

## **Annex 1**

### **Objections & Formal Representations to the Speed Limit Order.**

---

**I wish to register my objection to this proposal.**

**I feel it is a totally disproportionate response to RTAs in our city.**

**I believe your proposals will snarl up what is already a very congested city increasing emissions and impacting on journey times for commuters, visitors and business alike and having a negative effect on the local economy. It is also my belief that the many signs required will add insult to injury by costing council tax payers an excessive amount, at a time when other local services are being cut and the money could be much better spent.**

**I would have no objection to you introducing this speed limit in known hotspots such as outside schools providing the 20mph limit only applies at the appropriate times. This type of restriction seems quite effective when I have seen it in other cities where lighted signs warn when the limit applies.**

**To me this would be a much more appropriate response for all concerned.**

**I am in favour of reducing speed on residential streets, however your idea to simply put up more road signs is naive and a WASTE of money.**

**Motorists who like to drive fast will not take the slightest notice of the speed limits or 'signs'.**

**The only way to slow drivers down is to make it painful – that means speed humps ALL THE WAY ACROSS the road.**

**Partial speed humps are useless - I frequently witness drivers going over 40/50mph along Hamilton Drive when they get a clear run.**

**The wheels are positioned either side of the hump so it serves no purpose.**

On the streets you propose the signs, it is probably not possible to go fast anyway - as a driver runs the risk of crashing into all the parked cars.

This is the case on Queenswood Grove, where I live. it is not the 'sign' that slows drivers down but the other vehicles.

Your campaign is without real action - it is a token gesture to make it look like you are doing something when in fact all you are doing is wasting money and achieving nothing.

Why not waste more money and put signs on all pavements to say "Pedestrians only"

*Hello -*

*I would like to express my broad support for the proposal formally make more residential streets 20 mph. I do have a concern over a section of St. Helen's Road/Thanet Road in Dringhouses. The section to which I refer extends from the current 20 mph section in front of Dringhouses school toward Chaloner's Road. I hope that you would consider extending the current 20 mph zone on this section of road - or in fact along the length of Thanet Road/Gale Lane.*

*Vehicles tend to accelerate through the 30 mph section of this road (between the school zone and the sleeping policemen on Gale Lane). There is considerable pedestrian and bicycle traffic in this area, especially before and after school and also during the work rush hours. Bicycles struggle to cross and get into traffic at the end of Chaloner's Road and the area is particularly hazardous for young children with cars at 30 mph or more. This creates additional hazards with the rail way bridge blocking the view toward the school, again creating particular hazards for bicyclists where there is no cycle lane and also for children.*

*Please consider extending the proposed 20 mph zone on St. Helen's Road/Thanet Road in the Dringhouses area.*

**I am writing to you, as i am disappointed that it is being proposed to implement a 20 mph limit on certain roads within the Acomb area. We are already hindered by a plethora of "speed bumps" which are more than adequate in reducing the speed of traffic unless you wish to damage your vehicle.**

**If the limits are introduced, do the council intend on removing the speed bumps, as they will no longer be required and in my opinion would reduce noise levels, would this not further improve the quality of life for the community due to reduced noise levels?**

**On what other premiss are the speed limits being instigated? i find the comment on the speed limits being introduced to improve the quality of life for the community hard to justify; is there any evidence of elevated road traffic accidents in these areas to further support such a claim?**

**Has any consideration being given to pubic transport and how this limit will further delay any services running along the proposed routes?**

**The additions of further signage will also spoil the appearance of the area, another quality of life issue!**

**It seems whoever instigates these hair-brain schemes has in essence, given little consideration to the overall impact of the proposals not only in the Acomb area but across the entire York area; previous alterations and subsequent modifications to the traffic lights at Clifton green was another failure along with the "bendy bus " debacle; Lendle bridge closure is all well and good, but i doubt the council has truly considered the impact this will have on the other major routes into York.**

**Why don't York council along with the police tackle known areas of speeding, Beckfield lane and Moor lane,for example, neither of which have any traffic calming measures.**

**If the council is serious on improving quality of life for the community, they wold be advised to tackle ongoing anti social behavior issues in the Acomb area and employ extra community officers to tackle said issues and not instigating schemes which**

**are in my opinion a waste of tax payers money.**

I have received an information pack concerning a proposed 20 mph speed limit in the Dringhouses East area and am writing formally to object.

You will note the layout of roads in this area which by their nature preclude motor vehicles achieving an excessive speed. I am also not aware of any road accidents in this area resulting in death or injury to pedestrians or cyclists which would have been avoided by this scheme. Further, I live in a road in the designated area where children currently play football and practice their skateboards on the road (not the pavement) without any problems. I have lived at this address for some years and have not observed speeding, although if anyone was so minded we all know that a speed limit sign would not prevent it.

In my view this proposal will merely add extra roadside clutter and be unenforceable. It also seems rather premature even to consider such a scheme until we have some hard data as to its effectiveness in the South Bank area. My own observations indicate that people still travel at a speed appropriate to the conditions and within the speed limit which previously prevailed.

If York City Council has excess highway funding burning a hole in its pocket, I believe it would more effectively spent in improving lane markings at junctions and the edge of cycle lanes (many have worn away) and filling in pot holes.

**As a York resident I wish to object to the proposed 20mph speed limit (amendment No 11/4) in the strongest manner possible.**

**I feel very strongly that this is a criminal waste of public money on something that is neither wanted nor required. At a time of severe cutbacks on council services in attempts to make savings I am quite sure there must be a long list of alternative channels of where this money could be better spent to serve the residents of York.**

**I dread to think how much this proposal is likely to cost or even has already cost the tax payer. What's required is investment for the long term in York's essential services, may I suggest that instead of your proposed speed limit change the money might be better spent on actually maintaining the roads we already have in the form of resurfacing worn our tarmac and filling in potholes, or is it the councils policy to stealthily reduce the speed of drivers in York by relying upon random potholes to act as traffic calming measures?**

**As a Woodthorpe resident and owner of two properties and a business in the area I am not aware of the existence of a speeding problem. If it has indeed been genuinely identified that speeding within these areas is a problem i would suggest targeted action be taken to penalise and educate the minority at fault rather than inconveniencing the masses. 30mph has worked fine for many years, please stop wasting money on the latest dreamt up whim at the expense of the tax payer and focus on the day to day maintenance of York, the services we actually need and use on a daily basis.**

**I only hope that sufficient numbers of York residents voice their objections to make the council see sense.**

Thank you for your information pack setting out the proposals for 20 mph speed limits in York.

As far as I am aware the authorities have not been very successful in enforcing the existing 30mph limits over many years can you give an assurance that the new limit if imposed will be more successful.

In view of the present financial situation I would ask you to be as economical as possible when spending money creating hundreds of new 20mph road signs. It should only require a sign at the entry point and reminder signs painted on the roads as reminders.

**As a resident of Pheasant Drive I feel strongly that the stretch of Acomb Wood Drive**

**from around junction with Bellhouse Way to around junction with Alness Drive should be included within the proposed 20 mph limit. Especially of concern to me is the area adjacent to the shops and the Quaker Wood Public House. This area attracts a lot of vehicles and pedestrians. There is a bend in the road here, often with vehicles parked on this bend. This causes cars and buses to use the right-hand lane. I sometimes find it difficult to exit Pheasant Drive because I am unable to see vehicles approaching from around this bend, often in the wrong lane and too often travelling in excess of the existing speed limit. Neither drivers or pedestrians are able to see approaching vehicles until the very last moment.**

Mr Wood, I am writing to register my objection to the proposed 20 mph limit for York. I am a resident of the West side of York (postcode yo24 2rd) & hence will be affected by the next phase. In my opinion, the proposal is a waste of money & unenforceable. Accidents are most likely to be caused by drivers who are currently breaking the law, for example by speeding, drink driving, use of mobile phones etc. If someone fails to stick to the current speed limit then they won't stick to a lower one.

This money would be better spent in other ways such as more cycle lanes or pedestrian crossings, or clamping down on drivers using mobile phones (which I often see in York). Alternatively the money could be spent on maintaining essential services that are currently being cut.

**Hi,**

**I am pleased to see that the proposed 20mph speed limit for west of central York includes Trentholme Drive.**

**This road has a high proportion of 17 children under 10. These comprise currently 9 households out of around 42 in the road, so 20%.**

**The parents in the road would like to request a 'slow children playing' sign to be erected at the beginning of the road and ideally**

**a 5mph speed limit to allow for children playing. Being a horseshoe cul de sac and next to the racecourse, we get a lot of event visitors driving fast up our road and then straight out again. The children often ride their bikes and the horseshoe creates a series of blind corners. A sign/slower speed limit would at least alert strangers to the road to the need for extra vigilance.**

I wish to lodge my objection to the proposed 20mph speed limit – area to West of Central York. In my opinion this is a complete waste of money and resources. I feel that this will make no difference to the people who do speed and imposes the limits on the people who do drive safely and within the speed limits. In a modern vehicle it is actually very difficult to maintain a steady 20 mph and one does wonder if this could be a way of gaining revenue in the form of future imposed speeding fines rather than really addressing the heart of the matter which is a small minority of inconsiderate drivers.

The money would be better spent on repairing the damaged roads in and around York as well as footpaths.

*We would like to formally lodge our objection to the extension of the 20mph scheme to the West of York.*

*As residents of Moorgate we would be included in the scheme.*

*As far as we are aware there is no evidence to suggest that 20mph is required, if we are incorrect please can you provide us with details/evidence of accidents/incidents that have occurred because of travel exceeding 20mph.*

*The surface of the roads in York and surrounding areas are disgraceful and if there is spare money in the budget, it would be better spent on resurfacing. The roads are so bad that to exceed 20mph in some areas of the West of York would be virtually impossible. As cyclists and car drivers we are amazed that accidents don't happen on a daily basis, perhaps they do!?*

*A common sense approach of the correct speed in rural areas should be taken and if drivers do not adhere to a sensible speed appropriate*

*approach, then no addition of signs is going to deter them from their reckless approach, especially as it is unlikely to be policed/enforced.*

*Therefore we view the whole matter as a waste of money and again reiterate that our view is that the money should be spent on road re-surfacing which is certainly a safety issue.*

**I raise the following objection and representations relating to the proposed 20mph speed limit in York, with particular reference to Dringhouses East.**

**1 In general there is no need for 20mph speed limits as 30mph is a sensible existing limit. I would like to see measures to encourage and enforce the existing limit rather than reducing limits further.**

**2 In the case of Dringhouses East the residential roads are laid out and occupied with parked cars such that high speeds are not really realistic in any case. The only exceptions to this are where yellow line parking restrictions have been introduced - which has made the road a clearway at certain times of the day, and served to encourage an increase in speed.**

**3 I strongly object to the use of repeater speed limit signs shown throughout residential areas. These signs are intrusive into the residential environment and are ugly. I believe that they make drivers and inhabitants feel like idiots and that they are being treated as though they are living in a "police state". It is possible they can provoke a reactionary response. Please appreciate that on housing estates "we live here" and know what is required - it is not a case of controlling "through traffic". I have already visited areas where repeater signs have been put up and can only express annoyance at the ugliness and frustration of seeing 20mph signs every 50 yards when you are driving along residential roads where such speeds just aren't practical or possible. Using the Middlethorpe estate as an example, signs at the entrance to the estate at the junction with Tadcaster Road would provide plenty of information.**

I would like to object to the proposed 20 mph plans for the city of York on the grounds that they are utterly unenforceable on the scale proposed without 1. either massive CCTV spend not possible due to budget cuts or

2. a massive police force increase again not viable for the budget cuts which will only increase.

I cannot see what possible use of reducing the roads to 20mph when current restrictions of one way streets are ignored currently and no police or council official seems in anyway moved to any actions but to note that a comment from the public has been logged.

3. Will cycles also be subject to the 20mph speed limit? and how will you enforce that?

4. What study if any has been done to see what the impact of bringing cycles and motor vehicles down to the same top speed in York a cycle town. Unlike other cities who have little cycle traffic York has a great deal of all ages and sizes of cycle vehicle if a 20mph limit is in force the reality will be more accidents as cycles and motor vehicles bother each other under the 20mph limit rather than a motor vehicle being able to safely overtake a cycle without impeding other traffic.

5. A very bad idea all round not thoroughly thought through and not really able to enforce any speed limit or traffic restriction in York.

Maybe the monies would be better spent on improving road surfaces and more police.

**Just a quick email informing you of our objection to your proposal.**

**Although I encourage and promote, where possible, sensible driving etiquette, my wife and I cannot support the proposal for a city wide speed reduction.**

**In our view all this does is create more work load for the already 'stretched' police force. It will however generate more revenue in speeding tickets as every day, taxpaying (non-criminals) will be**

**caught, off-guard travelling 3-5mph over the restriction and subsequently be charged their hard earned money in fines.**

**I would like to question why your website has not argued the fact that vehicular technology is so much more advanced nowadays which makes cars stop faster than ever before and are more environmentally friendly?**

**It's always the same in York - Always against the motorist!**

**I do not suggest, in any way, that I'm a statistical expert for our great city, but what is so obvious to the average Joe is that more vehicular restrictions enforced throughout York will force motorists and trade away from the city centre. Sure we'll have a healthier city but we're hardly Beijing.**

**I'm fully aware that the lower limit proposal is to 'save lives' but surely the money that has been side-lined for the project would be better invested in road safety awareness. I remember attending a 'crucial crew' event at the old Clifton Hospital when I was a child. This touched upon all areas of general safety awareness, railways, road safety, basic first aid etc. It was comprehensive and interactive method of 'driving' safety home. Something that our generation's children appear to have been denied.**

my grounds for the objection are , Accident rates on the streets proposed to have a 20mph limit , are very low and available funds should be spent on safety improvements on roads with a high numbers of killed or seriously injured casualties . the estimated cost of £600,000 cost could be put to better use enforcing existing speed limits at known accident black spots

**I fully support the implementation of the proposed 20 mph speed limit areas. I have one request:**

**Can you please paint the limit on the road rather than have it designated by multiple signposts which clutter the urban environment and create an eyesore.**

**I believe that good drivers will see the limit painted on the road and reduce their speed accordingly, while the bad and unobservant wouldn't observe the limit even if you had reminder signs every 20 metres!**

*We formally object to the York speed limit ( amendment ) No. 11/4 Order 2013. Our grounds for objection are the waste of the estimated £600,000 that would be spent on trying to implement this.*

*We believe the money would be better used on something worthwhile and beneficial to all York residents.*

I formally object to the York speed limit (amendment) No. 11/4 Order 2013. My grounds for objection are:

1) Accident rates on the streets proposed to have a 20mph limit are already very low. Available funds should be spent on safety improvements on roads with a high number of 'killed and seriously injured' casualties'.

2) The £60,000 estimated cost of introducing the city wide limit is a waste of money seeing as the accident rates are already very low. Resources should be prioritised to enforce existing speed limits particularly at accident 'black spots'.

3) The lack of consultation on this order is unacceptable. There has been insufficient debate of the issue and publicity about the proposed change. It is unacceptable that residents are considered to have accepted if they have not formally objected. If the council wished to proceed in this manner then they should have notified each resident in

writing of the proposed change. In my opinion, failure to do so leaves the Council's decision open to legal challenge in the future.

### **I would like to object to the proposed 20 mph**

I formally object to the York speed limit (amendment) No 11/4 order 2013.

My grounds for objection are:-

The £600,000 estimated cost of introducing the new citywide limit represents poor value for money.

resources should be prioritised to enforcing existing speed limits particularly at accident "black spots"

**Rufforth with Knapton Parish Council object to the proposed 20mph limit on Trenchard Road and Portal Road as it feels that this would be a waste of the City of York Council's resources.**

**Trenchard Road and Portal Road are two cul-de-sacs that go nowhere and members of the Parish Council have never seen anyone speeding in either road. Residents in both roads object to this as being unnecessary.**

*I wish to raise my objection to putting a wide-spread 20mph speed limit in York, particularly in West York. I do not believe that police have the person-power available to enforce this, and resources would be better spent on focussing on accident blackspots. What with the roadworks in this area, it will slow journey times considerably.*

*Why is it assumed that people who break the 30mph speedlimit are going to obey the 20 mph speed limit? Plus what about the cost of putting up signs etc?*

*Where is the evidence that 20mph will significantly cut the accidents/injuries in specific streets anyway?*

I am objecting to the proposed west of York 20mph speed limit, and also to the limit being introduced citywide, for the following reasons

1. The £600,000 estimated cost of introducing the new citywide limit represents poor value for money.
2. The west of York has generally got a **good road safety record** and already **has 20 mph speed limits at appropriate locations** (e.g. outside schools).
3. Average speeds, in most of the roads to be covered by the 20 mph limit, are already below 30 mph and the Council's claim, that the new signs would reduce speeds by 3 mph, would therefore make little practical difference.
4. Accident rates in York (Killed and Seriously Injured casualties – KSI) have reduced dramatically over the last 6 years. Available resources should be focused on continuing the Council's successful accident prevention programme which is partly responsible for this improvement.
5. The impact of 20 mph speed limits on accident rates is not yet fully understood. In some City's, such as Portsmouth, the introduction of a wide area 20 mph speed limit has led to an increase in the number of KSI accidents.
6. The Police have said that they do not have the resources to enforce a wide area 20 mph speed limit. The Police and Crime Commissioner has confirmed that mobile safety camera vans will not be used to enforce such a limit. It follows that drivers will continue to drive at a speed that they consider appropriate for the conditions on a particular day.
7. Police speed limit enforcement resources should continue to be focused at accident black spots.

**Dear 20MPH scheme York,**

**We would like to write to provide our general support for this scheme with one or two comments please.**

**We believe that the limit will increase safety, safeguard children, reduce noise and improve the feel of the area for residents.**

**We would however like to suggest that the area should be a zone which once entered, unless otherwise signed, is a 20zone that drivers are expected to drive 20 at. We wondered if it were possible to have signs only at entry points to the zone to reduce the need for many repeater signs and thereby signage 'clutter' so to speak.**

**We would also be in support of a personal responsibility approach whereby speed pumps which are harsh are removed allowing a smooth journey at 20mph. For example, the new bumps on Askham lane cannot be smoothly driven over at 20mph in a normal-small car. we believe this encourages drivers to speed in between increasing their speed and associated engine noise.**

**Many thanks for listening to our comments.**

I would like to register a formal objection to the proposed 20 mph speed limit proposed for the streets of York

I wish to object to the 20mph scheme proposed for the West of York on the grounds that: -

1. It will add to pollution. Slowing the warm up of engines and abatement equipment will not operate to its full potential for longer.
2. It will add to pollution. AA tests show vehicles use 10% more fuel at steady 20mph than 30mph.
3. It will add to pollution. By creating more congestion.
4. It could have a detrimental effect on safety by falsely creating a feeling of a safer environment.
5. It could have a detrimental effect by increasing the severity of injuries sustained in accidents as pointed out by MJ Natt, Collision Investigations.
6. It will have a detrimental effect on the environment through the introduction of 20mph signage.

7. The £600,000 estimated cost of introducing the new citywide limit represents poor value for money. Resources should be prioritised to enforcing existing speed limits particularly at accident “black spots”.

**We formally object to the York speed limit (amendment) no 11/4 order 2013.**

**My grounds for objection are:**

**The £600,000 estimated cost of introducing the new citywide limit represents poor value for money.**

**The money should be used to enforce the current speed limits particularly at accident black spots.**

**If the council cannot keep control of speeding vehicles at the current limit how are they going to manage enforcing control at 20mph,**

**Again, just another stupid example of City of York council wasting tax payers money.**

**These ideas are the reasons why the city has no money**

**Whoever thought up of this stupid scheme needs sacking, obviously must be a cyclist.**

I formally object to the west York speed limit . My grounds for objection are :

Is poor value for money . The cost of £600,000 can be used for actually fixing the roads

**I object to the "York speed limit (amendment) No 11/4 Order 2013.**

- 1. The estimated £600,000 cost is a waste of money which could better be used in these cost saving times.**
- 2. Accident rates are very low on the streets it is proposed on.**
- 3. It will be ignored by most drivers, who drive either according to conditions or ignore speed limits anyway.**

I formally object to the York speed limit (amendment) No 11/4 Order 2013. My grounds for objection are:

Average speeds on many of the roads proposed for the new limit are all ready below 20mph and additional signage would make no practical difference, while increasing street clutter and maintenance costs.

The £600,000 estimated cost of introducing the new citywide limit represents poor value for money.

Accident rates, on the streets proposed to have a 20mph limit, are very low.

**I am writing to object to the 20mph speed limit for two basic reasons:**

**\* It is too costly venture when surely the National Railway Museum should be your priority in saving.**

**\* Unworkable to police properly due to vast amounts of drivers ignoring the limit.**

**In the years that Chaloners Road has had this 20 mph limit I have noticed that very few drivers respect this limit. In fact the only ones that do - are those that are parked!**

**I have noticed over the years more and more drivers not obeying any town limit and I feel a more personal approach may work. There has been many deaths and casualties on our city streets due to poor driving standards. If people or childrens faces are placed alongside these speed limits perhaps this personal touch might modify driver behaviour for the better?**

*I wish to lodge my formal objection to 20mph speed limit in York.*

*Average speeds on many of the proposed roads are already below 20mph and additional signage would make little or no difference, increasing street clutter and maintenance costs and I feel the money would be better spent enforcing current speed limits. I live near Westfield school where there is a speed limit of 20mph and frequently see traffic exceeding the limit in that area. Enforce it or scrap it.*

I wish to record my objection to the implementation of the above on the following grounds please:-

1. Accident reports clearly show that the imposition of a 20 mph speed limit on all roads in the West of York are totally unnecessary.
2. The limit does not apply to those roads which have the highest accident rates.
3. The £600k that this exercise is going to cost is disproportionate and should not be entertained when the Council is in financial difficulties.
4. The money would be better used on maintaining roads and pavements and would be a better justification to avoid trips and falls and subsequent claims on the Council and indeed treatment on the NHS.
5. The cul de sac in which I live has seen no accidents in over 40 years and indeed it is difficult to reach even 10 mph due to the layout of the street and the number of parked cars.
6. The local Foxwood Residents Association have never received a request for the lowering of speed limits in the last ten years.
7. There will be extra street clutter at a time when Reinvigorate York is supposed to be removing such clutter. Perhaps this only relates to the areas on which tourists gaze and frequent.

8. The campaign is politically motivated and unenforceable.

### **Formal objection to 20 mph speed limit**

**I formally object to the York speed limit (amendment) No 1114 Order 2013. My grounds for objection are:**

- **Average speeds on many of the roads proposed for the new limit are all ready below 20 mph and additiona signage would make no practical difference, while increasing street "clutter" and maintenance costs.**
- **The £600,000 estimated cost of introducing the new citywide limit represents poor value for money. Resources should be prioritised to enforcing existing speed limits particularly at accsdent "black spots".**
- **Accident rates, on the streets proposed to have a 20 mph limit, are very low. Available funds should be spent on safety improvements on roads with high numbers of "Killed and Seriously Injured" casualties**

Objection to the York Speed Limit (amendment) (no 11/4) Order 2013

As a resident of one of the affected roads I wish to formally object to the proposals for 20mph speed limits on roads in the West of the City on the following grounds:-

Many of the roads where the limit is proposed are already well below 20mph and I do not see that additional signs would encourage those people who already speed to slow down. There will be a forest of signs that will add to clutter and need maintaining.

Speeds on Moor Lane, Tadcaster Rd and Chaloners Rd are often higher than 30mph but you are not proposing to reduce those limits. Some of the proposed £500,000 should be spent tackling those roads where there is a known problem rather than wasting it on signs for cul-de-sacs, such as Chapmans Court, where it is impossible to get to more than 10mph. I understand that of the recorded accidents in the West of the City over the last 5 years only 13% occurred on roads where the speed

limit is proposed to be reduced. This makes no sense. Surely the roads with the highest accident records need attention first.

I have no objection to targeted 20mph limits where there is an accident record or there are a lot of pedestrians. Reduced speed limits should reflect the road conditions in the same way that some limits are raised to 40mph.

I travel along Scarcroft Rd and Bishopthorpe Rd fairly regularly and have not noticed a significant reduction in the speed of vehicle. Perhaps this is because of the difficulty of enforcing the 20mph limits which I understand that the Police are unwilling or unable to do.

I have lived on Grassholme for 27 years which currently has a 30mph limit and is a bus route. There is more dangers to road users because of indiscriminate on street parking than in speeding traffic. I brought 3 children up here and never felt the need for them to play in the street. Even if the limit is reduced to 20mph my grand children will still play in the garden when they visit.

I feel strongly that, in these times of decreasing budgets, this money should be spent on targeting areas with poor safety records rather than on a plethora of signs that will make little difference to drivers speeds.

I would be grateful if you could let me know when and how the decision on this consultation will be taken.

**I wish to object to current plans for 20 mph speed limits.**

**On the whole I am in favour of evidence based decision making and I see little in the way of this to support this plan in York. Is it the intention of the council to make available the evidence base on which its plan was based. Do you intend to make available the quantitative evidence maintained by the council to justify pressing ahead with this plan? What are the expected reductions in accidents and how were these calculated?**

**Please can you make publicly available the accident statistics around York and why you believe a non-targeted approach is the most appropriate use of resources? Can you also clarify how you expect your proposed limits to be policed?**

We formally object to the York speed limit (amendment) NO 11/4 Order 2012. My grounds for objection are:

Average speeds on many of the roads proposed for the new limit are all ready below 20 mph and additional signage would make no practical difference, while increasing the street "clutter" and maintenance costs.

The £600,000 estimated cost of introducing the new citywide limit represents poor value for money. Resources should be prioritised to enforcing existing speed limits particularly at accident "black spots".

Accident rates, on the streets proposed to have a 20 mph limit, are very low. Available funds should be spent on safety improvements on roads with high numbers of "Killed and Seriously Injured" casualties.

*I object to the 20mph speed limit no 11/4 order 2013*

**After consideration of the proposed introduction of 20 mph speed limits, I am broadly supportive. However, I would like to make one representation related to my local area.**

**The proposed plan is for a short portion of Hamilton Drive to remain at 30 mph, to create a small 30 mph 'island', surrounded in all directions by 20 mph zones. I am referring to the portion of Hamilton Drive from Lady Hamilton Gardens to Campbell Avenue.**

**I believe it is unnecessary to create a small 30 mph 'island', and that this short portion of Hamilton Drive should be 20 mph like all the surrounding roads. I consider some of the benefits to be as follows:**

**Reduced cost: The current proposal requires sixteen new 'entry/exit' traffic signs at junctions along this portion of Hamilton Drive, to create the 30 mph 'island'. My proposal requires no new 'entry/exit' traffic signs. Just the removal of four existing 'entry/exit' signs on Hamilton Drive, and the addition of a few 'repeater' traffic signs on existing lamp columns. This must be a less costly implementation, especially important when the whole**

**council is looking to make savings whenever possible. Also, long term maintenance costs would be reduced, with twenty fewer traffic signs/posts to maintain.**

**Improved safety: This is a residential area with parked cars on both sides of the road. Safety would be improved, specifically for:**

- Pedestrians walking to the park. Children accessing the play ground at the south end of West Bank Park, adjacent to the proposed 30 mph 'island'.**
- Pedestrians walking to the two nearby primary schools.**
- Cyclists using Hamilton Drive to access the orbital cycle route at Moorgate or Hob Moor.**

**The desire for a consistent and easily understandable approach to speed limits: Significant portions of the route along Hamilton Drive West, Hamilton Drive and Hamilton Drive East do already exist in the 20 mph scheme. Instead of the speed limit flip-flopping multiple times along this route, there would be a single coherent 20 mph zone.**

**Reduced visual clutter from traffic signs in residential areas: Instead of the proposed sixteen additional traffic signs than currently, there would be four fewer traffic signs than currently. The smaller repeater signs can be attached to existing lamp columns.**

**I would be interested in your thoughts. Particularly the reasons this 30 mph 'island' was excluded from the proposed 20 mph speed limits.**

*We feel the 20mph limit is unnecessary on the roads around Woodthorpe/Foxwood that are already speed restricted by bends and parked cars. However, if the current proposals go ahead, the one road not covered by the scheme (Acomb Wood Drive/Bellhouse Way to Foxwood Lane) is the most dangerous road in the area. Allowing cars, motor bikes, vans etc to resume their faster speeds near the pub and shops seems to us to be incomprehensible. This road is already regarded by many as a Motorway! Why is it not included in the scheme?*

*Alness Drive is a bus route as well as a through route, yet this will be restricted.*

I would like to voice my complete opposition to the introduction of the 20mph area in Woodthorpe.

It appears to be change for changes sake - these roads are not hazardous and accidents and incidents are few and not serious in nature.

If these changes are judged necessary, can someone explain the exclusion of Acomb Wood Drive? This has a nearly right-angle bend at its junction with Bellhouse Way and if ever a road needed calming it is this one.

In addition, if the proposed signage is as good and effective as that in the 'Existing 20mph Area', then I won't expect too much to change - I drive on Bellhouse Way frequently and Bellwood Drive sometimes and was not aware that either of them had a 20mph limit.

**We formally object to the York speed limit (amendment) no 11/4 order 2013. our grounds for objection are -:**

**1. Average speeds on many of the roads proposed for the new limit are all ready below 20mph and additional signage would increase street clutter and maintenance costs. Most drivers drive to the road conditions.**

**2. Costs of this introduction could be better spent providing better safety improvements on existing black spots in the city.**

I would like to express my concern that the proposals for 20mph areas in the city as this will consume funding that could otherwise be used to reduce accidents on those roads and junctions where there are high recorded incidents of accidents. This is particularly true of the junction of Ridgeway Beckfield Lane and Wetherby Road.

I live next to Westfield School, and there is a 20 mph zone in front of the school for the school crossing patrol and this will be devalued by the scheme which is unhelpful for the pupils and parents of the school.

**I have just discovered that there is a petition to stop this ridiculous proposal, as usual it is kept really quiet until the last minute.**

**I would like it recorded that I FORMALLY OBJECT to the proposal to have a 20mph speed limit (amendment) No 11/4 Order 2013 mainly in the Acomb area. There is no need for it. The speed bumps already in place in Acomb cause constant damage to the shock absorbers on my car, give me pain in a back injury and make driving around Acomb a misery. Resources should be prioritised to enforce existing speed limits, particularly on Tadcaster Road and Beckfield Lane.**

**I attended a police speed awareness course a year ago and thought it was wonderful and think every motorist should attend one. That is the way to stop people speeding, not adding more speed bumps. The new ones on Askham Lane/Foxwood Lane are lethal and will cause even more damage to cars. Council, wake up and see sense.**

I am emailing to formally object to the York speed limit amendment no 11/4 order 2013.

The cost (I believe estimated in excess of half a million pounds) does not give value for money in accident reduction. I believe that the 20mph speed limit is unenforceable and the money would be better spent on enforcing the current 20mph limits (around schools etc), concentrating on 'black spots' and driver education.

**I would like to formally object to the proposed 20mph scheme. Details obtained through the Freedom of Information Act show 335 of the 383 accidents in west York over the last five years – 87 per cent – were on roads where speeds will not change. Only 48**

**happened on streets earmarked for a 20mph limit, and 39 of these were classed as slight.**

**I think that 20mph should be concentrated on streets with the worst accident rates rather than a blanket approach, it should be noted that 95 accidents happened on roads whose existing 20mph limits were enforced through speed humps during this time.**

**Any proposed legislation should be rethought thoroughly.**

I want to object to the TRO on 20mph limits as not being wide enough. It should include Dalton Terrace as 20mph following NICE guidance on protecting children and best practice being to have slower speeds outside schools - the Mount school has a nursery, primary and secondary on that site. Children cannot judge road speeds over 20mph or assess looming effects reliably. So it is dangerous to leave streets with high child footfall and cycling movements at 30mph

Ditto Nunnery Lane and All Saints.

Nunnery lane also should go 20 because it is an AQMA and 20mph limits reduce braking, fuel use and pollution, so child safety and air quality would both be improved.

**Ref: Objection to Proposed 20mph Speed Limit in Dringhouses East**

I am writing to object to the proposed introduction of a 20mph speed scheme to East Dringhouses. Whilst I fully appreciate the need to have such zones around schools, on busy roads, or roads where other dynamics can create an increased safety risk for motorists, cyclists or pedestrians I do not believe this to be the case in this residential area.

The key reasons for my objection are:

- In the 9 years I have lived at this address I have only observed residents on the estate driving safely, respecting pedestrians, cyclists, and other motorists.
- The 3 roads leading off Tadcaster Road namely Middlethorpe Road, Middlethorpe Drive, and Hunters Way and the majority of roads leading off these have an area of grass between the kerb and the start of the pavement which I believe greatly enhances the visibility and therefore anticipation for potential risks such as a pedestrian stepping into the road.
- Whilst some streets leading off Tadcaster Road are narrow this is not the case in this residential area making it a very safe environment for both motorists and cyclists.
- Due to the sporadic parking of cars on the streets within the neighbourhood this naturally slows down motorists.

I do hope that you will take these points into consideration and invest the potential savings from the introduction of signage into more worthwhile schemes within the city.

## Proposed 20 mph Speed Limit – Area to the west of Central York

### Objection to the exclusion of Moor Lane from the 20 mph scheme

I am not objecting to a 30 mph limit on Moor Lane between Tadcaster Road and Chaloners Road, as this stretch of the road has a pedestrian crossing point, wide pavements and dedicated cycle lanes.

My objections concern the exclusion of Moor Lane from the 20 mph scheme from the junction with Chaloners Road westwards and are as follows:

1. Moor Lane is too narrow to safely accommodate bicycles and overtaking cars, never mind buses and lorries, at the current 30 mph limit.
2. For some 150 yards after Chaloners Road, the pavements are narrow and close to the road. In places, they are so narrow that a push-chair going in one direction and a pedestrian in the other cannot pass each other without someone stepping into the road.
3. Vehicles (including bicycles) turning right out of the car park for Chapmans Pond/"Love to Eat" are very vulnerable to traffic approaching at 30 mph round the bend to their right.
4. Unlike A and B roads such as Tadcaster Road and C roads such as Foxwood Lane and Chaloners Road, there are no pedestrian crossings, no speed humps and no cycle lanes on Moor Lane.
5. There is a dangerous bend between Grassholme and the end of Nairn Close. There have been a number of instances of cars leaving the road here. Fast moving traffic on Moor Lane is a danger to bicycles, cars and buses turning right out of Grassholme. Furthermore, cyclists heading up Moor Lane have to position themselves in the middle of the road on this bend in order to cross to the designated cycle route up Nairn Close and Eden Close; they are very vulnerable to vehicles travelling at 30 mph (or over), as there is no island in the middle of the road to protect them..
6. Further west on Moor Lane, there is another point where cyclists emerge onto the road from a safe cycle path. At this point, there are also pedestrians (including the elderly and school children) crossing to and from the bus stop on the other side of the road and pedestrians crossing to join the public right of way a short distance along the former Moor Lane. The 20 mph limit should cover at least the section of Moor Lane from Chaloners Road to this point, thus including all the old original Moor Lane up to the point where it is replaced by a more modern stretch of road. This would represent less than half the total length of Moor Lane from the ring road to Tadcaster Road and would add under half a minute to journeys along Moor Lane.
7. It may be more prudent to extend the 20 mph limit to the junction with Ainess Drive, in the light of York Council's intention to build hundreds of new houses on

the southern side of Moor Lane, thus increasing the number of vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists using Moor Lane.

8. On Moor Lane, there are two signs warning vehicles that they are travelling faster than designated maximum of 30 mph. Anybody who observes the traffic passing through these warning signs knows that most vehicles break the speed limit and do not slow down after the warning sign appears.
9. In conclusion, it makes no sense that the 20 mph limit will be introduced in short roads where speeds are already modest, while it is proposed to retain a 30 mph limit on a road where most vehicles travel dangerously faster than the legal limit and which has no safety measures, such as speed bumps, pedestrian crossings or cycle lanes, to help to protect pedestrians and cyclists. The aim of the 20 mph scheme is to make York's roads safer. If Moor Lane is not included in the scheme, it is very likely to attract more traffic and become even LESS SAFE than it is at present.

RECEIVED

Overall I am against the introduction of a 20 MPH speed limit in the Woodthorpe Ward. I do agree the 20 MPH limit should be enforced in areas such as Hospitals / Schools / Care Homes.

However, I am against the new proposals for the following reasons:-

- 1) There may be an increase in road rage.
- 2) It can only lead to cost increases for small businesses costs which will be surely passed on to customers.
- 3) Car owners may stop using their cars bringing a downturn of fuel and garage services and possible job cuts.
- 4) Has there been any follow up to recent 20 MPH set up down Bishopthorpe Road. I walk this route into town and approximately 70% of vehicles take no notice of the new speed limit.
- 5) Have the new proposals taken account of the historical accident rates compared to current rates. Will the new speed limit significantly improve accident rates.
- 6) Does the City of York Council propose to give the residents the chance to vote for <sup>or</sup> against the proposals. It would not be very democratic to steam roller through any changes.

A . . . .

**CITY OF YORK COUNCIL  
NOTICE OF PROPOSALS :THE YORK SPEED LIMIT (AMENDMENT) (NO11/4) ORDER 2013-06-11  
OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSALS**

I am in receipt of the York 20 mph Speed Limit Information Pack and wish to register my strong objection to the scheme. My grounds for objection are as follows:

- The 20 mph policy was never part of the Labour manifesto at the last council elections. It appears to have been adopted post election at the behest of Anna Semlyen, a former Green Party member, who changed to Labour to get her single issue campaign taken more seriously. I believe that this is undemocratic.
- Something that will affect every driver and cyclist in York should have been subject to a referendum.
- It is hard enough to travel anywhere in York by car without additional zones further impeding progress.
- Once the 20 mph zones are in place it is likely that the next step will be to extend them. Will there then be further calls for a reduction in the speed limit to 15 mph in some zones?
- As a cyclist I can frequently keep pace with cars. Speeds of 25 mph are easily attainable on a bike. Will I be prosecuted for cycling at a pace that exceeds the speed limit in the 20 mph zones, or is this something that is aimed at cars?
- The 30 mph speed limit has as far as I am aware served towns and cities across the UK perfectly well for many decades. Why do we need to change?
- I am not convinced by the fashion for stating that the 20 mph limit will reduce road casualties. In my experience many casualties are caused by impatience and lack of awareness on the part of both motorists, pedestrians and other road users. Only the other

day I had to break very hard to avoid hitting a pedestrian who crossed on a pelican crossing when the lights were green for road traffic. This woman walked up to the crossing and proceeded to cross without even looking right or left when the red man signal was clearly on.

- A lot is made of the need to reduce traffic pollution, noise and congestion. I lived in Singapore for 3 years and they have a very high population density, but manage to create a nice clean environment and have the traffic flowing relatively freely at 30 mph.
- Given that the council is supposed to be having difficulty balancing the books by removing litter bins, closing the Beckfield Lane tip and cannot seem to repair the footpaths nor clean the street drains it seems perverse to spend such a lot of money introducing 20 mph zones that we clearly don't need.

I expect that you will not like the views that I have expressed in this letter as they are not politically correct. However you have asked for objections and these are mine.

Liberal Democrat Group – Objection to York Speed Limit (amendment) (no 11/4)  
Order 2013

The Liberal Democrat Group would like to formally object to the 20mph proposals in the west of the City (No 11/4 Order 2013). We fully support the detailed objection submitted by our Dringhouses & Woodthorpe Ward Councillor, Cllr Ann Reid.

The Liberal Democrat Group has always recognised the important role that 20mph limits play in traffic management and road safety. However, we do not support the blanket approach being taken by the current Labour administration. We continue to support a targeted use of 20mph limits at known accident black spots and in areas such as outside schools and shopping areas.

The folly of the current approach is shown in the speed and accident data supplied in the submission from Cllr Reid. This shows that average speeds on many of the roads proposed for the new limit are already below 20mph and accident rates on the roads proposed are either zero or very low. This means that in many areas the £600,000 cost of the project will make little discernable difference on the ground, except to increase 'street clutter' and spend taxpayers' money.

It is particularly short-sighted that the Council is introducing 20mph limits on streets where they are not required and, based on previous consultation, are potentially not popular, but at the same time the Council is refusing to take immediate action in areas where there are pressing issues.

On the 16<sup>th</sup> June, the Cabinet Member for Transport, Planning & Sustainability resolved to take no immediate action on speeding, traffic and safety issues on Calf Close, Haxby, despite a petition signed by 107 local residents. Similarly, Cllr Reid's submission highlights roads in this area where there are speeding issues, but no action has been taken and no action is being proposed. Surely it would be a better use of resources to prioritise safety measures in areas where there are speeding issues and where there is local demand – rather than rolling-out 20mph zones on roads where there is no local demand and often no significant speeding, safety or traffic issues.

The Liberal Democrat Group continue to believe that the evidence used to support a blanket 20mph approach is very mixed in regards to accident levels, reducing speeds, helping produce a modal shift away from car use, and in reducing emissions. The evidence from the UK's first city-wide 20mph scheme showed that serious accident levels went up slightly, the average reduction in speeds was just 1.3mph, and the scheme "made little difference to the majority of respondents in the amount they travelled by their chosen mode"<sup>1</sup>. Meanwhile, the AA estimates that cutting the speed limit from 30mph to 20mph on the wrong roads can increase CO2 emissions by 10%<sup>2</sup>.

We also note the ongoing confusion over enforcement. The evidence is that locally and nationally the police do not have the resources or inclination to enforce all new 20mphs, with the Association of Chief Police Officers telling Parliament in March that "We are not enforcing 20mph speed limits at this moment in time"<sup>3</sup>. Residents consistently tell us that instead of introducing new speed limits they want the authorities to enforce existing limits, whatever these limits happen to be.

The Liberal Democrat Group believe that the £600,000 earmarked for this project would be better targeted on measures to reduce accident levels at known accident black-spots in this area and across York. Overwhelmingly, this is what residents tell us they want and this is what we believe the Council should implement.

### **Objection to the York Speed Limit (amendment) (no 11/4) Order 2013**

I wish to formally object to the proposals for 20mph speed limits on roads in the West of the City. I object as both a resident of one of the affected roads and as Ward Councillor for Dringhouses and Woodthorpe ward.

My reasons for objecting are:-

- Average speeds on many of the roads proposed for the new limit are already below 20 mph and additional signage would make no practical difference, while increasing street "clutter" and maintenance costs.
- The £500,000 estimated cost of introducing the new citywide limit represents poor value for money. Resources should be prioritised to enforcing existing speed limits particularly at accident "black spots".
- Accident rates, on the streets proposed to have a 20 mph limit, are either zero or very low. Available funds should be spent on safety improvements on roads with high numbers of "Killed and Seriously Injured" casualties

I attach a spreadsheet for source data which has been provided by York Council officers which shows that of the 383 RTA's in west York, the vast majority (339) have been classified as "slight". It also shows that the roads with the highest recorded speeds are the roads where there are no proposals to reduce speeds. On many of the roads that are to have the limits lowered the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds are already well below 30mph and some are below 20mph. Of those 383 accidents only 48 (13%) occurred on roads where it is now proposed to reduce the speed limit.

Moor Lane has a record of 1 serious and 12 slight accidents, an 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed of 38mph and a highest recorded speed of 64mph but there is no proposal to lower the limit or introduce any kind of speed reduction measures.

Moorcroft Rd has a record of 1 slight accident, an 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed of 19mph and a highest recorded speed of 25 mph but the proposal is to reduce the speed limit.

The roads in the Ward where I get complaints about speeding vehicles are Moor Lane, Tadcaster Rd, Thanet Rd, Chaloners Rd and Alness Drive. Of those only the limit on Alness Drive is proposed to be lowered but simply putting a sign at the beginning will not reduce speeds on this straight stretch of road. I get complaints that vehicles then take the bend into, and out of, Acomb Wood Drive too fast but on the stretch of Acomb Wood Drive where there have been accidents the limit will stay at 30mph.

The problems on Moor Lane were recognised by the Cabinet Member at his Decision Session on 9<sup>th</sup> November 2012 where it was added to the list of streets in the Partnership Speed Update Report. This report also includes Chaloners Rd and Tadcaster Rd as roads where there are confirmed speeding problems but these proposals do nothing to address those issues.

Many residents have expressed the view to me that they feel the £500,000+ cost of this scheme is too much to spend on rather dubious outcomes. We have seen the KSI figures steadily reduce by targeting resources on areas with accident records and/or high pedestrian footfall and by implementing appropriate speed limits for each street. New technology such as Vehicle Activated Signs (VAS) has been implemented and partnership working with the Police has seen the introduction of mobile speed cameras which are concentrated at locations with poor accident records. The Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) has confirmed that they will not be made available to enforce 20 mph speed limits in York.

Residents do not understand how putting a sign at the end of a short cul-de-sac will do anything but produce a forest of signs. I have counted that there will be 17 pairs alone on Tadcaster Rd. Many have commented that they have seen no discernible reduction in speed in the "signed only" 20mph area scheme in South Bank. Residents have absolutely no objection to speed limit reduction where it is appropriate but would like some of the limited resources spent on effective measures that encourage drivers to adhere to the current limits. They don't want the limit on Moor Lane reduced; they would just like drivers to keep to it.

On a personal note, I brought up 3 children on Grassholme which has a 30mph limit and is a bus route. I taught my children "kerb drill" and they walked to school. They did not play out on the road and I feel that, unless a street is designated as a "play street" children and vehicles do not mix, whatever speed they are doing. I feel that it is disingenuous of the Council to claim that lower speed make roads safer for children to play.

I am greatly concerned about this fundamental change to road safety policy. The Council has always had a targeted approach to accident reduction and I am fearful that moving the resources from a process that has shown a measurable reduction in KSI to an ideological

system that concentrates the money on roads with the lowest accident rates might prove to be a retrograde step.

#### **Objection to the York Speed Limit (amendment) (no 11/4) Order 2013**

Would you please record my formal objection to the above notice? My reasons are as follows.

#### **Background**

There are currently around 65 KSI accidents occurring in York each year. Most happen on trunk roads and in the City centre. Less than 20% occur in west York.

The Council has over the last 7 years achieved significant reductions in the number of "Killed and Seriously Injured" (KSI) on its roads.

It has done so by concentrating road safety funding at accident black spots and by implementing speed limits which reflect the accident potential of each street.

This has been backed up by the use of new technology such as Vehicle Activated Signs (VAS) which warn drivers that they are exceeding the speed limit.

The Police have refined their enforcement approach by adopting the suggestion made by the York Council in 2009 that mobile safety (speed) camera's be used in the City (and county). Part of the agreement for the introduction of the cameras was that their use would be concentrated at locations with poor accident records.

The Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) has confirmed that they will not be made available to enforce 20 mph speed limits in York.

If the Council wishes to abandon its targeted approach to accident reduction, then it must demonstrate that better value for money can be achieved by a redirection of the use of resources.

#### **20 mph wide area limits**

The Council's web site claims *"The introduction of 20mph speed limits in our residential streets will help promote more considerate driving and **increase confidence in the safety of neighbourhood roads**. **Safer streets** will hopefully encourage more of us to make greater use of our streets for walking, cycling, playing or just*

*socialising. With less traffic and more people around, the places we live will over time become safer, friendlier, quieter and cleaner places to be".*

I do not believe that a case has been made for the allocation of over £500,000 for the introduction of a Citywide 20 mph speed limit on the basis that this would make our roads "safer".

Rather the contrary is the case as the latest published accident and speed statistics for west York demonstrate (see attached spreadsheet for source data which has been provide by York Council officials).

Indeed, the introduction of a lower limit could make some streets less safe than they are now. This has proved to be the case in Portsmouth where the introduction of a wide area 20 mph limit has coincided with an increase in the numbers of KSI accidents recorded.

On the other hand, many streets would be safer (have a lower accident risk), both in terms of accident statistics and residents perceptions, if the existing 30 mph limits were enforced and complementary engineering improvements were made at accident black spots.

## Accident Risk

The main argument used by some Councillors, to justify the £500,000 project, is that it will reduce the number of road traffic accidents (RTAs) in the area.

The new figures made available by the Council undermine this claim.

In the last 5 years there have been 383 RTA's in west York (broadly the Acomb, Westfield, Holgate and Dringhouses wards).

Of these the vast majority (339) have been classified as "slight".

There were no accidents at all on the majority of roads which the Council proposes to implement a 20 mph speed limit. No current vehicle speed information is available for these roads either and they are excluded from the spreadsheet

The roads with the worst accident records in west York are Tadcaster Road, Boroughbridge Road and Holgate Road.

Of the accidents recorded, 335 (87%) occurred on roads where there are no plans to lower the speed limit.

This is not surprising as these are the main arterial routes which are heavily trafficked and where there are potential conflicts at road junctions. Of these accidents, 2 were fatal (both on Holgate Road) 33 serious (6 on Tadcaster Road) and 300 slight.

Only 48 (13%) of accidents occurred on roads where it is now proposed to reduce the speed limit.

Of the 48 accidents, there was one fatality (on Cranbrook Avenue), 8 serious accidents and 39 slight.

Significantly, 95 accidents occurred during this period on roads in west York which already have a 20 mph speed limit (enforced by road humps.)

Of these, 9 were classified as "serious"

## Vehicle Speeds

Vehicle speeds on roads which may get a 20 mph limit are already low.

The highest was 31 mph recorded on Tudor Road. (This reflects the speed that 85% of drivers travel at, or below, when using the road).

More typically the range, for the planned 20 mph streets, was between 15 mph and 25 mph.

The lowest recorded speed was on Ganton Place (13 mph) although this is typical of vehicle speeds on many short cul de sacs.

It is highly unlikely that the introduction of signed only 20 mph limits will have any effect on the speeds recorded on these streets.

In the case of many small cul de sacs it is impossible to accelerate a vehicle to 20 mph in the road space available. Placing a 20 mph speed sign in the area, and maintaining it, would therefore be a waste of money.

The highest recorded speeds were on Tadcaster Road (79 mph), Wetherby Road E (71), Carr Lane (66) and Front Street (66). However the recording devices cover 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, so the figures would include any emergency vehicles responding to calls.

## Speed and accidents

Accidents can occur anywhere, at any time. The fact that a large proportion of serious accidents (KSIs) are concentrated at particular locations has allowed the Council, in the past, to allocate its limited resources to addressing the main causes of these accidents.

Often high vehicle speeds will not be a major factor affecting accident rates in residential areas (or indeed the City Centre).

Vehicles reversing into street furniture are an example of an accident where a speed limit has no influence.

Similarly a cyclist colliding with a pedestrian is an accident which is unlikely to be caused by either party exceeding the speed limit.

The inescapable conclusion, therefore, is that the Council is focusing its safety budget on roads where there is little or no accident risk.

Those roads where high speeds may be an issue may already be receiving less attention.

The Council should abandon its wide area 20 mph speed limit project and focus resources on roads with high accident rates and/or where there is evidence of drivers systematically flouting the existing speed limits.

## In summary

I formally object to the York speed limit (amendment) No 11/4 Order 2013. My grounds for objection are:

- Average speeds on many of the roads proposed for the new limit are all ready below 20 mph and additional signage would make no practical difference, while increasing street "clutter" and maintenance costs.
- The £500,000 estimated cost of introducing the new citywide limit represents poor value for money. Resources should be prioritised to enforcing existing speed limits particularly at accident "black spots".
- Accident rates, on the streets proposed to have a 20 mph limit, are either zero or very low. Available funds should be spent on safety improvements on roads with high numbers of "Killed and Seriously Injured" casualties

In formally objecting I accept that there may be a small number of streets with poor accident records where a 20 mph speed limit might be more appropriate. The reduced speed limits agreed, for example for Low Poppleton Lane in 2010, and which have not been implemented by the present Council, may now need to be reviewed.

I object to the proposed 20mph blanket speed limits proposed for Woodthorpe, Dringhouses and the rest of York.

These limits will cause increased congestion and slower journey times for people who have no alternative but to use a car or bus.

Speeding is not a problem in this area (or, in fact, in York generally). For most of the smaller residential roads responsible motorists do not drive above 20mph due to parked cars and obstructions, and the irresponsible minority will ignore the 20mph limits anyway. In the case of larger, wider – and therefore safer – residential streets, there is no need to reduce the limit.

There is no safety case given except for general suggestion that slower=safier. Any safety scheme should be able to demonstrate that it is proportionate and effective, and no evidence has been presented to show this.

Woodthorpe and Dringhouses is not a dangerous area and I am not aware of any major road traffic accidents here.

This scheme is a waste of money at a time when council budgets are being tightly squeezed. There are much more important demands on my taxes than an ill thought-out and pointless scheme like this.

Thank you for your circular advising about the proposed 20 MPH speed limits for the area of York in which I live.

I wish to register my objection to this proposal on several grounds.

1). The estimated cost of rolling this programme out across York is £600,000 at a time when households are struggling to survive. Churches in Acomb, including the one I attend are now collecting food on a weekly basis to donate to the Acomb food bank. The York Council Tax has risen yet again despite valiant efforts from central government to encourage austerity to help reduce the overall burden of debt gripping our nation. The cost of this programme could be put to much better use if only we had a council that cared about people more than its own selfish ideology.

2). York City Police have registered their disapproval of this programme and have openly admitted it is unenforceable. At a meeting of residents last October in Woodthorpe Primary School Councillor Semlyn actually admitted that the speed limit was unenforceable. She went on to say "The hope is that some drivers will stick to 20 MPH and create tailbacks as other drivers will be unable to get past." How long will it take for some stupid driver to do something silly to get past and cause a serious accident?

I suspect the main beneficiary of the 20MPH scheme will be to enable the police to increase their crime detention figures and enable any officers behind in their arrest targets to make up the shortfall by catching a few honest hard working law abiding citizens, struggling to pay their mortgages and feed their families, who might inadvertently drive at 24 or maybe 26 MPH in perfectly safe conditions. A nice little earner for the treasury (£60 fines) and another family going short for no sensible reason whatsoever. Just Labour Party ideology and a complete lack of caring about the impact such ideology has on peoples lives.

3) Evidence from across Europe suggests that where similar schemes (20 MPH blanket areas) have been introduced the accident rate has increased. In our own country Department of Transport figures show that in 2011 there were 2,262 injuries on roads with a 20MPH limit – up 24% on 2010 before the 20MPH limits were introduced.

4) In Woodthorpe the main through road changes its name four times starting as Moorcroft Road, becoming Acorn way, Ryecroft and then Grassholme. One long road around the estate and this is a bus route. Do you really expect the buses to do 20 MPH? First York will have to re-write the timetables. If we are to be saddled with this silly idea then surely the Moorcroft Road/Acorn Way/Ryecroft/Grassholme through road should be exempt.

One last thing. Please could I ask you some questions.

Is this a genuine consultation or is the final decision a fait accompli?

Does the council really care what people think?

Have they noticed the signatures on the e petitions?

Will we be given details of how many people responded and how many were in favour/against?

Will the council take any notice?

When is the next local election in York???

Re: the York speed limit (amendment) (no 11/4) order 2013

Dear Mr Wood,

I would like to protest in the strongest terms about the plan to introduce blanket 20mph limits. My objections are aimed at the consultation for the plan in the Woodthorpe area, but also apply more widely to the entire scheme. I am primarily a cyclist (in the sense that I cycle to my office most days – a 10 mile round trip – and cycle for leisure) but in common with most cyclists, I also drive (lift sharing when working at remote work sites, driving to work when the weather is too poor to cycle, etc).

It is not clear what the plan is intended to achieve. The reasons given are confused, confusing and vague.

A good proportion of the proposed 20mph area is made up of narrow residential roads with parked cars where it is nearly impossible to achieve 20mph as things stand. It also includes a number of residential roads (Grassholme/Moorcroft Road/Ashbourne Way etc) that are extremely wide and therefore safe (in fact some of the widest I have ever seen in a residential area), where 30 is an entirely appropriate speed.

It is sometimes stated that the scheme is about safety, yet no actual evidence is ever put forward, presumably because there is no evidence other than a 'gut reaction' that lower speed is safer. In the absence of proper evidence and studies, it is quite possible that the changes will have unintended consequences that make the roads less safe such as loss of attention from drivers and pedestrians taking more risks. Particularly confused is the idea that this will encourage children to play in the road. Under no circumstances should parents be encouraging their children to play in the road, 20mph or not.

One of the sometimes stated aims is to tackle people who already break 30mph limits in residential areas. I can assure you that this is not a general problem in the Woodthorpe area. I am aware that my assertion is anecdotal, but I have driven and cycled in this area for several years and have never noticed a speeding problem.

It is also suggested that some people, such as the elderly and disabled, are discouraged from walking and cycling by the presence of 30mph limits and that a reduction of 10mph will lead to modal shift. The evidence for these statements is conspicuous by its absence. In fact, the elderly and disabled are far more dependent on cars and public transport than anyone else and they will face slower journeys as a result of this.

As cyclist, I am not at all convinced that my experience of the roads will be improved. It is a particularly unpleasant experience to be overtaken slowly by a motor vehicle; far better to have a car/van/bus/lorry overtake swiftly. I can envisage situations where the slow progress of a vehicle overtaking at 20mph rather than 30mph will lead to dangerous situations where the vehicle will be forced to move in sharply or pass too close to avoid oncoming traffic or where the cyclist will be forced to slow down to allow an overtaking vehicle to pull in. This will be particularly acute when the overtaking vehicle is a bus or HGV.

In a situation where York's roads are already congested, there is a danger that 20mph limits will increase that congestion. It will certainly increase the impression of 'clogged up' roads, particularly outside of peak hours, which will discourage potential cyclists especially. It will also slow down journey times and increase frustration for drivers. While some may see this as a desirable aim, I do not believe it is right to needlessly diminish the quality of life for other people just because you do not approve of their mode of transport. As the 20mph zone includes bus routes, it will also have a negative effect on public transport users who already have to put up with extremely slow journey times.

It is in any case unlikely 20mph limits will be adhered to. I believe that the figures show that only minimal reductions in speed have occurred elsewhere and I have seen no evidence that the newly-created South Bank area is having any effect. As always, motorists slow down in the high risk areas such as outside Bishopthorpe Road shops and blithely (and quite understandably in my opinion) ignore the new limits where it is safe to do so. One knock-on effect is that a huge number of people who would not normally break the law are now doing so and I worry that the 20mph limits may dilute the respect that most motorists formerly showed to the rules of the road. This is particularly acute for existing 20mph limits outside schools and other danger areas. These served to highlight specific dangers, but the effect will now be diluted by the blanket imposition of the new limits. A wide suburban street is far less dangerous than a school, yet both will now be 20mph.

It is especially galling that money is being spent on such an ill-thought out and seemingly pointless scheme when York roads are in such a poor state of repair. As a cyclist, one of the worst hazards I encounter on a daily basis are potholes. While these are a concern for motorists as well, the worst a motorist might expect is a repair bill. As a cyclist potholes are a very real danger. Not only can they cause dangerous wobbles or actually unseat you from your bike but navigating around potholes or dealing with riding over potholes robs precious concentration that should be spent on the surrounding traffic. Many times I have had to delay or avoid giving a shoulder check because of an area of broken road ahead that demands my attention. This is not a trivial issue - potholes are potential killers for cyclists! [Incidentally I would be happy to do an audit of my commute to work and highlight the worst areas. Many of them are on the COYC recommended cycle routes.]

I am aware that the budget for the 20mph zones is supposed to be relatively low, but once you add together the cost of the signage, the road painting, the consultations, the planning and the time of councillors and officials involved, the cost still adds up. Real repairs and improvements to the cycle routes and roads could be achieved with that money. Instead it is being wasted on what appears to be solely an ideologically driven scheme.

In summary:

- The scheme seems designed to tackle problems that either don't exist or are vague and unsubstantiated
- There may be unintended consequences that may lead to more road accidents, such as inattentiveness from pedestrians/cyclists/motorists
- It is highly unlikely motorists will obey the new limits in places where it appears safe to do 30mph and this dilutes the respect that most motorists currently show for the rules of the road, especially diminishing the effect of existing hazard-related 20mph limits
- 20mph limits will be unpleasant for cyclists and may create dangerous situations that did not exist with 30mph limits when motor vehicles overtake
- The new limits will exacerbate existing congestion and will have a negative effect on the quality of life of people who drive for no good reason
- The expense involved would be better off spent on genuine highway improvement, such as tackling potholes at the edge of roads where cyclists are particularly at risk

Ref: 20mph speed limit – Dringhouses – Public Safety

I would like to comment on the proposed imposition of a 20mph speed limit on the Dringthorpe /Middlethorpe estate in Dringhouses, York, as part of a road safety campaign.

I have been associated with the above property for over 50 years. Never over that period of time have I been aware of a concern with speeding vehicles on the estate. The estate is enclosed and there is no through traffic, so all vehicles either start or finish their journey on the estate. There are no schools in the proximity with the associated presence of small children. Over the years the increasing presence of vehicle on street parking, requires a careful and considerate approach from all drivers who wish to negotiate the increasingly congested streets.

At a time of financial austerity I find this proposed unnecessary 20mph speed limit to be a senseless waste of public expenditure. The council tax in York continues to rise despite appeals from the national coalition government for restraint. Even if the ridiculous traffic calming surface humps deployed on other estates in York are avoided at Dringthorpe, I regard the 20mph signage as unwelcomed street clutter and an unnecessary expense.

Before the imposition of traffic regulations, regard should be given as to how they will be enforced in order to avoid unenforceable regulations falling into disrepute. Deployment of cameras will be even more cost. Deployment of traffic police will be another impost upon a scarce resource, who surely have more pressing tasks.

If safety of the community is a concern then thought should be given to the number of dogs that are transported on to the estate to exercise their bowels on the Knavesmire. The bagging of dog waste unfortunately does not always result in owners depositing the offending material in the bins provided. Plastic bags containing dog waste are a regular sight to anyone walking the perimeter path of the Knavesmire. I congratulate the workers of the York Racecourse committee who performed an absolutely heroic task removing dog mess in order to prepare the Knavesmire for the recent race meetings.

Dog licences were issued 50 years ago at 7shillings and 6pence to fund control of dogs. Surely in times of austerity dog owners often with multiple animals should be expected to pay for the services they consume. A dog collar with annual coloured disc costing £25 would go some way to funding the council services provided for dog owners. (A similar one for feral cats costing £15 would also reduce the fouling of neighbours gardens and protect endangered wildlife). All vehicles not displaying a current tax disc in a public space are currently impounded. The same should happen to unlicensed dogs.

I submit these thoughts to be included in your requested consultation.

**RE: PROPOSED 20MPH SPEED LIMIT - WEST OF CENTRAL YORK.**

I refer to the above document recently pushed through my letter box.

I have never had any wish to get involved in Local Authority Politics but your proposals have annoyed me so much that I feel I must make you aware of my views which I believe will be shared by many other residents in the area.

How are you going to enforce 20mph limits when you cannot even enforce the current 30mph limit. I have lived at the above address for over 26 years and since the opening of the York College, the Askham Bar Park and Ride and Tesco, Moor Lane has become a race track. Periodic speed checks by the police do nothing to deter motorists (many of them being young college students) from travelling at up to 60mph and more along this road and the problem continues to a lesser extent down Alness Drive.

If you want to improve the environment in this area then I suggest you start by installing speed bumps/other traffic calming measures along the length of Moor Lane (up to the 40mph limit) and along part of Alness Drive. This action would have no adverse affect on traffic movement/journey times but would vastly reduce CO2 and noise pollution.

Your website states and I quote “Good motorists already drive considerably past schools and in residential areas” unquote and this is my point. You are using a sledgehammer to crack a nut. The majority of the internal estate’s roads do not have a speeding issue and those that have will not be solved by a 20mph limit because those drivers who are not “good motorists” and who already ignore the 30mph limit will certainly take little notice of a 20mph limit.

In summary, I agree that a 20mph limit **and traffic calming measures** are appropriate in certain areas but I believe blanket limits will just bring the whole initiative into disrepute and will be ignored by a sizeable minority of people who have little regard for any limits and people’s welfare anyway.

In closing, I would appreciate some response from you with regard to the Moor Lane/Alness Drive issue. This problem is only going to get worse and if you are serious about “improving the quality of life for the local community” (your words, not mine!) then you need to be taking action on this problem before you start wasting **my** money on **your** 20mph proposals.

Dear Sir,

Having read the proposal to introduce a 20mph area around Foxwood and Woodthorpe I felt I had to object to this being introduced.

Firstly we are supposed to be in a recession and saving money, how much has this ridiculous idea cost already? I’ve already seen what a waste of money it has been on Grange Street area just off Fishergate. Nobody could physically get above 20mph before the scheme was introduced because of narrow streets and parked cars etc, what happened to common sense?

Secondly, after it has been introduced into the Foxwood/Woodthorpe area there is nobody to enforce it. I travel all over the city everyday including the South Bank area and have never seen anyone enforcing Bishopthorpe Road.

This idea is supposed to make York safer? The only people who will travel at 20mph are those that already stick to the 30mph, those that speed with 30mph limits are going to ignore 20mph limits as well.

I would like to ask the following questions and also make some comments about the proposed 20mph speed limits in our area, West of Central York, -

How can you know that the majority of people want this proposal when we haven’t had a chance to vote about it? (Wouldn’t that have been the democratic thing to do?)

How many serious injuries/deaths have occurred in this area over the last 10 years? (Have the roads in our area been proved to be particularly dangerous?)

How will it be enforced? (This proposal appears to be useless unless the police are able to catch speeding motorists and at the moment they do not have sufficient resources to enforce the 30mph speed limits.)

How can it not mean a lot more road signs at a time when we are trying to cut down on street clutter? (This already seems to have happened in the South Bank area as you go from 30mph to 20mph and back to 30mph in a very short stretch of road)

How much will it all cost to implement? (Bearing in mind the cutbacks that have to be made at the moment and much more serious issues on which this money could be spent)

From my own experience there have been several occasions when I've observed the speed limit going over speed humps and yet been overtaken which is obviously very dangerous and more likely to cause an accident. This 20mph proposal will make no difference to the minority who are irresponsible drivers. What I think is needed to make our roads safer is to crack down hard on the minority of dangerous drivers with large fines and disqualification to give out a clear message and deterrent.

Most residential streets have so many parked cars and other obstructions that it is rare to be able to travel over 20mph anyway.

I look forward to hearing your response.

Dear Sir,

Most people like yourself travel to work once and travel home once, for the majority of car or small van drivers like me the proposed 20mph speed limits will be an annoyance and add time to our frequent cross York journeys.

Your whole attitude to York as a cycle city is misguided as you are forgetting the tradesman the workingman.

As plumbers in York for four generations and as a self employed GasSafe registered service and heating engineer I unlike the majority of people make my living travelling throughout York, north to south and east to west or a mixture of both servicing, repairing and installing new High Efficiency gas boilers we are the heart blood of York that keep everything running, not sat at a desk all day. We need the main roads of York to be free and remain at 30mph. Your proposals make my journey times longer for my criss-cross routes of my daily routine. If my journey times are longer between jobs I will have to put my prices up to my residents of York.

If these proposals are successful and inevitably, as York seems to be run by the un-elected "Cycle Lobby" then you must accept that you have forgotten the workingman the blood of our great city.

Sir I truly do understand that this lobby has a loud voice within York City Council and its elected councillors but the "Cycle Lobby" wishes are not representative of the majority of weekend cyclists like my wife and I who vote for our elected councillors, the safety issues are overestimated.