

Consultation Response Summary

	Objection/Comments	Comments from Director of Highways & Transport
	<p><u>Resident of Bramber, West Sussex</u></p> <p>While the idea can be supported in principle, the order falls short in its scope. The justification correctly refers to the high usage by cyclists and walkers of the section of the road south of the old railway bridge, then stops the 30 limit some 170m short of where the Downslink route meets the B-road. If you are that worried about vulnerable road user safety you would either provide an off-road alternative route, or continue the 30 limit south of the Downslink section.</p>	<p>The original proposal for the scheme did indeed include the point where the Downslink route meets the B2135, however the speed data did not support the installation of a 30mph in this section of the road against our Speed Limit Policy. It falls out of the area that could be considered a part of this proposal, utilising the March 2010 Policy exception.</p>
	<p><u>Resident of Partridge Green</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The text inaccurately describes the location of the TRO 2. Signage will impinge on visibility from the driveway of Jolesfield House 3. The northern end of the TRO is located at the bottom of a hill and will give rise to unpredictable vehicle speeds at the junction of Staples Hill and the driveway of Jolesfield House 4. The TRO is not addressing local concerns regarding speeding, as the local concern is greater at the southern end of the village. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Appendix A accurately shows the extent of the proposed restriction. 2. This is an issue that can certainly be avoided at the point of implementation. We have scope to make slight adjustments to the location of entry and exit terminals within (but not in excess of) the proposed restriction. 3. The extra measure to be taken by WSCC, to install centre hatching in the northern extent of the new restriction, is specifically designed to answer to this point. The contention is that centre hatching creates a visual narrowing of the carriageway and therefore engenders more considered driving behaviour and speeds. 4. As stated, a 30mph restriction at the southern end of the village would fall out of the WSCC speed policy both in terms of the speed data and the easement in the policy. The greater number of supportive comments received during the formal consultation period (29 expressions of support,

Consultation Response Summary

		<p>against 7 objections) suggests that there is local support for the scheme even in its reduced form.</p> <p>5. The extra measure to be taken by WSCC, to install centre hatching in the northern extent of the new restriction, and for the installation of village gates, are both intended to assist in bringing vehicle speeds down, thus making the restriction as self-enforcing as possible.</p> <p>6. With the extra measures being put in place we do not anticipate significant Crime and Disorder issues.</p> <p>7. The proposed speed limit will conform to WSCC Speed Policy, with its stated aim to provide consistency of speed limit setting across the county while also meeting local concerns regarding the speed of traffic in villages.</p> <p>8. The extra measure to be taken by WSCC, to install centre hatching in the northern extent of the new restriction, and for the installation of village gates, are both intended to assist in bringing vehicle speeds down.</p> <p>9. The Speed Limit Policy is considered to conform to national guidance and to be fit for purpose.</p>
	<p>5. The proposal is unenforceable</p> <p>6. The scheme therefore does not provide benefits that outweigh the Crime and Disorder Act implications</p> <p>7. The scheme will compromise the effectiveness of existing speed limits around the country</p> <p>8. Where there is non-compliance it is likely that pedestrians and other vulnerable road users may be at greater risk because they will have the expectation that traffic will be travelling at 30mph or less and so may unwittingly endanger themselves by misreading the speed of vehicles when crossing the road.</p> <p>9. WSCC Speed Limit Policy 3.4 (30mph easement for villages) is flawed and open to legal challenge and judicial criticism</p>	
	<p><u>Resident of Partridge Green</u></p> <p>1. The northerly stretch of the proposed 30mph limit change runs from Staples Hill to Partridge Green High Street. This is a straight stretch of road with no parked cars - accidents over the past ten years have been few and none due to speeding -</p>	<p>1. The balance of supportive comments, as against objections, suggests that there is local support for the speed reduction, which conforms with policy under the 30mph easement for villages.</p>

Consultation Response Summary

	<p>it easily accommodates a 40mph limit.</p> <p>2. No consideration has been given to how this speed limit will be enforced with implications regarding the Crime and Disorder Act that WSCC are obliged to consider. It is certain that a reduced limit will increase non-compliance with the law. In their background document para 9:3 WSCC are obliged to review changes in speed limits with regard to the Crime and Disorder Act - what reviews have they carried out to date?</p> <p>3. The public consultation procedure has been compromised by the failure of the WSCC Traffic Officer to turn up at a public meeting convened on 13/11/17 to give residents and the Parish Council an opportunity to ask questions relating to the TRO. At this meeting the Parish Council did not seem to be aware of the Crime and Disorder Act implications of the scheme and it should therefore not be implemented.</p> <p>4. Despite requests from the Parish Council WSCC have not released the background traffic data from their monitoring exercise carried out earlier in the year, relating to the TRO - this information can be obtained under the Freedom of Information Act.</p>	<p>2. The Speed Limit Policy is considered to conform to national guidance and to be fit for purpose. The extra measure to be taken by WSCC, to install centre hatching in the northern extent of the new restriction, and for the installation of village gates, are both intended to assist in bringing vehicle speeds down, thus making the restriction as self-enforcing as possible.</p> <p>3. The WSCC Traffic Officer was unable to attend the public meeting on 13/11/17, however he was able to attend the public meeting in December and was able to discuss the Crime and Disorder implications of the scheme.</p> <p>4. WSCC has received one FOI request in relation to this TRO. All relevant documents were released on that occasion and would be again were we to receive a further FOI request. All Traffic data is available to view by the general public on the Roads and Travel pages of the WSCC website.</p>
	<p><u>Resident of Partridge Green</u></p> <p>1. There have been few accidents on this stretch of road over the past ten years and according to West Sussex police data none have been due to speeding. The traffic flow at present is perfectly acceptable.</p> <p>2. West Sussex County Council are ignoring national policy government guidelines in their approach to reducing speed limits in villages across the county. Sussex police have also stated that this reduction in speed limit is unenforceable and refuse to accept responsibility.</p>	<p>1. The balance of supportive comments, as against objections, suggests that there is local support for the speed reduction, which conforms with WSCC policy under the 30mph easement for villages.</p> <p>2. WSCC are mandated to conform to the Speed Policy as amended in 2010. The extra measures proposed (centre hatching and village gates) are being delivered in order to answer to the concerns of Sussex Police.</p>

Consultation Response Summary

<p>3. Over the past four years developers have been lobbying to have the speed limit reduced in Church Road as they believe this will increase their chances of having an access approved to a proposed development site of over 100 houses north of The Rosary, something that the village of Partridge Green could well do without.</p>	<p>3. This proposal has been brought to WSCC with demonstrable community support, as well as the support of the local county councillor. The assessment of the scheme's merits has been made without reference to any development in the area.</p>
<p><u>Resident of Partridge Green</u></p> <p>I am a frequent user of the junction and find it perfectly safe. In terms of traffic safety I am much more concerned by the rumoured (and locally unwanted) housing development at the Rosary. This would result in substantially more traffic than at present, with increased risk of accidents. The proposed change seems designed to facilitate this development, rather than to make a serious contribution to road safety.</p>	<p>This proposal has been brought to WSCC with demonstrable community support, as well as the support of the local county councillor. The assessment of the scheme's merits has been made without reference to any development in the area.</p>
<p><u>Resident of Partridge Green</u></p> <p>Objection stated, but no reasons provided.</p>	
<p><u>Registered Online, without address details</u></p> <p>If the 40mph is respected that should not be a problem. Cyclists and pedestrians have a responsibility to look before they cross the road. If the speed limit is dropped it will put much more pressure on delivery companies. Speed flashing signs would work better.</p>	<p>While it is accepted that cyclists and pedestrians have a responsibility to consider their own safety on the public highway, it is difficult to see how a 30mph will put pressure on delivery companies in the area as congestion is not an anticipated consequence of the scheme. Vehicle activated signs could only be considered as part of a Community Highways Scheme due to the cost implications.</p>
<p><u>Comment from Sussex Police</u></p> <p>Whilst it is not the intention of Sussex Police to alter its decision not to object to the proposal, but upon reflection and in view of the speed data supplied</p>	<p>In response to the concerns of Sussex Police, WSCC has gained an undertaking from West Grinstead Parish Council to fund the</p>

Consultation Response Summary

	<p>we are concerned there is likely to be low levels of compliance and it is only fair to inform the Authority there is a realistic expectation that a Crime and Disorder Act issue will be generated. As you are aware the Service has limited capacity and resilience and will assume that if correctly placed, speed limits will be self-enforcing and that the Highway Authority will be responsible for ensuring it meets those aims.</p>	<p>installation of village gates, whilst WSCC will implement a section of centre hatching in the northern area of the scheme, all with the intention of lowering vehicle speeds.</p>
--	--	--