see you cannot drive down any of them quickly given the number of parked cars and potholes. Please spend time and money on improving public transport links and repairing the roads.</p>	<p>Essex Highways response is that to establish walking and cycling as the preferred mode of transport then the public needs to be fully confident that it is as safe as ECC can make the roads for cycling and walking. By introducing the 20mph speed limits it reinforces this safer environment. If this funding was instead spent on improving the road surfaces, then it is likely that the speeds of traffic may increase. The funding has been specifically granted to ECC to implement these schemes in order to increase walking and cycling and by doing this it helps ECC meet many of its Objectives for the overall benefit of the residents of Essex. These schemes will provide sustainable net zero transport choices, help improve residents' health and wellbeing, and reduce congestion and air pollution.</p>
Objection 2	<p>The Worrin Road and Parkway junction is a nightmare. I have never seen an accident on the roads listed. I have only ever seen two cars traveling a speed down the road, both of which have happened on a Sunday morning. I feel this restriction will not make these roads any safer and is unnecessary.</p> <p>I would really like to know what you hope to achieve by making the road 20 miles per hour apart from costing the council budget.</p>	<p>Essex Highways response is that the funding has been specifically granted to ECC to implement these schemes in order to increase walking and cycling and by doing this it helps ECC meet many of its Objectives for the overall benefit of the residents of Essex. There was an extensive consultation that supported the scheme and the speed limits that are part of it. By introducing these speed limits at the junctions in question it improves the road safety of all road users, including residents who are walking and cycling.</p>
Objection 3	<p>If the main idea was to encourage secondary school children to cycle to school, then this would not be possible because of the huge bags they carry!</p>	<p>Essex Highways response is that the funding has been specifically granted to ECC to implement schemes in order to increase walking and cycling, including by school children, and by doing this helps ECC meet many of its Objectives for the overall benefit of the residents of Essex. As stated in response to the first objection, these schemes will provide</p>

	<p>Many of the roads mentioned on the proposal are already busy with traffic on School hour runs and the proposal will greatly extend the queues of slow-moving traffic leading to greater pollution of air since it is a fact that the slower a car/van/lorry moves the greater the particulates it emits.</p> <p>Add to that the thousands of school parents who leave their engines running for hours outside schools so that they can keep warm in winter and cool in summer and we have pollution on a scale far worse than what is prevalent. You could of course add taxi ranks and shoppers to this. Far better to deal with this and cheaper than your present plans.</p>	<p>sustainable net zero transport choices, help improve residents' health and wellbeing, and reduce congestion and air pollution. By increasing the attractiveness of cycling and walking and the greater level of road safety, less traffic will use the surrounding roads and so reduce the levels of congestion.</p>
Objection 4	<p>I object to the Council's proposal to implement the 20mph speed limit. A few thoughts and questions below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - These are not built-up areas or urban environments - Unusual amount of accidents with bicycles & pedestrians on these roads to merit such a proposal - Many of these roads are narrow, drivers naturally slow down anyway - Before proposing or indeed implementing such measures I would like to hear of the focus groups you used to discuss this proposal: everyone in our area (Priests Lane) is very much against your proposal. 	<p>From consultations it has been found that there is a majority who do support the new measures and so whilst ECC is sympathetic to the objector's concerns and the scheme has been looked at again, designers of the scheme regard the proposed schemes as being the most effective way to encourage more cycling and walking in a safe way.</p> <p>ECC is proposing to introduce new 20mph speed limit in the vicinity of its new cycle and walking facilities, in order that the cycle lanes and footways are safer to be used by cyclists and pedestrians. A full safety audit has been carried out of the schemes to ensure that they are safe to use.</p>
Objection 5	<p>Lowering of the speed restrictions is a step too far. There is not an accident problem. Motorists struggle to adhere to speed limits. A 20mph speed restriction would do little to encourage more people to cycle – the traffic volumes would remain the same. A 20mph speed restriction is not intuitive for the motorist, will cause non-compliance and become un-enforceable, and cause greater danger and safety concerns in creating a bunching up of traffic as the free flow of traffic is hindered. Crossing opportunities for pedestrians would also be more difficult as a consequence of these proposals.</p> <p>With additional housing development proposed and</p>	<p>ECC is proposing to introduce new 20mph speed limit in the vicinity of its new cycle and walking facilities, in order that the cycle lanes and footways are safer to be used by cyclists and pedestrians. A full safety audit has been carried out of the schemes to ensure that they are safe to use.</p> <p>Objector 5 expressed the concern that the new housing developments that are proposed at Wilson's Corner will make already congested roads worse. During the application process ECC has considered these factors and through the development control process mitigation measures will be put in place so that any impacts are reduced. The benefits of the modal shift to sustainable transport modes of transport that the ATF2 schemes will bring will also act to mitigate against any increase in traffic due to the new developments.</p>

	<p>Wilsions Corner already badly congested, the 20mph zone would make movement of the main roads between Shenfield and Brentwood even worse.</p>	
<p>Objection 6</p>	<p>We are residents of Priests Lane and have first hand experience of the traffic on that road. We have approached our Councillors about the speed of traffic that uses this road, it being one of the main through routes between Shenfield and Essex. A significant amount of traffic exceeds the current 30 mph speed limit, and we have been told that there are no plans for measures to enforce this limit. We are not sure what the benefit of a 20mph limit should be as we do not think the argument has been properly articulated by Essex Highways. We do not think that reducing the speed limit will affect the behaviour of speeding drivers. In fact, we think it could create more risk on the road as we have witnessed reckless over taking by impatient drivers, and this could be made worse by a 20mph limit.</p> <p>This appears to me to be a way of claiming on paper that traffic speed is managed rather than the expensive approach of actually managing traffic speed.</p> <p>We think that the speed limit should not be reduced to 20 mph without steps being taken to enforce the limit or a proposal put forward to physically reduce traffic speeds. We would prefer that the funds would be better spent enforcing the existing speed limit.</p> <p>The same concerns apply to Worrin Road, and we think it unlikely that 20 mph apexes limit will be effective without enforcement or traffic calming measures.</p> <p>In addition, we cannot see that the proposed cycle lane on Crescent Drive will be effective. We use this road often and the width of the road and curving nature of the road does not seem well suited to a designated cycle lane. We consider it likely that drivers will use the cycle lane in order to drive safely along the road and</p>	<p>Objector 6 are raising the issue of enforcement and questioning how the introduction of a 20mph limit will be any more beneficial if it's not being enforced. They are particularly concerned about Priests Lane, Worrin Road and Crescent Drive. However, ECC does not have the powers to enforce restrictions that it introduces, rather it is up to Essex police to undertake any enforcement if they regard there is a high enough level of infringements of the speed limit or other restrictions. ECC can also if it sees a high level of speeding and other infringements then it will request that Essex Police undertake enforcement of the new speed limits and other restrictions. Essex police are supportive of the measures but with stretched resources they unfortunately will only provide enforcement, some of the time. However, the design of the measures is designed in a way that they are self-enforcing.</p> <p>They were also concerned about the proposed cycle lanes in Crescent Drive are too narrow and so maybe vulnerable to collision with other traffic with drivers driving over the proposed cycle lanes. ECC has carried out safety audits on the proposed scheme and these have been satisfied that they will be safe to use.</p>

	so will not have the desired effect.	
Objection 7	If you really wanted to encourage more people into cycling, why not actually repair the road surfaces already in existence which would be of benefit to cyclists, car drivers and pedestrians.	<p>Objectors 7 disagrees that the proposed schemes will encourage more cycling trips, instead they think better repaired roads is what is required. From consultations it has been found that there is a majority who do support the new measures and so whilst ECC is sympathetic to the objector's concerns and the scheme has been looked at again, designers of the scheme regard the proposed schemes as being the most effective way to encourage more cycling and walking in a safe way.</p> <p>However, ECC is unable to divert this funding, if indeed it would like, to road maintenance as funding was granted specifically to implement these schemes as part of the DfT's ATF programme. Where dangers are posed by faulty surfaces, ECC has other budgets to deal with such situations on a case-by-case basis; together with planned maintenance that ECC undertakes.</p>
Objection 8	<p>Worrin Rd and Priest Lane etc are through roads and should remain at 30mph which is sensible and reasonable. All roads need to take their share of traffic. Unrealistic limits cause congestion and waste of fuel.</p> <p>Priest lane in particular needs to be widened near Middleton Hall Lane where it's too narrow and has no pavement on one side.</p> <p>Lowering the speed to 20mph will cause more pollution not less.</p>	<p>From consultations it has been found that there is a majority who do support the new measures and so whilst ECC is sympathetic to the objector's concerns and the scheme has been looked at again, designers of the scheme regard the proposed schemes as being the most effective way to encourage more cycling and walking in a safe way.</p> <p>Where some extra pollution has occurred, this has been offset by the overall safety benefits of the proposed new 20mph speed limits as a pedestrian hit by a vehicle at 20mph has a greater possibility of surviving than hit at 30mph. Also, any increase in pollution will be greatly offset by the overall reduction in traffic across Brentwood due to the modal shift to more sustainable forms of transport.</p>
Objection 9	<p>Lowering the speed to 20mph will cause more pollution not less. If you want to increase safety repair the numerous deep potholes and repair the faded road markings in Shenfield - particularly Worrin Rd/York Rd junction.</p> <p>20 mph is unrealistic and unnecessary. Worrin Rd and Priest Lane etc are through roads and should remain at 30mph which is sensible and reasonable.</p>	<p>The objector raised the issue that by lowering the general speed to 20 and below it will cause an increase in pollution. However, ECC is satisfied that referring to evidence elsewhere indicates that no significant extra levels of pollution are produced as a result of the introduction of new 20mph speed limits.</p> <p>Where some extra pollution has occurred, this has been offset by the overall safety benefits of the proposed new 20mph speed limits as a pedestrian hit by a vehicle at 20mph has a greater possibility of surviving than hit at 30mph. Also, any increase in pollution will be greatly offset by the overall reduction in traffic across Brentwood due to the modal shift to more sustainable forms of transport.</p>
Objection 10	We are residents of Priests Lane and have first hand experience of the traffic on that road. We have approached our Councillors about the speed of traffic that uses this road, it being one of the main through routes between Shenfield and Essex. A significant amount of traffic exceeds the current 30 mph speed limit, and we have been told that there are no plans for measures to enforce this limit. We are not sure what the benefit of a 20mph limit should be as we do not think the argument has been properly articulated by Essex Highways. We do not think that reducing the speed limit	<p>The Residents of Priests Lanes do not support the proposed 20mph and expressed the view that without enforcement traffic would not slow down. They also regard that the proposed 20mph limit in Worrin Road will be equally ineffective without enforcement or traffic calming features.</p> <p>However, ECC does not have the powers to enforce restrictions that it introduces, rather it is up to Essex police to undertake any enforcement if they regard there is a high enough level of infringements of the speed limit or other restrictions. ECC can also if its sees a high level of speeding and other infringements then it will request that Essex Police undertake enforcement of the new speed limits and other restrictions. Essex police are supportive of the measures but with stretched resources they unfortunately will only provide enforcement, some of the time. However, the design of the measures is designed in a way that they are self-enforcing.</p>

	<p>will affect the behaviour of speeding drivers. In fact, we think it could create more risk on the road as we have witnessed reckless overtaking by impatient drivers, and this could be made worse by a 20mph limit.</p> <p>We think that the speed limit should not be reduced to 20 mph without steps being taken to enforce the limit or a proposal put forward to physically reduce traffic speeds. We would prefer that the funds would be better spent enforcing the existing speed limit.</p> <p>The same concerns apply to Worrin Road, and we think it unlikely that 20 mph apex limit will be effective without enforcement or traffic calming measures.</p> <p>In addition, we cannot see that the proposed cycle lane on Crescent Drive will be effective. We use this road often and the width of the road and curving nature of the road does not seem well suited to a designated cycle lane. We consider it likely that drivers will use the cycle lane in order to drive safely along the road and so will not have the desired effect.</p>	<p>The objector is concerned about the proposed cycle lanes in Crescent Drive are too narrow and so maybe vulnerable to collision with other traffic with drivers driving over the proposed cycle lanes. ECC has carried out safety audits on the proposed scheme and these have been satisfied that they will be safe to use.</p>
Objection 11	<p>I DO NOT support the proposals to introduce a 20mph speed limit across Shenfield as detailed in your letter dated 30th March 2022. In my view it is unnecessary, especially along the main routes of Priests Lane, Worrin Road and Crescent Drive. More effort is needed to enforce the current speed limits rather than reducing a new one which they too are unlikely to be unenforced.</p> <p>In my own road, Park Way, Shenfield, pedestrians often choose to walk in the road because the footpaths are in a dreadful and, in places, dangerous condition. They are in much need of resurfacing, something we have been waiting for YEARS to happen despite all surrounding roads having had the paths repaired. Spend money on that rather than 20mph schemes.</p>	<p>From consultations ECC has found that there is a majority who do support the proposed new measures and so whilst ECC is sympathetic to the objector's concerns and the scheme has been looked at again, designers of the scheme regard the proposed schemes as being the most effective way to encourage more cycling and walking in a safe way.</p> <p>As regards enforcement, ECC does not have the powers to enforce restrictions that it introduces, rather it is up to Essex police to undertake any enforcement if they regard there is a high enough level of infringements of the speed limit or other restrictions. ECC can also if it sees a high level of speeding and other infringements then it will request that Essex Police undertake enforcement of the new speed limits and other restrictions. Essex police are supportive of the measures but with stretched resources they unfortunately will only provide enforcement, some of the time. However, the design of the measures is designed in a way that they are self-enforcing.</p>

<p>Objection 12</p>	<p>I understand that the proposals are for the purpose of making walking and cycling safer, and therefore more popular with residents. I am firmly of the opinion that the money would be far better spent making the footpaths (which are an absolute disgrace in Shenfield) safer and filling in the many potholes in the roads. I have had the misfortune to trip over uneven paving stones in Shenfield on two occasions, fracturing my hip and being hospitalised on the first, and cutting my hand and bruising my knees on the second.</p> <p>The introduction of 20 mph speed limits will not stop drivers from travelling at whatever speeds they like.</p>	<p>Whilst the objector would like the funding to be spent on improving footpaths and filling pot holes. ECC is unable to divert this funding, if indeed it would like, to road maintenance as funding was granted specifically to implement these schemes as part of the DfT's ATF programme.</p> <p>Where dangers are posed by faulty surfaces, ECC has other budgets to deal with such situations on a case-by-case basis; together with planned maintenance that ECC undertakes.</p> <p>As regards enforcement, As regards enforcement, ECC does not have the powers to enforce restrictions that it introduces, rather it is up to Essex police to undertake any enforcement if they regard there is a high enough level of infringements of the speed limit or other restrictions. ECC can also if its sees a high level of speeding and other infringements then it will request that Essex Police undertake enforcement of the new speed limits and other restrictions. Essex police are supportive of the measures but with stretched resources they unfortunately will only provide enforcement, some of the time. However, the design of the measures is designed in a way that they are self-enforcing.</p>
<p>Objection 13</p>	<p>I am very concerned about the person/s who have travelled around Shenfield and found all these little Closes that no way can you speed at more than 20mph or is it a he/ she sitting at a desk in some office and never set foot in Shenfield, no doubt the same will be applying in Brentwood.</p> <p>Examples. Friars close, Bishops walk, Grantham's close, Clevedon clos, Glendale Close, Longmead Close, Trotwood Close.</p> <p>Whoever these people are, they do not come from Shenfield and wonder if they are even from this planet. You have to be realistic.</p> <p>The plan to make the length of Friars Avenue and Priest Lane to be a 20mph limit is just going to be unfeasible, the same with the length of Worrin Road.</p> <p>Re Priest Lane and Worrin Road, how are you going to implement this limit with all the arrogant drivers in their Chelsea tractors taking their children to Brentwood school.</p> <p>If whoever you are, just give this some thought and go and stand in Priest Lane for an hour during school time both AM and PM with an open mind and just see how many people in their cars will give them up to either walk to the school or even ride a bike. NO CHANCE.</p>	<p>Objection 13 is concerned that the designers of the scheme have not visited the roads in question. This however is not the case, and the designers/planners are familiar with these areas. Has expressed the view that 20mph limits in a number of the cul-de-sacs as being unnecessary, these however are being included for completeness and it would appear strange to drivers that these short lengths of road are subject to a different speed limit than the roads that they are accessed by.</p> <p>As regards enforcement, As regards enforcement, ECC does not have the powers to enforce restrictions that it introduces, rather it is up to Essex police to undertake any enforcement if they regard there is a high enough level of infringements of the speed limit or other restrictions. ECC can also if its sees a high level of speeding and other infringements then it will request that Essex Police undertake enforcement of the new speed limits and other restrictions. Essex police are supportive of the measures but with stretched resources they unfortunately will only provide enforcement, some of the time. However, the design of the measures is designed in a way that they are self-enforcing.</p>

	<p>Please do not waste this money on an ill-thought-out plan.</p> <p>In addition, why has this letter been sent to selected people only – THIS IS UNDEMOCRATIC.</p> <p>Lastly to our Councillors, why has nothing been said about this in your latest newsletter?</p>	
Objection 14	<p>I wish to register an objection to the proposed speed limit reduction from 30 mph to 20 mph.</p> <p>The reduction is entirely unnecessary and will adversely affect the flow and progress of traffic. What is however needed is proper enforcement of the existing 30 mph speed limits.</p> <p>Indeed, if drivers are not currently adhering to the current 30 mph limit then where is the evidence to support that a reduction of the speed limit to 20 mph will not be similarly ignored?</p>	<p>Finally, the final objector objects on the grounds that the existing 30mph limit is not enforced. However, ECC does not have the powers to enforce restrictions that it introduces, rather it is up to Essex police to undertake any enforcement if they regard there is a high enough level of infringements of the speed limit or other restrictions. ECC can also if it sees a high level of speeding and other infringements then it will request that Essex Police undertake enforcement of the new speed limits and other restrictions. Essex police are supportive of the measures but with stretched resources they unfortunately will only provide enforcement, some of the time. However, the design of the measures is designed in a way that they are self-enforcing.</p>