

Annex C External Consulation Returns Summary

Resident Group or Notable	Pos/ Neg/ Neutral	summary
Late	Negative	The resident opposes installing ramps on Alness Drive, saying they’re ineffective, as SUVs often ignore them and speed anyway. They argue ramps are poorly maintained, damage vehicles, and represent a waste of money that should be spent elsewhere. The resident questions the need for the scheme, noting 23–24mph speeds, no injury accidents, and only localised issues at one corner. They ask who requested it, what evidence supports it, and why Alness Drive is prioritised over Acomb Wood Drive near the shops. They want the cost–benefit case, success criteria, and a maintenance plan, saying the proposal doesn’t yet show a clear, evidence-led justification.
Resident	Negative	The objection argues that there’s no evidence of a real safety issue on Alness Drive, since no accidents or injuries have been recorded. It says the proposal relies only on subjective perceptions of risk, not data, and that speed bumps bring downsides like noise and vehicle damage. Overall, it concludes the new measures are unnecessary and disproportionate. The objection says speed ramps aren’t justified, as no injuries have occurred since 2022 and the proposal is based on perception, not evidence. It argues ramps would waste taxpayer money, punish normal drivers, and damage vehicles, and urges the council to police speeding instead and leave the road unchanged.
Resident	Negative	The objection argues that speed bumps aren’t needed, pointing to zero injuries and saying the safety concerns are based on perception, not evidence. It claims the road already slows traffic naturally due to parked cars, bus stops and potholes, and that bumps would be a waste of money and personally irritating. Overall, it says the speed problem is fiction, while the long-term irritation from bumps would be real.
Resident	Negative	The objection says speed bumps are unnecessary, waste money, are poorly maintained, don’t reduce speeding, and damage vehicles. It asks for alternative measures instead.
Resident	Negative	The resident says ramps aren’t needed, the 20mph limit is already ignored, 30mph feels safe, and there’s no evidence of extra accidents. They believe the plan is fixing a non-existent problem.
Resident	Negative	The resident strongly opposes speed bumps, saying no collisions are linked to speed, the road surface is already poor, and bumps would damage vehicles. They argue money should go to fixing the road, not installing bumps.
Resident	Negative	The residents say the scheme is too expensive, adds unnecessary signage, would slow emergency vehicles, and that a chicane would be better. They argue the road should be fully resurfaced, most drivers are responsible, and enforcement should target the few noisy speeding cars instead.
Resident	Negative	The resident strongly opposes speed humps, saying they damage small cars, make cycling with a child unsafe, and don’t deter truly dangerous drivers. They highlight poor road maintenance, note Foxwood Lane as a failed example, and warn they may have to stop cycling and buy a larger car. They urge the council to reconsider.
Resident	Negative	The resident objects to the plan, saying they’ve never experienced speeding, the area is mostly older residents who don’t walk or cycle, and the scheme is a waste of money. They fear car damage, want the road properly resurfaced, and say the real hazard is illegal parking at the Nevis Way junction.
Resident	Negative	The resident says speed ramps are unnecessary, arguing funds should go to pothole repairs, most drivers already keep to the limit, and there’s no evidence the road feels unsafe. They oppose 20mph expansion and humps, prefer targeted speed-camera enforcement, and warn ramps can cause noise, braking/acceleration issues, emissions, and add to existing road-surface vibration problems.
Resident	Negative	The resident says speed ramps are disproportionate, given no injury collisions, only modest speeding, and already poor road surfaces. They argue ramps would harm vehicles and buses, and that the priority should be resurfacing plus less intrusive measures like better markings, signage, VAS signs and targeted enforcement.
Resident	Negative	The resident says there’s no real need to change anything, and that adding speed measures would be a waste of money when potholes and poor road conditions urgently need fixing to prevent accidents.
Resident	Negative	The resident opposes the speed-ramp proposal, saying parked cars already slow traffic, average speeds are only 22–23mph, and there have been no recent accidents. They welcome resurfacing, but believe ramps would be an unnecessary annoyance and a waste of money better spent elsewhere.
Resident	Negative	The resident says ramps won’t improve safety, arguing SUVs ignore them, smaller cars suffer damage and pollution, and there have been no injury collisions. They believe the road is already safe, the scheme is a waste of money, and funds should go to fixing dangerous surfaces on nearby roads instead.
Resident	Negative	The resident supports some calming on Alness Drive but says speed bumps are unacceptable because their low-clearance cars can’t drive over any type of ramp, and Alness Drive is their only exit. They prefer speed cameras and illuminated signs, argue bumps won’t stop real speeders, and say noise—especially from motorcycles—is the bigger issue.
Resident	Negative	The resident strongly opposes the scheme, saying 20mph already works, no injury collisions show the road is safe, and speed bumps would punish rule-abiding residents. They argue the road surface is already poor, bumps would hurt family members with medical conditions, increase pollution, slow emergency services, add noise, and worsen anxiety. They urge the council to fix the road instead.
Resident	Negative	The resident says they’ve never felt unsafe walking, and believe parked cars and the poor road surface are bigger issues than speed. Survey data shows most drivers are under 30mph, so the 20mph limit already works, and Moor Lane and the ring road are the real speeding problems. They argue ramps will be noisy, may damage vehicles, and will affect everyone who must use these roads daily. They also say it feels wrong to tie long-overdue road repairs to the ramp scheme.
Resident	Negative	The resident says speed ramps are a poor use of money, as no incidents have occurred and they feel safe cycling on Alness Drive. They argue potholes are the real hazard, forcing cyclists into danger, and that parked cars and the road bend already slow traffic. They add that ramps can make drivers race between them, creating noise and unsafe behaviour.
Resident	Negative	The resident fully objects to the scheme, saying Alness Drive has never had a speeding problem, even before the 20mph limit. They argue average speeds are within police tolerance, so spending money the council “doesn’t have” makes no sense. They note strong local opposition, with many residents on social media rejecting the proposal, and urge the council to scrap the scheme entirely.

Resident	Negative	The resident objects to the speed-bump proposal, saying they’ve never seen speeding or incidents in 30+ years. They believe bumps are a poor use of money, and funds should go toward proper resurfacing instead of patching. They formally oppose the scheme.
Resident	Negative	The resident objects to the scheme, questioning the location and relevance of the speed-survey data, especially near the 30mph transition on Acomb Wood Drive. They say parked cars already slow traffic, and with no injury collisions, current speeds appear safe. They argue the scheme won’t meaningfully boost walking or cycling, feels isolated from any wider sustainable-travel plan, and may reduce bus comfort. They welcome road repairs but believe funds should go to better bus services and vehicle-activated signs instead of ramps. They see the scheme as poor value for money.
Resident	Negative	The resident objects, saying the scheme was rejected before, there have been no accidents, ramps won’t stop reckless riders or delivery vans, and 30mph would be cheaper. They argue 20mph makes cyclists weave unpredictably, slow traffic increases pollution, and the real issue is poor road maintenance, with unsafe potholes and bad patching.
Resident	Negative	The residents say they’ve never noticed a speeding problem, as parked cars and sharp corners already slow traffic, and no accidents have occurred. They feel the 20mph limit is enough, note Acomb Wood Drive has similar traffic with no humps, and argue money should go to road repairs, not new calming measures.
Resident	Negative	The resident welcomes resurfacing but strongly opposes speed cushions, calling them a waste of money. They say parked cars, the bus stop, and tight bends already slow traffic, pavements are wide and safe, and the 20mph limit isn’t clearly signed. They prefer bold road markings or electronic speed signs instead.
Resident	Negative	The resident says speed humps aren’t needed, as most drivers already obey the limit. They argue SUVs damage hump edges, creating hazards for cyclists and motorbikes, and parked cars can block humps, making them unsafe. They say the priority should be fixing potholes to make the road safer and smoother.
Resident	Negative	The resident doesn’t support traffic calming, saying they’ve never felt unsafe, the real issues are potholes and bad parking, and the area already has good off-road walking/cycling routes. They say inconsistent speed limits are more distracting, note no recorded injuries, and argue the priority should be road repairs and improving the path network, not humps.
Late	neutral	The resident objects to speed bumps on Alness Drive but supports them on Acomb Wood Drive. They say parked cars already slow traffic on Alness Drive, so four ramps aren’t justified, and at most they’d accept one near Dalmally Close. They report consistent speeding on Acomb Wood Drive, where they believe ramps are needed.
Resident	neutral	Traffic on Bellhouse Way is too fast, and adding chicanes or ramps could slow vehicles from 30mph to 20mph in both directions.
Resident	neutral	The resident opposes speed ramps, saying they’re uncomfortable, can damage cars, are often poorly maintained, and don’t slow larger vehicles. They prefer speed cameras or vehicle-activated signs instead.
Resident	neutral	The resident says speed ramps aren’t justified, with speeds only slightly above 20mph and no injury collisions. They argue the road already naturally slows traffic, ramps would cause noise, vibration and vehicle wear, especially on a bus route, and that chicanes or build-outs would be more suitable.
Resident	neutral	The resident says speed humps shouldn’t be used, arguing the 20mph signs are too small, better signage and road markings should come first, and a speed-activated sign would be more effective. They say the road already naturally slows traffic, they don’t see the safety problem, and speed cushions are unpopular and poorly maintained. They ask the council to try other measures before installing humps.
Resident	neutral	The resident says speed humps are a hazard, need constant maintenance, and can damage vehicles. They argue chicanes are a better, low-maintenance alternative that slow traffic effectively, citing Rufforth as an example.
Resident	neutral	The resident says the evidence doesn’t justify speed humps, which would disrupt traffic and emergency access. They argue a better, cheaper fix is extending the 20mph zone past the Quaker Wood Pub to Foxwood Lane, where traffic and pedestrians are busier.
Resident	neutral	The resident says speed humps aren’t needed, pointing to no injury collisions and arguing money should go to fixing the poor road surface instead. They also suggest extending the 20mph zone past the Quaker Wood pub to Foxwood Lane to improve safety.
Resident	neutral	The residents oppose the speed bump outside their home, saying cars already slow for the corner, so a bump immediately after it could increase accidents. They worry about noise, difficulty accessing their driveway, and extra wear on tyres. They say money would be better spent on pothole repairs or returning the road to 30mph.
Resident	neutral	The resident questions the need for speed ramps, noting no injury collisions, speeds already reduced by the 20mph limit, and that nearby higher-risk areas weren’t included in past changes. They say funding should prioritise fixing potholes, warn humps will mean extra long-term maintenance costs, and conclude the scheme is unnecessary and financially unjustified.
Resident	neutral	The resident opposes speed ramps, saying they damage cars, waste fuel, and hurt the environment. They argue parked cars already act as natural chicanes, and if anything is needed, proper chicanes (like Rufforth) are better. They add ramps need repairs and don’t slow trade vans or “mum taxis.”
Resident	neutral	The residents say speed needs managing, but the real problem is Moor Lane, not Alness Drive. They regularly see cars far above 30mph on Moor Lane and believe the removal of the speed-activated cameras was a mistake that needs re-examining.
Resident	neutral	The resident says the 20mph limit already works, and that the real issues are parked cars, poor junction judgement and heavy vehicles damaging the road. They argue resurfacing is more important than humps, and that speeding is far worse on Moor Lane, where enforcement has been lacking for years. They add the shop/pub area should be 20mph and feel the scheme looks like a councillor’s pet project, not a genuine safety need.
Resident	neutral	The resident says speed humps are pointless, because the 20mph zone starts too late, the sign is dirty and obscured, and the busier Acomb Wood Drive section is still 30mph. They’ve never noticed speeding, and the poor road surface already slows traffic. They think illuminated speed-indicator signs would work better.
Resident	neutral	The resident says ramps will inconvenience locals, while rat-run drivers and Moor Lane speeders are the real problem. They argue 20mph limits don’t work without enforcement, and money should go toward speed control at the A1237 end, plus cameras, traps and sanctions. They support tackling unsafe driving but feel the scheme targets residents instead of offenders.

Resident	neutral	The resident supports traffic calming overall but objects to the specific ramp outside their home, saying it will increase noise and pollution, contradict smooth-driving guidance, affect young and elderly residents, and is redundant given an existing ramp and the corner that already slows traffic. The resident accepts 20mph zones but has strong concerns about humps, saying they don't slow aggressive drivers, worsen tailgating, and are often poorly maintained. They highlight potholes on Acomb Wood Drive, argue the 20mph limit should extend to the shops, and disagree the road is unsafe since many already walk and cycle. They oppose returning to 30mph at the sharp bend and favour fixed safety cameras over humps. The resident isn't convinced ramps are suitable, saying they annoy drivers, don't slow larger vehicles, and some motorists simply ignore limits. They think vehicle-activated signs and red surfacing would help more. They worry asphalt ramps will deteriorate, and note they personally feel safe walking and cycling, questioning whether safety concerns actually come from residents. The resident objects because the proposed sign appears to be placed directly at their driveway boundary. They want clarification on its exact location, plus the size of the sign and pole, as the map suggests it may sit right in the middle of their drive.
Resident	neutral	The resident objects, saying speed ramps will make drivers brake hard, causing more road wear and potholes, and they doubt ramps will reduce speeds overall.
Resident	neutral	Walk York's Planning Group supports the scheme, welcoming efforts to manage speeds on this key route. They believe six well-designed, full-width humps with 60m spacing will be the most effective way to control speed, given limited police enforcement, and therefore support the proposals.
Resident	neutral	The resident objects, saying speed ramps will make drivers brake hard, causing more road wear and potholes, and they doubt ramps will reduce speeds overall.
Group	Positive	Walk York's Planning Group supports the scheme, welcoming efforts to manage speeds on this key route. They believe six well-designed, full-width humps with 60m spacing will be the most effective way to control speed, given limited police enforcement, and therefore support the proposals.
Group	Positive	The York Civic Trust supports the scheme, saying it aligns with Council policy to promote active travel and reduce car use. They welcome sinusoidal humps as more cycle-friendly, and want fixed cameras kept as a backup option if the humps don't sufficiently reduce speeds.
Late	Positive	The resident says traffic calming is definitely needed on Acomb Wood Drive, citing multiple past accidents: cars ending up in neighbours' gardens, a garage wall knocked down, and a corner wall destroyed. Their own car was written off outside No. 16. They've previously asked for chicanes and a change in junction priority so Alness becomes the through-route. They also note large buses and lorries from the pub and Tesco that shake houses, so slowing everything down is a priority.
Late	Positive	The resident supports keeping 20mph along all of Alness Drive and wants it extended past Acomb Wood, the shops, and the Quaker Wood pub, where many people and children cross but the limit is still 30mph. They are not keen on speed cushions, saying they disturb residents, and prefer vehicle-activated signs, which drivers pay attention to.
Phone	Positive	The resident asked why the measures aren't being extended further along Alness Drive, as they're also concerned about speeding on that stretch. After being told the scheme focuses on the main route where complaints were raised, and that no concerns have been reported on side roads, they were satisfied and said they support the wider measures.
Resident	Positive	The resident strongly supports traffic calming, preferring French chicanes over speed bumps. They say Moore Lane suffers from cut-through traffic, boy racers, and off-peak speeding, with vibrations from vehicles over 30mph shaking their house. They've already raised the issue with Cllr Fenton.
Resident	Positive	The resident supports adding full-width speed humps, saying speeding has been a long-term problem for cars and buses. They feel children can't cross safely, visibility is reduced by parked cars, and cycling has declined because the road feels unsafe. They believe proper humps would finally slow all vehicles and make the area safer.
Resident	Positive	The resident strongly supports speed bumps, saying drivers regularly exceed 20mph, creating a sense of danger for children and families. They see bumps as a proactive safety measure, welcome the smoother ramp design, and believe the scheme will make the street safer for walking and cycling.
Resident	Positive	The resident fully supports the speed management scheme, saying they often see drivers speeding on Alness Drive. They believe the measures will be beneficial, and request that the speed humps be rubber, as tarmac ones break up over time. The residents support the traffic-calming plan, saying speeding is common, but the road surface repairs are even more important. They warn potholes near the Acomb Wood Drive bend force drivers onto the wrong side of the road, creating a serious hazard for cyclists and motorcyclists.
Resident	Positive	The resident says the corner at Alness Drive / Acomb Wood Drive is dangerous, with multiple incidents, and believes a speed hump between nos. 2 and 10 Acomb Wood Drive is essential at the existing SLOW marking. They add the danger has affected how they use their garden.
Resident	Positive	The resident supports the scheme in principle but wants reassurance that the speed humps won't be harsh, will be cycle-friendly, and won't increase pollution. They welcome resurfacing, say the road needs better, deeper materials, and ask when works will start, how long they'll take, and whether Moor Lane will also get calming.
Resident	Positive	The resident supports the speed-management scheme, saying speeds have steadily increased over the past decade, especially when college students are around and on Sunday afternoons. They believe the sinusoidal humps are well-planned and offer wholehearted support for the safety improvement.
Resident	Positive	The resident says drivers and motorcyclists come round the Moor Lane corner far too fast, so they think speed-calming measures are a good idea. They add that motorcyclists are too noisy, and request concealed-drive signage for their garage exit on Alness Drive.
Resident	Positive	The resident supports the speed-ramp proposal but wants it expanded further up Alness Drive. They say drivers leaving the main section accelerate dangerously past No. 49, and a nearby footpath funnels pedestrians and cyclists into this fast-moving traffic. They ask the council to add extra ramps at the upper end to address this.
Resident	Positive	The resident supports the scheme but only if ramp noise is genuinely low. They welcome the planned resurfacing, saying Alness Drive and parts of Acomb Wood Drive are in terrible condition. They also ask whether the council can restrict heavy lorries delivering to Tesco Express, as they believe these vehicles damage residential roads.
Resident	Positive	The resident says speeding needs action, supports full-width sinusoidal humps, and rejects cushions, chicanes and islands. They believe constant-on cameras with heavy fines are the best deterrent.