Residents Committee
8 December 2016
Consultation Results on Proposed 20mph zone for the Surbiton area
Report by the Director of Place

Purpose
To consider the views of the Surbiton Neighbourhood Committee in relation to the results of the public consultation on the 20mph speed limit proposals across all residential roads in Surbiton Neighbourhood area, excluding Ewell Road, Upper Brighton Road, Portsmouth Road and Hook Road, within the Surbiton Neighbourhood.

Recommendations of the Portfolio Holder for Resident’s Participation
To Resolve that -
1. the Surbiton Neighbourhood Committee’s comments of 7 December 2016, as reported verbally at this meeting, be noted;
2. the results of area wide consultation, as contained within the reports and in annexes 1 - 10, be noted;
3. a blanket 20mph speed limit is not implemented in the whole of the Surbiton Neighbourhood area at this time, due to the low response rate received to the consultation;
4. the support received in St Mark’s and Berrylands Ward be noted, and that the Committee refers consideration of 20mph speed limit schemes for the specific roads in those wards, as set out in paragraphs 23-24, back to the Surbiton Neighbourhood Committee.

Key Points
A. Surbiton Neighbourhood Committee passed a resolution on 6 February 2016, to consult on the introduction of a 20mph speed limit to cover the Surbiton Town Centre area, excluding Ewell Road, Upper Brighton Road, Portsmouth Road and Hook Road, within the Surbiton Neighbourhood.
B. A similar report to this, and the results of the consultation, as shown in Annexes 1 to 10, were presented to the Surbiton Neighbourhood Committee on 7 December 2016, and the views of that committee will be reported verbally to this meeting.

Context
1. In 2014, a consultation was undertaken on introducing a 20mph speed limit to cover the Surbiton Town Centre area. The consultation took the form of a letter to all affected households and business premises, which invited them to comment on the proposal. It did not include a questionnaire.
2. The proposed scheme was approved by the Neighbourhood Committee in September 2014. The matter was then requisitioned under the provisions of Paragraphs (A) (2) (i) (a) and (b) of the General References and Delegations to
Committees for consideration at a full Council meeting.

3. At a full Council meeting on 4 November 2014, a revised scheme was approved, with 20mph limits to be introduced within 100 metres of accesses to schools (including pre-schools and nurseries) within the original scheme consultation area. A revised scheme, based on these caveats, was approved by both the relevant Lead Members (for Environment and Transport and Capital, Projects and Contracts), and the Surbiton Neighbourhood Committee at its meeting in January 2015. The scheme was implemented in March 2015.

4. Additionally, full Council returned the responsibility for the remainder of the neighbourhood roads to the Surbiton Neighbourhood, to give further and proper consideration to the proposals for a 20mph speed limit.

5. In December 2015, Officers were approached by the Chair of the Surbiton Neighbourhood Committee, requesting that consideration be given to introducing a 20mph speed limit in all residential roads across the Neighbourhood, excluding primary routes - that is ‘A’ and ‘B’ roads. In February 2016, a Surbiton Neighbourhood Committee resolution gave authority to consult on the introduction of a 20mph speed limit covering the Surbiton Town Centre area, excluding Ewell Road, Upper Brighton Road, Portsmouth Road and Hook Road, within the Surbiton Neighbourhood. The Committee also agreed the wording of the consultation such that it was contained in a single question.

6. In September 2016, a consultation was distributed to the whole of the Surbiton Neighbourhood area, on the proposal to introduce a 20mph speed limit for the whole neighbourhood, as shown in Annex 1.

7. Accident records were checked over a 3 year period, up to January 2016, and are shown in Annex 2. Existing recent speed surveys were checked to assess the level of compliance, and new ones were carried out where needed.

8. The Surbiton Neighbourhood Committee consider the results of the consultation at their meeting on 7 December 2016, and the views of that Committee will be shared verbally at the Residents’ Committee meeting, as they will not be available in time to incorporate into this report.

Proposal and Options

9. A public consultation was undertaken on proposals to introduce a 20mph speed limit for the whole of the Surbiton Neighbourhood, excluding the ‘A’ roads, to seek the views of the public.

Consultations

10. Letters were delivered to 18,300 addresses, covering the whole of the Surbiton Neighbourhood area, to encourage Surbiton residents and business to take part and have their say on the proposals.

11. In addition to the letters dropped, adverts were placed in local newspapers, magazines and the Surrey Comet. Bus stops adverts were put up throughout the Surbiton and Kingston area to raise awareness and encourage a higher response rate.

12. The online consultation questionnaire went live from 5 September 2016, and closed on 3 October 2016, allowing a 4 week consultation period. Hard copies of the consultation were available at Surbiton library and Guildhall offices for those with no internet access.
13. The consultation posed one specific question that was agreed by the Neighbourhood Committee back in February 2016: “To what extent do you support the introduction of a 20mph speed limit in all residential roads across Surbiton Neighbourhood? (excluding Ewell Road, Upper Brighton Road, Portsmouth Road and Hook Road)?”.

**Results**

14. The results of the consultation, along with a break down, heat map and analysis of the results are all shown in Annexes 1 – 3 (attached to this report), and Annexes 4 - 7, which are available on the Council website at www.kingston.gov.uk and have been provided there due to the size of the documents. In terms of the results a number of key points have been set out below.

15. A total of 1,125 questionnaires were completed and returned, including hard copy and online. Out of the 1,125 responses 964 were from residents within the Kingston borough, of which 828 were residents of the Surbiton neighbourhood.

16. Of the total 1,125 who responded, 57% supported the introduction of a 20mph speed limit, while 43% opposed it and 1% felt neutral about it. It should be noted that the results have been rounded up, so add up to more than 100%.

17. Of the 964 Kingston borough residents who responded, 54% supported the introduction of a 20mph speed limit, while 45% opposed and 1% were neutral.

18. Of the 828 Surbiton residents who responded, 53% supported 20mph speed limit, while 47% opposed it and 1% were neutral. Again, it should be noted that the results have been rounded up, so add up to more than 100%. A response of 828 of Surbiton residents corresponds to 4.5% of the 18,300 Surbiton addresses, which is considered a low response rate.

19. From the Surbiton Neighbourhood area:
- Berrylands Ward got the highest response rate of 6%, compared to a 5% response rate for both Alexandra Ward and Surbiton Hill Ward, while St Mark’s Ward got the lowest response rate of 3%.
- St Marks Ward which currently has a 20mph speed limit on most of its roads received the highest level of support for the proposals with 73%, compared to 26% who did not support the proposals.
- Berrylands Ward received the second highest support of 56% compared to 44% opposition.
- Surbiton Hill Ward had the highest level of opposition to the proposed 20mph speed limit of 57%, compared to 42% support.
- Alexandra Ward had the second highest opposition to the proposed 20mph speed limit of 54%, compared to 44% support.

**Officer Conclusions:**

20. In terms of the overall response to the consultation, officers would highlight that the response rate of 4.5% for the residents from the Surbiton Neighbourhood is considered to be too low to warrant further consideration of the consultation proposals.

21. Furthermore, given that the Surbiton Neighbourhood ward results were inconsistent, with two wards supporting and two wards opposing, it is considered that this further supports the recommendation not to pursue an area-wide scheme at this time.
22. However, it is noted that from those who responded there is some significant support in parts of both the St Mark’s and Berrylands wards, and consideration should be given to schemes to introduce 20mph speed limits in some parts of the two wards, rather than over the entire Surbiton neighbourhood area. This suggestion would impact fewer roads, as some parts of those wards are already covered by 20mph limits/zones, and those roads proposed for review are set out below.

23. St Mark’s ward already has a significant number of 20mph speed limit roads, but those meriting consideration comprise Brighton Road, Balaclava Road, Cottage Grove, St Mary’s Road, St Andrew’s Road (part), Victoria Road, St Philip’s Road, Claremont Road, The Crescent, St Mark’s Hill, Adelaide Road, Church Hill Road, Avenue Elmers (part) and Selsdon Close.

24. The results for Berrylands ward indicate that there was some strong support for the proposals in the area containing the following roads - Berrylands Road, Alfriston, Alfriston Close, Meadowbank, Fulmer Court, Howard Road, Etwell Place, Paragon Place and Paragon Grove.

25. Kingston Cycle Campaign (KCC) was consulted and they strongly support the introduction of 20mph speed limit in Surbiton Neighbourhood. Their full response is shown within Annex 8, which is available on the website.

26. The Emergency Services were consulted, and only Metropolitan Police responded back and their full response is shown within Annex 9, which is also available on the website.

27. In summary, Metropolitan Police raised concerns about some roads where the mean speeds of vehicles are higher than 24mph and hence do not comply with the DfT threshold for implementing a 20mph speed limit, nor would they create a self 20mph enforcing scheme. Another concern raised was that even where roads had a mean speed of 24mph or less, there are numerous hour-long periods within the data, where the mean speed exceeds this threshold.

Officer response:
The Metropolitan Police concerns are noted, and it is accepted that some roads have existing mean traffic speed over 24mph. If a 20mph speed limit is to be approved, the DfT criteria suggests that traffic speeds should be monitored for a period of a year to review the effect of the proposed speed limit. The introduction of other traffic calming measures could be considered as an option to reduce speed to less than 24mph, and so achieve a more self enforcing 20mph scheme.

Support and Opposition Comments Received

28. In total, 55 people provided further comments. Although this is a small number in relation to the total number of respondents to the survey, nonetheless these people wanted to send in their views and expand upon their answers.

29. There were 27 comments supporting the proposal, 24 opposing and 4 that were either neutral or related to a criticism of the survey.

30. These comments were categorised into broad themes. A detailed chart is shown in Annex 10, which is also available on the website, summarising these categories with the number of respondents for each one. (Note that in some cases respondents’ comments covered more than one category).

Below are the main issues raised, together with officer responses:

Survey criticism
23 comments criticising the survey questionnaire, were made by those who
either support, oppose or felt neutral about the scheme:
“I logged in online to complete the ‘survey’ only to find there was just one question in it... Where is my chance to express my views”

**Officer response:**
The wording of the one specific consultation question was agreed by the Neighbourhood Committee in February 2016. An email address to facilitate further liaison about the scheme was provided on the letters. This email address was used by some of those who commented back.

**Enforcement**

This theme was mentioned by 21 respondents who either support, oppose or feel neutral about the scheme:
“... Whatever the speed limits is set they cannot be enforced as there are no police to monitor this and speed cameras on every road is not viable.”

**Officer response:**
20mph zones and 20mph speed limits are generally self-enforcing schemes however traffic speed will be monitored for a year period and reviewed to see if other measures should be introduced to reduce traffic speed further. In addition, as stated by the Police in their comments on this scheme, there could be police enforcement in exceptional circumstances in a complying 20mph speed limit road, and where there ‘is a collision problem and/or a particular risk to vulnerable road users and evidence of persistent high harm speeding motorists’.

**Extending the 20mph area**

11 comments from scheme supporters were received. The suggested roads or areas to be covered were Upper Brighton Road, Ewell Road, Portsmouth Road, Hook Road and everywhere in Kingston.

**Officer response:**
The scope of this scheme involves consulting on introducing 20mph speed limits in Surbiton Neighbourhood area, excluding some of the ‘A’ roads mentioned above. Any additional roads to be included within a 20mph speed limit would be subject to the approval of this scheme. This would also require further consultation, following on from further investigation to decide if it would suitable to introduce a 20mph speed limit for these roads.

**Against a ‘one size fits all’ approach**

5 comments were made by those who oppose the scheme arguing that each road needs to be considered on its own merits.

**Officer response:**
The scheme has excluded the ‘A’ roads as they were not considered as appropriate for a 20mph speed limit. For implementing a 20mph speed limit, TfL guidance shows that 20mph speed limit is more effective when applied 'over an area consisting of several roads and not just an individual road. There may be exceptions to this but it is doubtful that a single road 20 mph speed limit would have any significant effect on speeds or accidents unless it was at least 500m in length.’

However, each road would still be assessed to decide if any traffic management measures should be introduced in that road.

**Will make traffic worse**

Three respondents say that the proposal will increase congestion: ‘Roads were constructed to get from ‘a’ to ‘b’ and lower speed limits will cause
unnecessary road congestion and make people's journeys longer.'

**Officer response:**
A majority of these roads are residential where mean traffic speeds are already below 30mph, so a change in limit from 30mph to 20mph would have a limited impact on journey times (compared to implementing safer speed limit within residential roads).

**Pollution**
Two comments were made citing that driving at 20mph is less fuel efficient and creates more pollution.

**Officer response:**
Generally, fuel efficiency is maximised when acceleration and braking are minimised. So a fuel-efficient strategy is to anticipate what is happening ahead, and drive in such a way so as to minimise acceleration and braking. This also helps to reduce particulates and other emissions, since these are increased by braking and accelerating.
The driver will be travelling at a slower speed for a longer time, minimising sudden braking as travelling at a lower speed gives the driver more time to read the road and adjust speed accordingly, minimising the reduction in fuel efficiency. Optimal fuel efficiency can be expected while cruising with no stops, at minimal throttle and with the transmission in the highest gear at a speed of 45-55mph (although the actual figures will vary by engine and vehicle), which is not applicable to the roads in the study area.
The mean speed recorded for the majority of the roads in the proposed 20mph speed limit area is already below 30mph so, although a change in limit from 30 to 20mph could have a limited negative impact on fuel efficiency in this case, reductions in emissions offset this to some degree.
Also, a 20mph speed limit should encourage an increase the use of environmentally friendly transport modes like cycling and walking.

**Exclude bus routes**
Some respondents think the 20mph speed limit should exclude roads used as part of bus routes.

**Officer response:**
Some of the K buses routes are on residential roads. A change in speed limit to exclude residential bus routes roads could be confusing to drivers and would require additional signing, so increasing street clutter and scheme costs.

**Apply during certain hours**
Two respondents asked if speed limit could be varied by time of day.

**Officer response:**
This proposal would result in a substantial number of new road signs to indicate speed limit operational times. This would increase street clutter and would be expensive to implement and maintain.

**Timescale**
31. If the Committee were minded to approve the area wide scheme, it is anticipated that the earliest work would start on the Traffic Management Order (TMO) process would be February 2017. Preparing a TMO for such a wide area would take a significant time, and it likely that the advertised TMO would not be published until March 2017. Any objections received in response to the TMO would need to be reported back to this committee for consideration decision on the way forward.
Resource Implications

32. If a scheme were supported and agreed, this would cover around 163 roads (excluding private roads and roads less than 80 metres long) and an outline estimate of the costs associated with the TMO, signs and lines would cost approximately £45,000 - £50,000.

Legal Implications

33. There are no legal implications associated with this report, at this time. However, if the Committee approves the scheme, a statutory legal process for a Traffic Management Order (TMO) would be required for this scheme and legal implications would then be considered at that time.

Risk Assessment

34. The introduction of 20mph speed limits will promote the message of road safety in these residential roads and help reduce the risk of road traffic accidents. The proposed scheme does not involve any additional physical speed reducing features and should reduce the risk and severity of accidents to the benefit of the whole community.

Equalities Impact Assessment

35. There is an overarching EQIA in place that covers LIP Schemes, and as such individual assessments are not required. This proposal has potential to benefit both pedestrians and cyclists as they can both travel safely and separately from motor vehicles.

Environmental Implications

36. The introduction of a new 20mph speed limit would encourage more sustainable travel mode in the area.
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