

### TWYDALL ACCESSIBILITY SCHEME REPORT ON CONSULTATION

#### 1. Summary

- 1.1 The consultation document, incorporating a return questionnaire, for the Twydall Accessibility Scheme, was delivered to all properties, some 5,000, within its boundary and handed out to people attending the two exhibitions of the scheme proposals. Also numbers of the consultation document were placed in the local library, in schools and local community buildings.
- 1.2 Of the occupiers of the some 5,000 properties, 376 returned a completed questionnaire. A further 9 questionnaires were returned from residents beyond the Twydall area. The level of return, as a proportion of the 5,000 properties is 7.5%, which is lower than the 10% hoped for.
- 1.3 Of the 385 returns an initial examination of their answers and comments showed that 235 were in favour of the proposals and 98 were against them. A further 52 provided what was considered to be a mixed view, in that answers and comments providing an agreement to the proposals, were contradicted by comments questioning certain aspects of the proposals.
- 1.4 A detailed analysis of the 98 returns not in favour of the proposals found that whilst the scheme could be amended to accommodate a number of the individual concerns expressed, this would not be sufficient to indicate that the views of the residents might be changed as a result of their being advised of them.
- 1.5 The similar analysis of the 52 returns providing a mixed opinion, found that the scheme could be amended to accommodate the concerns expressed in 16 of them. Therefore, it would be reasonable to assume that with the amendments the residents responsible for these returns would support the scheme.
- 1.6 On the basis of the returned questionnaires 61% are in agreement with the proposed scheme, 26% against, with the remaining 13% providing a mixed view. However, when the outcome of the detailed analysis is taken into account, see summary comments at 1.4 and 1.5, the percentage in agreement increases to 66% and the mixed view reduces to 8%.
- 1.7 From the analysis of the responses by street, their outcomes demonstrate an agreement of around 66% with the proposed scheme. This increasing to some 71% with analysis D (Streets Subject To Most Severe Traffic Conditions).
- 1.8 Summary comment that the consultation provides clear support for the introduction of the proposed scheme.

### 2. Analysis Of Returned Questionnaires By Street

#### 2.1 Response Received By Street

2.1.1 At Schedule No. 1 the responses received under headings of *YES (in agreement)*, *NO (against)* and *MIXED (mixed view provided)* are set down against each street within the consultation area and the number of properties within them.

##### A. Street From Which No Response Was Received

2.1.2 From Schedule No. 1 it can be identified that no responses were received from 36 streets / elderly persons housing; within these streets there is a total of 544 properties (approximately 11% of the total number of properties receiving the consultation document).

2.1.3 All of the residents of these properties would be affected to varying extents by the proposed scheme. ***Therefore, it would not be unreasonable to conclude that they do not have any significant issues with the proposed scheme.***

##### B. Streets From Which A Higher Response Was Received

2.1.4 For the purpose of this analysis a 'higher response' is defined as the level of return of 7.50% and above (see 1.2).

2.1.5 The streets falling into this analysis are identified in Schedule No. 2. Their properties total 2,061, which equates to approximately 41% of the total number of properties within the area. ***The level of response, measured against the number of properties, is approximately 12.50%, which is considerably greater than the overall response of 7.5%, and comfortably exceeds the hoped for response of 10%.***

2.1.6 Consideration of the returns shows 61% in favour, 24% against and 15% providing a mixed view. When the analysis referred to at 1.4 and 1.5 is taken into account the percentages change to 67% in favour, 24% against and 9% having a mixed view. Similar results to those of the overall area (see 1.6). ***The ratio of in favour to against is 2.8:1, which is significant.***

##### C. Streets From Which A Lower Response Was Received

2.1.7 For the purpose of this analysis, a 'lower response' is defined as less than the levels of return of 7.50% (see 1.2).

2.1.8 The streets, which are the subject of this analysis, are identified in Schedule No. 3. It shows 126 responses being provided by the residents of 2,365 properties, 47% of the total number, which gives a percentage level of return of 5.32%.

### D. Streets Probably Subject To the Most Severe Traffic Conditions

2.1.9 The streets meeting this criteria are listed in Schedule No. 4, having been identified on the following basis:

- Provide routes through the Twydall area which allow drivers of vehicles to avoid sections of the A2.
- Major routes within the Twydall Area.
- Public Service Vehicle routes.
- Streets used to access schools, shopping centre and other generators of vehicular traffic.
- Complaints received from residents and Ward Councillors.

2.1.10 From Schedule No. 4 it can be seen that the rate of return, responses as a proportion of properties is 11.59%. This is considerably greater than the overall rate of return of 7.5%. ***Also significantly greater than 'hoped for' 10% rate of return.***

2.1.11 Consideration of the returns initially shows 65.60% in favour, 19.35% against and 15.05% mixed view. ***However, when the analysis of the mixed view responses were considered, see Summary 1.4 and 1.5 the percentage in favour increases to 71%; a ratio of in favour to against of 3.67:1.***

2.1.12 ***Therefore, there is substantial support at a level above the 'hoped for' rate of response return for the proposed scheme.***

### 3. Analysis Of Returned Questionnaires By Response

- 3.1 The analysis was undertaken of those responses which, from an initial examination of them, were classified as against the proposals (98) or provided a mixed view (52).

#### Mixed View

- 3.2 Of the 52 responses falling into this category their detailed analysis produced the following information:

1. Whilst agreeing the overall intentions of the scheme, 22 responses specifically advised that speed cushions should not be provided or too many were proposed and that speed humps were a better measure.

#### **Response**

***The provision of speed cushions has been reviewed and it has been considered that their total number can be reduced. Furthermore, at a number of locations it is recognised that speed humps would be preferable to speed cushions.***

2. 19 responses agree the overall proposals but express concerns about specific issues:

- Provide speed tables as in Chilham Road
- Retain road humps on Twydall Green
- Remove proposed chicane on Pump Lane
- Extend zig-zags at specific zebra crossings
- Quality cycle routes
- Parking on footways
- Provide dropped crossings
- Position speed cushions in centre of road
- Is 20 mph Zone going to be policed
- Zebra crossing required on Eastcourt Lane
- Need humps / cushions on Hawthorne Avenue
- Blean Road ignored
- Retain mini-roundabout on Pump Lane

#### **Response**

***It would be possible to amend the proposed scheme to accommodate most of the individual concerns.***

## APPENDIX 2

3. Unachievable changes to the proposed scheme are sought through 11 responses. The type of changes are summarised below:

- Provide traffic cameras with warning notices
- Provide 20 mph limits outside schools
- Enforce the speed limits
- Make corners wider for fire and ambulance services
- Make Twydall Lane one-way, or have double yellow lines along one side
- Will require 'digging up the roads' causing more chaos
- Persons with disability concerned about pain caused to them by 'passing over' humps / cushions

### **Response**

***Changes required by the responses cannot be introduced for reasons of cost, impracticality, not legal, would cause wider problems or would prejudice the proposed scheme.***

3.3 A summary view of the responses, when considered against the changes that could be made to the scheme without questioning its purpose, is that 16 of them could be transferred across to the 'in favour' response.

### Against The Proposals

3.4 There are 96 responses from the residents of individual properties which indicate for varying reasons their objection to the proposed scheme. A detailed analysis of the responses, and specifically the reasons of concern, are provided below:

1(a) *Not in favour of the 20 mph Zone*

- 38 responses with this comment

(b) *In favour of 20 mph speed limits at specific locations - schools, shops and similar, but not on main roads*

- 8 responses with this comment

2. *Not in favour of speed cushions or similar*

- 21 responses with this comment, however of these 3 refer to specific roads

3. *Will cause greater levels of pollution*

- 8 responses with this comment

4. *Proposed scheme is considered to be a waste of money*

## APPENDIX 2

- 12 responses with this comment
- 5. *Consider that speed cameras should be installed*
  - 2 responses proposed speed cameras on Pump Lane and Beechings Way
- 6. *Remove parked cars from footways / provide more parking enforcement officers*
  - 4 responses with this comment
- 7. *Eastcourt Lane, Beechings Way etc., are main vessels to this town*
  - 1 response with this comment
- 8. *Other matters of more interest*
  - 2 responses with this form of comments
- 9. *Problems of disability and pain that would result*
  - 2 responses with this form of comment
- 10. *Biggest problems are at schools*
  - 3 responses with this form of comment
- 11. *Improve condition of the roads, fill in potholes*
  - 5 responses with this type of comment
- 12. *Roads are safe*
  - 1 response with such a comment
- 13. *Comments on parking problems / issues*
  - 3 responses with comments on parking issues
- 14. *Poor appearance of cushions and they degrade quickly*
  - 1 response with such a comment
- 15. *Provide secret sign speed indicators*
  - 1 response with this comment
- 16. *Comments indicate complete opposition*

## APPENDIX 2

- 1 response with this comment
- 17. *Questioning cost assessment and the occurrence of accidents*
  - 2 responses with this comment
- 18. *Does not believe speed limits would be adhered to*
  - 1 response with this comment
- 19. *More consultation required*
  - 2 responses with this comment
- 20. *Educate pedestrians*
  - 1 response with this comment
- 21. *Twydall is not a "rat run" area*
  - 1 response with this comment
- 22. *Complaints about reduction in parking - Featherby Road*
  - 2 responses with this comment
- 23. *Objection to zebra crossings - Featherby Road*
  - 2 responses with this comment
- 24. *Consultation scope and extent not adequate, displays not accessible*
  - 2 responses with this comment
- 25. *No point*
  - 1 response with this comment
- 26. *Opposed to one-way for Lewis Avenue and Brenchley Road*
  - 1 response with this comment
- 27. *Also provide speed cushions on Lewis Avenue*
  - 1 response with this comment
- 28. *Too many speed cushions, but in favour of traffic calming*
  - 1 response with this comment

## APPENDIX 2

29. *Leave Pump Lane as it is*
    - 5 responses with this comment
  30. *Provide more cycle tracks*
    - 1 response with this comment
  31. *Retain humps in Twydall Green*
    - 3 responses with this comment
  32. *Traffic lights required at A2/Pump Lane junction*
    - 3 responses with this comment
  33. *Beechings Way retain 30 mph, 20 mph will cause traffic delays. Also provide alternative traffic calming on Beechings Way*
    - 1 response with this comment
  34. *Make Twydall Lane and Eastcourt Lane one-way as far as Lewis Avenue / Brenchley Road*
    - 2 responses with this comment
  35. *Parked cars have more effect on reducing traffic speed*
    - 2 responses with this comment
- 3.5 Generally within any one response a number of concerns are mentioned and either none of them or only one could be addressed through amendments of the scheme. Therefore, whilst it is possible that a number of persons making the responses, might, when presented with the proposed amendments to the scheme, change their view on it the view has been taken that notwithstanding the proposed scheme amendments all responses should remain as being against the proposals.