

## Appendix 3 – Comments / objections received and officers’ response

No	Comments / objections	Officers’ response
1	<p>I strongly object to this ridiculous 20 MPH limit. It has been noticed that even bus drivers do not adhere to this local speed restriction. I do agree that limited speed restrictions should be adhered near school areas.</p>	<p>This has been addressed with Transport for London.</p>
2	<p>Dear Nick, how can it be right that you are trying to reduce the speed limit to 20mph borough wide? I live in Eynham road and its already a ridiculous waste of money to have put the road markings in. 30mph is the legal speed limit for built up areas it works. why not inforce the existing law rather than wasting money on something new which won't work or be obeyed. Have you forgotten that you serve the people it is not for you to control the people.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 30mph speed limit is the national speed limit on roads with street lighting. The speed limit regime enables traffic authorities to set local speed limits in situations where local needs and conditions suggest a speed limit which is different from the respective national speed limit (Setting Local Speed Limits, DfT circular 01/2013)</li> <li>2. The Council has no enforcement power in relation to speed limit. It is the Police that enforce the speed.</li> </ol> <p>The aim of introducing the 20mph speed limit extension was to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To address a real danger</li> <li>To reduce deaths and injuries</li> <li>To reduce accidents</li> <li>To make our children and all of us healthier</li> <li>To cut delays on the road</li> <li>To make our neighbourhoods more pleasant</li> </ul> <p>30mph is the national legal speed, however, local authorities reserve the right to change/reduce it if necessary. (RTRAO 1999)</p>
3	<p>I understand that you are the correct person to write to concerning the recently imposed 20 mph Speed Limit on many of the minor roads In Hammersmith and Fulham. I also understand that this was introduced via the Experimental Traffic Order No. 1283 and that, as this was only</p>	<p>In total 5,287 responses were received and recorded,            45% of respondents (or 2,367) replied YES for all roads managed by LBHF            26% of respondents (or 1,351) replied YES but not on all roads            29% of respondents (or 1,493) replied NO.</p>

temporary, objections against it may still be entertained.

I am one of those who voted against this proposal and, when the result was announced, I understood that there had been no majority in favour. I was therefore somewhat surprised to see the limit imposed on so many roads – apparently against the wishes of a majority. I can only presume that you assumed that those not voting must have been in favour of the limit, although how you came to this conclusion is a mystery. Why ask and then ignore the result?

My experience of the new limit is that, for the first few weeks, it was followed by a majority of drivers but that after a short time it is now almost totally ignored. We have all spotted that there is nothing to enforce the limit – no speed cameras, and no policemen or traffic wardens lurking in the shadows.

A number of questions occur to me –

- Is there some evidence that 20mph is safer than the country-wide limit of 30mph in towns?
- Why are we residents being criminalized?
- Are there any statistics to prove that the new limit has decreased the number of speeding accidents?
- Why are the hundreds of bicyclists on our roads apparently allowed to ignore the speed limit – in the same way as so many of them totally ignore other road users?
- Why make criminals out of safe drivers?
- There is already a plethora of speed bumps on the Borough's roads, and in my opinion – as I said at the time – whilst they play havoc on the springs of our cars, surely they are amply sufficient to reduce speed.
- It is a well-known adage that hard cases make bad law. Speeding in H & F is not a hard case. But the arbitrarily impose 20mph speed limit is a bad law.
- The cost of painting all those hundreds of signs on so many roads must have been enormous.
- But is there some link between the proposed fines imposed for speeding, and the announcement that our Council Tax is not going up this year?

I write in my capacity as a concerned Fulham resident of over 40 years, although in my time I have been the Chairman of the Fulham Society as well as of the large block of flats where I live.

Thus 71% of respondents voted for some form of extension of 20mph speed limits in the borough (whether all roads or some roads).

The Council has no enforcement power in relation to speed limit. It is the Police that enforce the speed

- 1) The speed of the vehicle travelling is directly related to the severity of injuries sustained after the accident.
- 2) We do not think that residents are being criminalised with this scheme. However, motorists observing the speed limit would not be subject to enforcement.
- 3) It is currently not possible to evaluate casualty and collision data, due to data still not being available. It is standard procedure within the industry to provide and analyse casualty data three year prior to the scheme implementation and three years after.
- 4) Cyclists can be subject to the Police enforcement as other drivers do, should they endanger other road users or themselves.
- 5) As under 2 above
- 6) This scheme does not involve additional installation of speed humps.
- 7) We do not believe that reducing the speed to 20mph is an example of a bad law, for all the reasons mentioned as well as for being supported by the majority of residents who responded to the consultation
- 8) This scheme was and is fully funded by Transport for London
- 9) The Council has no financial benefits from this scheme.
- 10) There is no link connecting this scheme with the Council tax not going up this year. Also, the speed enforcement is not carried out by the Council

<p>4</p>	<p>Greetings, I write to complain about the reduction of speed limits and the imposition of speed bumps defined in Traffic Management Order no. 1283. I object to several points from the cluttering of the roadside with signs to the additional screwing of money out of the motorist.</p> <p>I see no reference to the “abort conditions”, whereby after a certain number of months have passed, the accident statistics will be analysed, and the whole scheme abandoned as having shown no real benefit, apart from potentially screwing money out of motorists. Is this the main target for this initiative??.</p> <p>30 MPH is the national safe driving speed limit. I see no reason for this to be reduced by local government officials who will be spending money which could be used to serve the community more effectively.</p> <p>Punishing drivers and screwing money out of them for driving below an already safe speed limit is not right.</p> <p>Please acknowledge this e mail</p> <p>.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) It is currently not possible to evaluate casualty and collision data, due to data still not being available. It is standard procedure within the industry to provide and analyse casualty data three year prior to the scheme implementation and three years after.</li> <li>2) 30mph speed limit is the national speed limit on roads with street lighting. The speed limit regime enables traffic authorities to set local speed limits in situations where local needs and conditions suggest a speed limit which is different from the respective national speed limit (Setting Local Speed Limits, DfT circular 01/2013)</li> <li>3) The council has no financial benefits from this scheme. The aim of the scheme is to address a real danger, to reduce deaths and injuries, to reduce accidents, to make our children and all of us healthier, to cut delays on the road and to make our neighbourhoods more pleasant for living</li> </ol>
<p>5</p>	<p>I am writing to state my opposition to the 20mph limit currently in force in Hammersmith.</p> <p>My experience to date has been that very few people are taking any regard of this limit, which indicates that most people think it is not effective. 30mph has been shown to be a safe and effective speed limit in most areas of the country and the additional signage and traffic warning systems must have cost a considerable amount of money. Now to enforce it you will have to install speed cameras and maintain them. In these cost constrained times, there are surely more effective ways to achieve road safety.</p> <p>Please could you provide details of any accident statistics before the trial period and during it. Does the cost justify the expense?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Motorists not observing the speed limit would be subject to Police enforcement. The scheme has been fully funded by Transport for London. There was no additional speed camera installation as part of the scheme, therefore no additional costs associated with installing or maintaining them.</li> <li>2. It is currently not possible to evaluate casualty and collision data, due to data still not being available. It is standard procedure within the industry to provide and analyse casualty data three year prior to the scheme implementation and three year after</li> <li>3. This scheme does not involve additional installation of speed humps.</li> </ol>

	<p>I am sure that you are aware that speed bumps have now been shown to damage vehicles and cause additional pollution by the slowing down and speeding up of the engine - this is particularly relevant at the moment.</p> <p>I sincerely hope that the council will reconsider this initiative which was not approved of by the majority of residents in the borough.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Joanna Busvine Brook Green</p>	<p>4. In total 5,287 responses were received and recorded, 45% of respondents (or 2,367) replied YES for all roads managed by LBHF 26% of respondents (or 1,351) replied YES but not on all roads 29% of respondents (or 1,493) replied NO.</p> <p>Thus 71% of respondents voted for some form of extension of 20mph speed limits in the borough (whether all roads or some roads).</p>
6	<p>Dear XXX,</p> <p>I've recently been sent an e-mail asking me to object to the above order. It sounds as though it's been drafted by someone who drove too fast, was caught/fined and is now an aggrieved motorist. As an LBHF resident (SW6 3SB), my e-mail is to register my support for the Council's action in setting a 20 mph limit, given the high levels of air pollution in Inner London and the frequency of accidents involving either cyclists or pedestrians. The residential streets of Fulham are safer for the limit (if only it were observed !). If anything, the limit should be extended and more rigorously enforced.</p> <p>With kind regards,</p>	<p><b>This is not an objection.</b></p>
7	<p>My email, is regarding the Traffic Management Order Number 1283</p> <p>1. Please return our streets back to the 30 mph. This is the legal limit for most built up areas in most of the country. All 20mph limits are doing is causing more traffic build up. In some areas the 20 mph is forcing drivers to slow down from 40mph to 20mph BUT we do not have the time to slow down, we have to put full breaks on, hence more traffic holdups. Drivers use their initiative when driving and we slow our vehicles accordingly, As</p>	<p>1. 30mph speed limit is the national speed limit on roads with street lighting. The speed limit regime enables traffic authorities to set local speed limits in situations where local needs and conditions suggest a speed limit which is different from the respective national speed limit (Setting Local Speed Limits, DfT circular 01/2013)</p>

	and when needed.	
8	<p>RE: Traffic Management Order no. 1283 &amp; The London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham - ROAD TRAFFIC REGULATION ACT 1984 - THE HAMMERSMITH AND FULHAM (20 MPH SPEED LIMIT) EXPERIMENTAL TRAFFIC ORDER 2016 (Per publication in London Gazette, 23 August 2016, Notice ID = 2598828)</p> <p>Dear Mr.</p> <p>I previously wrote quite a detailed objection to this speed limit reduction project at the time of the initial consultation. And I maintain my objection now.</p> <p>Some of my grounds for objection include the following.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 • 20mph is an unnaturally low speed. 30mph is the legal speed limit for built up areas in most of the country.</li> <li>2 • It is wrong to criminalise safe driving. The majority of drivers do seem to drive both safely and within existing 30mph speed limits. Traffic congestion itself provides a very effective speed limiter.</li> <li>3 • It is unreasonable for drivers to get a fine for driving at a safe speed, even under 25mph. This already reportedly happens on Shepherds Bush Green, Hammersmith Road and Old Oak Road, where there are cameras.</li> <li>4 • If it's safe to drive at 30mph on roads like Fulham Palace Rd, New Kings Rd and Scrubs Lane, then it should be as safe to drive at the same speed on roads like King Street or Old Oak Rd, and the myriad of quieter less busy side streets that provide through roads.</li> <li>5 • When approached, LBHF failed to provide accident statistics justifying a lower limit. Apparently Speed wasn't a factor in even 1% of the accidents studied. I previously asked Council to provide detailed accident statistics (Freedom of Information, etc.), that specifically identified those accidents within the Borough that related only to speed of motor powered vehicles, as opposed to carelessness by pedestrians and cyclists, possibly crossing at</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 30mph speed limit is the national speed limit on roads with street lighting. The speed limit regime enables traffic authorities to set local speed limits in situations where local needs and conditions suggest a speed limit which is different from the respective national speed limit (Setting Local Speed Limits, DfT circular 01/2013 refers)</li> <li>2. We do not think that residents are being criminalised with this scheme. However, motorists observing the speed limit would not be subject to enforcement.</li> <li>3. The Council has no enforcement power in relation to speed limit. It is the Police that enforce the speed</li> <li>4. Fulham Palace Road, Scrubs Lane and New Kings Road are Borough's classified A roads. The speed on these roads were retained at 30mph (except within or close to town centres), following consultation with residents.</li> <li>5. We have provided collision statistic prior to the scheme implementation which is publicly available. however, the post scheme implementation collision data is still not available for analysis.</li> <li>6. We do not believe that reducing the speed to 20mph is an example of a bad law, for all the reasons mentioned as well as for being supported by the majority of residents who responded to the consultation.</li> <li>7. Statement</li> <li>8. This scheme does not involve additional installation of traffic calming.</li> <li>9. This scheme was/is fully funded by Transport for London (TfL).</li> </ol> <p>In total 5,287 responses were received and recorded,  45% of respondents (or 2,367) replied YES for all roads managed by LBHF  26% of respondents (or 1,351) replied YES but not on all roads  29% of respondents (or 1,493) replied NO.</p> <p>Thus 71% of respondents voted for some form of extension of 20mph speed limits in the borough (whether all roads or some roads).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10. Police would enforce 20mph speed limit the same way as they would</li> </ol>

non-authorized crossing points, or actively using mobile phones at the time of an accident. LBHF failed to provide even an acknowledgement of my objection let alone requested information relevant to a case for reduced speed limits.

6 • Bad laws breed disrespect for the law. There is evidence that drivers are just ignoring the badly-set limits when they can. Rather than waste money on enforcing them with more speed humps and the like, LBHF should scrap the experimental scheme.

7 • Frequently we see quoted research and commentary that in actual reality the average speed of motorised traffic through London is no faster now than in the days of horses and carriages, usually no higher than 10-12 miles per hour being covered. This suggests any arbitrarily imposed speed limit of 20 mph is redundant in any event for the vast majority of journeys.

8 • The use of speed humps as a traffic and speed calming measure are, in any event, of limited effectiveness, and seem to have 2 key negative effects. Firstly the increase neighbourhood noise as vehicles (especially commercial vehicles) bounce over them. And secondly they definitely increase the wear and tear on all vehicles, increasing maintenance costs, notably tyre wear and exhaust wear/damage. These additional costs will be passed on by commercial firms, adding an inflationary factor in distribution channels. But private drivers have to bear extra wear & tear vehicle costs themselves.

9 At a time of budgetary constraints both nationally and within local Councils, Hammersmith & Fulham should NOT be using local Council Tax funds and other scarce (human and financial resources) on a scheme that is unwanted by the majority of local residents (as recorded in your previous, flawed, Consultation on this topic), and which is poor value for money.

10. Also local Police Resources are already very stretched across the Borough (as I well know from participation in the Shepherds Bush Safer Neighbourhood Team Committee since its inception). Expecting Police to give valuable time to such a minor matter as enforcing a reduced speed limit as an alternative to tackling serious crime and disorder, in its many forms, is unrealistic. Over my years at SNT Committees the issue of local road speed limits and their enforcement has NEVER been prioritised for local policing in the Shepherds Bush area.

11. As I understand it, at the original flawed Consultation, some 55% of respondent opposed the proposed reduction of Speed Limit from 30mph to

enforce 30mph speed limit, if deemed necessary. They are expected to manage their own resources.

11. As explained under 9 above

	<p>20mph with the LBHF Borough.          Is this very significant majority in opposition to the traffic management project, and hopefully should prompt Councillors and Officers to respect the democratic process of Consultation.</p>	
9	<p><b>OBJECTION TO EXPERIMENTAL TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ORDER (#1283, 20mph extension)</b>          I would like to raise a formal objection to LBHF Traffic Management Order 1283 which came into effect on 5 September.</p> <p>a) First I would like to comment that although I searched the LBHF website, I could not find any mention of this opportunity to object. It should have been in the Consultations section. For some reason, LBHF is very keen to send residents lots of very self-congratulatory emails, but less keen to tell us about our rights to object.</p> <p>A website search on 20mph at first just prompted the most propagandistic articles pushing 20mph. The many hostile comments from residents about</p>	<p>a) The Council has followed the required statutory process in terms of advertising and consultation in the making of the TRO in accordance with sections 9 and 10 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. All previous consultations are classified as a 'good practice' in which the public informed was informed about oncoming scheme.</p> <p>The LBHF web site provided information about the scheme which residents can access. The Consultation carried out offered residents and all relevant parties the opportunity to object to the scheme, as well as this way. 29% of the people who responded objected to the scheme.</p>

the biased consultation and the inappropriateness of 20mph speed limits on one page seem to have been “lost” in the website redesign.

The biggest casualty in the sorry saga of the 20mph extension has been LBHF’s reputation. Since the rigged consultation and associated propaganda exercises, LBHF has increasingly been seen as a racket, a listening council prepared only to listen to what it wants to hear. People who might otherwise respond to the call for objections will not do so if just because they believe that they will not be listened to. LBHF will continue to delude itself about ‘majority support’ as the figures had to be contrived. In reality, about 95% of people canvassed, particularly in traditional Labour areas, think that the wide-area 20mph extension is a total waste of time and money.

I am also not surprised that some residents believe that LBHF profits financially from the 20mph extension, even though the campaign against made it quite clear that the infringement fines go to central government.

Maybe some people make a connection between general central government revenue and grants to local authorities?

Anyway, for what it is worth, some quick points about the practicalities of the scheme

1) 20mph is an abnormally low speed limit. 30mph is the natural and therefore default legal speed limit for built-up areas in most of the country. The Highway Code requires drivers to drive according to the conditions, so the lowered limit should be totally unnecessary. Truly dangerous driving can be prosecuted at any speed.

By forcing local learner drivers to crawl at no more than 20mph, the scheme will largely deny them the opportunity for (legal) full use of gears and ill-prepare them both for their test and driving in most of the country. I bet that their needs were never considered.

2) It is wrong to criminalise safe driving between 21-30mph and totally unreasonable for drivers to get a fine for driving at a safe speed. I note that the lower limit applies on Hammersmith Road and Shepherds Bush Green to name just two locations where there are cameras.

LBHF recognises that it is clearly safe to drive at 30mph on roads like Fulham High St and Wandsworth Bridge Rd (as conditions permit). It is

LBHF does not profit from this scheme as the Council has no such enforcement powers in respect of speeding.

- 1) 30mph speed limit is the national speed limit on roads with street lighting. The speed limit regime enables traffic authorities to set local speed limits in situations where local needs and conditions suggest a speed limit which is different from the respective national speed limit (Setting Local Speed Limits, DfT circular 01/2013)
- 2) The scheme is not about penalising drivers for safe driving but to have safe roads and pleasant neighbourhoods, to reduce the number and severity of collisions. Cameras on roads mentioned were installed prior to the 20mph scheme implementation. Fulham Palace Road and Wandsworth Bridge Road are classified A roads, and the 30mph speed limit on these roads was retained (except within or close to town centres) following consultation results in which residents asked for the main routes to retain 30mph speed limit..
- 3) We have in our report provided collision statistic data (prior to the scheme implementation). Contributory factors that lead to collisions are very subjective and written by the police officers assessing the case. With higher speed of travelling the time of drivers reaction is increased as well as braking distance, therefore chances of getting involved in collision too.
- 4) The money for the scheme has come from TFL and £300,00 has been secured for the second stage of the scheme (2017/18). The money for other improvements mentioned will be identified from other sources.
- 5) This scheme does not involve installation of traffic calming. However, in case supporting measures are needed, would consult and install them only where supported by local people.
- 6) In an attempt to keep costs down we have tried to use existing street furniture to accommodate signs and used minimum number of signs and signs repeaters required. If signs in some places are excessive or not needed, we are happy to reduce the numbers and where applicable we will remove them, should this be legally correct. However, the signage needs to conform to national legislative requirements.
- 7) noted



therefore a joke to enforce 20mph limits on similar roads such as King St, Peterborough Rd or Askew Rd.

3) When approached, LBHF failed to provide accident statistics justifying a lower limit. Speed not demonstrably a significant factor in two years of accidents examined. Careless road user behaviour was, but it seems LBHF has a blind spot, in spite of me booking a meeting to discuss road safety improvements with Cllr Harcourt. It seems LBHF is more interested in appeasing the 20's Plenty lobby with its contrived statistics than addressing the predominant causes of accidents.

4) Even if LBHF claims the funds come from the GLA, it is all still money still levied on our Council Tax bills. This is money that could be spent on things that the public actually wants like more police or keeping the price of our tube fares and travelcards down. The GLA claims to be short of money, and the London Mayor has let some fares rise in breach of his election pledge. It has also been reported that the GLA levy on our Council Tax bills is due to rise in April 2017.

Yet the Cabinet Minutes, 5 Dec 2016 and other working papers show that a large sum of money has been approved for feasibility design and consultation. The Integrated Transport Programme 2017/18 implies that further spend on the 20mph project area could reach £300,000 out of a total commitment of £1m for the project!

The 'reason' seems to be to "encourage compliance with the new speed limits", and is a tacit admission that drivers routinely ignore speed limits they regard as insanity. I have been in a friend's car and seen even a police car (not on siren/blue lamp) ignore the limits.

5) Given LBHF's history, "compliance" is most likely taken to mean more speed humps, which previous council papers admit can be property-damaging.

6) The extra 20mph and 30mph signs give a cluttered look to our streets. It also looks obsessive to have 20mph limits on short cul-de-sacs such as Purcell Crescent and in Cambridge Grove, where it would be difficult to build up any speed.

	<p>7) With the power of the internet, rest assured that many residents have become aware of LBHF’s muddled priorities and this potential obscene waste of their money. If certain councillors insist on going ahead with this vanity project, they will have only themselves to blame if there is a backlash in the 2018 council elections.</p> <p>So, rather than “do things to people”, as a senior councillor puts it, LBHF needs it come to its senses.</p> <p>It has made itself a laughing stock by posing as wanting to be “fairer to drivers”.</p> <p>Ideally LBHF should promptly terminate the experimental scheme and sell the surplus road signs to another local authority or a scrap dealer.</p> <p>At the very least it should decriminalise safe driving at between 21-30mph by immediately suspending the 20mph limits and making the borough ‘Advisory 20mph’. If the ruling group wants to revive it as an enforced limit, it should be put openly to local voters as a clear manifesto item well before the 2018 council elections. The 2014 manifesto, released under 48 hours before polling day in 2014 but after postal votes had been cast cannot be considered as a proper mandate. Rather, it was seen as something-to-hide and an insult to the intelligence of voters.</p> <p>It is unfortunately a fact of public life that once trust has been betrayed, it is difficult to regain. In a moment of candour, Ed Miliband MP observed that his party was voted out because it had become out of touch with the public. There is still time to learn from others’ mistakes.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>	
10	<p>Dear Mr</p> <p>I previously took part in a consultation around introducing 20 mph speed limits in the borough and it seem to me that the implementation is not at all the approach that had public support. I am writing to you as I understand that you are the Chief Transport Planner for London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.</p>	<p>1. In total 5,287 responses were received and recorded, 45% of respondents (or 2,367) replied YES for all roads managed by LBHF 26% of respondents (or 1,351) replied YES but not on all roads 29% of respondents (or 1,493) replied NO.</p> <p>Thus 71% of respondents voted for some form of extension of 20mph speed limits in the borough (whether all roads or some roads).</p>

In responding to the consultation, I was strongly in favour of 20 mph limits to cover residential streets but opposed to 20 mph limits on the major through routes through the borough.

1. I understand that the view from the consultation was similar to mine - a majority view that residents did not support 20 mph limits on most major roads in the borough. And yet, the scheme when implemented under Traffic Management Order no. 1283, has put in 20 mph stretches on many major roads - e.g. Hammersmith Road, Shepherds Bush Road and Fulham Palace Road.

2. I think it is important that traffic should be able to get through the borough on the major routes. It does not help us if slow moving traffic clogs the main arteries adding to congestion and pollution.

A further consequence I detect is that the level of rat-running in residential streets is increasing. There is reduced incentive to stick to the main routes if they do not offer a quicker route. And in fact, there is a perverse incentive to use side roads as lack of enforcement means that speeding drivers are far less likely to be caught if they speed in residential streets.

3. The signage for the 20 mph zones in many places is extremely confusing given all the other street side clutter. The main indicator seems to be the roundels painted on the roads but it is often not at all clear where 30 mph limit actually changes to 20 mph (or back again) - particularly when 30 mph would be a perfectly safe speed according to the road conditions. It is confusing even for those of us who live in the area and who are familiar with the roads. It is far too easy to unwittingly infringe the 20 mph speed limit and this only feeds public cynicism about the purpose and serves to bring the policy into disrepute.

4. I think there are far better uses for scarce resources to tackle real problems, rather than penalising motorists who drive at what is considered a safe speed elsewhere - 30mph.

5. It seems to me that LBHF did not follow the majority wishes of borough residents in implementing this scheme. I wish to lodge an objection while

2. Following consultation results we decided to retain a 30mph speed limit on the borough's classified A roads (except in or close to town centres). Necessary signage and markings are prescribed by DfT and we generally used minimum number of signs and repeaters required.
3. We do not think that residents are being criminalised with this scheme. However, motorists are expected to conform to the speed limit.
4. As under 1 above

	<p>this is still an Experimental Traffic Order. Please can you reconsider before any further resources, which are likely to impact on local council tax, are wasted on implementing and enforcing the current scheme. Yours sincerely,</p>	
11	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed introduction of 20 mph speed limits in Hammersmith and Fulham. The cost of implementation and the eyesore of additional signs is not justified by grounds of safety – it seems to be a thinly disguised project to raise revenue. 30 mph is slow enough. Anything less than that becomes frustrating and boring – and therefore dangerous. Please conserve resources for things that residents really need – park maintenance, policing and segregated refuse collections to capture organic waste. Sincerely,</p>	<p>This project is not about raising revenue as the Council has no enforcement powers in respect of speeding. Park maintenance, policing and segregated refuse collections are funded from other resources.</p>
12	<p>I am a driver, a keen cyclist and a pedestrian, and I object to the widespread roll-out of 20mph limits across the borough. Unarguably, 20mph limits are reasonable in crowded and narrow residential streets. We have had them for years in the Brackenbury area and my own road - no problem. But 20mph feels too slow on major streets like Askew Road and Old Oak Road. In other parts of the country 30mph is the limit on streets such as this, and no one is questioning it. No vehicles actually respect the 20mph limit, including buses and police cars! I have tried driving at 20mph on Old Oak Road and I just caused a tailback. The driver behind me got irate and started flashing his lights at me. This is a law that criminalises safe driving at between 25 and 30mph, and lessens respect for road safety measures because it seems so poorly thought out.</p>	<p>The 20mph is a long term project and we expect drivers to conform to the speed limit. It is not about penalising drivers, however drivers that don't respect the speed limit may be subject to enforcement. The aim of introducing the 20mph speed limit extension is to: To address a real danger To reduce deaths and injuries To reduce accidents To make our children and all of us healthier To cut delays on the road To make our neighbourhoods more pleasant</p> <p>The Council did not ignore the wish of the majority. There was a higher number of people in support to 20 than those rejecting the proposal. In total 5,287 responses were received and recorded, 45% of respondents (or 2,367) replied YES for all roads managed by LBHF</p>

	<p>I am concerned that the council has ignored the general lack of support, and even opposition to this program in order to placate a constituency who are irrationally anti-car. That is not a good basis for action and risks damaging our local economy, not to mention wasting large sums of money in implementation.</p> <p>I hope you will reconsider. There are better ways to make our roads both safer and more efficient than this.</p> <p>yours sincerely,</p>	<p>26% of respondents (or 1,351) replied YES but not on all roads 29% of respondents (or 1,493) replied NO.</p>
13	<p>Dear Sir</p> <p>I have recently been alerted to your new idea of a blanket 20mph limit on driving in the borough. I should like to make you aware of my objection to this policy. 30mph has proved to be a reasonable speed limit without irritating motorists. To reduce it by 10mph would just be a step too far and motorists would be angered and take unnecessary risks. I can see in a year's time you might reduce the 20 to 15 and then 10mph in the borough. This is not logical or the way to make our streets more safe.</p> <p>Please reconsider this policy and keep the 30mph and do NOT reduce it to 20mph.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>There are no plans for further reduction in speed. 30mph speed limit is the national speed limit on roads with street lighting. The speed limit regime enables traffic authorities to set local speed limits in situations where local needs and conditions suggest a speed limit which is different from the respective national speed limit (Setting Local Speed Limits, DfT circular 01/2013)</p> <p>The aim of introducing the 20mph speed limit extension was/is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To address a real danger</li> <li>To reduce deaths and injuries</li> <li>To reduce accidents</li> <li>To make our children and all of us healthier</li> <li>To cut delays on the road</li> <li>To make our neighbourhoods more pleasant</li> </ul>
14	<p>As a longstanding resident and council tax payer in the London Borough of Hammersmith &amp; Fulham, I cannot believe that there was overall agreement to the above Traffic Management scheme and would highlight the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20 mph is an unnaturally low speed (although I am in agreement for this speed limit to be imposed on many residential streets); however, 30 mph is the legal speed limit for built up areas in most of the country and 30 mph should be extended to roads such as on Fulham Road, Fulham Palace</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 30mph speed limit is the national speed limit on roads with street lighting. The speed limit regime enables traffic authorities to set local speed limits in situations where local needs and conditions suggest a speed limit which is different from the respective national speed limit (Setting Local Speed Limits, DfT circular 01/2013)</li> <li>- The roads mentioned have the speed retained at 30mph, except if within town centre. Old Oak Road has however changed the speed limit from 30 to 20.</li> </ul>

	<p>Road, Shepherds Bush Road, Hammersmith Road, Uxbridge Road, Goldhawk Road and Old Oak Road etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• — It is unreasonable for drivers to get a fine for driving at a safe speed on these roads, even under 25 mph. This already stands to happen on Shepherds Bush Green, Hammersmith Road and Old Oak Road, where there are cameras!</li> <li>• It is wrong to criminalise safe driving and I feel the above scheme is gesture politics. The Council should divert their efforts on educating some road users to take due care and NOT be distracted by the use of mobile phones or headphones whilst driving!</li> </ul> <p>I sincerely hope you are able to scrap this 'experimental' scheme and use the money more wisely, for example, in providing extra care homes for the elderly and also in saving our hospitals rather than the provision of even more traffic cameras and speed humps!</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you.</p> <p>With thanks and kind regards</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There were no safety cameras installed as part of the scheme. As with any speed limit, motorists are expected to conform to the speed limit. The Council does not collect any revenue from speed camera fines</li> <li>- Drivers using mobile phones whilst driving are subject to the Police enforcement</li> </ul>
15	<p>"I would like to point out that I am fully against the 20mph speed limit that is in place on Fulham. I am fully in support of this being scrapped.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
16	<p>I am writing to object to the 20 mph speed limit. This order is not welcomed by people in the borough. It is designed to catch out unsuspecting motorists and is nothing more than money spinner for LBHF.</p> <p>In most cases the traffic is painfully slow anyway and as a responsible driver and local resident I strongly urge you to end this experiment.</p> <p>Best Wishes,</p>	<p>The majority of people who responded to the consultation voted in favour of the scheme. The scheme is not a 'money spinner' as the Council has no such enforcement powers in respect of speeding.</p>

17	<p>Dear Sir,</p> <p>I am writing to confirm that I would like both the Experimental Traffic Order and the 20 MPH scheme scrapped.</p> <p>Many of the roads I already take require me to drive at the unnatural speed of 20 mph. I have found this requirement lulling me into an unnaturally sleepy state and it has certainly has given me a false sense of security.</p> <p>Although it may be slightly counter-intuitive I suspect that slightly higher speed limits probably encourage safer and certainly more alert driving.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p>	<p>Following consultation results we have retained 30mph speed limit on borough's classified A roads except in or close to town centre. The aim of introducing 20mph speed limit was/is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To address a real danger</li> <li>To reduce deaths and injuries</li> <li>To reduce accidents</li> <li>To make our children and all of us healthier</li> <li>To cut delays on the road</li> <li>To make our neighbourhoods more pleasant</li> </ul> <p>Drivers should always remain alert when driving, regardless of the speed limit</p>
18	<p>This experiment has failed. It has been extremely costly and the 20mph limit been ignored by most motorists. It has brought the law into disrepute and when disrespect becomes the norm more dangerous practices such as jumping red lights will be encouraged.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There has been no published data about the change in accidents since the trial commenced but speed was not a factor in 99% of accidents before the trial.</li> <li>2. Even ROSPA does not support wide area 20mph speed limits BECAUSE THEY DO NOT WORK.</li> </ol> <p>Just because the money comes from the GLA doesn't mean that we the tax payers aren't funding it.</p> <p>Gesture politics must stop and common sense restored. We have had the experiment and it hasn't worked so abandon it please.</p> <p>Regards</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The post implementation collision data is still not available therefore not possible to analyse the effectiveness of the scheme in relation to casualty reduction.</li> <li>2. ROSPA in its document '20 mph zone fact sheet' explains about zones and limits. The document is not against limits but states that 'There is less experience with 20mph limits although they have generally been positive at reducing traffic speeds. They do not reduce traffic speeds as much as zones'.</li> </ol>

19	<p>I do hope that the experimental 20mph will be scrapped, 1. it is a waste of council tax payers money, I have also had to have my exhaust replaced twice due to road bumps and my wheels aligned many times, 2. if it is safe to drive at 30mph on New Kings Road and Fulham Palace Road then why is it not safe on King Street? To fully enforce this would be a waste of police time, driving at 30mph is a safe speed.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The scheme was/is funded by TfL and it did not involve implementation of speed humps.</li> <li>2. King Street is largely part of Hammersmith Town Centre and thus regularly used by a large number of pedestrians that cross the road more often than in New Kings Road or Fulham Palace Road which are classified A roads.</li> </ol>
20	<p>Please do not go ahead with the 20mph speed restrictions in our area (W14), they are actually quite disruptive to traffic and could even cause accidents if people slow down by 10mph suddenly. Taking a driver's eyes off the road ahead, and the traffic on it can also be dangerous, especially to cyclists. I vote NO to this scheme.</p>	<p>We don't see how the speed reduced can be disruptive to traffic or dangerous to cyclists. With the lower speed limit drivers have more time to react to a potential danger which reduces the chance of a collision occurring.</p>
21	<p>I understand that the 20 mph limit in Hammersmith and Fulham is an experiment and that the speed limit change will not be permanent unless people object and in that context, I object very strongly indeed. The principal reasons are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It turns perfectly safe and lawful driving into a criminal offence – that is unjust, oppressive and bad policy.</li> <li>• It will result in safe drivers being aggravated by unnecessarily slow traffic – I speak from personal experience as a driver. It puts me in a frame of mind where I am more likely to be distracted; it makes me worry about looking for speed cameras rather than for hazards on the road, which is an unsafe scenario and it makes me angry because I did not vote for it,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The injuries sustained at 30 are more severe than those sustained at 20. Driving at 20 gives pedestrians and other more vulnerable road users to feel more safe. Major routes have however retained 30mph speed limit.</li> <li>• the majority of people who responded to the consultation voted in favour of 20mph speed limit.</li> <li>• 20mph is very relaxed with no many oppressive measures e.g. police enforcement, large number of speed cameras etc. It is still left to drivers to adjust their speed and drive safely as we would expect motorists to comply with the speed limit.</li> <li>• LBHF have provided collision statistic prior to the scheme implementation. Post scheme collision data is still not available to examine. Once the data becomes available it will be analysed against the data prior to the scheme implementation. Speed is one of few contributory factors often mentioned by the Police. Usually more than one factor can contribute to the collisions. Speed is</li> </ul>



	<p>because the majority did not vote for it and because it unnecessarily slows down the traffic, which wastes my time and everyone else's time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is a better strategy to trust people to behave well (ie drive safely) than to so constrain them (with punitive and oppressive measures) that they disengage or rebel.</li> <li>• The safety argument is bogus. I understand that LBHF has failed to provide accident statistics justifying a lower limit. Speed wasn't a factor in even 1% of the accidents studied! If one wants to make roads safer, then it is important to look at the causes of accidents and to address them; that would be sensible. However, reducing speed for dogmatic reasons is a bad waste of money and leaves reasonable people justifiably disrespecting the politicians, the law and the people responsible for enforcing the law.</li> <li>• It is and/or will be perceived to be yet another wheeze by the council to put its hands illegitimately in drivers' pockets.</li> </ul> <p>Therefore, please stop the experiment and put the speed limits back where they were before.</p> <p>With very best regards</p>	<p>often one of them. With the higher speed of travelling, drivers have less time to react to the danger which increase the chance of the collision occurring.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council has no such enforcement powers in respect of speeding</li> </ul>
22	<p>Dear Sir I am totally against the 20mph speed limit imposed on many of the main arteries of H&amp;F, within the last year. I say this because –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There does not seem to be consistency in terms of the roads being enforced. Some main arteries remain 30mph and others not.</li> </ul> <p>Total confusion will naturally result – i.e. all drivers driving through H&amp;F, (Londoners and those from outside). The National Road standard should</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Following consultation with residents we have decided to retain a 30mph speed limit on the borough's classified A roads except those in or close to town centres.</li> <li>• All drivers are required to obey the highway code and speed limits.</li> <li>• Most of our A roads retained 30mph speed limit, as explained above.</li> </ul>

	<p>apply or have that changed!!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20mph as an advised speed in 'back streets' might be sensible, only if VERY clearly marked – otherwise, those visiting such roads will not be respectful of such restrictions.</li> </ul> <p>The average 'white van man' does not care to think of the implications of a child running out on a narrow residential street – he/she just wants to deliver an order during the course of a congested busy day! VERY clearly advising them to drive carefully is the best way to win them over – not making their lives more difficult with pan borough restrictions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If this is an experimental scheme, then lessons should be learnt from the trial – i.e. the main arteries of H&amp;F all need to conform to national roads speed limits, so as to gain free-flow of traffic and most importantly driver respect/recognition/implementation</li> </ul> <p>I hope my comments will be duly considered. They are entirely non-political and only wish to seek sensible and practical solution for all, whilst delivering economic road safety initiatives.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p> <p>JUSTIN SUMNER 11 NITON STRET, SW6 6NH 020 7385 9719</p>	
23	<p>Dear Mr Boyle, I wish to advise of my ongoing objection to the 20mph speed limit currently imposed within the borough. I am both a pedestrian, cyclist and motorcyclist within the borough. I find it harder to drive having to continually scan for street speed signs when I should be concentrating fully on the road by following it's well recognised and national speed limits / rules. In addition I have been undertaken / overtaken / flashed and beeped</p>	<p>20mph is no different than any other speed limit and a qualified driver is expected to conform to the speed limit as well as traffic signs advising on it.</p>

	<p>at a number of times whilst on the motorbike trying to abide by this trial speed limit. I genuinely feel less safe on the roads within lbhf as it creates additional hazards on the roads and should be withdrawn immediately.</p> <p>With Thanks for your consideration, David</p>	
24	<p>Please register my objection to the present experimental 20 mph speed limit in the Borough</p> <p>With at least 178,000 residents the original survey only asked less than 1% of the population; Over 99% were not consulted</p> <p>When the plan was announced it failed to say that the majority of residents did not vote for this scheme nor that it was experimental</p> <p>There has been little or no advertising of the deadline for debate</p> <p>There is no evidence to suggest that this new 20 mph speed limit reduces accidents</p> <p>As a driver, biker and pedestrian for over 40 years, I see a deterioration of road safety</p> <p>On many occasions cars are speeding, and by that I mean too fast in the circumstances, or drivers on the phone, or better put 'driving without due care and attention. I see pedestrians walking off the pavement without even looking and I see bikers jumping the lights and hurtling down the inside of traffic all too often</p> <p>I personally cannot see the upside for people in any of these circumstances but I have never seen any convictions or admonishments being issued</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consultation leaflets were sent to every registered address in the borough and residents were asked to vote online too. We have held open public meetings and the information about progress of the scheme or key dates were detailed on the Council's Web Site as part of the Council's communication drive to be open and transparent. The majority of people that responded to the consultation voted in favour of the scheme. In total 5,287 responses were received and recorded, 45% of respondents (or 2,367) replied YES for all roads managed by LBHF 26% of respondents (or 1,351) replied YES but not on all roads 29% of respondents (or 1,493) replied NO. Thus 71% of respondents voted for some form of extension of 20mph speed limits in the borough (whether all roads or some roads).</li> <li>2. The post implementation collision statistic is still not available. Once it becomes available we will be able to analyse data. The industry standard is to analyse collision data three years before and three years after the scheme's implementation.</li> <li>3. Many factors can contribute to the traffic collision and speed is one of them. With the higher speed of travelling, drivers have less time to react to the danger which can increase the chances of a collision occurring. Reducing the speed of traffic, can have direct impact on severity of injuries.</li> <li>4. This scheme is entirely funded by Transport for London (TfL)</li> <li>5. This is not a revenue generated scheme. The Council has no such enforcement powers in respect of speeding.</li> </ol>

	<p>Most injuries are caused by lack of care and attention by car drivers, bikers and pedestrians and reducing the speed limit to 20 mph will have no effect whatsoever on this</p> <p>Surely the key to this is to enforce better the existing legislation/bye laws</p> <p>Let's try and enforce better what we have, for example why is it that bikers are not required to register as are all other road users, thus making them accountable</p> <p>The huge amount of money being spent on the new 20 mph limit is a misuse of Council funds and could be better employed elsewhere in enforcement, registration or elsewhere in the community</p> <p>The Council assured me on 7 March last year that there were no plans to impose fines and that this was not a money making venture and I quote from Councillor Stephen Cowan "I assure you this is not a revenue generating scheme. It can't be as no legislation allows that to happen so it would be unlawful." his comments to me were copied to Cllr Wesley Harcourt, Cllr Larry Culhane, Chris Bainbridge, and Mahmood Siddiqi</p> <p>I am now informed that this is not the case and plans for enforcement are already in the pipe line</p> <p>My objection is clear</p> <p>Regards Gavin Hamilton-Deeley 30 Settrington Road, Fulham</p>	
25	<p>I would like to register my objection to the experimental 20mph speed limits on many of the roads around W12.</p> <p>I understand that the council has disregarded the results of its own</p>	<p>The majority of people that responded to the consultation voted in favour of the scheme. In total 5,287 responses were received and recorded, 45% of respondents (or 2,367) replied YES for all roads managed by LBHF 26% of respondents (or 1,351) replied YES but not on all roads 29% of respondents (or 1,493) replied NO.</p>

	<p>consultation.</p> <p>Most motorists are trained to drive safely. Most understand that a speed limit of 20mph is - at times - silly, even dangerous. For example, a driver travelling at 20mph (at max) when it is safe to drive at 30mph, frustrates drivers behind, encouraging them to overtake dangerously.</p> <p>Bad laws encourage disrespect for the law. This speed limit is widely flouted and disrespected, for good reason. Please return the speed limit to 30mph, as it was before, and please stop wasting our money.</p>	<p>Thus 71% of respondents voted for some form of extension of 20mph speed limits in the borough (whether all roads or some roads).</p> <p>We do not believe that reducing the speed to 20mph is an example of a bad law, for all the reasons mentioned as well as for being supported by the majority of residents who responded to the consultation Driving at 30 can be safe, however the chances of a collision occurring are higher and as well as severity of them.</p>
26	<p>Dear Mr Boyle</p> <p>I understand that there is a review coming up of the 20mph limits imposed throughout large parts of the borough at which this imposition could be overturned.</p> <p>As a resident I responded to the original consultation and I was disappointed to see at that time that the council chose anyway to impose these restrictions.</p> <p>I urge you and the council to roll back these reduced speed limits and by so doing listen to the opinions and opposition I believe of many of your constituents.</p> <p>If it is believed that the reduced speed is defensible for accident prevention or mitigation reasons then I should like to see any evidence you have that what has been imposed already has actually made a jot of difference. The interpretation of the limit on my part is that it is primarily a back door revenue generating initiative disguised as something else, which seems to be a favourite ploy of many council decisions.</p> <p>The speed limit in towns and cities across the country is 30mph; if I may assume you yourself drive then you will know just how ludicrous many of these new 20mph limits are on what are in the majority of cases in the borough quite large roads.</p> <p>In short and as I imagine will be evident from my email may I again urge you all to reconsider and admit you got this wrong; you might actually win more support for yourselves if you admitted error from time to time!</p> <p>kind regards</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The council decided to proceed with the implementation of the scheme after the majority of people that responded to the consultation voted in favour of the scheme.</li> <li>2. The post implementation collision data is still not available therefore it is not possible to analyse the effectiveness of the scheme in relation to casualty reduction. Once the data becomes available we will analyse it.</li> </ol> <p>This scheme has no financial benefits to the council. The Council has no such enforcement powers in respect of speeding.</p>

	Jonathan Scherer	
27	no comments	No response
28	<p>Dear Mr Boyle,</p> <p>I opposed the 20 mph speed limit in the borough when it was mooted and now that it has been partially implemented have not changed my mind. First, the 20 mph speed limit is wholly inflexible. At many times of day 20 mph is sensible and drivers travel at 20 or slower. At other times it is safe to drive at up to 30 mph. Secondly, there is a lack of clarity about the roads that are part of the 20 mph scheme. Drivers who wish to obey the law find themselves breaking it.</p> <p>Traffic calming measures such as chicanes, humps, pedestrian crossing lights and box junctions do a pretty good job at keeping traffic moving slowly and a mandatory 20 mph blanket limit is unnecessary. I support a 30 mph blanket limit on all but the main roads in the borough.</p> <p>Finally, I should declare that I am a car owner and driver. My annual mileage is well under 1,000 miles a year so I do not often contribute to traffic congestion in the borough.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Christopher Bellew  56 Margravine Gardens  London W6 8RJ</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We sign and mark roads according to the Department for Transport requirements and recommendations. We are happy to review these and put some extra signs if deemed necessary, in order to improve clarity of the scheme.</li> <li>2. All drivers contribute to congestion. We cater for all our residents and try to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic as well as pedestrians in accordance with our various statutory duties..</li> </ol>
29		

	<p>Can I add my voice to object about the Council's 20 mph zones on many of the borough's major streets. I use Askew Road and Paddenswick Rd almost every day and the 20 mph limits are unsurprisingly ignored by the vast majority of motorists. I doubt you will be able to point to any serious accidents in the last year to show that non-compliance has endangered the safety of pedestrians/ road users. You should abandon this trial.</p> <p>Kind regards Tim Russell</p>	<p>Following consultation with residents, we have decided to retain the 30mph speed limit on borough's classified A roads except those in or close to town centres. Askew Road and Paddenswick Road are not A roads. Often more than one factor can contribute towards a collision occurring. A higher speed of travelling, an increase in vehicle stopping distance and time, can result in more collisions with severe consequences.</p>
30	<p>Dear Sir, We would like the current 20mph and increased use of speed bumps H &amp; F traffic scheme scrapped. We feel only roads near schools or with bad accident histories should be at 20 mph rather than 30 mph. With heavy traffic the speed cars are actually moving at is regulated anyhow. The normal 30 mph speed limit ensures generally sensible and proven safety, as is found in most built up UK areas. We also feel the Polices' time would be better spent on fining drivers using mobile phones, and other in-car-distractions, which provide an acute &amp; increasing danger.</p>	<p>Collision statistic shows that most of the collision occur on main roads, however, with so many schools and nurseries, most of our roads are near them or on route to them. The aim of introducing 20mph speed limit was/is to: To address a real danger; to reduce deaths and injuries; To reduce accidents; To make our children and all of us healthier; To cut delays on the road; To make our neighbourhoods more pleasant.</p> <p>Police can manage their resources according to the situation.</p>
31	<p>The 20/30 mph boundaries are far from clear and not logical (seemingly similar roads have different limits. Frequent changes too. There is much to concentrate on. What matters is drive safely, not slowly. Please may we revert to the old 30 mph on all roads? Regards</p>	<p>When driving slow, drivers have more time to react and breaking/stopping distance is reduced, which reduces the chance of a collision occurring.</p>

32	<p>I wish to add my voice to the many who object to the 20mph speed limit on any road in the borough which is not purely residential: it is almost impossible to comply with, there is no fair way of enforcing it consistently, and if in order to do this you start putting speed bumps and cameras everywhere we will feel that we live in a police state rather than in the pleasantest borough in London. Please will you reconsider this scheme.</p>	<p>Following consultation results we have retained 30mph speed limit on borough's classified A roads except those in or close to town centres. The aim of introducing 20mph speed limit was/is to: To address a real danger To reduce deaths and injuries To reduce accidents To make our children and all of us healthier To cut delays on the road To make our neighbourhoods more pleasant</p>
33	<p>Dear Mr</p> <p>I am writing as a resident at 64 Niton Street , London SW6 6NJ, to object to your ill-advised temporary 20 mph order for LBHF. I would like this temporary scheme removed.</p> <p>Of course, everyone wants fewer accidents. The 30 mph limit is a sensible compromise between safety and moving at a reasonable speed. Do you want to go back to a 4mph limit and a red flag? This is your direction of travel. At 4mph there would be few if any accidents but life would be impossible, including for LBHF doing its business. It is never wise to have "virtue-signalling" laws, which people do not comply with: in my experience no one in Fulham keeps to the 20 mph limit, including LBHF vehicles. My experience is that not concentrating is the main cause of accidents in Fulham, rather than the difference between 19mph and 29mph.</p> <p>If you want to do something that would cut risk in H&amp;F, please:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Take steps to stop drivers using mobiles when driving;</li> <li>- Take steps to stop cyclists jumping red lights and zebra crossings;</li> <li>- (One dear to my heart as a scooter rider) ensure speed bumps are kept</li> </ul>	<p>It is not only about driving slow, but about other factors that slower speed of traffic contribute to, e.g.. safer environment, reduction of number and severity of collisions, more people walking and cycling etc.</p> <p>The aim of introducing the 20mph speed limit extension was to: To address a real danger; To reduce deaths and injuries; To reduce accidents; To make our children and all of us healthier; To cut delays on the road; To make our neighbourhoods more pleasant.</p> <p>Often more than one factor can contribute to the collision. Higher speed of travelling increase vehicle stopping distance and time, therefore contributing to collision with more severe consequence.</p> <p>Road users mentioned are subject to the Police enforcement as the Council has no enforcement powers in respect to contraventions mentioned.</p> <p>We maintain our roads and other markings mentioned in your comments as per our maintenance programme.</p>



	<p>painted white on top. You put them in, painted at first, but you do not keep them painted. They are then very dangerous to scooters at night.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>	
34	I object to this scheme	noted
35	<p>Sir,</p> <p>I am writing to object strongly to the proposed full rolling out of the 20mph speed restrictions in Hammersmith and Fulham.</p> <p>1. Firstly 20 mph is an unnaturally low speed, indeed most cars emit more pollution at this speed and by rolling out this scheme you are increasing the pollution levels in the borough.</p> <p>2. Secondly where are the accident statistics to back up the arguments that speed is a factor in injuries? I would suggest that more injuries are caused to pedestrians by cyclists showing no respect for road users than cars, and I speak from experience.</p> <p>3. Money which is in scarce supply could and should be spent in far more important areas than on increasing this unnecessary scheme. Social care, schools, street crime, are just a few things which have been grossly neglected over the past few years. A rethink is necessary.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is not well documented yet if lower speed limits increase the pollution levels. Different researches give different as well as opposite results. This scheme also emphasises on alternative and more sustainable use of transport, and this is likely to have positive influence on air pollution.</li> <li>2. There is often more than one factor that is contributed to the collision. The recording of contributory factors is very subjective and the officer's opinion at the time of reporting so care should be taken when using them</li> <li>3. This scheme is financed by TfL. The areas mentioned have different sources of financing.</li> </ol>
36	I am writing to you as I understand that you are the Chief Transport Planner	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Following consultation with resident we have retained the 30mph speed limit on borough's A roads, amongst them those mentioned (except if within town centre)</li> </ol>

for London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham. I previously took part in a consultation around introducing 20 mph speed limits in the borough.

My view was that I supported increasing the 20 mph limits to cover residential areas not already covered. My own area has had a 20 mph limit in force for many years now. However, I did not support making major roads, e.g. Hammersmith Road, Shepherds Bush Road and Fulham Palace Road, in the borough subject to these limits, except for specific areas such as those immediately round a school on a major road.

My understanding was that the consultation had resulted in a majority view that residents did not support 20 mph limits on most major roads in the borough. However, the scheme when implemented under Traffic Management Order no. 1283, put in 20 mph stretches on many major roads which I feel were not supported by the outcome of the consultation.

I feel that the signage for the 20 mph zones in many places is extremely confusing and I cannot see the rationale for introducing the limits in areas on many major roads. When driving round the borough I notice that frequently other road users are not complying with the limits and I think that to enforce the current restrictions will be an extremely costly exercise. The research I have read about shows that speed is only a factor in less than 1% of accidents in the borough, and that is more about driving without due care and attention. I think that the resources would be far better used in tackling the real problems, rather than penalising motorists who drive at what is considered a safe speed elsewhere, 30mph.

I feel that LBHF did not follow the majority wishes of borough residents, that were given in the original consultation, when the scheme was implemented. I now understand that there is still time to raise objections as the current scheme is still an Experimental Traffic Order.

Please can you reconsider before any further resources, which are likely to impact on local council tax, are wasted on implementing and enforcing the current scheme as it stands.

Yours sincerely

2. The majority of people who responded to the consultation have voted for the scheme to go ahead. In total 5,287 responses were received and recorded, 45% of respondents (or 2,367) replied YES for all roads managed by LBHF, 26% of respondents (or 1,351) replied YES but not on all roads, 29% of respondents (or 1,493) replied NO.
3. 20mph speed limit is signed and marked as per DfT requirements and recommendations. Drivers are expected to comply with the speed limit. There is often more than one factor that contribute to collisions. The higher the speed, the longer braking and stopping distance which increase the chances of the collision as well as the severity. The scheme is not about penalising anyone but in making this borough safer and better place to live. The Council has no enforcement powers in respect to speeding.
4. The majority of people that responded to the consultation have voted in favour of the scheme, as explained above.

	<p>Liz Fairclough 65 Bolingbroke Road London W14 0AH</p>	
37	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed borough-wide 20mph scheme. 20mph is an unnaturally low speed to stick to. In most of the country 30mph is the legal speed limit for built-up areas. A 20mph restriction with more speed-humps would infuriate drivers and they would not respect it. I have not seen accident statistics to justify it. Please scrap this experimental scheme.</p>	<p>30mph speed limit is the national speed limit on roads with street lighting. The speed limit regime enables traffic authorities to set local speed limits in situations where local needs and conditions suggest a speed limit which is different from the respective national speed limit (Setting Local Speed Limits, DfT circular 01/2013)</p> <p>The aim of introducing the 20mph speed limit extension was to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To address a real danger</li> <li>To reduce deaths and injuries</li> <li>To reduce accidents</li> <li>To make our children and all of us healthier</li> <li>To cut delays on the road</li> <li>To make our neighbourhoods more pleasant</li> </ul> <p>This scheme did not involve implementation of speed humps.</p>
38	<p>This scheme is having no effect as nobody polices it. Far better would be to address the misuse of mobile phones by drivers which is taking place all over London streets. This would have effect on everyone's safety. I am a Fulham resident living in Bishops Park Road.</p>	<p>Drivers using phone whilst driving is addressed by the Police. The Council has no enforcement powers in respect to this.</p>
39	<p>Dear Sir,</p>	<p>More than a third of the borough was already covered with 20mph speed limit. The</p>

	<p>1. I would like to object to the above traffic order which had been implemented in LBHF. I have not heard or seen any reliable evidence to support this draconian measure to get people, out of their cars in the borough. Thankfully we do not have a high rate of accidents in this borough and this is nothing new so why we would waste money of this silly proposal to reduce the already slow speeds in the borough to 20mph? If you have bothered trying to drive in this borough you are doing remarkably well to ever get into second gear. If the evidence could be relied upon then that is another discussion.</p> <p>This borough is one that is filled with families who generally try and encourage their children into various activities that by their very nature require a vehicle to ferry them around. Reducing the traffic speed with a combination of speed humps creates more problems than they solve. Ensuring that all traffic must use the very few main roads going north/south in the borough you are ensuring that vehicle speed limits reduce, as are the phrasing of traffic lights. More measures are not needed.</p> <p>The Council could try educating the residents about speed as it must for cyclists who seems to ignore road rules and red lights. How can you protect people from their own stupidity, should we all suffer. What happened about taking responsibility for your own actions and abide by the speed limits that are in place across pan London, to protect everyone and allow traffic to flow.</p> <p>Yours faithfully,</p>	<p>aim of this scheme is not to get people out of their vehicles but to encourage them to drive slower and safer.</p> <p>Regardless of the rate of accidents in this borough is, we aim to reduce them further, as well as the severity of them.</p> <p>Following consultation results, we have retained 30mph speed on the borough's classified A roads, except if they are within or close to the town centre where large number of pedestrians are expected.</p> <p>We as a Council provide educative programme for cyclists, adults and children as well as drivers and encourage modal shift.</p>
40	<p>Dear Mr. ,</p> <p>I live at xxxx Road. I would like to register my objection to the Borough-wide 20 m.p.h. speed limit which is presently imposed on an experimental basis. I make the following points.</p> <p>1. Imposing a borough wide limit like this is 'cheapening the product'. The 20 mph limit should be reserved for situations which specifically demand it, such as on the approach to schools, children's playgrounds, old people's crossings and so on. Then people approaching will see a special, or different, sign and there is a reasonable chance that they will lower their</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A third of the borough was already covered with 20mph speed limit, this scheme is only the extension of the previously introduced. This is very small and densely populated borough where the great majority of roads are residential. We have however retained 30mph on most main, A roads except those in or close to town centres.</li> <li>2. A competent driver should be able to drive and observe traffic ahead as well as the speed of travelling.</li> <li>3. It is inevitable that a person hit at 30mph will sustain more severe injuries than if hit by 20mph. 30mph speed limit increase braking and stopping</li> </ol>

speed and keep a special look out. I expect that there is evidence that such limited speed limit schemes do tend to reduce accidents; but you cannot extrapolate that evidence to support a borough wide scheme because the special value of a specific warning for a specific danger will be totally lost.

2. All that the borough wide 20 mph limit will do is encourage people to look out for speed cameras, which of course lowers their concentration on important safety considerations.

3. I know that it is said that an impact at 30 mph is far more dangerous to a pedestrian than one at 20 mph. True no doubt. But where is the evidence that people lawfully driving at 30 mph fail to slow down before impact? Surely those who strike a pedestrian at 30 mph were driving at considerably more than that when the danger appeared in front of them and they began to brake? Why will such people be driving at a slower speed if the limit is lowered? Is there any statistical evidence that a borough imposing a borough wide scheme such as this one experienced lower Impact-speed accidents after imposition of the scheme than before?

4. From my experience, I don't believe anyone is complying with the new speed limit. It is simply being disregarded. Certainly, on my street I have noticed no difference in traffic speeds. It brings the whole idea of speed limits into disrepute if unreasonably and impracticably low limits are imposed on a borough wide basis.

5. The people who you want to slow down are the bad drivers who have no regard for their speed; they drive too fast and without proper regard for the safety of others. They are not going to respond to these new limits especially if they are applied in a blanket fashion.

6. Good drivers adjust their speeds to the conditions. 30 mph is accepted by all as a reasonable urban speed limit, to which they conform even where a higher speed would be perfectly safe (in certain conditions). But they should be encouraged to judge the speed at which they can safely travel, not be dictated to.

7. Indeed, speed limits are often seen by inexperienced drivers as 'speed licences' – i.e. "because the powers that be have designated this a 20 mph zone, I have the 'right' and am perfectly safe to drive at 20 mph". This leads to irresponsibility "it's not my problem if that child runs into the road, because I am complying with the speed limit". People should be encouraged to take responsibility for all aspects of their driving, and they will drive more safely.

distance which also contribute towards the collisions. Evidence on effectiveness of 20mph speed limits can vary. It is still too early to evaluate the effectiveness of this scheme in relation to number of collisions or casualties as the post implementation collision data is still not available.

4. We would expect motorists to comply with the speed limit. Drivers still need to comply with Highway code, even if they drive at 20mph.

5. Same as under no 4

6. We agree with this, however in reality this is often not the case

7. As under 6

8. Ok

9. We tried to utilise existing street furniture and use the new one only if necessary. Also we used minimum number of signs, as required by DfT recommendations and regulations.

10. The scheme is funded by Transport for London (TfL). Other projects are funded from different sources.

	<p>8. I believe that years ago there was a study done in Park Lane which showed that when the speed limit was raised from 30 mph to 40 mph the average speed of cars fell! In other words, motorists were ignoring what they saw as an unreasonable limit and not caring at what speed they drove; then, when the limit became reasonable, they slowed down to the limit.</p> <p>9. I object to yet more street furniture which will no doubt be required to impose this speed limit. Warning signs and other furniture is surprisingly ugly and depressing, as well as, on occasions, actually obstructing sight lines in a thoroughly dangerous way.</p> <p>10. I am sure the scheme comes at a significant cost, which is not worthwhile and takes money away from more worthy causes.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Howard Palmer</p>	
41	<p>I would like this scheme scrapped. 20mph is an unnaturally low speed. 30mph is the legal speed limit for built up areas in most of the country. Also, It is unreasonable for drivers to get a fine for driving at a safe speed, even under 25mph. This already stands to happen on Shepherds Bush Green, Hammersmith Road and Old Oak Road, where there are cameras. Sincerely, John Gray, Binden Rd</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 30mph speed limit is the national speed limit on roads with street lighting. The speed limit regime enables traffic authorities to set local speed limits in situations where local needs and conditions suggest a speed limit which is different from the respective national speed limit (Setting Local Speed Limits, DfT circular 01/2013)</li> <li>- As part of the 20mph speed limit extension we did not install any new speed enforcing cameras and the Council has no such enforcement powers in respect of speeding.</li> </ul>
42	<p>Dear Sir, I object and do not support the 20mph restriction in Hammersmith and Fulham. Yours sincerely,</p>	Noted
43	<p>Dear Mr I understand that the trial 20mph scheme in LBH&amp;F is still under review. I wish to state that I view this scheme as being totally without merit and</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 30mph speed limit is the national speed limit on roads with street lighting. The</li> </ol>

<p>believe it should be disbanded.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. First, 20mph is an unnaturally low speed and 30mph remains the legal speed limit for built up areas in most of the country. This type of difference tends to lead to non-compliance and disregard for regulations. Bad laws create disrespect for the law, which cannot be good for society.</li> <li>2. I have noted significant non-compliance to the 20mph limits over the past year in local side streets. I am concerned that the council will waste more money on enforcing such limits, with more speed humps and the like. This would likely lead to focus traffic seeding to between enforcement sites (bumps/cameras etc). Such driving patterns would provide no safety improvement and would likely increase pollution levels. LBHF should scrap the experimental scheme.</li> <li>3. I would also be interested in any independently audited data that may support a view that the lower 20mph speed limit has in any way contributed to a significant reduction in accidents in the borough.</li> <li>4. In addition, the extra 20mph and 30mph signs give an overly cluttered look to our streets, in a most unsightly way. They are a distraction to drivers at road junctions where most driver attention should be paid to look out for traffic and pedestrians. Any moves to try and enforce compliance (speed bumps or further signage) will only increase driver distraction and street clutter.</li> </ol>	<p>speed limit regime enables traffic authorities to set local speed limits in situations where local needs and conditions suggest a speed limit which is different from the respective national speed limit (Setting Local Speed Limits, DfT circular 01/2013). We do not believe that reducing the speed to 20mph is an example of a bad law. It is also supported by the majority of residents who responded to the consultation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Motorist not complying with the speed limit can be subject to the police enforcement. 20mph speed limit is no different than any other speed limit. The Council has no enforcement powers in respect to speeding.</li> <li>3. It is still too early to evaluate the effectiveness of this scheme in relation to the number of collisions or casualties as the post implementation collision data is still not available. Once the data become available we will do so.</li> <li>4. We install Signs as per DfT requirements and recommendations using minimum numbers of signs and markings required. Competent drivers should be able to drive within the speed limit with regard to road surroundings and other road users. If drivers adhere to the speed limit, there would be no need for additional measures to support the speed limit.</li> </ol>
<p>44 Dear Sir or Madam I am writing to object to the proposed 20mph speed limit in Hammersmith and Fulham.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 20mph is an unnaturally low speed. 30mph is the legal speed limit for built up areas in most of the country.</li> <li>2. If it is safe to drive at 30mph on roads like Fulham Palace Rd, New Kings Rd and Scrubs Lane, then it should be as safe to drive at the same speed on roads like King Street or Old Oak Rd.</li> </ol> <p>Having lived in Fulham for over 40 years, I find it quite unreasonable to impose this speed limit and would like to make my objections quite clear. This limit should not be adopted. Yours faithfully</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 30mph speed limit is the national speed limit on roads with street lighting. The speed limit regime enables traffic authorities to set local speed limits in situations where local needs and conditions suggest a speed limit which is different from the respective national speed limit (Setting Local Speed Limits, DfT circular 01/2013)</li> <li>2. 20mph is a widely accepted speed in built-up areas. The severity of injuries when a person is hit at 30 is higher than if the same person is hit by vehicles going 20mph. Most of the roads in our borough that have retained 30mph speed limit are classified 'A' roads. In addition, adjoining Boroughs (Hounslow and Ealing) have also adopted or are about to adopt 20mph speed limit which</li> </ol>

		provide continuity and continuous speed limit along King Street and Old Oak Road.
45	<p>Dear Sir</p> <p>We wish to object to the above experimental traffic order being made permanent.</p> <p>1. While we support 20mph limits on mainly residential roads we do not support the general implementation of the limit on main roads. These roads are important for the movement of people and goods and 20mph limits on these roads have not been shown to reduce the number of accidents. We feel that the imposition of borough wide 20 mph restrictions is generally done for reasons of political expediency when it would be much more effective to target measures at known accident blackspots and for example at areas where there are large numbers of pedestrians interacting with heavy traffic. We therefore would like to see where possible all main roads removed from the current experimental restrictions.</p> <p>2. 20 mph restrictions are not generally enforced by the police and we believe that their resources should continue to be directed at enforcing poor driving standards not simply speed and the use of mobile phones etc. while driving.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All our roads are residential. The scheme was designed following consultation results and the 30mph speed limit was retained on most of the borough's classified A roads (except those in or close to town centres). It is standard procedure to examine 3 year casualty data prior to the scheme implementation against three year casualty data after the scheme implementation. However, the post implementation collision data is still not available for analysis.</li> <li>2. 20mph speed limit is no different than any other speed limit and it will be enforced by the Police if necessary.</li> </ol>
46	<p>I have no objection at all to 20mph limits <u>in side streets</u> in the borough, but it is ridiculous to expect traffic to keep to this limit in busy through roads like Askew Road, Old Oak Common Road and Hammersmith High Road, when immediately you turn into the Goldhawk Road the limit rises to 30 mph, as it is in Fulham Palace Road (where traffic means you can seldom drive above 15mph anyway). I quite understand that you want to avoid accidents but there are plenty of crossings on all these roads and there should not be a safety issue as I agree there can sometimes be in narrow residential side</p>	<p>All our roads are residential. The scheme was designed following consultation results and the 30mph speed limit was retained on most of the borough's classified A roads except those in or close to town centres.</p> <p>The aim of introducing the 20mph speed limit extension was to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To address a real danger</li> <li>To reduce deaths and injuries</li> <li>To reduce accidents</li> </ul>



	streets.	To make our children and all of us healthier To cut delays on the road To make our neighbourhoods more pleasant
47	Not even buses or the Police comply; how can sensible enforcement take place of a scheme that is unnecessary on the majority of roads. Yes, close to schools etc, but no on the remainder	We have already addressed this with TfL (London Buses). All drivers and services should comply with the speed limit, including emergency services, who often drive faster than limit to address emergency calls. With so many schools and nurseries in LBHF many roads are leading to schools or nurseries.
48	<p>Dear Mr X</p> <p>I understand that you are accepting comments on the new 20mph speed limit across he Borough until Sunday 5 March.</p> <p>I voted in favour of such a move but with the proviso that major roads would not be included and then I discovered that all roads appear to have been included. Given the amount of traffic on say, the Fulham Palace Road or Hammersmith Road, it is impractical to expect this traffic to move at no more than 20 mph or none of us will ever manage to get anywhere.</p> <p>Furthermore I should be interested to know how many prosecutions the police have succeeded with since the 20 mph was introduced as there is no point having a limit if the vast majority of motorists in our Borough are allowed to get away with ignoring the limits set. I should have expected to see an article about the police's success in this particular area appearing in the local paper but I have not.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you on both issues.</p> <p>With many thanks</p>	<p>Not all roads are included within the 20mph speed limit. Most of the Borough's classified A roads have retained a 30mph speed limit (unless within or close to town centres). Fulham Palace Road and Hammersmith Road have therefore retained 30mph speed limit, except when within town centre.</p> <p>We have no information about Police enforcement associated with this scheme.</p>
49	<p>Dear Mr X</p> <p>We would like to give our opinions on the new 20mph speed limit in</p>	<p>1. 20mph speed limit is widely accepted across the country, with in some cases whole cities, e.g. Portsmouth or Edinburgh accepting the 20mph</p>

	<p>Hammersmith.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is out of kilter with the rest of the country, thus complicating and confusing to anyone having to pay fines.</li> <li>2. Traffic congestion in Hammersmith automatically prevents high speed driving anyway.</li> <li>3. It is a dreadful waste of tax payers' money.</li> <li>4. We can't find anyone who agrees with the scheme.</li> </ol> <p>We therefore urge you to do your best to prevent scheme from progressing any further.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>	<p>speed limit across the cities. 20mph speed limit is the same as any other speed limit.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Traffic congestion may often prevent drivers from speeding, however, once the roads are clear from traffic motorists should comply with the speed limit. Speed is associated with collisions with more severe, life changing or even fatal consequences.</li> </ol> <p>There are more benefits from reduced speed. The aim of introducing the 20mph speed limit extension was to: To address a real danger; To reduce deaths and injuries; To reduce accidents; To make our children and all of us healthier; To cut delays on the road; To make our neighbourhoods more pleasant</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The scheme is fully funded by Transport for London (TfL)</li> <li>4. Consultation results shows that majority of people who responded agree with 20mph speed limit to be extended;</li> </ol> <p>In total 5,287 responses were received and recorded,  45% of respondents (or 2,367) replied YES for all roads managed by LBHF  26% of respondents (or 1,351) replied YES but not on all roads  29% of respondents (or 1,493) replied NO.</p> <p>Thus 71% of respondents voted for some form of extension of 20mph speed limits in the borough (whether all roads or some roads).</p>
50	<p>I strongly object to speed limit of 20 mph. What does this achieve? In particular I object to this on main roads where it will just further clog up the flow of traffic.</p> <p>Why doesn't the borough do something which really would make a difference and crack down on the white van drivers who are often really dangerous and sometimes lethal drivers?</p> <p>With the continuing delivery craze this type of dangerous driving will only increase.</p> <p>All the best,</p>	<p>Not all roads are included within the 20mph speed limit. Many of the Borough A roads have retained a 30mph speed limit (except those in or close to town centre).</p> <p>The Council has no enforcement power in relation to speed limit. It is the Police that enforce the speed.</p>
51	<p>Reference the HAMMERSMITH AND FULHAM (20 MPH SPEED LIMIT)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The aim of introducing the 20mph speed limit extension is/was to: To address a real danger; To reduce deaths and injuries; To reduce accidents; To make our children and all of us healthier; To cut delays on the road; To make our neighbourhoods more pleasant.</li> </ol>

<p>EXPERIMENTAL TRAFFIC ORDER 2016: Please note our objections to this proposal on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is simply unreasonable to impose a 20mph restriction on so many roads in the borough which will result in a considerable slowing of traffic and hence an increase in journey times.</li> <li>2. There will be no road safety benefit as a result of this change as it has been clearly demonstrated in other parts of London, and in the rest of the country, that introducing such limits does not reduce casualties. Indeed in some cases they have increased. There are several articles on this page of our web site which covers some of the evidence to date: <a href="http://www.freedomfordrivers.org/Road_Safety.htm">www.freedomfordrivers.org/Road_Safety.htm</a></li> <li>3. This change pre-empts the results of a Government study which has been commissioned by the Department of Transport which is investigating the benefits (or otherwise) or wide-area signed-only 20 mph schemes.</li> <li>4. It is in essence a waste of money, which would be better spent on other road safety measures.</li> </ol> <p>Yours sincerely Roger Lawson Campaign Director</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. It is still too early for us to assess the casualty and collision data, as the data is still not available. Once the data becomes available, we will do so. With slower speed of traffic, drivers have more time to react to danger and avoid the collision. The speed is often associated with collisions with more severe, life changing or even fatal consequences.</li> <li>3. As a result of the scheme traffic should move slower and with traffic running smooth and without delays caused by traffic collisions, delays are not expected or are to be minimal.</li> </ol>
<p>52 Dear Sirs and Madam, I am writing to confirm that I would like both the Experimental Traffic Order and the 20 MPH scheme (Traffic Management Order no. 1283) scrapped.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Many of the roads I already take require me to drive at the unnaturally slow speed of 20 mph. I have found this requirement lulling me into an</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A competent driver should be able to drive within the speed limit with regard to road surroundings and other road users</li> </ol>

	<p>unnaturally drowsy and disengaged state and it has certainly has given me and apparently other drivers a false sense of security.</p> <p>2. The research I've seen also shows that speed is a factor in an incredibly small percentage of accident cases.</p> <p>Although it may be slightly counter-intuitive I suspect that slightly higher speed limits probably encourage safer and certainly more alert driving.</p> <p>Kind regards</p>	<p>2. Often more than one factor contributes to the collision. With the higher speed of travelling, the stopping distance is longer, drivers have less time to react and consequences of the collision are more severe.</p>
53	<p>I understand that the 20 mph limit in Hammersmith and Fulham is an experiment and that the speed limit change will not be permanent unless people object and in that context, I object very strongly indeed.</p> <p>The principal reasons are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It turns perfectly safe and lawful driving into a criminal offence – that is unjust, oppressive and bad policy.</li> <li>2. It will result in safe drivers being aggravated by unnecessarily slow traffic – I speak from personal experience as a driver. It puts me in a frame of mind where I am more likely to be distracted; it makes me worry about looking for speed cameras rather than for hazards on the road, which is an unsafe scenario and it makes me angry because I did not vote for it, because the majority did not vote for it and because it unnecessarily slows down the traffic, which wastes my time and everyone else's time.</li> <li>3. It is a better strategy to trust people to behave well (ie drive safely) than to so constrain them (with punitive and oppressive measures) that they disengage or rebel.</li> <li>4. The safety argument is bogus. I understand that LBHF has failed to provide accident statistics justifying a lower limit. Speed wasn't a factor in even 1% of the accidents studied! If one wants to make roads safer, then it is important to look at the causes of accidents and to address them; that would be sensible. However, reducing speed for dogmatic reasons is a bad waste of money and leaves reasonable people justifiably disrespecting the</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Motorists are expected to comply with the speed limits and Council has no powers of enforcement in respect of speeding. The scheme was introduced: To address a real danger; To reduce deaths and injuries; To reduce accidents; To make our children and all of us healthier; To cut delays on the road; To make our neighbourhoods more pleasant.</li> <li>2. A competent driver should be able to drive within the speed limit with regard to road surroundings and other road users. Consultation results shows that majority of people who responded agree with 20mph speed limit to be extended;</li> </ol> <p>In total 5,287 responses were received and recorded,  45% of respondents (or 2,367) replied YES for all roads managed by LBHF  26% of respondents (or 1,351) replied YES but not on all roads  29% of respondents (or 1,493) replied NO.</p> <p>Thus 71% of respondents voted for some form of extension of 20mph speed limits in the borough (whether all roads or some roads).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. This scheme is not about enforcing, and the aim of the scheme is explained under 1 above.</li> <li>4. Often more than one factor contributes to the collision and the speed is one of them often contributing. With the higher speed of travelling, the stopping distance is longer, drivers have less time to react and consequences of the collision are more severe.</li> <li>5. The Council has no enforcement powers in respect of this scheme. however, if lives are saved, and if there are less collisions with less people injured or less people with life changing conditions after collisions, then the money will be well spent.</li> </ol>

	<p>politicians, the law and the people responsible for enforcing the law.</p> <p>5. It is and/or will be perceived to be yet another wheeze by the council to put its hands illegitimately in drivers' pockets.</p> <p>Therefore, please stop the experiment and put the speed limits back where they were before.</p>	
54	<p>Dear Sir</p> <p>I wish to object very strongly to the extension of the Experimental Speed Order that is currently rolling out throughout the borough.</p> <p>Residents, when consulted, made it very clear that it was not wanted but for some unknown reason our salaried servants decided that they knew better and went ahead with implementation. I would expect that most of these are now Brexit Remoaners.</p> <p>The 20 m.p.h. limit is completely unnecessary in all but very few locations and will give drivers an added distraction in crowded and busy streets.</p> <p>The damage caused to vehicles by 'traffic calming measures' even when driving within the limit is criminal and places an even greater burden on motorists who are severely overcharged at every turn.</p> <p>In most cases road conditions, congestion, bus stops and deliveries are speed self-limiting and it is anyway impossible to exceed 20 m.p.h.</p> <p>More signage and traffic calming measures are not required to achieve this.</p> <p>There appears to be enough demands on the Council Tax without the officers searching for ways to spend on spurious and personal projects.</p>	<p>1. This scheme was launched following consultation with residents. In total 5,287 responses were received and recorded,  45% of respondents (or 2,367) replied YES for all roads managed by LBHF  26% of respondents (or 1,351) replied YES but not on all roads  29% of respondents (or 1,493) replied NO. Thus 71% of respondents voted for some form of extension of 20mph speed limits in the borough (whether all roads or some roads).</p> <p>2.This scheme does not involve additional traffic calming installation. However, traffic calming devices in LBHF are designed by DfT recommendations and guidance and should not cause damage to vehicles if the speed on the approach to the traffic calming measure is adjusted.</p>

	Regards	
--	---------	--