

Appendix C - Consultation Report

Proposed 20mph Speed Limit, Various Roads, Braintree		
<u>A Consultation was carried out between 24/03/22 to 15/04/22. 14 objections received as summarised as set out below</u>		
Comment Type	Comment	Response
Objection 1	<p>I have no objections to the plans; however, I seek to understand how you plan to enforce the new speed limit. Panfield Lane between Tabor Avenue and Aetheric Road is regularly used as a racetrack between the two roundabouts. A number of complaints made to Essex Police appear to have fallen on deaf ears and no enforcement of the current 30mph speed limit has taken place in the 9 months I have lived on the road.</p> <p>The 'no entry' section of Panfield Lane between Bunyan Road and Rayne Road is also regularly used as a cut through and the no entry to not enforced.</p> <p>Without enforcement, the new speed limit is pointless and potentially more dangerous than the current speed limit as pedestrians, cyclists and the like will be lulled into a false sense of security, only for vehicles to travel up and down the road at up to 50mph - faster for motorbikes!</p> <p>I would like a commitment from Essex Police to regularly enforce the speed limit at various times of the day for a significant period of time after the implementation of the changes. Not just once or twice, then we're left to our own devices!</p>	<p>Whilst Objector 1 did not object to the proposals, they were raising the issue of enforcement and questioning why enforcement was not part of the proposed scheme. However, ECC does not have the powers to enforce restrictions that it introduces, instead 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. Also, if ECC see a high level of speeding and other infringements then ECC 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 are designed in a way that they are self-enforcing.</p>
Objection 2	<p>I am a resident of Victoria Street in the Town, I applaud the scheme, however I would implore you to include Victoria Street in the 20mph restrictions.</p>	<p>Together with objectors 4,6 & 7 this objection questioned why Victoria Street wasn't included in the streets that would be subject to the new proposed speed limit. In response, when ECC was designing the new ATF2 scheme in Braintree, the main purpose of introducing the new 20mph speed limits was to make the road</p>

	<p>Victoria Street has seen a massive increase in traffic since the junction improvement scheme at the junction of Fairfield Road and South Street. For traffic heading east on south street it has become a rat-run for traffic to turn left into Fairfield Road then right into Victoria Street, as they avoid the pedestrian crossing in South Street and the traffic lights at the junction of South Street and Railway Street.</p> <p>This kind of rat-run traffic is always in a hurry and impatient. They turn into Victoria Street, which is a dead straight road, and they want to get to the other end as quick as possible. Victoria street is a residential road with cars parked either side of the road, there is not room for cars to pass cyclists, or indeed to open your car door to get out when parking.</p> <p>Victoria Street is the only exit for cars out of the town centre and a 20mph limit in Victoria Street would fit very well into your safety for cyclists and pedestrian's remit. Drivers do not all adhere to the current 30mph limit, some you can hear late at night generally at weekends doing I would estimate 60mph.</p>	<p>in the vicinity of its new cycle and walking facilities, the cycle lanes and footways, safer to be used by cyclists and pedestrians. As there are no new facilities in either Victoria Street, there is no need to implement new 20mph speed limits.</p> <p>I think what we have as a starting point around ATF measures is correct and we can always look to include more in the future.</p> <p>However, the scheme that has been consulted upon id just a start and over the years, if the new facilities are successful, ECC will look to expand them further, possibly also including Victoria Street.</p>
Objection 3	<p>May I take this opportunity to put forward my total objection to the proposed plan for cycle routes and 20 mph zones throughout Braintree as a total waste of tax payers money on a folly that will do nothing to improve this town or the traffic problems within it, I believe it will actually make the situation worse as roads will be narrowed so even passing traffic from the opposite direction would be near impossible plus the few cyclists that use these routes already create their own low speed zone to the frustration of motorists that are already infuriated at being stuck in traffic created from traffic lights that are not needed at most junctions and are not timed correctly for traffic flow or the previous set of lights so if you really want to improve the situation maybe you should try driving</p>	<p>Objectors 3 regards the proposed new cycle routes and 20mphs as being a waste of money that should be spent on repairs to the roads and that this scheme will only worsen congestion. 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 unable to divert this funding to that purpose, ECC was granted specifically the funding to implement these schemes as part of the DfT's ATF programme.</p>

	<p>around this town and take note of the obvious lack of joined up thought from the highway planners so far, Ps may I add I live on one these proposed routes and have for 60 years so I've seen and see every day the chaos created by these schemes and the only time the traffic flows freely is when all the traffic lights have stopped working after a power cut, I know this objection and all the others you receive will make no difference to your decision and you will continue to waste more money and make a bad situation worse in the belief that you know better but at least you have my thoughts on this ridiculous proposal.</p>	
Objection 4	<p>Please would it be possible to add Victoria Street, CM7 to the above proposal of a 20mph speed limit zone.</p> <p>I am a resident of Victoria Street and the speed at which some drivers thunder down this road on a daily basis is very concerning to most residents.</p> <p>If it is not possible to add Victoria Street to this existing proposal, please advise who would need to be contacted regarding an application for speed restrictions or even speed humps.</p>	<p>Together with objectors 2,6 & 7 this objection questioned why Victoria Street wasn't included in the streets that would be subject to the new proposed speed limit. In response, when ECC was designing the new ATF2 scheme in Braintree, the main purpose of introducing the new 20mph speed limits was to make the road in the vicinity of its new cycle and walking facilities, the cycle lanes and footways, safer to be used by cyclists and pedestrians. As there are no new facilities in either Victoria Street, there is no need to implement new 20mph speed limits.</p>
Objection 5	<p>I believe putting up 20mph limits in Braintree a pointless exercise. The police in Braintree are a joke and they would never be anywhere near someone breaking the law, it would confuse them!</p> <p>This money should be spent on repairs to the roads. I look forward to your response??</p>	<p>Objectors 5 regards the proposed new cycle routes and 20mphs as being a waste of money that should be spent on repairs to the roads and that this scheme will only worsen congestion. 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 to that purpose as funding was granted specifically to implement these schemes as part of the DfT's ATF programme.</p>
Objection 6	<p>I do not understand why the fastest 2 residential roads in Braintree Town Center: Victoria Street & South Street are not included in the proposed 20mph limit restriction?</p>	<p>Together with objectors 2,4, & 7 this objection questioned why Victoria Street and South Street weren't included in the streets that would be subject to the new proposed speed limit. In response, when ECC was designing the new</p>

	<p>Can you please explain this decision?</p> <p>Whoever is deciding which roads are to be included in the proposed 20mph limit restriction obviously has no knowledge of Braintree Town Center & therefore, this being the case, is not in the informed position to make decisions of this nature.</p>	<p>ATF2 scheme in Braintree, the main purpose of introducing the new 20mph speed limits was to make the road in the vicinity of its new cycle and walking facilities, the cycle lanes and footways, safer to be used by cyclists and pedestrians. As there are no new facilities in either Victoria Street or South Street, there is no need to implement new 20mph speed limits.</p>
Objection 7	<p>With regards to the healthier - greener-safer scheme can I ask why Victoria Street is not included in the 20mph speed limit. You have included the two roads that lead into the town centre conservation area (Manor Street and Fairfield Road) yet excluded Victoria Street, the one road out of the town centre (other than the cars that go through the bus gate on Fairfield Road)</p>	<p>Together with objectors 2,4, & 6 this objection questioned why Victoria Street wasn't included in the streets that would be subject to the new proposed speed limit. In response, when ECC was designing the new ATF2 scheme in Braintree, the main purpose of introducing the new 20mph speed limits was to make the road in the vicinity of its new cycle and walking facilities, the cycle lanes and footways, safer to be used by cyclists and pedestrians. As there are no new facilities in either Victoria Street, there is no need to implement new 20mph speed limits.</p>
Objection 8	<p>As residents of Coldnailhurst Avenue, Braintree in the affected area, we are generally in favour of traffic calming measures however we note the lack of logic in the lines drawn and can only assume that this plan has been drawn on a street map in an office some miles away from the reality.</p> <p>The decisions do not appear to acknowledge the reality as to how the community uses the roads and spaces.</p> <p>If these decisions have been made as part of a wider scheme to ease the traffic problems of Braintree, then this has not been shared.</p> <p>1. Our first objection is therefore one of context. Coldnailhurst Avenue is an integral part of the 'ring road' for Braintree as there is no direct access to Springwood Industrial Estate, The Community Hospital, various businesses and schools from the Northeast of the town without using this road, Panfield Lane and Aetheric Road. We can only envisage an increase in traffic congestion during peak times and at others a total</p>	<p>Objector 8 felt that there would be an increase to congestion with the new 20mph speed limits. In response ECC regard this as unlikely, as the whole package of measures that are being proposed are designed to reduce the numbers of journeys being made by private cars, instead the schemes will be designed to support more journeys being undertaken by sustainable modes.</p> <p>To include the extra roads that Objector 8 refers to, the available budget to ECC is not big enough and those roads that are included are judged to be the ones that will make the overall scheme as effective as possible.</p> <p>In regard to the objector's third point and the fourth and final general point, all schemes that ECC implement have been safety audited and will be as safe as can be reasonably expected to be as long as they are used sensibly. This includes the required signage.</p>

	<p>disregard for the 20mph speed limit as is currently the case for the 30mph limit.</p> <p>2. Our second objection is again one based on a lack of logic and local knowledge. Why restrict John English Avenue, Saunders Avenue, Nottage Crescent and Rana Drive? Why not Alexander Road (a drop off for the John Bunyan School) Pegasus Way and Arnhem Grove?</p> <p>3. Our third objection is again based on the lack of context. This proposal does not show how pedestrian and cycle routes will be improved by these restrictions.</p> <p>A general comment is that without adequate and sufficient signage it will be difficult to encourage a change in attitude to any change in the speed limit. I suspect that you have only budgeted for signs at the entrance to zones rather than on multiple points within the zone.</p>	
Objection 9	<p>No! I don't agree with your decision. I must enter on high street at least 10 times a day. If I order food or something else how I'm going to receive it? The traffic in Braintree is already messed up because of too many empty useless buses. For no reason at busy time, you will see at least 10 empty buses on High Street. If you want to reduce the traffic, cancel that bus lane on Queen Street and I think the problem is sorted.</p>	<p>The objector regards what ECC are proposing as not being the right way to reduce traffic on Queen Street, instead 'empty' buses are the problem. This would be against ECC transport policy to support the use of buses where possible and therefore to remove buses from Queen Street cannot be supported. Much effort is made each year to promote bus use and the ECC works with the bus companies to encourage their use.</p>
Objection 10	<p>Whilst I feel this would perhaps work for the outskirts of the town, I'm not happy about it in the town centre. At present it takes so long to get out of Braintree, and I feel this would cause more congestion and chaos.</p>	<p>The objector felt that there would be an increase to congestion with the new 20mph speed limits. In response ECC regard this as unlikely, as the whole package of measures that are being proposed are designed to reduce the numbers of journeys being made by private cars, instead the schemes will be designed to support more journeys being undertaken by sustainable modes.</p>
Objection 11	<p>As a resident in a section of one of the roads that this proposal will affect, namely Coldnailhurst</p>	<p>The objector felt that there would be an increase to congestion with the new 20mph speed limits as with the existing speed limit of</p>

	<p>Avenue, I wish to raise an objection to the general introduction of this plan.</p> <p>Currently the roads in & around Braintree are gridlocked for parts of the day as it is & I can guarantee that during school term time the traffic will be moving extremely slowly along the stretch of road by my house for almost two hours every morning from approximately 7:30am. It is therefore disappointing to think that a general reduction in the normal speed is being considered so that we will be unable to drive at the current speed limit of 30mph when we are able to do so.</p> <p>I appreciate that there are three schools in the vicinity & I would reluctantly accept a reduction to 20mph at the start & end of the school day as I have seen used by other areas &, as I stated, vehicles are moving very slow anyway, but I cannot agree with a general reduction.</p>	<p>30mph traffic moves extremely slow. In response ECC regard this as unlikely, as the whole package of measures that are being proposed are designed to reduce the numbers of journeys being made by private cars, instead the schemes will be designed to support more journeys being undertaken by sustainable modes.</p>
Objection 12	<p>I would like to put forward the inclusion of Sunnyside.</p> <p>We have many school children that use our road and there has always been concern over the speed that road user achieves in the short distance from Panfield Lane to the junction with Bunyon Road.</p>	<p>Again, an objector is requesting that another street, Sunnyside is included. Similar to objectors 2,4,6 & 7, when ECC was designing the new ATF2 scheme in Braintree, the main purpose of introducing the new 20mph speed limits was to make the road in the vicinity of its new cycle and walking facilities, the cycle lanes and footways safer to be used by cyclists and pedestrians. As there are no new facilities in either Victoria Street or Sunnyside, then there is no need to implement new 20mph speed limits</p>
Objection 13	<p>I wish to register my objection to the proposals.</p> <p>I cannot see how lowering the speed limit will encourage people to walk and/or cycle instead of driving or using public transport when the majority of journeys made are for the purposes of grocery shopping or for travel further afield out of Braintree.</p> <p>The time and monies spent on "robust and meaningful" consultation periods and the setting up of Steering Groups would be better spent on repairing, the frankly disgusting and dangerous state of the roads in and around</p>	<p>Objector 13 feels that whatever measures are introduced it won't encourage people to switch from their cars to walking or cycling. However, ECC regard that this is unlikely to be the case, as the whole package of measures that are being proposed are designed on based practice from around the country, to reduce the overall numbers of journeys being made by private cars, instead the schemes will be designed to support more journeys being undertaken by sustainable modes. This is the main driving force behind the DfT's funding for these schemes.</p>

	<p>Braintree – Rayne Road is prime example. The condition of many roads is a danger to all road users and is more likely to lead to accidents (for motorists, motorcyclists, cyclist and pedestrians) than the imposition of a 20mph speed limit.</p> <p>A 20mph speed limit is not going to encourage people to choose to walk as there already exists a perfectly adequate pavement system. Roads in a better state of repair might encourage a few more people to cycle, but again a 20mph speed limit isn't going to encourage a whole new swath or generation of cyclists.</p> <p>Cynically it could be viewing as another revenue generator by targeting the motorist yet again, with the potential for more fixed penalty notices.</p> <p>The argument of improving the shopping and walking environment of Braintree Town centre doesn't really hold much water either, as it's already pedestrianised.</p> <p>Also, I'm not really sure how the proposals would provide "local sustainable travel to schools and shops." I think "sustainable" is simply a catchy buzzword.</p> <p>I believe better maintenance of the road network would have a more positive impact for the businesses and livelihood of Braintree.</p>	
Objection 14	<p>If you are going to put 20mph limits on such roads, please will you install cameras. There has to be seen there is a penalty to pay otherwise there seems to be little point lowering the speed limit.</p>	<p>Whilst Objector 14 did not object to the proposals, they were raising the issue of enforcement and questioning why enforcement was not part of the proposed scheme. However, ECC does not have the powers to enforce restrictions that it introduces, instead 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. Also, if ECC see a high level of speeding and other infringements then ECC will request that Essex Police undertake enforcement of the new speed limits.</p>