

OFFICER DECISION
DIRECTOR OF TRANSPORT AND REGULATORY SERVICES
BOROUGH-WIDE 20MPH SPEED LIMIT

29 MARCH 2022

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. The Council announced its plans to extend the 20mph speed limit to cover the rest of the borough in July 2020 as part of the Council's Covid-19 response Active Travel Plan (KD05659/20/T/A). This followed a successful and well-received pilot scheme in a number of streets across the borough and in the whole of St. Helen's and Dalgarno wards which was made permanent in November 2020.
- 1.2. The Council introduced the remaining borough-wide 20mph scheme (from here on referred to as the 'borough-wide 20mph scheme') on 13 November 2020 under an Experimental Traffic Order (ETO). The ETO formally invited comments and observations on the new speed limit during its first eleven months of operation. It will expire in May 2022 and a decision is needed on whether to make the new speed limits permanent, amend them or remove them.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1. It is recommended that the Director of Transport and Regulatory Services:
 - a) notes the officer responses to the consultation comments in Appendices 1 and 2; and
 - b) approves Option 4 in Section 7 - make the experimental borough-wide 20mph speed limit permanent on all roads for which the Council is the traffic authority.

3. REASONS FOR DECISION

- 3.1. On 13 November 2020 the Council introduced a borough-wide 20mph speed limit under an ETO. The ETO formally invited comments and observations on the new speed limit up to 1 October 2021. It will expire in April 2022 and a decision is required on whether to make the new speed limits permanent, amend them or remove them.

4. BACKGROUND

- 4.1. Following a positive informal consultation, the Council introduced pilot 20mph speed limits in several streets and the whole of St. Helen's and Dalgarno wards in October 2019 using an ETO. The pilot schemes generally received widescale support, with few objections and several requests for expanding the 20mph speed limit to other streets and areas. The results of some early 'after' monitoring at ten sites in February 2020 - before the first Covid-19 lockdown - suggested a very positive speed reduction impact. In November 2020 the Director of Streets and Regulatory Services subsequently decided to make the ETO

permanent, establishing a permanent 20mph limit in those specified streets and the two wards.

- 4.2. In light of the success of the pilot scheme, a proposal to apply 20mph limits to all remaining Borough roads was included in our Active Travel Plan, as approved by the “Transport Measures to Support Recovery From Covid-19 Lockdown” Key Decision (Ref KD05659/20/T/A) in August 2020.
- 4.3. It was also in response to the many residents who over the years have told the Council that traffic speeds on their roads were too high. Speed surveys on many of these roads tended to find that most drivers were already travelling below 30mph. This suggests that these residents felt that the previous 30mph limit was simply too high.
- 4.4. The borough-wide 20mph scheme was introduced on 13 November 2020, again under an ETO and the limit came into force in each road when the boundary speed limit signs and the repeater 20mph roundel road markings we used were laid. All the signs and markings were in place by the end of February 2021. The ETO invited comments and representations on the new speed limit up until 1 October 2021.
- 4.5. Traditionally, lower speed limits were seen primarily as a road safety tool. Collisions at 30mph are much more likely to result in serious injury, particularly to pedestrians, cyclists and motor cyclists, than collisions at 20mph. However, in recent years, the main arguments in support of 20mph limits have been around the idea of ‘liveability’, and of lower speed limits making our streets more attractive and enabling higher levels of walking and cycling.
- 4.6. This view is also now supported by Central Government. The Department for Transport (DfT) updated national network management statutory guidance several times during the pandemic in response to the impact of, and recovery from Covid- 19. The latest update in July 2021 stated: *“20mph speed limits are being more widely adopted as an appropriate speed limit for residential roads and many through streets in built-up areas. 20mph limits alone will not be sufficient to meet the needs of active travel, but in association with other measures, reducing the speed limit can provide a more attractive and safer environment for walking and cycling.”*
- 4.7. In the pilot 20mph streets and areas officers received feedback from residents that drivers did not always notice the smaller 20mph repeater signs so we supplemented the signs with 20mph road markings which act as a very clear reminder to drivers of the speed limit and were well received. For this reason, when rolling out the borough-wide 20mph scheme, we focussed on using road markings rather than signs, other than on boundary roads where the speed limit changes from 20mph to 30mph or vice versa.

5. CONSULTATION AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

- 5.1. We introduced the borough-wide 20mph speed limit on 13 November 2020 under an ETO. The ETO formally invited comments and observations on the new speed limit up to 1 October 2021.
- 5.2. We received 79 comments - 24 objecting to the borough-wide scheme and 55 in support.

- 5.3. Some of those that were generally in support of the scheme also raised concerns about some of its aspects. The top five themes against the scheme and the number of representations mentioning that theme from both those who objected and supported were:
- The visual impact of 20mph signage / road markings - 14
 - Increased pollution / emissions - 11
 - Makes driving more difficult / inconvenient / less pleasurable - 9
 - Not practical / ineffective so will not improve safety or only provide a marginal improvement - 8
 - Poorly consulted / policy not advertised widely enough - 6
- 5.4. The full list of themes against the scheme and officers' responses to them can be found in Appendix 1. Redacted versions of all the objections and support received and officers' responses can be found in Appendix 2.
- 5.5. The overwhelming theme of comments in support of the scheme was improving road safety (25) followed by enabling active travel (5). Twenty of the supporters also felt that there needs to be better enforcement of the 20mph limit, including by camera.
- 5.6. The Council's latest Citizens' Panel survey in summer 2021, which received 301 responses, included two questions on the borough-wide scheme as below, along with a summary of the responses:

Q1 Have you noticed new 20mph signs or road markings in Kensington and Chelsea?

Option	Total	Percent
Yes	228	75.75%
No	62	20.60%
Not sure	10	3.32%
Not answered	1	0.33%

Q2. Do you think the Council should make the 20mph speed limit permanent on:

Option	Total	Percent
All roads managed by the Council	95	31.56%
Some but not all roads managed by the Council	173	57.48%
No roads managed by the Council	21	6.98%
Other	11	3.65%
Not Answered	1	0.33%

- 5.7. The results show that around 89 per cent of respondents supported the borough-wide 20mph limit on all or some roads in the borough whilst around seven percent did not. However, around 57 per cent felt that 20mph should not apply to all roads in the borough. This point is addressed in Issue No. 11 in Appendix 1.

6. SPEED MONITORING

- 6.1 The results of some 'before' and 'after' monitoring at ten sites within the pilot 20mph scheme suggested a positive impact on average 85th percentile speeds (the speed at which 85 per cent of traffic travels at or under - the standard used by the police and local authorities when assessing traffic speeds and speed limits) and in particular on the number of vehicles exceeding 30mph.
- 6.2 The results from that pilot scheme showed average 85th percentile speed reductions across the board, ranging between 0.7mph and 2.8mph. Our other measure is the number of vehicles recorded as exceeding 30mph before and after we introduced the new limits. With the exception of one road, where in one direction only, the number of vehicles travelling over 30mph increased by one (four percent), the results were very encouraging. The others all saw significant reductions in the number of vehicles exceeding 30mph, ranging between 20 per cent and 60 per cent.
- 6.3 As we introduced the experimental borough-wide scheme during the pandemic, we were not able to collect any robust 'before' speed data. It was widely observed that in addition to traffic volumes falling sharply at that time, there was an increase in the incidence of higher speeds across London.
- 6.4 We therefore used speed data at 27 locations from 15 streets within the borough-wide scheme that we had collected between 2018 and February 2020, before the pandemic impacted traffic patterns, as our 'before' data. We collected 'after' data at these sites in early December 2021, when traffic patterns had returned to relatively normal, and before the Government's announcement to move to 'Plan B' measures following the spread of the Omicron variant of Covid-19.
- 6.5 As with the pilot scheme, the monitoring results were very encouraging, showing average 85th percentile speed reductions at 23 of the 27 locations, with no change at one site and small increases at the remaining three. The reductions ranged between 0.6mph and 5.0mph. The number of vehicles travelling over 30mph decreased at 22 locations, with no change at one and increases at five. The reductions ranged between three per cent and 100 per cent with a decrease of more than 50 per cent at 14 of these 22 sites.
- 6.6 The results are summarised in Tables 1 and 2 below.
- 6.7 We will continue to monitor speeds across the borough both routinely and reactively and will prioritise those with average 85th percentile speeds of greater than 25mph on cycle routes and 30mph elsewhere for additional 20mph roundel markings, Speed Indicator Devices (SIDs) and ultimately traffic calming measures subject to Transport for London funding and consultation. We will also continue to consider applications for Neighbourhood Community Infrastructure Levy funded traffic calming, without requiring speeds to meet these thresholds, again subject to consultation.

Table 1: Comparison of before (various dates) and after (December 2021) average 85th percentile speeds at 27 sites on 15 streets

Location	Before Dir 1 mph	After Dir 1 mph	Diff mph	%age Diff	Before Dir 2 mph	After Dir 2 mph	Diff mph	%age Diff
1 - Addison Crescent	25.6	22.3	-3.3	-12.9	24.6	20.6	-4.0	-16.3
2 - Cadogan Place	26.5	23.0	-3.5	-13.2	26.2	24.4	-1.8	-6.9
3 - Earl's Court Road	24.0	24.0	0.0	0.0	22.7	24.0	+1.3	+5.7
4 - Evelyn Gardens	25.9	24.6	-1.3	-5.0	19.0	16.8	-2.2	-11.6
5 - Fulham Road	24.0	23.0	-1.0	-4.2	26.5	25.3	-1.2	-4.5
6 - Harcourt Terrace	27.8	26.0	-1.8	-6.5	22.3	21.1	-1.2	-5.4
7 - Hornton Street	22.9	21.4	-1.5	-6.6	24.7	22.7	-2.0	-8.1
8 - Hortensia Road	24.8	25.2	+0.4	+1.6	23.3	25.0	+1.7	+7.3
9 - Kensington High Street	27.4	24.4	-3.0	-10.9	30.3	28.4	-1.9	-6.3
10 - Manresa Road	26.5	25.9	-0.6	-2.3	26.6	26.5	-0.1	-0.4
11 - Queen's Gate Gdns (N)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	25.6	21.6	-4.0	-15.6
12 - Queensdale Road	26.4	21.4	-5.0	-18.9	25.2	24.3	-0.9	-3.6
13 - The Boltons (west arm)	25.2	23.9	-1.3	-5.2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
14 - Tregunter Road	26.0	24.3	-1.7	-6.5	25.9	24.6	-1.3	-5.0
15 - Whiteheads Grove	25.8	23.0	-2.8	-10.9	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Averages	25.6	23.7	-1.9	-7.4	24.8	23.5	-1.3	-5.4

Table 2: Comparison of before (various dates) and after (December 2021) speeds - number and percentage of vehicles travelling above 30mph

Location	Before Dir 1 >30mph	After Dir 1 >30mph	Diff No.	%age Diff	Before Dir 2 >30mph	After Dir 2 >30mph	Diff No	%age Diff
1 - Addison Crescent	23	3	-20	-87.0	6	0	-6	-100.0
2 - Cadogan Place	35	8	-27	-77.1	35	16	-19	-54.0
3 - Earl's Court Road	43	31	-12	-27.9	45	65	+20	+44%
4 - Evelyn Gardens	55	31	-24	-43.6	0	1	+1	-
5 - Fulham Road	117	93	-24	-20.5	257	190	-67	-26%
6 - Harcourt Terrace	111	55	-56	-50.5	5	2	-3	-60%
7 - Hornton Street	4	3	-1	-25.0	35	16	-19	-54%
8 - Hortensia Road	42	64	+22	+52.4	17	44	+27	+159%
9 - Kensington High Street	678	216	-462	-68.1	1016	500	-516	-51%
10 - Manresa Road	48	29	-19	-39.6	72	70	-2	-3%
11 - Queen's Gate Gdns (N)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	30	2	-28	-93%
12 - Queensdale Road	14	2	-12	-85.7	66	23	-43	-65%
13 - The Boltons (west arm)	51	31	-20	-39.2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
14 - Tregunter Road	36	39	+3	+8.3	65	19	-46	-71%
15 - Whiteheads Grove	68	18	-50	-73.5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

7. OPTIONS, ANALYSIS AND PROPOSALS

Option 1 - Do Nothing

- 7.1. If we did nothing the borough-wide 20mph ETO would expire, the speed limit would no longer be enforceable and would no longer apply. The implications would be as for Option 2 below. We would also need to remove all the associated signs and road markings at an estimated upfront cost of £150,000 which we would need to identify from existing budgets.

Option 2 - Remove the borough-wide 20mph scheme

- 7.2. If we were to remove the borough-wide scheme we would not see any of the longer-term liveability and potential road safety benefits it may bring. We would also need to remove all the associated signs and road markings at an estimated upfront cost of £150,000 which we would need to identify from existing budgets.

Option 3 - Make the borough-wide scheme permanent except on principal roads

- 7.3. If we removed main roads from the borough-wide scheme there would be the issues of consistency, streetscape, cost, liveability and road safety implications described in Item 11 in Appendix 1. We would need to install hundreds of new 30mph signs and posts and remove the associated road markings at an estimated upfront cost of £163,000.

Option 4 - Make the borough-wide scheme permanent on all roads

- 7.4. We consider this to be the best option in terms of consistency, streetscape, cost, liveability, and road safety - **this is the recommended option**. The estimated upfront cost of this option is negligible.

8. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1. The Council in its capacity as “Traffic Authority” has the power under section 84 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (“The Act”) to make orders imposing a 20mph speed limit. The procedure to be adopted by the Council for the making of such an order is contained in the Local Authorities’ Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. All road signs and markings comply with The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016. Enforcement of the 20mph speed limit is undertaken by the police.
- 8.2. The Council has had regard to its Network Management Duty contained in Section 16 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 to secure the expeditious movement of traffic on the road network.
- 8.3. The Council has had regard to its duty to improve public health in its area pursuant to Section 12 of the Health and Social Care Act 2012 given the strong links between road safety and public health.
- 8.4. The Council has had regard to Sections 121B and 122 of the Act. Section 121B concerns the exercise of powers which will or are likely to affect another traffic authority’s roads. Section 122 concerns the duty to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic when exercising their functions.

9. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1. Option 4, the recommended option, has estimated upfront costs that are negligible and can be met by existing service budgets. However, there will be a need to refresh the new 20mph roundel road markings every two years commencing in 2023/24 at an estimated cost of £35,000 per year.
- 9.2. From 2023/24 an additional £35,000 will need to be built into annual base service budgets to fund the ongoing maintenance costs associated with making this scheme permanent.

10. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1. There are no direct Human Resource implications arising from this report.

11. EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

- 11.1. The Council has had regard to its Public Sector Equality Duty contained under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, when making decisions to have regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation, or other prohibited conduct; advance of equality of opportunity and foster good relations between person who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it. The relevant characteristics are age, disability, gender assignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation. The duty also applies to marriage and civil partnership but only in relation to the elimination of discrimination.
- 11.2. Groups with age and disability protected characteristics will benefit most from lower speed limits making our streets more attractive and amenable to walking and cycling. A safer road network will make our communities more inclusive for all. Officers do not consider that there would be any negative impacts based on age or disability, which would need to be set against these benefits.
- 11.3. Officers consider that making the 20mph limit permanent will not have any negative impact on any of the other protected characteristics.

12. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

1. Business Plan - None
2. Risk Management - None
3. Health and Wellbeing - Most studies do not account for how speeding restrictions may affect the publics' choice of transportation. Insofar as lower speed limits increase the 'liveability' of the designated roads and areas, they should provide a more attractive environment for walking and cycling, with consequent benefits for more active travel and lower vehicle emissions.
4. Health and Safety - None
5. Crime and Disorder - None
6. Human Rights - None
7. Privacy Impact Assessment - None
8. Impact on the Environment - Most studies agree that the effect of a 20mph speed limit is dependent on vehicle type and the nature of the road and has a mixed overall effect on emissions (and by extension air quality) resulting in no significant net impact.
9. Sustainability and energy measure issues - None

Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) - Background papers used in the preparation of this report – None

Contact officer(s): Ian Davies, Principal Engineer - Transport Policy, Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, ian.davies@rbkc.gov.uk

Cleared by Corporate Finance (officer's initials)

PS

Cleared by Director of Law (officer's initials)

LLM

Cleared by Communications (officer's initials)

LH

Appendix 1

Objection Themes and Officers' Responses

Ref	Issue (Number of representations raising this point)
1	Objections to visual impact of 20mph signage / road markings - (14)
	<p><u>Response</u></p> <p>These signs and markings are essential elements of the 20mph speed limit - Department for Transport regulations require that Councils must install these signs wherever the speed limit changes from 20mph to 30mph or vice versa. The signs are legally required to enable the police to enforce the speed limits as well as clearly inform drivers of changes in speed limits.</p> <p>In view of our established streetscape policy we have kept the number of new signs to the absolute minimum required by the regulations.</p> <p>Whilst we would agree that the 20mph markings are not a particularly attractive addition to the streetscape, they are nonetheless an essential element of the scheme to regularly remind drivers of the 20mph limit. The markings do look very bright when they are first installed, but they fade a little in time as they are exposed to traffic and the elements.</p>
2	Increased pollution / emissions - (11)
	<p><u>Response</u></p> <p>Most studies agree that the effect on emissions of driving at 20mph is dependent on vehicle type and the nature of the road, and that it has a mixed overall effect on emissions resulting in no significant net impact. A steady driving speed, with minimal acceleration and braking, results in lower emissions. Because most vehicles will have a shorter range of speeds with a 20mph limit, they are likely to accelerate and brake for less time. It has always been accepted that in urban streets, it is not safe - or legal - to drive vehicles at their most fuel-efficient speeds.</p>
3	Makes driving more difficult / inconvenient / less pleasurable - (9)
	<p><u>Response</u></p> <p>20mph speed limits are now commonplace across the majority of London and drivers of modern vehicles should have no problem driving at around 20mph.</p>
4	Not practical / ineffective so will not improve safety or only provide a marginal improvement - (8)

	<p><u>Response</u></p> <p>The majority of ‘before’ and ‘after’ speed surveys for borough-wide scheme showed average 85th percentile speed reductions of between 0.4 and 18.9 per cent as well as significant reductions in the number of drivers exceeding 30mph. It is accepted that a lower speed limit will not necessarily deter drivers who are intent on “racing” at very high speeds. This is also true of the previous 30mph speed limit.</p>
5	Poorly consulted / policy not advertised widely enough - (6)
	<p><u>Response</u></p> <p>We consulted widely in advance of introducing our pilot 20mph scheme in October 2019 and received very high support for the idea. However, the Government’s instructions to councils in 2020 was to deliver schemes as quickly as possible and, initially, on a temporary or experimental basis. This ruled out being able to consult before we installed the experimental 20mph borough-wide scheme.</p> <p>We announced our plans for a borough-wide 20mph speed limit in May 2020 as part of our Covid-19 response Active Travel Plan. This move was subsequently confirmed in the “Transport Measures to Support Recovery From Covid-19” Lockdown Key Decision in August 2020 which can be viewed here - KDR.</p> <p>We publicised the experimental scheme through various Council media channels. The ETO invited comments and representations between 13 November 2020 and 1 October 2021. These comments are all being reported and addressed in this decision on whether to make the borough-wide scheme permanent. The installation of the signs and road markings themselves also clearly drew attention to the 20mph limit.</p> <p>We also ran a poster campaign on the back of 60 buses that run through the borough publicising the new speed limit for six weeks in March / April 2021.</p>
6	Increases congestion - (5)
	<p><u>Response</u></p> <p>Congestion implies stationary or very slow moving traffic. In free-flowing traffic the speed at which it travels has no impact on congestion. Officers have not seen any evidence from the pilot or from other areas that reducing the speed limit to 20mph leads to traffic moving at very low speeds (i.e. congestion). If there were a widely held view amongst residents that the 20mph limits had contributed to increased congestion, officers would expect to have had more than five people make this point.</p>
7	Will criminalise / penalise sensible drivers - (5)

	<p><u>Response</u></p> <p>It is accepted that some people feel 20mph is an unnecessarily low limit. Even if someone believes that the speed limit on a given road is too low, they do not have to drive above that limit and take the risk of a fine or points on their driving licence. This is true on motorways, trunk roads and urban streets.</p>
8	Causes extra delays / delays which impact local economy / increases costs for businesses - (5)
	<p><u>Response</u></p> <p>Clearly a vehicle that travels at a consistent speed of 30mph will reach its destination in less time than a vehicle that travels at a consistent speed of 20mph. However, in urban road conditions, most vehicles do not travel at a consistent speed, and certainly not at a consistent speed of 30mph. So any increases in some journey times are likely to be very minor and any related economic impacts impossible to measure.</p>
9	20mph is too slow generally - (4)
	<p><u>Response</u></p> <p>This is a valid opinion that people are free to make, and four people have done so. Set against that, the vast majority of roads in inner London are now subject to 20mph limits. Furthermore, the Government has given a clear message to councils that 20mph should be used in its latest update to statutory network management guidance in July 2021.</p>
10	Waste of money - (4)
	<p><u>Response</u></p> <p>Officers believe that this comment was based on the view that the 20mph limits were not necessary or not effective, rather than the actual cost of their implementation. However, it is worth noting that by introducing the scheme across most of the borough in one step, the Council has spent a lot less money than it would have done had it introduced limits incrementally over a number of years, as many councils have done. The scheme was largely funded by our Transport for London, London Streetspace Plan allocation which was ringfenced for Covid 19 recovery-related transport schemes, including 20mph speed limits.</p>
11	20mph is too slow for main roads - (4) In addition to the four people who felt that 20mph was too slow in general (point 9), four felt that it was too slow on main roads. This point also featured in the Citizen's Panel survey where around 57 per cent of those responding felt that it should not apply on all roads in the borough.
	<p><u>Response</u></p>

	<p>The Council could have chosen to exempt its main roads from the 20mph speed limit, but it chose not to do so. There are several reasons for keeping a single limit on all borough-managed roads.</p> <p><u>Consistency</u> - It can be frustrating for drivers when speed limits change between boroughs or even on streets within boroughs. Retaining the 20mph limit on all borough roads including main roads makes it very clear to drivers and riders what the prevailing speed limit is. Furthermore, most neighbouring boroughs also have 20mph speed limits in place on their main roads that come into the borough. Hammersmith and Fulham has recently included some of its main roads that it previously excluded from its 20mph scheme including King's Road that continues into the Borough. Transport for London (TfL) has also recently introduced a 20mph limit on Chelsea Embankment and is currently consulting on doing so in Redcliffe Gardens - other TfL managed roads in the borough are likely to follow.</p> <p><u>Streetscape / Cost</u> - If we excluded main roads from the borough-wide 20mph scheme, we would need to install new 20mph / 30mph boundary signs at every junction where the limit changes from 20mph to 30mph on the main roads, significantly adding to street clutter and at considerable cost. We would also need to remove all the 20mph roundel markings on main roads, again at considerable cost.</p> <p><u>Road Safety</u> - Whilst not the primary motivation behind our borough-wide 20mph scheme it is widely acknowledged that collisions at 30mph are much more likely to result in serious injury, particularly to pedestrians, cyclists and motor cyclists, than collisions at 20mph. The majority of collisions involving serious injuries in Kensington and Chelsea occur on main roads and junctions.</p> <p><u>'Liveability'</u> - In a densely populated borough such as Kensington and Chelsea all roads are residential to some extent - even the major ones and TfL roads such as Redcliffe Gardens, which is currently under consideration for a 20mph limit. Removing main roads from the scheme risks losing the 'liveability' benefits of lower speed limits on our main road network making it more attractive and amenable to walking and cycling.</p>
12	Should be limited to short sections when needed (for example near schools) - (4)
	<p><u>Response</u></p> <p>See response to Ref 11 above. People deserve to feel safe on all roads, not just those that are close to particular locations.</p>
13	20mph too slow outside of congested periods - (3)
	<p><u>Response</u></p>

	See responses to Ref 6 and Ref 11 above. Also, unlike on motorways, it would not be practical to introduce part-time or variable speed limits on urban streets that only apply at certain times of the day.
14	Will not be enforced and will be ignored - (3)
	<p><u>Response</u></p> <p>Only the police, rather than councils have the power to enforce speeding. They do so using on-street officers, mobile speed cameras and fixed speed cameras. However, they don't always have the resources to do so or view it as a priority compared to targeting other criminal activity.</p> <p>Nonetheless, according to TfL, in 2018, 154,785 people were caught and penalised for speeding-related offences, including 38,878 on 20mph limit roads. Furthermore, there were 263,000 prosecutions for speeding offences in London during 2020 and 360,000 during 2021.</p> <p>Plans are also in place to give more than 500 Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) in London enforcement powers with the police targeting 1 million prosecutions a year for speeding.</p> <p>More importantly, high levels of compliance with the limits do not necessarily require aggressive enforcement. Section 6 of the main report describes the results of traffic speed monitoring surveys.</p>
15	Not required as speeds already low on residential roads - (3)
	<p><u>Response</u></p> <p>Speed surveys suggest that on some residential streets this is not the case with average 85th percentile speeds well above 20mph being recorded.</p>
16	Excuse for council / government to collect fines (money making policy) - (3)
	<p><u>Response</u></p> <p>Only the police have the power to enforce speed limits rather than councils so there is no financial benefit for the Council. Income from speeding fines goes directly into central government coffers for general expenditure rather than directly to the police.</p>
17	Aggression from other drivers if you observe the speed limit / increases general driver frustration - (3)
	<p><u>Response</u></p>

	While this bullying behaviour can be intimidating for drivers trying to comply with the speed limit it is not a strong argument for relaxing that speed limit.
18	Not required if existing speed limits were enforced - (2)
	<p><u>Response</u></p> <p>The fact that the Council received so many complaints about traffic speeds from residents in roads where the vast majority of vehicles were recorded driving below 30mph, suggests that on many streets, residents feel that 30mph is not the appropriate speed.</p> <p>Only the police have the power to enforce speed limits - see response to Ref 14 above.</p>
19	Creates conflict with cyclists, as drivers pass at the same speed as the cyclists - (2)
	<p><u>Response</u></p> <p>Latest national policy and design guides for enabling higher levels of cycling, including the DfT's Local Transport Note 1/20 on Cycling Infrastructure Design (July 2021) acknowledges that 20mph is being more widely adopted as an appropriate speed limit for access roads and many through streets in built-up areas.</p> <p>20mph speed limits do reduce the differential in speed between general traffic and cyclists. Vehicle speeds are one of the main contributing factors to the severity of collision injuries and lower vehicle speeds are expected to reduce the number collisions which result in serious injuries, particularly when vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, motorcyclists and cyclists are involved.</p> <p>While it is possible to reach speeds of 20mph on a bike, most cyclists will not be travelling at that speed, allowing drivers to overtake when there is sufficient space to do so. For cyclists who do reach speeds of 20mph, drivers would be expected to proceed behind the cyclist, observing the posted speed limit.</p> <p>The recently updated Highway Code advice is for drivers to leave at least 1.5 metres (5 feet) when overtaking people cycling at speeds of up to 30mph and give them more space when overtaking at higher speeds. It also states that drivers should wait behind them and not overtake if it's unsafe or not possible to meet this clearance.</p>
20	20mph road markings create slip hazards for two wheelers - (1)
	<p><u>Response</u></p> <p>All our road markings comply with DfT standards regarding skid resistance. A huge number of roads across London now have 20mph road markings at their entrance</p>

	/ exit, but even before then, a great many of them had 'Give Way' triangle markings as well.
21	Delays emergency vehicles (because of congestion) - (1)
	<p><u>Response</u></p> <p>Delays imply stationary or very slow moving traffic. In free-flowing traffic the speed at which it travels has no impact on congestion. We are not aware of any reports from the emergency services of their response vehicles being delayed by the 20mph limit.</p> <p>Under Section 87 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 police, fire and ambulance services are already allowed to exceed speed limits in the course of their emergency response duties.</p>
22	Increased pressure on police to enforce - (1)
	<p><u>Response</u></p> <p>The lowering of the speed limit has not created a new offence. Operational decisions about enforcement remain with the Police. Plans are in place to give more than 500 Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) in London enforcement powers as well as police officers, with a future target of 1 million prosecutions a year for speeding.</p>
23	Increases risks as drivers take eyes off the road to check speedometer - (1)
	<p><u>Response</u></p> <p>Dashboards are designed in such a way that qualified drivers should be able to monitor their speed while remaining fully focussed on the road ahead and behind them.</p>

Appendix 2

All Representations Received

Borough Wide 20MPH - Objections and Support

Ward	ALL - Borough-Wide
Subject	20 MPH
Officer	Allan Evans 20mph@rbkc.gov.uk
Consultation Dates	13 November 2020 to 1 October 2021
Numbers	24 objections and 55 expressions of support.

Position	Comment
Opposer 1	<p>I have noticed the 'stealthy' way the Council is bringing in 20 MPH limits and noticed a posted sign about having borough Wide 20 MPH Speed limits.</p> <p>I am used to the Council's anti car agenda through arguing (successfully) about Single Yellow lines, but it seems the war is endless.</p> <p>It was bad enough that you ruined Kensington High Street by adding two cycle lanes on one of London's most busy roads and have added a Pointless 'Taxi/Bus/Cycle Lane' Sloane Street Northbound, but now the War on the Motorist must go one step further; 20 MPH limits!</p> <p>I see absolutely no reason to have such slow limits on main 4 lane roads such a Sloane Street, or even main streets such as Fulham Road and Kensington High Street; you need a higher speed for when there is no traffic</p>

	<p>flow. Not to mention when the roads are empty 20 MPH is so slow, many cyclists even go faster than that, but of course since they are cyclists and do not have number plates, the Police lets them go and instead focuses on punishing motorists through speed cameras and Police Patrols. Imagine, losing your licence for going above 20 MPH! What a crime!</p> <p>I really start to wonder sometimes; do those responsible in the council for these decisions even drive cars? I cannot see any other way that the council would hate cars so much.</p> <p>I urge you to reconsider this decision, motorists have a voice and feelings as well, not everyone hates cars and ubers it/buses/cycles/walks it at all times. The council is there to help people, not be the enemy of people and motorists are people as well. Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p><u>Opposer 1 Further Response</u></p> <p>Thank you for your response to my email. 20 MPH limits are simply too slow on main roads. You talk about pedestrians and cyclists, but on a main road such as High Street Kensington, you tend not to have pedestrians walking on it! The same goes with cyclists, most accidents with cyclists are regarding blind spots in junctions or Cyclists ignoring Red Lights.</p> <p>When there is congestion the speed limit is irrelevant as you cannot reach 20 let alone 30, my issue is when the roads are empty in the evenings and nights where 20 is hideously slow. All that will end up happening is more money for the government from speeding fines.</p> <p>I understand the logic of 20 MPH limits around schools or very tight neighbourhood roads, but not 4 lane roads such as High Street Kensington; they simply do not make sense.</p> <p>Also I hope the council stops using COVID-19 as an excuse to bring illogical plans into action or using pointless phrases such as (COVID-19 Action Plan), and High Street Kensington cycling pilot may have been removed, but all this has done is waste taxpayer money to bring in and remove as anyone with a mind would have been able to see that High Street Kensington is far too busy to even consider capacity it being cut in half for cyclists!</p> <p>I would hope that the council uses its budget more wisely, we pay enough tax as it is.</p>
Opposer 2	<p>I hereby object to the making of the proposed order. I do so in the absolute certainty that any and all objections will be overruled, but nonetheless wish to register my dissent to the making of this order. The order would cover a number of main distributive roads such as Kensington High Street, which based on national guidelines should be a 30 mph limit. There might be a need for the existing limit to be properly enforced, but that is a matter for the</p>

police (though the legal power to install static speed cameras rests with the council, so some degree of cooperation would be required).

The order would also cover a number of residential streets which are short, narrow, and where speeds are likely to be low already. That being said, there appears to be nothing specific about these streets that warrants the making of a 20 MPH zone, in particular:

1) Traffic travelling at 20 mph or less is likely to cause higher emissions than traffic travelling closer to 30 mph, which is the default speed limit on lit residential roads.

2) As most traffic is likely to travel along such roads at speeds of not much over 20 mph, the benefits of the order would be limited, they would however criminalise the behaviour of the law abiding majority. It is unclear that reducing someone's speed from 25 mph to 20 mph would lead to any statistically significant benefit (aside from a higher carbon footprint).

3) The cost of implementing such a scheme is likely to be significant and compared to the number of lives likely to be saved (which I suspect is going to be less than 1 per 100 years that the order is in force), the expenditure is almost certainly going to be unwarranted. The council's scarce resources would be better spent fixing potholes, or on adult social care or schooling.

It is also a significant consideration that a large number of motorists disregards 20 mph limits in the absence of visible enforcement, and implementing a speed limit that is likely to be ignored by most concerned. The DfT report at [hyperlink](#) explains at 12.3 that:

Following the introduction of 20mph limits (signed only) the median speed has fallen by just under 1mph, with faster drivers reducing their speed more. The evidence suggests that this is partly due to the implementation of 20mph limits, but also reflects background trends in speed on urban roads.

- In residential case study areas, the introduction of 20mph limits is estimated to have resulted in a 0.8mph reduction in median speeds and a 1.1mph reduction in 85th percentile speeds⁴⁶ on 'important local roads'.

Given the financial challenges that face the council, which have only been exacerbated by the COVID crisis, spending tens of thousands of pounds to achieve a reduction in speed in the order of 0.8 MPH or less is a wanton waste of resources.

As I have said, I am certain my objection will be overruled and the orders will be made just as I am certain that the sun will rise tomorrow, but you should know that these zones do not have universal support.

	<p><u>Further Response from Opposer 2</u></p> <p>From your email it is quite obvious that you have already decided the outcome.</p>
Opposer 3	<p>I believe, too many unwarranted roads have 20 Zone, by COUNCIL .Long roads like Greenford Road has 20 Zone (not required) and Traps Lane in New Malden as well.</p> <p>Journeys take much longer time to complete to reach destinations, and can be tiring for motorists, for evening hours trying to reach home in time. Joy of driving on CITY roads has gone as a result.</p> <p>ZONE 20, should only be restricted for only half mile stretch, near schools, at not 20, but at 25 MPH. PENALTY only if speed exceeds 30 or more MPH, to be fair to motorists. COUNCILS too keen to collect penalties, as for "offences" but unfair to motorists in UK.</p> <p>POLLUTION as such is much higher level(CO/CO2 emissions) at lower speeds around schools, and harmful to children with asthma, cystic fibrosis etc.IE. More at 20 ZONES compared to 30 ZONE areas.</p> <p>COUNCIL/GOVT. need to reconsider "20 Zone" on UK roads, as a matter of URGENCY. , to preserve joys of driving.& have to have limited use.....and not abuse 20 ZONE restrictions.</p>
Opposer 4	<p>1. The blanket 20mph in RBKC is ill thought out, will make next to no difference to safety but will instead criminalise people going about their day at the heady speed of 30 mph</p> <p>2. In particular , Oakley St is a major road leading to a river crossing . It is a wide straight road - apart from the dangerous contractions recently added by your good selves - with good visibility . How does it help in any way to lower the speed limit to 20mph ?</p> <p>I have lived on Oakley St for 20 years and I can not remember a single accident in that time . So , no, you are not helping the "liveability" of my street - you seem intent merely on making everyone's lives a little bit more difficult .</p> <p>Follow up</p> <p>I am appalled that you have taken the frankly idiotic decision to reduce the speed limit on the boroughs road to 20. There are many , many arterial roads that lead through the borough, including the one I live on where 30mph is not be remotely dangerous . I have cycled extensively through the borough for about 25 years now . This</p>

	<p>ridiculous measure will do absolutely nothing for me or my fellow cyclists but will be extremely annoying for all motorised road users . You are criminalising people going about their days basically being good citizens.</p> <p>Have you really not got something better to waste your time and our money on than just thinking up new ways to make our lives slightly worse ?</p>
Opposer 5	<p>I live on Astell street london, and I have noticed that there is an experiment of a 20 mph happening on our road and area. I would like object to this and I really cannot understand the sense of this.this will only slow the traffic down and add to already congested roads. I do not think that this will make the roads any safer,sorry. If we want to make these roads safer then we should stop all the large delivery trucks and other massive busses using these small lanes in London. These extra big vehicles block the roads, congest the traffic and are a danger to the public.</p> <p>It is also quite difficult to adapt the speed of the car to changing speed zones. We are al used to driving at 30mph and now 20mph will be a challenge.i am worried that the police will use this opertunity to check speeds and issue speeding tickets, which just cost a lot of money and points. If I am driving my usual 30mph and go into a 20mph zone and there is a speed check I can suddenly be 50% over the speed limit which is a lot and I will get a heavy fine and points.</p> <p>So again I disagree with this experiment. Please stop the large trucks and vehicles if you want to make these small roads safer</p> <p><u>Further response from objector 5</u></p> <p>This is with regard to the proposed 20 mph speed limit in the borough of Chelsea and Westminster. I have the following questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Your Notice is dated 06.11.20 and only gives me 6 weeks to question the validity of the order, but the problem here is that the order was only displayed beginning of December. Therefore, I request reissue and renofice of the order giving other community members ample time. 2) I would please like to get the statistics on what you have based the facts that the test was a success. What parameters were applied for this 20 mph speed per zone and what information were you considering. Could I please get the statistics over the last 3years of reduction in accidents, injuries, deaths, speeding, etc. (please consider this request pursuant to the freedom of information act).

	<p>This information can be sent to me in an Excel spreadsheet please.</p> <p>3) Can you also please provide me meetings that is on public record where this proposal was discussed.</p> <p>I would like to register my complaint here because of the 20 mph speed limit the traffic has been badly affected by cycle lanes and there is definitely higher congestion of vehicles which is leading to more air pollution.</p> <p>Also by slowing the traffic down it means that cars will be on the road longer (33% longer) to get from Point A to B, thereby increase the air pollution by 33%.</p> <p>There are many measures being taken to better the quality of the air in London so I do not understand this measure which will increase the air pollution in our borough.</p>
Opposer 6	<p>I think that the council needs to focus on enforcing the 30mph rules before considering changing the speed limit.</p> <p>Case in point, we live on Ladbroke Grove by Lansdowne road where the speed sign consistently shows the majority of people driving at around 40 mph, but the limit of 30mph is not enforced.</p> <p>If 30 mph was actually enforced the traffic would be going at a considerate and safe speed given the size of the road. The 20 mph is artificially low for this type of artery.</p> <p>Enforce current restrictions and then reassess. Rushing to change everything to 20mph is missing a step so arbitrary and ill conceived.</p>
Opposer 7	<p>I am writing as invited by the attached RBKC Notice to ask for further information in relation to the recently introduced one year 20mph Speed Limit experiment as follows.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Re the Number 1 Experimental Traffic Order 2020 please can you email me a copy of the document. 2) Who originally initiated the Experimental Order and what was the basis for deciding it should proceed? 3) Assuming it is not a coincidence that other Boroughs (eg Westminster) have also brought in the 20MPH limits at the same time how was this coordinated between the Boroughs, and who oversaw this and drove the decision for the co-ordinated approach?

- 4) What were the deciding considerations and factors that resulted in the decision to proceed with the experiment? For example what traffic accident statistics were analysed by car; bicycle; e-scooter; moped; pedestrian etc, and were other factors such as Pollution and Congestion taken into account?
- 5) Assuming that pollution and congestion were taken into account, how was it proven that slower speeds, where cars can as a result run at higher revs and be less efficient would not result in an increase in such pollution, and also would not result in higher congestion due to slower journey times which in turn also leads to more pollution?
- 6) With regard to accident statistical analysis, when the one year experimental period is complete will the types/numbers of accidents be directly compared to the “before and after” periods?
- 7) What other metrics and comparables will also be used and assessed to judge whether the experiment was actually a success or not?
- 8) As I am sure RBKC is aware, an ever larger percentage of traffic numbers is made up of not black taxis where numbers are declining, or privately owned vehicles where numbers are also declining but UBERS/and equivalent where numbers have increased massively over the last few years and where no numbers cap applies. Further, such private hire cars continually drive around in many cases empty waiting for a booking. It has been estimated that at any one time depending on the time of day half of UBERS/equivalent can be empty which adds hugely to RBKC traffic congestion and pollution levels. Are plans being made to address this issue and for example limit the number of private hire vehicles?
- 9) Similarly 20mph is not only an inefficient speed for a normal car engine, but so often mopeds (if they are not going through red lights); cyclists and (illegal on the roads) e-scooters exceed the 20mph speed limit, so what is the Boroughs policy on addressing this as it makes no sense having cars going slower than such other modes of transport, especially as in the case of cyclists and e-scooters they are in essence uninsured and have no means of identification such as a registration number (and of course make no financial contribution to the road network)?

I look forward to your answers to the above questions, and to receiving any additional information you think relevant and helpful to understanding this sudden change to the RBKC road network.

Please let me know if you have passed these onto someone else in the Council or whether you will be responding personally.

Follow Up

Further to my email below of the 15th January with a series of questions in relation to the various Streetspace initiatives including the Borough wide experimental 20mph speed limit scheme, I wanted to add a further question following yesterday's High Court judgement and the now proven illegal nature of the whole "Streetspace" scheme and how the London Mayor and TFL "pushed" radical changes without due process or proper consideration. This was very clearly explained and articulated in the judgement which I am sure you are now also aware of.

In the RBKC "**Key Decision Report**" of the 16th July 2020 (copy attached), the Council explains about receiving funds from TFL and DfT re the "**London Streetspace Plan**" (LSP) and how these and Council funds will/have been used to in particular create "**strategic cycle routes**"; "**reallocate road space**" and the implementation of the Borough wide 20mph limit "**to support walking and cycling across the whole borough**".

In view of this important development, can RBKC residents now assume that in view of the illegal nature of the recommendations and therefore by definition the actual physical major borough wide changes that emanated from City Hall/the London Mayor and TFL, that the various initiatives such as temporary cycle lanes, road closures and 20mph signs will be reversed and removed? In this vein I note that the Key Decision Report said that a "**cycle route along Kensington High Street.....should be of great utility to many staff**". However this has already proven to have been a mistake and has been dismantled, hence my question about the Council now addressing the wider issues of this nature.

If they are not to be reversed and removed, then please can you explain why not?

Look forward to hearing your answers to these additional questions, and to my ones of the 15th January.

Opposer 8

You have asked for comments from residents about the current 20mph speed limit being imposed in Kensington.

I would like this limit to revert to 30mph when the trial ends. Here are my reasons;

1. The 20mph limit is an unreasonable restriction on the freedom of individuals to drive at the speed they wish. Yes, speed limits are a necessary way to limit accidents. But freedom of the individual is also an important aim of any open society. Limiting speeds below 30mph would bring insufficient benefit to justify the extra restriction on individual freedom. Please see below regarding the insufficient benefits.

	<p>2. The 20mph appears to have only a modest effect on actual speeds. It does not reduce speeds by 10mph. It may reduce median maximum speeds by, say, 2 or 3mph. This modest reduction will only bring modest benefits in terms of pollution, safety and "liveability". The modesty of the benefits is important because the benefits have to be counted against the drawbacks mentioned above and below.</p> <p>3. The 20mph limit is not and will not be observed by a large proportion of drivers. This, of course, can be analysed on the basis of evidence although the evidence at present, of course, is somewhat impaired by lockdown, which reduces the number of drivers on the road. From my personal observation as a pedestrian and driver, I would guess that a majority of drivers are not respecting it. This indicates that the limit does not have their consent. When laws are created, it is important that they command the consent of people. The more laws there are which do not have consent, the more laws will be disobeyed and the more laws, in general, will gradually cease to be respected. This is a significant change in the nature of the relationship between people and the law. It is damaging if they no longer see the law as a reasonable part of a society of which they are a willing part. They can come to see the law and legal enforcers as almost akin to an enemy or opponent which they are seeking to defeat. This is the kind of situation in which some Continental countries like France already find themselves. It is contrary to the tradition in Britain which, I suggest without wishing to insult France, is more civilised.</p> <p>4. If, as I suggest, the 20mph limit is not observed, the police will have a choice. Either to accept it or to increase the level of enforcement. Are we really to have speed cameras or enforcement officers on residential streets around the borough? That would add to the street furniture in the first case and the sense of living in a police state in the second.</p> <p>For these reasons, I would like to argue that the 20mph should be ended as soon as possible.</p>
Opposer 9	<p>Dear Councillor,</p> <p>I was disappointed that you did not respond to my objections to the speed reduction – which I believe was not consulted on.</p> <p>I am annoyed that a huge 20 has been painted on the surface of the road just outside my house.</p> <p>Why on earth was it thought necessary to disfigure a quiet, narrow local road where traffic is in any case slow?</p>

It's also a waste of money as the road is often dug up to maintain or repair underground services.

And of course it was done with no consultation either.

Why not just put up a post in the normal way?

I wish to complain about this road painting and to ask for its removal.

Follow Up

Thank you for the quick reply and for passing on my email as an objection.

I remain unconvinced by 20mph limits for the reasons already given, and am strongly opposed to them as a borough-wide policy. You regard reducing vehicle speed as something desirable; I think it's the opposite.

It also seems to me undesirable that the Council can introduce changes in this way, which will last for up to 18 months, without prior consultation.

You have responded to my query about the size of the sign, thank you.

However, there is one point which you didn't cover. Which is that it's unnecessary to place this road surface sign on the western direction lane of Redfield Lane at all. Please allow me to expand on the reasons.

The sign we are discussing is about 40 yards west of the junction between Redfield Lane and Wallgrave Road, after the chicane in Redfield Lane, between numbers 14 and 18, just where the road briefly straightens before the junction with Earls Court Road.

Any vehicle coming to that sign will already be travelling slowly because of the sharp turn it has just made. The driver will only see the sign after having made the turn. The vehicle will in any case be going slowly because it's a narrow street, and because in another 50 yards it would have to slow down for the junction with Earls Court Road.

So the likelihood of the sign actually making any difference is tiny. And even if it did, it would only make a difference for, say, the stretch of road 20 yards west of the sign, because after that the driver would in any case have to slow down for the junction with Earls Court Road.

	<p>Redfield Lane is not and could never be a rat run. Any vehicle going into Redfield Lane can only exit by Redfield Lane. A vehicle could leave Earls Court Road, enter Kenway Road and come out on Redfield Lane, but in doing so, would only end up further back on the one-way system in Earls Court Road. So we only have local traffic.</p> <p>I've lived here since 1992 and have never seen any car accidents in the street. It feels to me that this sign is addressing a risk of speeding that is theoretical, not real; it's driven by health and safety ideology, or broad borough-wide statistics, rather than by local facts on the ground.</p> <p>It's also worth mentioning that pedestrians on the pavements are protected by large bollards, and that the road is constantly being dug up for services.</p> <p>I appreciate that the size of the sign is standardised, but this should be a factor in deciding where it is deployed. Serious consideration should be given to its unattractive visual aspect before placing such a large sign in a narrow, short street, particularly where the safety justification is so limited.</p> <p>I dislike it being imposed on my street, directly front of my house where I will see it all the time. I would much prefer this unnecessary and intrusive sign to be removed.</p>
<p>Opposer 10</p>	<p>*Summarised from a phone call*</p> <p>Complaint against 20 mph speed signs, as they look bad and do not actually slow traffic down – he also wanted to know if the residents were consulted before this was painted</p> <p>this is totally unacceptable in an area of historic beauty and listed buildings .</p> <p>It is interesting that as owners of the buildings in this road , we have to get permission for everything from the council to do any alterations and yet you can ruin the beauty of the road without consultation with residents.</p> <p>Your comment regarding 20 mph repeater signs seems bogus as I don't recall there ever having been any here on Elm Place.</p> <p>Each road should be considered individually and it should not be a one size fits all approach .</p> <p>As soon as my quarantine ends , I will be contacting all of my neighbours to make sure that we can put a strong case against these markings , which appear to be irrelevant to our road . I really see no point in them , because the road is so short that it is impossible to get up a certain amount of speed within such short distance . The</p>

	<p>only real issue that I see is the noise created by the increasing amount of delivery motorbikes using Selwood Place and Elm Place as a cut through , maybe there should be a sign saying no motorbikes , if it's safety and the residents that you are concerned about .</p> <p>You talk about a review of the new 20mph speed limit in August 21 , but mention nothing about the review of the unsightly and inappropriate road markings. Are you saying that the two have to go hand-in-hand ?</p> <p>I have always been so pleased with the attentive and considerate nature of the RBKC council , but I find this response extremely disappointing .</p> <p>I can assure you that I will be consulting with our MP , Felicity Buchan and my neighbours as I said already</p>
<p>Opposer 11</p>	<p>I wish to strongly object to the outright imposition of the blanket 20mph speed limit in the borough. I am a resident, driver, cyclist and a pedestrian. The imposition of this new speed limit appears to have come without consultation. There are already enough driving hazards that limit the speed in the borough and we do not need any more.</p>
<p>Opposer 12</p>	<p>I would like to know when an actual and proper borough-wide consultation on this will take place and see whatever statistics you are gathering in relation to both benefits and detriments of this scheme.</p> <p>It strikes me that you yourselves are suggesting very modest reductions in speed and limited benefits from this exercise while potentially criminalising huge swathes of the driving population. I understand this around schools and areas where children play, but it strikes me as phenomenally overbearing to impose this on everyone, everywhere.</p> <p>How do you calculate the cost of the additional congestion and of peoples' time wasted in longer journeys, commutes, school runs? How do you calculate the additional stress brought about by this? I don't see that taken into account anywhere.</p> <p>Anecdotally, I have noted to my dismay that between 20mph speed limits, road closures and cycle lanes simple journeys like Kensington to Mayfair have doubled from 20 to 40 minutes and above. This impacts productivity, it impacts wellbeing and stress levels. I would imagine most people want to get on with their law abiding life in an efficient way without stress or fear.</p> <p>If it wasn't clear from the above I oppose the blanket 20mph speed limits outside of specific risk zones.</p> <p>I look forward to your consultation and data.</p>

Opposer
13

Movement through Central London

Road Speeds in Central London Q2 0700 > 1900

2014/15 9.2 mph

2015/16 8.1 mph

2016/17 7.4mph

Falling mph equals

> Longer journey times = Less calls being made per day = Increased number of vehicles to cover shortfall
= More congestion = More emissions = More delivery failures thus leading to redeliveries and even more congestion/emissions

> Increased costs to operator, leading to increased cost of goods (currently£100 per ton to deliver in central London)

> HGVs are not generally designed to cruise optimally at 20 mph and would be inefficient at these speeds

> We support 20 mph on some roads in London

> Cyclists should also stick to these speed limits

> More deaths from air pollution which is the one thing we are trying to reduce

Taking the latest figures

Current 30 mph speed limits yields traveling cover of 7.4mph in Central London

20 mph speed limit will therefore yield travelling time in Central London of circa 5mph

To support this 20 mph proposal up to date figures (2016/2017/provisional 2018) suggest 128 people were killed in speed related collisions on London Streets

Air Pollution

Air pollution report

“Understanding the Health Impacts of Air Pollution in London”

signed off 14th July 2015 relating to a report commissioned by TfL and the GLA to estimate the mortality burden of 2010 concentrations of PM2.5 in London.

In addition, for the first time, emerging techniques have been used to assess the mortality burden of NO2 in London The World Health Organisation (WHO) acknowledges un certainty in this evidence so the associated figures are considered approximate and need to be used with care.

It is assumed that the concentrations remain at2020 level until 2114

Currently the stats from 2010 being used show that 9400 premature deaths per year result from long term exposure to PM25 and NO2

	<p>Trends in NO2 and PM 2,5 state</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Estimate of respiratory hospital admissions assc with anthropogenic PM 2.5</th> <th>est cardiovascular hospital admissions b/fwd PM 2.5</th> <th>Death as a result of short term exposure To NO2</th> <th>NO2 respiratory hospital admis</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td>1658</td> <td>654</td> <td>499</td> <td>399</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010</td> <td>1992</td> <td>740</td> <td>461</td> <td>419</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2012</td> <td>1924</td> <td>715</td> <td>439</td> <td>398</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2015</td> <td>1854</td> <td>689</td> <td>413</td> <td>375</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2020</td> <td>1749</td> <td>650</td> <td>355</td> <td>323</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>+5.5%</td> <td>- 0.6%</td> <td>-28.9%</td> <td>-19%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Assuming that the figure of 9400 is accurate then the increase in deaths from ait pollution, could easily increase by a minimum of 5% which is an additional 470 being killed by reducing speed limits, this could be compared with the 128 killed in the figures quoted above</p>		Estimate of respiratory hospital admissions assc with anthropogenic PM 2.5	est cardiovascular hospital admissions b/fwd PM 2.5	Death as a result of short term exposure To NO2	NO2 respiratory hospital admis	2008	1658	654	499	399	2010	1992	740	461	419	2012	1924	715	439	398	2015	1854	689	413	375	2020	1749	650	355	323		+5.5%	- 0.6%	-28.9%	-19%
	Estimate of respiratory hospital admissions assc with anthropogenic PM 2.5	est cardiovascular hospital admissions b/fwd PM 2.5	Death as a result of short term exposure To NO2	NO2 respiratory hospital admis																																
2008	1658	654	499	399																																
2010	1992	740	461	419																																
2012	1924	715	439	398																																
2015	1854	689	413	375																																
2020	1749	650	355	323																																
	+5.5%	- 0.6%	-28.9%	-19%																																
Opposer 14	I do not agree with the proposed reduction of the general speed limit within the borough to 20 MPH. I believe 30 MPH is a realistic speed limit and I see no need for a lower limit except in exceptional circumstances.																																			
Opposer 15	<p>Possibly the worst public policy I have ever come across:</p> <p>It increases pollution in my area with 1,000s of trapped cars/lorries and buses running their engines. It slows journey times - inconveniencing residents. It discourages journeys to the borough for shopping etc - thus hurting local businesses. (Small businesses are hit hardest). It potentially traps emergency vehicles amongst stationary cars - making the borough less safe. The painting of 20 mph signs has been a huge waste of money - two close to my home have been placed where it is simply impossible to be doing 20 mph in any case.</p> <p>All part of S Khan's policy to drive all cars out of central London - under the guise of an environmental policy. No meaningful consultation with residents or businesses. Because we are a 'rich' borough - I don't suppose he cares a jot.....</p>																																			

<p>Opposer 16</p>	<p>I do appreciate your interest and it gives me more confidence. As regards the white paint, what appals me was the sudden appearance of numerous garish white painted circles with large figure 20s inside them all over our protected streets. I know this is because of the introduction of the lower speed limit – not something which I personally support – but, in my view, these markings were carried out in a very insensitive way in areas where the residents are not even allowed to repaint their front doors in another colour without the Council's permission. The fading brightness will not significantly reduce the eyesore of these markings when viewed from anything above ground floor level.</p>
<p>Opposer 17</p>	<p>I am writing this as both a regular cyclist and a car driver.</p> <p>While I see no issue with this proposal for narrow side streets, it is a real problem on more major roads for a number of different reasons.</p> <p>1) Interaction of motor vehicles and cyclists: Many cyclist already travel at close to 20 mph and much more than this down hill, such as on the Holland Park Avenue. Having a car crawl past you at a very small speed differential is uncomfortable and unsafe. Your time in close proximity to the motor vehicle is increased and so therefore is your time during which there is the potential of conflict and accident. Of course there is a happy medium in this- you don't want to feel as if you're cycling up the M1. As a cyclist I really want the car to move away quickly and as a driver I want to minimise my time next to cyclists who on the most part have quite variable skills and behave unpredictably.</p> <p>2) Even with your carefully written obfuscation of how much motor vehicles have actually slowed down, it is clear that many cars are difficult to drive at 20 mph. You really need to be in second gear or very possibly third gear if you are to maintain proper control and the ability to accelerate safely. This cannot be good for emissions and it is bad for overall efficiency to be driving in a low gear like this.</p> <p>3) You have the potential of criminalising a lot of people if these limits are rigorously enforced. That seems most unfair for a policy which you admit is not a safety based initiative but for some suggested nebulous 'quality of life' aspiration. A speeding ticket is not a one off expense- you have points and you have the owner's insurance company rubbing their hands with glee as they jack up the unfortunate driver's insurance premiums. You admit yourselves that it is unlikely that everyone will drive at 20 mph- you are lucky that in fact almost no one does, because then you really would see gridlock! Is it right to create a rule that is manifestly so unworkable that most people rightly ignore it? Does this not seem quite hypocritical? A sort of 'greenwash'?</p> <p>Finally a plea on the 20 mph road markings: Please remove them, at least from the approaches to junctions. Anyone who has been properly taught to ride a motorcycle knows that such road markings-all road markings-</p>

are much more slippery than the road itself when wet. Furthermore, placing such markings on the approach to junctions is a dangerous distraction when road users should be looking forward for potential conflicts and not down at the road surface. You are actually increasing the danger to one of the most vulnerable groups of road users, those on two wheels. Don't believe me, see the references below.

In summary: Have this reduced limit on narrow residential streets- no one should drive fast along streets which are barely one lane wide and with parked vehicle down both sides obstructing their view of pedestrians. But on Holland Park Avenue or Ladbroke Grove or Kensington Church Street and the like? It is actually dangerous and energy wasting and so manifestly unworkable that it brings your policy initiative into disrepute.

Respondent Follow-Up

Thank you for your detailed response. Yes please register my comment as an objection to the borough wide proposal for a 20mph limit. I would suggest a cut off depending on road width such that the limit would apply only to residential street where you are likely to cause conflict between cars and cyclists. This would mean streets where the available carriageway width, allowing for the restriction caused by parking, does not allow for opposing vehicles to pass each other without slowing down- this effectively means it is unsafe to pass cyclists and give them sufficient room. If you want a specific width of clear carriageway I can go out with a laser measure and give you a rough measure.

I think the point I'm trying to make is that if you want compliance you need to take the majority of residents with you rather than trying to impose a proposal that to many people makes not much sense.

This morning we woke to find a very large number of these enormous 20 graffiti. Quite ambivalent about how useful they are- the real problem we have is drivers doing 40 or more down Aubrey Walk because it is a short cut and you absolutely must drive fast down a short cut. However, the positioning and size of these 'banners' makes me wonder if anyone involved in their placement has ever ridden a motorcycle. The road marking paint is extremely slippery when wet- the particular marking I show below is actually on a corner, but many others seem to be on the approaches to junctions where you might have to brake suddenly. You could not create a much more serious hazard for two wheeled users than this sudden transition to a surface which has about as much grip as teflon when wet. On a more trafficked road, it's where you would lay 'shellgrip' high mu surface, not the opposite. I do hope they are temporary, to be replaced by small discrete signs in the conventional and legally binding form. The example below is not only on a corner, but fairly impossible to avoid, as any remotely skilled motorcyclist would want to do.

<p>Opposer 18</p>	<p>I appreciate the objectives of the 20mph speed limit to make it safer for pedestrians and motorists alike. However, I believe that with the increasing amount of cyclists the speed limit actually has the unintended consequence of making the roads less safe.</p> <p>The average cyclist is travelling at around 15MPH. Some cyclists even reach 20MPH. This makes it unsafe for both the cyclists and motorists. It is inherently unsafe to be driving right next to a cyclist and the safest action is to overtake. However the speed limit at 20MPH prohibits this from happening safely. Whilst we want to encourage cycling we also want it to be done safely. As a result I strongly encourage the council to rethink the 20MPH and limit it to less busy residential roads such as Argyll Road in Kensington or Tedworth Swuare in Chelsea.</p>
<p>Opposer 19</p>	<p>I hope you're keeping well. I remember you encouraged feedback on the 20mph speed limit currently being trialled across the Borough, so I thought I should write in.</p> <p>As a driver, it is an understatement to say that I find it frustrating to drive around the Borough, specially at times when there is little/ no traffic like early mornings, when sticking to the newly imposed limit makes little sense. At other times, the aggression I experience from other drivers (mostly visitors to the Borough - such as trade vans etc) who don't understand there is a 20mph speed limit is pretty frightening!</p> <p>Some residents have favoured the lower speed limit saying that it will eradicate "boy racers" from the Borough - but that is nonsense as we had drivers racing around despite the 30mph limit prior. Also you may recall that the driver who crashed on Moore Street 2yrs ago was flying through Lennox Gardens at nearly 100mph! So I believe those who want to break the speed limit will do so no matter what the legally set limit is.</p> <p>So, I tried in vain to do a bit of research on the benefits of a slower speed limit - other than a lower mortality rate of pedestrians on impact with vehicles I cannot find any other useful studies or evidence that such a low speed limit benefits the environment. In fact, what I came across was that the pollution caused by the particles from the erosion of the rubber tyres is far worse for the environment and for our lungs.</p> <p>Furthermore, one of the most infuriating incidents I have experienced was when my husband was stopped by the Police for driving "over the speed limit" at 23mph!!! He was not only cautioned but his license details were retained. I only wish we had such speedy reactions when residents are stabbed for their phones and watches. I find it intolerable that the already over-stretched Police force is now burdened with monitoring the new speed limit when they have higher priorities no doubt.</p>

	<p>I understand that the Council may have been under pressure from the current Mayor to adopt his (utterly stupid) scheme but was wondering if you could kindly advice on what basis RBKC made the decision to trial it please?</p> <p>For the record, I am vehemently against it.</p>
<p>Opposer 20</p>	<p>I wanted to put forward my views on the 20 mph speed limit in Kensington and Chelsea.</p> <p>Having been a driver in London for many years I have obviously seen many changes This 20 mph I feel is quite dangerous you have to constantly look at your speedometer while driving to make sure that you are below the 20 mph. This in itself is a hazard</p> <p>.Naturally one should drive not only sensibly and with courtesy to others but the times I have been hooted or yelled at for going below 20 is unbelievable.</p> <p>First of all when there is no traffic one should be able to drive at an acceptable speed which is not above 30 mph. If one is driving on a small side road one should adapt accordingly.</p> <p>I would like to point out that the other day sitting in Walton street cars and motorbikes were racing down at certainly above 40 mph plus we still have to put up with speeding motor bikes and cars at all hours of the day and night.</p> <p>Residents should not be penalised for driving sensibly and I look forward to our Council getting rid this 20 mph speed limit .</p>
<p>Opposer 21</p>	<p>I have been a resident in the borough for the last 15 years or so, having spent the last c.13 years living on the border of SW10, SW7 and SW3. In my opinion, as a pedestrian and driver, the 20mph speed limit has adversely impacted upon traffic congestion and pollution.</p> <p>I don't think that the argument that there are fewer fatalities at 20mph than at 30mph is sufficient justification to roll out the 20mph speed limit across the borough. The uniform application of one speed limit across varying types of roads seems ridiculous. Lower speed limits causes frustration (even road rage) amongst drivers, leading to riskier driving, such as the jumping of red lights and overtaking. These impacts increase the likelihood of accidents.</p> <p>Moreover, crawling along at 20mph when the roads are wide enough for higher speeds, appears to me to generate more pollution. Many of the streets of the borough already stink of fumes. I don't want vehicles lingering on the roads longer than they need to be.</p>

	<p>In terms of accidents, the near misses that I have witnessed in and around the borough have been caused not by speed but by:- pedestrians not paying attention to the road;- road users jumping red lights;- cyclists and scooters going the wrong way down a road;- vehicles not indicating when turning;- mopeds leaving their indicators on after turning; and- mini cabs driving too slowly and stopping suddenly.</p> <p>Introducing a 20mph borough wide speed limit does not tackle these causes.</p> <p>My opinions for what they're worth. Happy to discuss further if required</p>
<p>Opposer 22</p>	<p>I am writing to ask why it is necessary to post "ENORMOUS" 30 mile an hour road signs in our side street, and all other side streets, running alongside the Finborough Road. I have lived here for over 25 years and we have managed perfectly well without them. People know that the speed limit is meant to be 30 miles an hour in inner London when the traffic is not at a standstill anyway, which happens most days. In addition to the increased traffic flow, not least because of all the ill thought through over development in the area, soon we will not be able to move. You have now ruined my view from my property to just remind me that I live next to one of the busiest roads in London. I am so disappointed that these signs had to be so enormous and fear you will now continue to prune up the tree outside my house, so people can view it clearly, and which is so valuable in protecting my view and the noise of all that traffic and my own well-being.</p> <p>The people that speed in the area are not the residents, side street traffic flow, but people from outside the borough and I would argue that the only traffic calming measure that does appear to work is the new flashing sign erected on Redcliffe Gardens.</p>
<p>Opposer 23</p>	<p>I was given this email address to contact regarding our shock to an enormous 20 suddenly painted in front of our house.</p> <p>We are very upset, this is all you see now when you look out our window. It's horrid and very upsetting. Shocking. Please can this be removed. Surely a speed camera would be more efficient and profitable.</p>
<p>Opposer 24</p>	<p>I hope you are all well despite a difficult beginning of the year.</p> <p>I am writing to you this morning as in the middle of the night on Friday/Saturday a bright white speed limit sign has been placed just below my windows (I live on [REDACTED]) whereas there is a free space 3 meters before with no windows overlooking this. Beyond the ugly view, the reflection of the sun / cars' lights disturbs (during homework or reading) both my sons (8 and 10 years old) who have their bedroom facing this street.</p> <p>Please see the photos attached and the suggestion of where it could have been less disruptive to have placed them out of the direct line of sight of the residents such as ourselves and our neighbours.</p>

	<p>Could you please change these positioning of the signs asap? We are greatly frustrated that we have neither been warned nor consulted prior to this taking place in the middle of the night.</p> <p>Many thanks for your swift reply. I never objected the need for speed limit signs although the road bumps and traffic are already a good speed regulator. Moreover, I can guarantee you there is a place just a few meters behind where there is no windows overlooking it. This is really upsetting. Could you please let me know how we can send comments to the ETO you mentioned in your email?</p>
--	--

Position	Comment
Supporter 1	<p>Thank you, thank you, thank you!</p> <p>As a RBKC resident and driver I applaud this long due initiative. Thank you for making our Borough safer and more enjoyable.</p>
Supporter 2	<p>I am completely in support of 20mph zones in certain areas, but only if it is policed. In H&F it is not policed and very few obey the 20mph limit. Consequently, there is a conflict between motorists - and a far more dangerous situation than we had before, something that is completely lost on H&F council.</p>
Supporter 3	<p>We are so pleased to see Kensington and Chelsea introducing a 20 mph speed limit. It makes so much sense for road safety and the health and well being of residents. We live on Cliveden Place, leading into Sloane Square, and have long been upset by the high speeds of cars on this stretch. It would be great if speed cameras could be installed to encourage drivers to adhere to the new 20mph limit. The more boroughs that take the 20mph on board the better for everyone.</p>
Supporter 4	<p>My Wife and I are very pleased with the 20mph on Cliveden Place. This hugely improves our standard of living.. making it safer crossing the road and much less noisy. We would welcome speed cameras to make restrictions even more effective.</p>
Supporter 5	<p>I am writing to request a speed limit change of 20mph for Beaufort gardens with signs to be placed at the top of the road.</p> <p>I live on Beaufort Gardens and am constantly telling drivers to slow down as they speed along the road to turn around. The road is a dead end and should not be driven down at speed. A motorcycle of mine has been hit</p>

	<p>before and with the sheer amount of parked vehicles blocking pedestrians from view of the speeding cars, it's essential to sort this.</p>
Supporter 6	<p>I am very pleased that the council is placing 20 mph signs on the roads in the borough. These signs have been placed in adjacent roads to the one where I live (on the Kensington side of Chepstow Place). Thus there are 20 mph signs in Pembridge Place, Dawson Place and Pembridge Square. But there are none in Chepstow Place. Can you please let me know when these will be done?</p>
Supporter 7	<p>Following on from this email I'm delighted to see the 20 m.p.h. notices in so many roads in RBK&C but am surprised that there aren't any in Cadogan Square. Even though Milner Street and surrounding streets are already marked. I am wondering when you plan to paint signs here? This was the area I was enquiring about and my concerns still stand - an increasing amount of traffic speeding down a residential street with lots of families - young children and elderly people too.</p>
Supporter 8	<p>Great news that you will be implementing a borough wide 20mph speed restriction. As a matter of interest how will this be policed?</p>
Supporter 9	<p>Thank you for enforcing the 20mph speed limit on Kensal Road. I do note however it is at the Trellick Tower end and not the Sainsbury's roundabout end, where motorists speed at excessive rates. There are also quite a few schools on that end of Kensal Road. There is a "Slow" sign on the road, it is however ignored by all motorists. I am not certain why this has not been implemented but please can you consider enforcing the 20mph speed limit at the Sainsbury's roundabout end of Kensal Road. Thank you for considering this.</p>
Supporter 10	<p>As a longstanding resident of the borough I want to say I wholeheartedly support the new 20 mph speed limit being made borough-wide. I hope the council will make this a permanent feature and not buckle under pressure from the motorist/business lobby as it did with the cycle lane on High Street Kensington. I am a car owner and a cyclist and 20 mph is quite fast enough for any vehicle travelling in the borough. Voters will take a dim view if this is made anything other than borough-wide and permanent.</p>

<p>Supporter 11</p>	<p>This morning you teams placed 2 signs, one on each side of the road, outside our house one of them. We believe these are wrong placed, as there is a pole for a sign outside 499 aprox, but this one was placed on a different type of pole.</p> <p>One sign shows 30mph the one on the carriage going towards Sloane Square, the other on our side going towards Fulham, shows a 20mph speed limit. We believe both should enforce 20pmh, specially with the view towards the fatal accidents taking place on the crossing with Gunter Grove, like the one happening yesterday. Please get back to us with your proposed actions.</p> <p>Follow Up</p> <p>Thank you very much for your detailed response.</p> <p>I agree that the '20mph' sign is on public way, however let's be open - it's really 'on my family heads' when we enter or leave our house and this is very annoying, I don't think anyone likes a speed warning sign on their doorstep and I hope you appreciate this.</p> <p>I am asking you to kindly move it to the black post intended for this and that your teams planted on the pavement a few metres away only. Please let me know if this is agreeable.</p> <p>Once again thank you for being open and discussing with me.</p> <p>Follow Up</p> <p>We noticed the sign has been moved a few metres away from our house door. Thank you very much for being so kind with our request.</p>
<p>Supporter 12</p>	<p>I am very much in favour of the new 20mph speed limit in the borough. I think this is an essential step towards improving safety for cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>I am, however, slightly concerned that the new speed limit is not being properly enforced in much of the borough. For example, on Holland Park Avenue as far as I am aware there are no 20mph signs yet. Cars continue to drive >30mph much of the time. Similarly, on Addison Road there are no 20mph signs and cars continue to drive far too fast.</p>

	<p>I would suggest the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • more 20mph signs throughout the borough, including painted 20mph on the road • speed cameras to enforce the new speed limit • speed sensor signs that give your speed as you drive past (the ones with the happy/sad faces)
<p>Supporter 13</p>	<p>I have been informed that this is the e-mail address to which to submit feedback on the 20mph speed limit for motorised traffic in Kensington and Chelsea. As a regular pedestrian, cyclist and motor vehicle driver in the borough, I was delighted to hear that the 20mph speed limit was being introduced.</p> <p>It appears to me to have the following benefits. First, and foremost, it appears to bring improved safety for vulnerable road users. Though I have no data on this, I can report that I perceive it to be safer when walking or cycling. Second, it reduces noise pollution on residential roads, with vehicles travelling on the whole slower and with a reduced tendency to accelerate between speed bumps.</p> <p>The drawbacks of the scheme for me as a motorist, I believe, are minimal. It is not often that I would otherwise travel above 20mph even if the speed limit were higher, and any inconvenience caused by limited speed is minor if existent at all; the usual fruit of driving at 30mph rather than 20mph is a longer wait at the next set of traffic lights.</p> <p>As to possible improvements for the scheme, I would suggest increasing the number of signs and painted road markings indicating the 20mph speed limit as it is rather rare to come across such indications in the Borough. In fact, I rather think I would not be aware of the introduction of a 20mph speed limit if I had not been forwarded the announcement of it on a Councillor's social media page.</p>
<p>Supporter 14</p>	<p>Thank you for introducing the 20 mph speed limits in the borough and I look forward to seeing it implemented on all roads in the borough. A very good initiative! I'm just wondering how the scheme is monitored and what sort of enforcement is going on? Also, how many fines have been issued since the scheme was instated? It seems to me that motorist not necessarily always abide by the new limit.</p> <p>Follow up</p> <p>Thanks so much for your email. I guess the council needs to evaluate whether or not the 20 mph limit is effective before deciding if it's worthwhile implementing throughout the borough. I'm just curious how that will be done if you don't keep statistics on speed limit breaches and/or fines issued?</p>

Supporter 15	<p>I called earlier the RBKC after our great shock and disappointment to see these unsuitable overscale speed signs that have been placed on the square.</p> <p>For years I have been asking the council to have speed bumps placed in the entrance of all sides of Redcliffe Square as well as Redcliffe gardens. Now they have placed these dreadful large speed signs.</p> <p>We choose to live here as it is part of the Bolton's conservation area. These signs, as you can see by the images, are the first thing we now must see from our windows and as soon as we step out.</p> <p>These signs do not belong here and have been carelessly placed. They could paint them on the road if they must do so. I would kindly ask you to have them removed as soon as possible. They are an eyesore and do not belong in the Square.</p> <p><u>Follow Up</u></p> <p>Good afternoon, thank you for your response email. As you indicate, the real problem with speeding it's on Redcliffe Gardens not on Redcliffe Square. Cars must stop to then cross over from one side of the square to the other or into Redcliffe Gardens. What they should place are speed bumps.</p> <p>Speaking with some neighbours they pointed out that in other surrounding areas, such as the Little Bolton's, the Bolton's they have now placed large signs on the pavement rather than these ill placed signs. (See attached images).</p> <p>Safety and being practical is essential, the speed limit we are happy with, 20 is better than 30 on the Sqaure but the signalling must be done with common sense and some sensibility to the local residents. This is a residential conservation area, and we would appreciate the Council and TFL would respect this. It is the same as real estate agent not being allowed to place advertisement for sale or rent, otherwise it is abused. The other day I was on Draycott Place and in a section of less than 100 meters there were 23!</p> <p>We would very much appreciate they would remove these truly eyesore signs and place speed bumps and painted signs on the pavement as they have done in other streets. This is a historic Chelsea garden square not Picadilly or The Strand!</p>

	<p>Could you advise on what we would need to do, what steps we would need to take to have these signs removed please. There must be other options.</p> <p>Regarding Transport of London and the Traffic, the issue it's not on boundry road, being Redcliffe Square, the issue is on the red route, Redcliffe Gardens. I can assure you that from every 100 automobiles and motorcycles that come down that road, 1 or 2 drive at 30 or below that speed. Most of them drive fast.</p> <p>The speed should be the same on this section of Redcliffe Gardens at it is still goes through Redcliffe Square, a school on one side and a park with a playground on the other.</p>
Supporter 16	<p>We are in favour of a 20mph borough wide speed limit but you might consider retaining the 30mph limit for Cromwell Road west of Exhibition Road and Warwick Road</p>
Supporter 17	<p>I live at xx St Anns Villas which is situated on the corner of Queensdale roAD. i fully support the new proposed limit for obvious reasons. Queensdale Road has become a race track in both ways for private cars and vans. On St Anns Villas speed is relatively controlled because of 2 bus lines 316 and 295 during the busy hours. However, speeding picks up after office hours and in the evening. The important issue will be how to control the new limit is respected!</p> <p>On a different matter, I also have witnessed many private cars and vans coming in to St Anns Villas from the Royal Crescent, and not withstanding the red sign not to turn right into Queensdale road, still do turn right at full speed. I once was almost run over by a van and the driver was furious at me!!! . The private cars owners live in the area and do not bother to drive an extra 100 meters to respect the rules. I strongly recommend you install a camera and serve the culprits with a fine.</p>
Supporter 18	<p>I have noticed that most streets in the borough have 20 mph speed limit signs either on lamp posts or painted directly on the street. Princedale Road has become a busy cut through recently and speeding cars are a regular occurrence but no speed limit signs have been installed. It would be greatly appreciated if the council could rectify this and hopefully reduce the number of speeding cars using Princedale road.</p>
Supporter 19	<p>Why are these limits not enforced properly by camera .</p> <p>The Earl's Court is still a racetrack and there are no 30 mph signs or speed cameras on the red routs where traffic speeds often exceed 50 mph.</p>

Redcliffe Gardens, Finboro Road and Warwick Road all need to have 30 mph signs which have recently been placed on side streets just before one turns on to these roads. That was a really stupid decision not to place the signs on the red routes.

Speed cameras should surely be mandatory on all red routes???

I live in Redcliffe Square which is a rat run from Chelsea to the Cromwell Road. We have no 20mph signs and no speed bumps which we desperately need.

Follow Up

Why are the 30 mph signs being put at junctions before you enter a 30 mph road rather than on the road itself.

All the red routes are race tracks and have no 30 mph signs at all.

Redcliffe Gardens, Finborough Road and Warwick Road all need 30 mph signs plus speed cameras.

Also I live in Redcliffe Square which is a rat run from Chelsea to the Cromwell Road. It is really dangerous and we have no 20 mph signs or speed bumps.

Further Follow Up

I really appreciate your email

I have lived in Redcliffe Square since 1990 and have been appalled by the lack of speed enforcement on the red routes passing through or near the Square.

I have been pursuing local Mps as far back as Michael Portillo to get some speed cameras on these roads which are so dangerous and unpleasant for both pedestrians and cyclists.

On weekends vehicles and motor cycles literally race down Redcliffe Gardens at speeds near 60 mph.

The new signs would be better placed if they were on the side of those roads where speeding is commonplace.

	<p>Redcliffe Square is a rat run from the Fulham Road across to Finborough Road or the Cromwell Road for commuters leaving town. We have neither speed bumps nor raised crossings. I live in sheltered accommodation where there are alot of pensioners . Across the road there is a church and a school whilst the traffic hurtles by exceeding the 30 mph limit.</p> <p>In 30 years of residence I have only once seen the police using g a speed gun on Redcliffe Gardens. Motorists know that they are unlikely o get ticketed and carry on regardless.</p> <p>I will email TFL as you suggest. I would recommend that all buses are fitted with 30 mph speed limiter mechanisms.</p> <p>I look forward to seeing 20 mph limits on all our streets with full camera enforcement. This will surely make our roads roads safer and less polluted.</p> <p>In hindsight I think it was a mistake to abolish the WEZ and the sooner all diesel vehicles are banned from RBKC the better.</p> <p><u>Related Follow Up</u></p> <p>This is excellent and I look forward to installment and enforcement of these new limits.</p> <p>It would also be helpful if the 20 mph limit on the Earl's Court Road was properly enforced as motorists generally ignore the limit. Many of these motorists have driven along the M4 and into London. There are speed cameras located regularly from Heathrow to Earl's Court but none on the Earl's Court Road or Redcliffe Gardens where motorists feel free to drive as fast as they can since they know there is o enforcement or speed cameras.</p> <p>Please can we have speed cameras on the Earls Court Road and also get TFL to be responsible and only allow the operation of red routes with full speed control diligence</p>
<p>Supporter 20</p>	<p>We are writing to you to express our concern about a traffic sign that was recently installed in front of the entrance to our home at XX Stanhope Gardens.</p> <p>The additional, new signpost in front of xx Stanhope Gardens undermines the RBKC-wide 20mph speed limit, does not comply with the RBKC's Streetscape policies, and attracts rubbish on the pavement.</p> <p>We request the Council to remove the 30mph sign and post.</p>

<p>Supporter 21</p>	<p>We are writing to you to express our concern about a traffic sign that was recently installed in front of the entrance to our home at XX Stanhope Gardens. The additional, new signpost in front of xx Stanhope Gardens undermines the RBKC-wide 20mph speed limit, does not comply with the RBKC's Streetscape policies, and attracts rubbish on the pavement.</p> <p>We request the Council to remove the 30mph sign and post.</p>
<p>Supporter 22</p>	<p>Recently we had the local roads painted with 20mph restriction notices. Very good news except that I struggle to find one car obeying the speed limit.</p> <p>I sat on the bench on the corner of Franklin's Row and Cheltenham Terrace at mid day today. Not one car obeyed the speed restriction, in fact without exception they all accelerated into Cheltenham Terrace. May I suggest that you put a speed camera on Cheltenham Terrace. I can tell you that the National debt will be repaid within a year.</p> <p><u>Respondent Follow-Up</u></p> <p>I am interested in the fact that you feel that cars are travelling more slowly as a result of the 20mph markings. As someone who walks the area every day I have not seen a marked difference and I am amazed there are not more pedestrian casualties. If speed cameras and fines are a matter for the Police and not the local council, I feel sure that the Home Office would listen to your advice, if you were to suggest a camera on Cheltenham Terrace. The cameras on Royal Hospital Rd showing the speed at which cars are travelling have made a difference but only for the short stretch on which the cameras are situated.</p> <p>Could I suggest that on a nice sunny day you excuse yourself from the office and spend half an hour on the bench at the bottom of Cheltenham Terrace watching the traffic flow, perhaps you could suggest that one of our local policemen join you. The fact that we never see a Policeman in this area is possibly the reason we have cars speeding through.</p> <p>It is very good news that you are monitoring the situation, as you say these are not normal times.</p>
<p>Supporter 23</p>	<p>I support the 20mph borough wide speed limit and would like to congratulate you on this important initiative.</p> <p>In this context I would like to bring to your attention that the road on Cadogan Square leading south from B319 to Cadogan Gate of which I am a resident is often used by cars to avoid the traffic on Sloane St. When the road is not busy cars will routinely accelerate and significantly exceed not only the 20mph speed limit but also much higher speed limits.</p>

	<p>I would welcome if you could consider additional traffic calming measures. I was recently visiting a low traffic neighbourhood in Highbury Fields, Islington, and was impressed by the results achieved there. Personally I think the council should consider closing either the north or south entry to Cadogan Sq so that the square, which often has children playing, would no longer be used as a bypass for the main roads.</p>
<p>Supporter 24</p>	<p>I would like to raise a complaint over road signage recently painted on the road in Boyne terrace Mews W11 . This morning without consultation with residents large 20MPH road markings were painted in Boyne Terrace Mews and surrounding roads.</p> <p>Whilst I accept and agree with road safety and the application of the signage in surrounding roads because they are busy through roads it's not necessary to apply them to Boyne terrace Mews as it's a cul de sac (short no through road) .</p> <p>The road signage is unsightly and over scale. Indeed you couldn't travel at 20 MPH in Boyne terrace mews without running out of road and crashing into a brick wall.</p> <p>I hope and believe BTM has accidentally been caught up in a larger let's paint all the roads with 20 MPH campaign.</p> <p>I do appreciate the roads are council property and safety is important but there needs to be some proportionality here.</p> <p>Could I respectfully ask someone to review the road signage in Boyne terrace mews and consider removing the out of proportion unsightly white paint markings given it's a no through road and I'm certain there are many no through roads in the borough without same markings.</p> <p>I hope after review you will agree to remove them.</p>
<p>Supporter 25</p>	<p>I would like to say THANK you for implementing the 20 mile an hour speed limit to residential roads in K&C. It has made all the roads start to feel safer, particularly when crossing the roads to the parks and generally when walking or cycling with our kids.</p> <p>Less cars is surely a good thing for all our health and our environment!</p> <p>Next request: more cycle lanes</p>

<p>Supporter 26</p>	<p>So now we have 20mph painted on all side roads, not the prettiest additions. I think for the moment though it has stalled the speed of most cars and vans but not cyclists nor scooters. The mopeds are the worst, mostly delivering in a hurry I would imagine.</p> <p>Many years ago I proposed that yellow line painting would be much reduced (saving cost and being more slightly) if they were painted only where you may park rather than where you may not park. The response was to agree but that worldwide the perception of parking restrictions on yellow lines was just too established at that time to reverse the use. Similarly in due course I hope that the perception might be that one can only drive at 20mph max unless 30 was painted on the road. Saving paint and the post signage would be considerable and the lesser street furniture and decoration would save cash and be less intrusive to our streetscapes.</p>
<p>Supporter 27</p>	<p>I cannot believe that the Kensington High Street cycle lanes are once again the subject of headlines....and that I am writing to you again! I cannot stress enough upon how much the cycle lanes were a nuisance - for pollution levels as well as a day-to-day traffic jams, not to talk of them being an eyesore and making the street look ugly.</p> <p>The new speed limit of 20mph has worked very well (to my mind and to a lot of people that I speak to) in making sure that cyclists and motorists can coexist without anyone getting in the other's way.</p> <p>I just want to reiterate that the high street is much safer, better for everyone ever since the cycle lanes were removed and the old high street restored.</p> <p>I hope that Kensington High Street will continue to look and serve the residents exactly the way it is meant to, without causing air pollution and being a nightmare for other forms of transport too (cars, buses, emergency vehicles).</p>
<p>Supporter 28</p>	<p>I wholeheartedly support the 20 mph limits in the area and would welcome measures to enforce the limits.</p>
<p>Supporter 29</p>	<p>I am writing to comment on the 20mph speed limit. I note the consequential reduction in traffic noise has rendered the area appreciably quieter. I expect, and I appreciate, significant improvements regarding safety and air quality as well. Many thanks for making the borough quieter and safer. I hope you will count me as in favour of the speed limit reduction going forward.</p>
<p>Supporter 30</p>	<p>As a Tite Street resident I am broadly supportive of the 20mph restrictions, predominantly for safety reasons.</p> <p>However, it will not be effective until it is properly enforced. A small but significant minority not only ignore it but appear to revel in blatantly doing so. The stretch on Royal Hospital Road west of London Gate has become a</p>

	<p>particularly popular race way, as has Ormonde Gate northbound towards Smith Street. Could something be done to monitor this?</p> <p>The SPEED CHECK indicator on Royal Hospital Road also sadly appears to be broken?</p>
Supporter 31	<p>Impose it and , above all, enforce it...</p>
Supporter 32	<p>Hi. Just to let you know that the TfL London digital speed map now shows the whole of K&C as having 20mph speed limits.</p> <p>content.tfl.gov.uk/london-digital-speed-limit-map.pdf</p> <p>Thanks so much for all your work on this.</p>
Supporter 33	<p>Trialling a 20mph speed limit would help decrease carbon emissions and reduce the number of people using their cars.</p> <p>However, this has to be accompanied by improved ELECTRIFIED public transport (clean buses, clean tubes) Otherwise, it defies the purpose.</p> <p>Please remove all diesel-buses from the roads.</p>
Supporter 34	<p>I noticed that you had put 20mph limit road markings on the part of Lots Road from the King's Road to Chelsea Harbour, but not between the vehicle pound and Cremorne Road</p> <p>Can you do so please?</p>
Supporter 35	<p>As a resident of Holland Road Kensington I was wondering if speed/ sound cameras could be installed on Holland road, as living there is almost unbearable with the Monaco style races that go on constantly. It would earn the council considerable revenue!</p>
Supporter 36	<p>I have noticed during lockdown there have been brand new signs put up on every corner of Ladbroke Grove and the residential roads extending from it, as well as very visible floor signs stating the speed limit is at 20mph. I thought great, what a fantastic way to remind people that this is still a residential area, with schools and families.</p> <p>Most houses on both Oxford and Cambridge Gardens, council or private, are all listed buildings and so like many others my council flat windows are not double glazed.</p>

	<p>It's easy to hear, for example, at peak market hours a couple speaking normally outside of my bedroom window at 1pm Saturday with the windows closed fully, blinds and curtains drawn.</p> <p>This becomes tolerable after living in the area for over a quarter of a decade, you get used to it. Though, it's important to give context to why the rest of this email has been sent.</p> <p>I live just off the very busy hustle and bustle of portobello road, I have grown up in and around this area my whole life and the vehicle noise due to the popularity of the area has naturally increased.</p> <p>As a point of reference, since the tarmac has been re-laid on both Cambridge and Oxford gardens, I am woken up every other evening at 11pm into the hours of the early morning with motorbikes and cars speeding up and down the road.</p> <p>The signs and markings are not sufficient. Would it be possible to place speed cameras or something drivers will be more concerned about as most drivers past the hours of 10pm seem to not care about the visible signs.</p>
Supporter 37	<p>We live in W8 and the residents would desperately like to slow down motorists who are driving down Lexham Gardens travelling east from Marloes Road. This section of Lexham Gardens appears to offer a short cut from Marloes onto Cromwell Rd - a way of avoiding traffic lights.</p> <p>There are no 20mph signs or speedbumps and we suffer from motorists racing down Lexham Garden at very high speeds. There are residents, many children and hotels on this stretch of Lexham Gardens, as well as a Santander city bikes docking station.</p> <p>We have signatures of many of our neighbours and video footage demonstrating the pace at which motorists drive down Lexham Gardens which we are happy to provide to you. This is a health and safety as well as a noise issue.</p>
Supporter 38	<p>As a resident And parent in RBKC, I support the 20mph limit and would encourage the borough to add speed camera to have it being strictly followed by all residents. It will in the long term make our streets safer.</p>
Supporter 39	<p>I'm writing to voice my support for this restriction as a resident and cyclist / pedestrian. The limited speeds make everyone's experience in the borough safer and quieter. Given the frequent congestion anyways, drivers speeding up and slowing down is not environmentally friendly or noise friendly for residents, so the reduced speed is welcome. As a cyclist, drivers are (hopefully) less likely to perform dangerous road manoeuvres when they're not able to go faster than 20 mph, which is about my top speed as well.</p>

<p>Supporter 40</p>	<p>I live on St Anns villas and have young children at home. I very much welcome the introduction of the 20mph speed limit in the area. However, at least by St Anns Villas, based on my observation there's a high percentage of cars and motorbikes that simply disregard the speed limit. I think increase in speed cameras, speed bumps and ultimately issuance of fines for violation of the speed limit is probably as important as having the speed limit itself.</p>
<p>Supporter 41</p>	<p>The 20 miles per hours pilot scheme is a very productive initiative, which could be very beneficial to all if it was enforced properly. The signs are up. However, there is no monitoring and evaluation to monitor the effectiveness of its implementation. Motorist do not follow the 20 miles per hour rules because there is no sanction if they break the rules.</p> <p>'Ward Councillors met the '20s Plenty for Us' campaigners in 2013, soon after there had been a fatal accident in St Helen's Gardens. She worked with St Helen's ward Councillors since 2014 on road safety, demanding with a petition to Council a pilot scheme for the area that has so many primary schools and nurseries. In 2015 the Council undertook a speed survey. The results were shocking, with more than half of car drivers travelling at over the speed limit, and the top speed recorded was 130mph.</p> <p>St Helen's finally got its pilot scheme, and the Labour Group continued to lobby for 20mph speed limit on Council-managed roads, especially when neighbouring Councils of Hammersmith and Fulham, Westminster and Brent had all adopted this limit.</p> <p>We were hugely relieved when RBKC finally adopted the 20mph limit in ??????. While many drivers are more than happy to drive within the limit, some continue to beep, rev or overtake drivers obeying the rule. In St Helen's Ward, sad to say, we are still subjected to the noise and dangers of drivers breaking the speed limit - mostly at night, but also during the day. Some are clearly frustrated but decide to flout the rules, driving at high speed with impunity.</p> <p>Without any kind of enforcement or system of fines, the speed limit will not work. A gentle 'nudge' will only work for those who are careful drivers anyway. We ask for draconian enforcement, at least for a period; without this, the roads continue to be a genuine danger to our children and elders who cannot cross the street in safety.</p>
<p>Supporter 42</p>	<p>I'm writing to bring your attention to the current road marking disrepair, lack of signs in Warwick Road SW5 (from Old Brampton road to Cromwell Road). I'm a concerned resident, father and husband to a young family that has been living in Nevern Mansion for the last 14 Years.</p>

	<p>Warwick road is a hazard, extremely busy at all time, impossible to cross, with poor road marking and speed limit signage which currently stands at 30mph in most SatNav providers and not defined by signage on the road.</p> <p>As you can see in the picture below, is not a stock picture downloaded from the internet, it was taken recently outside Earls court tube station exit from the Warwick road side. Another fatal collision ! I wonder how many more lives needs to be lost before the introduction of (lower speed limits "20mph" and more pedestrian crossing? Furthermore, there is no cycling lane, the road is quite wide and poorly light for cyclists. We have a few nurseries, schools and hostels in the area and the road is extremely challenging to cross !</p> <p>Please, I urge you to take urgent action and something about the health and safety of the local residents !</p>
Supporter 43	<p>Why are these limits not enforced properly by camera .</p> <p>The Earl's Court is still a racetrack and there are no 30 mph signs or speed cameras on the red routes where traffic speeds often exceed 50 mph.</p> <p>Redcliffe Gardens, Finboro Road and Warwick Road all need to have 30 mph signs which have recently been placed on side streets just before one turns on to these roads. That was a really stupid decision not to place the signs on the red routes.</p> <p>Speed cameras should surely be mandatory on all red routes???</p> <p>I live in Redcliffe Square which is a rat run from Chelsea to the Cromwell Road.We have no 20mph signs and no speed bumps which we desperately need.</p>
Supporter 44	<p>Thank you for your time in replying. I understand it is impossible to reply to everyone, and thank you for the excellent news personally and for all residents and visitors to RBKC that a 20 mph limit will be implemented. I definitely think it a very worthy cause.</p>
Supporter 45	<p>Thank you for the good news. Please also thank Cllr Thalassites and his/her colleagues for their sterling work. If it's any comfort to them, they will have ,collectively, made two of the Borough's residents very happy.</p>
Supporter 46	<p>That's good news</p>
Supporter 47	<p>As a RBKC resident and driver I applaud this long due initiative. Thank you for making our Borough safer and more enjoyable</p>

Supporter 48	After a 20 year campaign – it is very gratifying to have this at last, especially thanks to you. The team delivering this have been very helpful in making this work
Supporter 49	I am writing to indicate my wholehearted support for the cycle lane on High Street Kensington and the maximum 20 mph speed. This really is a great initiative for the council.
Supporter 50	I was delighted to see the 20mph limit announcement, however, I note that the limit is for Council controlled roads only. I live on Edith Grove, which is a TFL controlled road. Naturally, the traffic is heavy, however there are many occasions where cars race along, particularly between Fulham and Kings Rds, some vehicles accelerate very hard. On many occasions vehicles drive through the red light of the pedestrian crossing metres away from the intersection. Will there be similar speed limits for TFL controlled roads?
Supporter 51	<p>The change to 20 mph across the borough is extremely welcome news. I see the shocking clutter of 20/30mph signs have now been removed which is also extremely welcome.</p> <p>Will Council be enforcing the new speed restrictions and will you be announcing to all residents the change in the speed limit?</p> <p>Thank you for all your hard work to bring this change about.</p>
Supporter 52	Have you any news about the 20mph speed limit for Christchurch Street and Caversham Street ? I wrote a while ago on behalf of the residents association and was told it would be in place hopefully by the end of the year . I have seen plenty of streets in the borough where this has already taken place. With the school and the sheltered housing i really feel it is long overdue
Supporter 53	20 mph in Kensington - After a decade or more of pressing for this, our patience is rewarded. Well done Johnny and Co.
Supporter 54	<p>The VRARA have been lobbying for a 20mph limit for over 20 years, which we see as complementing our 50-year old Low Traffic Neighbourhood and vital to slowing down traffic in our local neighbourhood centre, Gloucester Road North.</p> <p>The introduction over a year ago was well received and I have not heard a single complaint. There could be some further tweaking – additional or relocated roundels to make the information more effective, such as in St Alban's Grove westbound, Stanford Road and in the approaches to Gloucester Road local centre.</p>

	<p>In analysing public response, please could you ensure that VRARA is recorded as being strongly supportive for this initiative.</p> <p><u>Supporter Follow-Up</u></p> <p>I am writing on behalf of the Victoria Road Area Residents' Association, which is coterminous with the De Vere Conservation Area and is a 50-year old low traffic neighbourhood, as a result of a traffic management scheme introduced in 1971.</p> <p>We first requested to become a 20mph area in 1999 and in 2019 achieved a pilot 20mph street - St Alban's Grove. We had speed measurements about 3 years ago for traffic on Victoria Road and St Alban's Grove, which justified the pilot.</p> <p>We are very pleased with the impact of the new 20mph speed limit, and, whilst it is difficult to provide evidence of reduced vehicle speed, the net effect has been to reinforce the benefits of our low traffic neighbourhood by making it more pleasant to walk around the area, as traffic feels less threatening. It has changed the perceived relationship between pedestrians and traffic and thereby changed behaviour.</p> <p>Elsewhere in the borough there are similar benefits, but there are gaps in signage (such as Kensington Park Road) and places where the signs could be more strategically placed (such placing them just before entering Gloucester Road North local centre) to improve the effectiveness of the scheme.</p>
<p>Supporter 55</p>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to respond to your ETO consultation below</p> <p>As a boundary London Borough, the City Council supports the proposed making of the Royal Borough's borough wide 20mph limit permanent</p> <p>Given that the scheme is already on the streets its anticipated that there will be no additional works to speed limit signs at Westminster Highway Network boundaries, but if there are any questions in this respect can my colleague [REDACTED] be contacted.</p>