

Appendix 1b

Thorpe 20mph Traffic Calming Pilot comments received by email or post.

Comments

1.	<p>I have been made aware that this scheme is planned to go ahead despite strong opposition from local residents. I went to the link to fill in the survey but there is no option for no installation.</p> <p>My reasons for opposing this scheme is that, having lived in this area all my life there have been very few major incidents – in fact only one that I can remember. If this scheme goes ahead it will reduce parking for local residents, cause more air pollution due to the stop/start nature of driving that one would have to employ. We already have more vehicles parking in the area due to the high charges to park on the seafront and car parks.</p> <p>Might I suggest that if there is money to spare it could be spent on filling in the many potholes, repainting the road markings and ensuring signage is clearly visible. Also, installing speed cameras and penalising the few motorists who break the rules rather than punishing the majority of people who obey the law with this ill thought out scheme. I feel that installing these humps will just push the problems of the few speeders who flout our laws on to other roads in the area.</p> <p>I hope this is helpful.</p>
2.	<p>Just wanted let you know speeds humps and pillows stop disabled people like me riding on roads because height bikes etc damage and being stuck on them is terribly dangerous</p> <p>I also believe they don't work like in Cambridge council have taking them out</p> <p>I think speed cameras are best in my opinion</p> <p>Photos of me riding roads in Southend</p> <p>On my wheelchair bikes</p>
3.	<p>Please be advised that I am sharing my responses to the traffic calming proposals for Thorpe Ward with yourselves as well as submitting the survey.</p> <p>In summary:</p> <p>I disagree with both 20mph schemes, as there has been no evidence provided to explain what problem you are trying to solve. a pilot is expensive and unjust when budgets should be spent elsewhere in the area. If this happens and fails to achieve anything the council would blame budgeting constraints to not remove the measures - totally against the proposal.</p>
4.	<p>I have already submitted views on the above Scheme and received an acknowledgement. However, I have 'mislaidd' that correspondence in my computer. I would like to make two more points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1. One of the aims of the Scheme is to encourage cycling. Would having to navigate round speed bumps/tables act as a discouragement? • 2. Imagine living next to a speed bump and having rattling lorries going by and over it - including at night. I do not want one outside my house!
5.	<p>On behalf of all the employees at The Roslin Hotel.</p> <p>I am writing to express my dissatisfaction of the consultation process for the proposed traffic calming measures in Thorpe Ward. Residents were previously assured in Open Council, by Steve Wakefield that the consultation would be open and fair and include an option to 'take no action until further data has been gathered to support any measures'. There is no such option included in the Thorpe Ward survey, as promised.</p>



Under duress, I selected Option B when completing the survey, in the absence of a third option. I would like to stress that I do not agree that any traffic calming measures are required in Thorpe Ward and the funds could be much better utilised elsewhere. Some of my main concerns are:

- Lack of data to support any measures
- No funds available to remove the measures following the pilot
- No funds available to maintain the measures
- No information on how the success of the pilot will be measured
- Many roads within the city are in far greater need of measures
- Proposal for completely unnecessary measures by SBC in the midst of a cost of living crisis
- Lack of collaboration with blue light services
- Lack of consideration for non-physical traffic calming measures
- Lack of consideration on impact on those with disabilities
- Number of local authorities removing such measures as proven these measures do not work

I urge the Council to reconsider these proposals and focus their efforts on supporting projects that can be proven are needed with statistical evidence.

6. I thank the Council for recently giving me the opportunity to comment on their revised proposal for a 20 mph Pilot Scheme in Thorpe Bay, but I find it is very similar to the previous unsatisfactory scheme championed by Cllr Woodley. This subsequently led to a Thorpe Councillor at the last local elections only keeping his seat by one vote after having an 800 plus majority at the previous election in 2018. This demonstrates how unpopular this proposed scheme is to local Thorpe residents and should be a warning shot to any other councillors who support it and are willing to waste taxpayers' money on this unfounded scheme. Remember, if this scheme does eventually get the council's full approval after 12 months, it may give the green light for the council to implement this pilot scheme across all the residential roads within our City.
- This proposed Thorpe pilot scheme only gives the residents' two options, which basically only gives them a 'Hobson's choice'. Thorpe residents should be given a 3rd Option. i.e. 'Status Quo'.
- The council's reasons given for this pilot scheme are:
- The Thorpe area has been chosen for the pilot 20mph speed limit study owing to the street layout, available highway space and 85% speeds (the percentile speed average used to assess vehicle speeds) of the area, and it already has an experimental School Street scheme (implemented under DfT Emergency Active Travel funding):
- My response: The council's own data (85% percentile of average local area speeds in the Thorpe Ward, equates to an average speed of 25.5 mph). This should tell the council that there is not a significant vehicle speeding problem in the Thorpe Ward, so why are they asking in their surveys if residents are concerned about vehicles speeding in this area, when their own data tells them there is not a major problem. If traffic goes much slower in Thorpe, it will come to a stand still.
- Thorpe has already demonstrated that it has one of the most road safety records in all of our City's Wards. Sure, 25.5 mph is only the average speed, and some vehicles will have been slower and others faster. The problem with trying to stop the minority of motorists who exceed our road speed limits is one which our council and other authorities (both local MPs & Police) do not seem keen on tackling, and this appears to be the elephant in the room.
- This only goes to further demonstrate how useless any of these options are when our City does not have a dedicated Police Traffic team to ensure vehicle drivers are compliant with traffic speed limits in our area (Currently, there is no deterrent for drivers who continually disrespect local speed limits).

- ii) The rationale behind the proposals is that lower vehicle speeds are likely to create streets where pedestrian movements are easier, vehicle noise is less prevalent, and the general dominance of traffic is reduced. All of these factors create environments which are more conducive to walking and cycling and lead to an overall improvement in liveabilities of communities.

My response: The government and some local councils' would like their residents to have a false 'good feel' factor, and they think by reducing 30mph speed limits to 20mph limits will result in a cleaner and quieter environment, which will be more conducive to walking and cycling and lead to an overall improvement in liveabilities of communities. How wrong can they be? Remember how central government a few years ago recommended that diesel vehicles emitted less dangerous exhaust emissions (carbon dioxide, nitrogen dioxide, carbon monoxide and other hydrocarbons) than petrol engine vehicles, only to admit later they got it totally wrong.

What we are not being told is that when the majority of combustion engine vehicles slow from 30mph to 20mph, their engine speeds (RPMs) remain at the same or even higher levels because the vehicles need to drop to a lower gear ratio to maintain a steady momentum. For example, if a vehicle is travelling along a road at 20mph, it will emit 50% more dangerous exhaust emissions in the same stretch of road as if it was travelling at 30mph. How can this be more conducive to walkers and cyclist if we are filling their lungs with higher levels of dangerous exhaust emissions? How is this improving our environment if we emit 50% more dangerous exhaust emissions into our atmosphere every time we drive on our local streets at 20mph compared to 30mph?

You do not have to take my word for this, as you can carry out your own experiment by driving your vehicle at a constant 30mph and read your RPM at this speed, then repeat the exercise at 20mph and compare both RPM readings (Please ensure the road terrain is relatively flat and is safe to carry out this experiment). My car when set in the ECO mode runs at 1,250 RPM at a constant 30mph and 1,400 RPM at a constant 20mph (an increase of 150 RPM). This means when my vehicle is driven at 20 mph in a residential street, it will emit 50% more dangerous exhaust emissions into the local atmosphere. Likewise, all other combustion engine vehicles will emit similar amounts of dangerous exhaust emissions when being forced to travel at 20mph compared to 30mph.

iii)The pilot will remain in place for a period of 12 months, after which the council will review data taken before, during and after installation to determine how successful the pilot has been.

My response: It is not clear to me how the council is going to honestly measure if the pilot scheme has been successful or not. i.e. They have not defined what measuring tools they will use to determine how successful, or not, the pilot scheme has been. They refer to the fact that they will review data taken before, during and after, but don't define what this data is.

My Recommendation:

Based on my aforementioned comments, the Chief Executive and his team should immediately stop any further spend of taxpayers money on this unfounded scheme, which has the potential of putting the health of Thorpe's residents at additional risk. i.e. Children and older residents would be put at greater risk of respiratory infections resulting from higher levels of air pollution in their area. In essence, the residents of Thorpe would be being used as guinea-pigs during this pilot scheme.

If you agree with my comments and recommendation regarding this topic, please forward them to as many interested people as possible.

In addition to my previous email, I would like you to consider the following facts which relate to this unfounded pilot scheme.

Hopefully, it is clear to you by now that the government's '20mph is Plenty' recommendations, promoted by Cllr Woodley, are misleading because if implemented, they would have a potential adverse impact on our resident's health/lives. The '20mph is Plenty' road safety campaign mentions the benefits of this scheme, but does not make any reference to the fact that if implemented, it effectively increases the exhaust emissions of combustion engine vehicles by 50%. These additional exhaust emissions will result in higher levels of air pollution, which kill more people each year than those killed in road accidents in the UK. i.e. Department of Transport figures for 2021 were 1,390 road deaths and Public Health England in March 2019 claimed air pollution is the biggest environmental threat to health in the UK, with between 28,000 to 36,000 (average 32,000) deaths a year. This means that within the UK, more deaths are caused by air pollution (mainly caused by dangerous vehicle exhaust emissions) than road accidents, by approximately an average ratio of 19:1. So, why is our council proposing a pilot scheme which will subject its Thorpe Bay residents and visitors to increased levels of harmful air pollution?

What I find even more interesting that this week, Southend Council have launched a new website, which claims to cover everything the council is doing to tackle climate change in Southend-on-Sea, and how residents and businesses can play their part to reduce carbon emissions and help the planet. How controversial is this? Especially, when the council has plans to roll out this pilot air polluting scheme to the majority of residential roads in our City, if they consider the pilot scheme has been a success.

Recently, I have received an email from Simon Anslow CH/SUPT: Head of Operational Policing Command, Essex Police in response to my concerns regarding the inadequate levels of traffic policing within our City's roads. I accept, he has provided me with a comprehensive response of what the Essex traffic police do with their limited resources, and currently they don't have any plans to provide our City with a dedicated traffic police team.

In my opinion, much more could be done to make our City's roads and pavement areas much safer places for pedestrians, cyclist and other road users. Surely, when our own City councillor who is responsible for public safety feels that sometimes the roads of Southend are like the lawless 'Wild West', we should support him by providing funding for adequate policing resources to rectify this unsatisfactory situation. i.e. Instead of our council wasting public taxpayer's money on unfounded pilot schemes aimed at reducing speeding motor vehicles, they spent this money on providing a dedicated traffic police team for Southend, which would be self/partly self funding, depending, if the speeding problems in Southend are as bad as Southend council reports.

Once again, I note Cllr Woodley is using the BERA E-Newsletter dated 14th October as a political tool to promote his views on this council's unfounded pilot scheme, which promotes our central government's '20 is plenty' scheme, by making misleading comments like: "The myth about reducing speed increases poor air quality, is just that, a myth. It has been proven that reducing speeds improves air quality". How wrong can he be?

As usual, Cllr Woodley has not backed up his comments with any factual evidence, where I have given you undisputed factual evidence based on how you can do a simple practical demonstration with your own combustion engine vehicle to prove that you are emitting approximately 50% more dangerous exhaust emissions when travelling at a constant 20mph speed compared to 30mph, over the same distance of road. Also, I have

given you referenced facts from government departments which highlight the fact that on average 19 times more people in the UK each year are being killed by poor air quality, compared to road accidents. All these facts can be read in my previous emails below dated, 27th September, 2nd October and 6th October 2022.

The above proposed pilot scheme also totally conflicts with current central government and our council's policies on protecting our planet from increased levels of harmful air pollution.

In one respect, I should be grateful to Cllr Woodley for drawing to my attention, his intension to implement this flawed '20 is plenty' scheme in my local area, because it has allowed me to scrutinize the scheme and highlight its potential serious harmful impact it would have on our local resident's lives if implemented and is having on those residents lives across the UK where this scheme is already being implemented. This flawed scheme is as significant as the previous central government's policy to reduce harmful air pollution by promoting diesel engine vehicles over petrol engines, only for them to later agree that they got it totally wrong.

Conclusion:

The Chief Executive and Cabinet Council members should now take steps to cancel all activities relating to this flawed pilot scheme and inform the government ministers responsible for transport and environment what corrective action they intend to take regarding the consequences of their government's flawed '20 is plenty' policy, which is already having a potential harmful impact on the health of those residents lives, where this policy has already been implemented across the UK.

I welcome any constructive comments from any of the addressees to this email. Also, you have my permission to circulate this email to as many people you know who possibly support my concerns.

7. Do you expect us residents in Thorpe Bay to believe that the temporary speed limit trial which would include spending thousands and thousands on signs and humps would be removed at the end of the trial if it doesn't work. That is an insult to our intelligence, after spending all that money you have no intention of removing any of it. We have lived in this area for fifty years and can assure you this is the quietest area in Essex for traffic. This idea comes from Councillor Woodley who we all know has a considerable dislike for cars. When he proposed this nonsense of an idea there was uproar from most residents who considered this totally unnecessary. He went on to insult the residents by referring to us as NIMBYS. Cars travelling at 20mph would have to be in a low gear which would mean more petrol used and more pollution and noise. I spend many an hour walking this area and do not want to be surrounded by pollution which causes cancer and other illnesses. The idea that this quiet area needs ridiculous speed bumps and signs is not acceptable. Perhaps some of this wasted thousands could be used to repair our potholes and crumbling road surfaces and paths.

8. I am extremely unhappy about the proposed traffic calming measures in Thorpe Ward. As regular pedestrians in this area, we do not consider there to be any particular issue with regard to excessive vehicle speeds.
There tends to be a disregard of Give Way signs at junctions.
There is currently no problem to address with regard to pedestrian crossing in this area except in The Broadway shopping area, ie crossing between cars parked on both sides of the road and congestion in the road whilst trying to park.
Vehicle noise would probably be increased by the introduction of speed humps.
The only dominance of traffic in the Thorpe Ward area is in and around The Broadway shopping area.
An area will be less conducive to cycling with speed humps in place.

	<p>Driving along a road whilst negotiating speed humps and parked cars can distract one's eyes from other dangers, such as cyclists, pedestrians and oncoming traffic.</p> <p>Option B - this is far more preferable than Option A as it does not contain speed humps. However, there is an imbalance in the layout of speed tables. For example Fermoy Road is far busier than Johnstone Road and yet has only one speed table compared to the proposal of four in Johnstone Road.</p> <p>Replace all Give Way signs with STOP signs in this area.</p> <p>Any reduction in speed limits will have no effect unless there is policing of these measures.</p>
9.	<p>Thank you for replying so quickly to my initial e mail. I fully accept it is impossible to reply to all respondents, but in a previous unrelated consultation the aggregated responses recorded by the council failed to include other options I had put forward, and most critically, a question on the legality. Consequently I am not personally minded to invest too much time in future consultations.</p> <p>I would therefore be grateful if you would accept this as my response to your consultation on this pilot.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Area of Pilot. Part of Station Road is included with 4 tables. As this is a major thoroughfare with bus routes, I propose there are no calming measures and this is designated 30 mph. All roads off would still lead to 20 Mph zones. 2. Option A. I do not support. I would have little support for physical calming measures other than access and ingress to the designated zones. Stop start with increase and decrease in speed have been found to add to pollution and more erratic driving 3. I would be more in favour of Option B. However, it does not include include electronic LED reminders of the speed limit. I consider these should be at the foundation of any solution and are a very effective ongoing visual reminder you are close to or exceeding 20 mph particularly at night or during bad light. 4. Enforcement. The favoured option should actively consider ongoing enforcement as a deterrent. Studies have found this to be very effective when added to other calming measures. 5. Measures of success/data. At the outset the Council should be explicit on all the specific measures to be used for this pilot. For example air quality measured at fixed areas before and during the pilot. Measures to capture the average speed of vehicles before and after etc. This provides a consistent visible audit trail. <p>I hope this is a helpful contribution to the consultation.</p>
10.	<p>We will be completing the on line consultation process, but are concerned that our views, which are that no scheme should be introduced in the Thorpe Bay area, will not be taken into account as the consultation does not provide a third option for 'no scheme' to be implemented, which we understood was going to be included as an option.</p> <p>Therefore we have provided additional information by way of an email to the City Councillors and, also a separate email to the three local Ward Councillors in Thorpe.</p> <p>I have enclosed a copy of the emails for you, expressing our views and concerns.</p> <p>Please would you be able to confirm that our views will be included within the final consultation report.</p>
11.	<p>I live in Marcus Avenue and walk and drive these roads every day. I have seen nothing which leads me to believe that either of these schemes is necessary.</p> <p>What would be helpful would be the repainting of badly worn road marking and replacing of faded signs. These both give the air of uncaring and neglect which do not lead motorists to respect the area. Please address this issue urgently.</p> <p>I do not see speeding, but only residents, learner drivers and delivery vans. Rarely has there been any driving which has caused me concern.</p> <p>I am concerned however about the introduction of speed bumps.</p>

	<p>I now cannot drive along Thorpe Bay Gardens due to the pain caused to my back – an on-going problem, further speed bumps would hamper me further and restrict my movements.</p> <p>Residents in Burges Road have told me that the introduction of these bumps have moved the problem of noisy teenager drivers to their road. The bumps have not really addressed the problem in Thorpe Bay Gardens, merely moved it.</p> <p>Sometimes the hedges obstruct visibility at junctions and should be kept in check.</p> <p>Please seriously consider the option 'none of the above' as I believe was promised. £400,000 could be well spent in other areas of the city and on other projects. These schemes would be a complete waste of money.</p>
12.	<p>As a resident of St James Avenue, Thorpe Bay. I am totally opposed to both Scheme A and Scheme B. What has happened to the "None of the above Option" which we as residents were promised by the Council?</p>
13.	<p>We are resident in Wyatts Drive and are fed up with both commercial vehicles and private cars exceeding the current 30 mph limit.</p> <p>We have witnessed many incidents where near misses involving both vehicles and pedestrians have occurred.</p> <p>This road is used by many people including children going to and from a nearby school. Let's not wait until there is a fatality, reduce the limit to 20 mph now.</p>
14.	<p>Please make these roads safer by restricting speed to 20 mph.</p>
15.	<p>My wife and I support the proposed 20 mph speed restrictions in Thorpe Bay. We'd support appropriate signage on lampposts. Or another form of restriction, of your choosing.</p>
16.	<p>Please note that I have completed the online form, selecting option B which is the least invasive and has the minimum of structural changes.</p> <p>I have lived in Elm Grove for over 40 years and the pilot scheme does not address the actual speeding issues.</p> <p>I would have preferred an option C which said no to any pilot until backed up by genuine evidence and not anecdotal ones from Ron Woodley.</p> <p>Please deal with Thorpe Hall Ave, Maplin Way, Burges road and woodgrange drive.</p>
17.	<p>As a resident in the area of the proposed speed humps I have not been given the option to state my views on this matter which will be of a significant importance to this area. My only option being Scheme A (Speed Humps) or Scheme B (Speed Humps) it does not include None of the Above as promised to residents.</p>
18.	<p>Am distraught at the ongoing proposal for speed bump's, we thought that had been stopped!!</p> <p>We are not opposed to 20mph limits and possibly bump's at major junctions but to plaster them all over Thorpe Bay and the town is a nonsense and total waste of money. We have lived in St James Avenue for approx 18 months and have never seen anyone speeding down there. There is an abundance of learner drivers up and down but not speeding.</p> <p>Certainly the road signs can do with cleaning and quiet happy for more signs to go up. For the enormous cost of speed bumps will the council really take them out in a year and make good the roads if they are not necessary?? I don't think so.</p> <p>If the council are so desperate to spend money why don't they repair pavements and roads? ***** is disabled and walk's with a walker, they have to walk in the road because the pavements are not good. Bump's will make it much more difficult for him and emergency services.</p> <p>Please, please stop this nonsense going ahead.</p> <p>Thanking you</p>
19.	<p>I was unable to provide my comments on the proposal as the form does not permit any options other than those listed. My comments are as follows...In don't believe the number of accidents and/or deaths in this area are sufficient to warrant the problems and expense associated with this proposal.</p>

	<p>20MPH is too low and will be ignored. The cost of installing speed bumps, etc will be high and I do not believe that at the end of the trial the council will spend more money to take the constructions away. At 20 mph, people will ignore the limits. I believe that a much more acceptable plan would be to have a 30mph ZONE, with signs at the entrance to all of the main roads of Thorpe, which will avoid the cost of constructions and be better accepted by the users and residents of this area. However, like most times, the council will ignore my comments.</p>
20.	<p>We have received the letter from the council regarding the above consultation. We are writing to express our dissatisfaction with the consultation process for the proposed traffic calming measures in Thorpe Ward (Burges Estate). Residents were previously assured in Open Council, by Steve Wakefield that the consultation would be open and fair and include an option to 'take no action until further data has been gathered to support any measures'. There is no such option included in the Thorpe Ward survey, as promised.</p> <p>Our only option is to select Option B (the option with the least impact) when completing the survey, in the absence of a third, 'take no action' option and register our objections in the free text boxes.</p> <p>We have lived in Tyrone Road for 7 years and are well acquainted with the Burges Estate environment. We would like to stress that in our opinion no traffic calming measures are required in Thorpe Ward and the funds could be much better utilised elsewhere. For example in repairing the uneven paving slabs on our pavements. The consultation talks about reducing traffic speed to create a safer and more vibrant community. This is ridiculous because traffic on the Burges Estate is so minimal and unable to speed that we already have a safe environment for residents and visitors to walk, cycle and drive vehicles. Some of our other concerns are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NO data to support any measures • NO funds available to remove the measures following the pilot • NO funds available to maintain the measures • NO information on how the success of the pilot will be measured • Many roads within the city are in far greater need of measures • Proposal is for completely unnecessary measures by SBC, in the midst of a cost of living crisis • NO collaboration with blue light services • NO consideration for non physical traffic calming measures <p>There are a number of local authorities removing such measures after pilots have proven such measures do not work</p> <p>I urge the Council to reconsider these proposals and focus their efforts on supporting projects that can be justified, provide value for money and are of benefit to residents, by the use of compelling statistical evidence.</p>
21.	<p>I am appalled and dismayed at the thought of having speed bumps all over Thorpe Bay. I live in St James Avenue and have never seen anyone speeding. Surely it is sensible to target the main roads, Maplin Way, Station Road, Thorpe Hall Avenue and Burgess Road. I am not opposed to 20mph sign's but speed bumps are a total waste of time and money.</p> <p>We also know that once that money is spent, if it doesn't work, that the council will take not take them out and make good the roads!!!</p> <p>Surely some sort of common sense must come into play???</p> <p>If the council are so desperate to spend money why don't they fix the pavements and roads.</p>
22.	<p>I recently completed the form about the 'consultation' on the Thorpe Bay Pilot scheme which entails spending a lot of money on unnecessary speed bumps. There was no provision to say if your were against either option proposed. The process is therefore flawed. Could you please revise the form and resend it to get the appropriate feedback.</p>

	Mr Woodley had told me by email on the 30th January 2022 that speed bumps were not part of the proposal.
23.	<p>I received your letter today concerning the proposed pilot for speed bumps on Burges road Thorpe bay.</p> <p>Your letter gives me no easy method of stopping this politically motivated idea.</p> <p>I would therefore like to register a complaint about this proposal.</p> <p>I categorically reject the proposal of having a pilot scheme to instal these road calming measures.</p>
24.	<p>We do hope that the Southend on sea council do listen to the Residents of Thorpe ward, as we don't want the below scheme as it's a complete waste of money and not required.</p> <p>Can you please look into why roads in this area are not being resurfaced as most of the junctions in the area have faded markings that are hard to see when you are in a car (and if you want me to send some examples I will be happy to do this)</p> <p>Thank-you for reading this message</p>
25.	<p>Regarding the speed restrictions in Thorpe Bay I wonder if you could tell me why there is no option C (to do nothing until further data has been gathered).</p> <p>We were meant to be having a consultation regarding any scheme regarding restrictions so surely the first thing to be consulted on should be do we need or want them on some of the quietest roads in the borough(hence an option C).</p> <p>If these roads were so dangerous why do so many driving instructors choose to teach their pupils on these roads when first starting to drive?</p> <p>I am not opposed to a speed restriction (if required)or speed hump restrictions in Greenways where there is a school to make it safer for the children.</p> <p>As for other areas It appears the council have made this decision by themselves and are telling us it is only A or B regardless of what people feel.</p> <p>I fail to see how anyone can justify this project and the money to be spent on it when there are plenty more roads within the borough that need these restrictions.</p>
26	<p>Thank you for your letter and documents related to the above - we have studied the detail.</p> <p>We feel it necessary to write to you regarding these proposed schemes which we find wholly inappropriate, unnecessary and unacceptable for our area in Thorpe Bay. To have these bumps and tables would hem in this lovely established residential suburb making it a castle or prison for entry and exit.</p> <p>Road and pedestrian safety are very important factors that can be brought about by simple cost effective and maintained methods and introduction, none of which have been suggested or proposed by this Council. It appears to prefer having "desk designed" schemes that have not been brought about by current research, science, statistics, monitoring or assessment. There is no current or past evidence or proof that these such drastic measures are necessary here in Thorpe Bay. The funding available would be put to better use in the areas that have been proven to require such greater needs.</p> <p>At the Council and Cabinet Meeting held earlier this year, we as residents, over 100 attended, had the opportunity to voice our views to stop the then proposed schemes published through BERA. Our questions, feelings and opinions were not fully answered or replied to at the time or since - just side stepped, but it was agreed by the Council that a full public consultation would take place which we thought would involve all of the proposals put forward. This included the option to not pursue costly and disruptive Civil Engineering works but to improve and reinstate the worn and faded road markings, better renewed road safety signage, improved lighting and upkeep of the uneven and trip hazard paved footpaths.</p> <p>Where is this Option?</p> <p>We would suggest to you and the Council, in a positive and constructive way forward, that rather than attempt to force one of these two published options on us as residents, in an undemocratic manner, that small Working Party from the two Residents</p>

	<p>Associations (BERA and Thorpe Bay Residents Association) together with a couple of experienced and qualified road safety and estate management experts plus Councillors who actually live in this area, if there are any, "walk and monitor the area" to ascertain what could or is needed to be achieved to improve the road and pedestrian safety in a cost effective and least disruptive manner before any such work is undertaken or agreed by whomever.</p> <p>We hope you find our views useful and will take them forward.</p>
27	<p>I have already submitted my opinion on this. Option B is probably the best. But there have been a few recent collisions with vehicles unable to see the give way sign where Burges Road crosses Thorpe Hall Avenue.</p> <p>There is excessive speed from traffic leaving the seafront and heading North when the traffic sees an upcoming dual carriageway ahead, the traffic accelerates under the mistaken impression there is a higher speed limit in the dual carriageway. This is disastrous for vehicles crossing Thorpe Hall Avenue at Burges Road.</p> <p>The Scheme doesn't include the possibility of a speed camera to catch vehicles turning off the seafront heading North, after the zebra crossing, and before the dual carriageway in Thorpe Hall Avenue. Having witnessed collisions at the junction Burges Road and Thorpe Hall Avenue, to me, a CAMERA would be the most important part of a pilot scheme with an objective for safety.</p>
28	<p>I have tried to respond via the various web addresses in your letter and they either do not exist and the one I managed to complete went to the Outbox in garbled script. However this is hardly a survey as there is no option to oppose the scheme entirely! Where is your scientific evidence that cars travelling as 20mph make less noise and pollute less than cars travelling at their engine optimum speed of 30mph. It is absolute nonsense</p> <p>And cars slowing down and speeding up continually will clearly make more noise and pollute far more. Therefore your premise for any restriction is bogus in its conception and should be cancelled immediately before it goes any further.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide the evidence of the cyclists being in danger – there are very few. • Provide the evidence of pedestrians being in danger – there are few in Thorpe ward. • Provide the evidence that cars speed in the Ward, apart from Burges Road – the cars in most roads are learner drivers <p>Furthermore we all know that pilot schemes of twelve months never get removed by this council and the money would be better spent dealing with the appalling road surfaces in every road in Thorpe ward.</p> <p>I will try again to complete the consultation form and return it, but I am TOTALLY OPPOSED to the scheme in its entirety.</p>
29	<p>The idea of having Consultations is great and allows the residents to share their views with the Council, whatever their opinion, but they must be allowed to travel in the direction of their choice.</p> <p>As a Residents Association we often post details of these consultations on our Facebook page, where we have access to over 8,100 members and if we think their view would be relevant to Shoebury or the City of Southend, so we share this information, as we do with other Police, NHS, Council or Covid information..</p> <p>However, we are finding the way the Consultation is presented and the actions taken by the Council afterwards, gives our members the impression this is just a "tick the box" exercise, to comply with government rules?</p> <p>As an example, when you submitted details about having a dog beach in the City for the whole year, residents throughout Southend were given the opportunity to give their preferred choices. In a way the result was sensible, spreading the load to Thorpe Bay, Chalkwell & Leigh. However, the Cabinet members decided to ignore their residents' choice & the consultation process (at great expense), to select East Beach & Two Tree Island, which really annoyed our members. After we told the Cabinet that</p>

	<p>Two Tree Island has no beaches and certainly was not safe to use, East Beach was singled out.</p> <p>Now we have a consultation for Thorpe Bay and a reduction in speed limits. We gave the link to our members, thinking it would allow them choices with "open questions". Once again, we had a deluge of complaints when they were told they could only approve one of two schemes, with no option to reject. Residents gave us sensible objections, saying many roads in our City are already listed as being the most dangerous, needing urgent speed reductions to not only reduce accidents, but to possibly save lives.</p> <p>How can we answer their questions when you drive through all the straight roads in Thorpe Bay with little evidence of speeding. In Shoebury we have had two fatal accidents in Ness Road, but this was not related to speed, so where is the evidence to support a "one side fixes all" approach?</p> <p>We feel your consultation process needs an urgent overhaul to include "open questions" and the facility to share residents' views in a transparent way or alternatively close it down.</p>
30	<p>I write with regard to your proposals for the 20 MPH speed restrictions in Thorpe bay. Despite being signed off by our three ward councillors you have sent out a consultation document without the option " None of the above" which we , the residents of the area were promised ! I conclude from this that this consultation is a complete sham !</p> <p>I cannot believe Southend Council is even considering this scheme at all. The council is already overspent again this year, with still 6 months to go. The existing roads around Thorpe bay are a disgrace with potholes, patchwork areas, poor signage etc. Your schemes add no value at all to motorists and yet it is the motorists that pay for the streets through their vehicle tax. As for reducing air pollution I was involved with two schemes with speed humps in Thurrock, both of which actually increased pollution as cars brake then accelerate as they pass over the humps or tables. Mind you the youngsters certainly used to enjoy roaring over them trying to get "lift off " in their vehicles ! With the increase in electric cars there will be a reduction in air pollution anyway.</p> <p>In addition I'd like to know how much these proposals are going to cost. The thought that this is a pilot for 12 months and could then be removed sounds like we could be wasting a whole load more money.</p> <p>Please put my wife, son and I down for a most definite " None of the above " option for this consultation.</p>
31	<p>I apologise in advance for emailing you regarding the Thorpe Ward Traffic Calming Pilot Consultation, I am sure mine is not the first email that you have received on this subject. I know you are not a councillor for Thorpe Ward but our own Councillors Woodley, Stafford and Terry have been extremely manipulative throughout the consultation using the "supposed" support from members of the Burges Estate Residents Association BERA (of which Cllr Woodley is Chairman and Cllr Stafford Treasurer) and a fake consultation not sanctioned by the council, to try and push a scheme on residents of Thorpe Ward which I believe the majority do not want. I also believe that there are roads far more in need of safety measures, possibly in your own wards, so what Thorpe Ward Councillors are trying to push through if successful, will ultimately affect us all.</p> <p>I have selected Option B under duress because the council have not provided an option to gather more data following an improvement in road markings and signage.</p> <p>Following the Scrutiny Committee on 22 February 2022, where many residents came to object to this 'pilot' scheme the council agreed in 3.1.2 of their minutes 'That the proposals for the 20mph Neighbourhood in the areas within Thorpe Ward be subject to full consultation with residents before considering whether the scheme SHOULD progress in these areas.' The fact that the Council have not provided an option to say no, the scheme should not progress, is not providing a FULL consultation. It is simply asking would you like speed humps here, or speed humps there and including a comments box where objections to either option will be more difficult to quantify. Residents I have</p>

spoken to have been left confused as to how they should respond if they do not want either option, but do want their voices heard and this is why I have felt the need to write to you.

Most of the data that Cllr Woodley relied on to support this scheme was carried out in 2014 with a small update of some roads in 2020. Both reports showed that there were no significant speed related issues in this area so the data does not support the need for such a scheme.

Furthermore in 2020 when residents of Burges Road raised a petition for speed humps and other traffic calming measures, Councillor Woodley, reported to the council (Meeting minutes dated 2 November 2020) that 'Speed monitoring was carried out and that the results ranked Burges Road as 152 in the list of roads that have been monitored and that in the last three years there have been 4 accidents which does not meet the councils intervention criteria.' He concluded that 'Taking into consideration all of the evidence on file, the safety criteria that is needed to be met, the other roads which have a higher percentage of vehicles exceeding the speed limit and with a greater accident history, it would be an inappropriate use of the council's resources and funds to currently intervene with the matters raised in the petition.'

What further data has been obtained considering one of the busiest roads in Thorpe Ward was not deemed worthy of speed humps by Cllr Woodley two years ago but now all roads within our relatively quiet ward are? The two other busiest roads within Thorpe, Maplin Way and Thorpe Hall Avenue still have no traffic calming measuring included within either option under the consultation.

From its inception Councillor Woodley, having chosen his own ward for this scheme, has also misrepresented the support of residents. He claimed in his initial paper that 80% of members of BERA were in support of the plans. At the scrutiny meeting in February when questioned how evidence of this support was gathered he said "Over the last 25 years all members are aware that 20mph limit was one of the objectives of BERA and newsletters were sent out to all 1500 members, if they don't read their newsletters that is not a problem of BERA but they were sent out and we didn't get responses and it goes forward on that basis." Yet in February this year 844 residents signed a council e-petition calling on the plans to be abandoned due to lack of evidence.

None of the roads in Thorpe Bay fall into the top 150 dangerous roads in the Southend area. If funding is available for making roads safer, it should be directed to areas of Southend that really need it. Councillor Woodley has already admitted that the scheme was vastly over budget and that there were no funds to remove any of the physical measures installed should the scheme not be a success. Perhaps as he has no data to show it is justified in the first place, this is not a concern to him, but it should be to other members of the council whose balance sheet is in negative figures.

If this is not enough evidence for council members to stop what is an obvious vanity project for Councillor Woodley, with no supporting evidence that it is necessary and against the wishes of the majority of the residents, then I am afraid any real democracy here is lost. I urge all other councillors to please represent both the residents of Thorpe and their own ward, in pushing for the funding for this scheme to be used in roads that have the statistical evidence that it is necessary and would prevent further accidents.

32	I understand that I can contact you regarding the traffic calming consultation in the Thorpe Bay area. My wife and I fully support "speed humps". They already seem to be very acceptable to the residents of Thorpe Bay Gardens, where they already exist. Likewise in various roads in Leigh. Certainly, I am not seriously inconvenienced by the humps. The police are far too busy to monitor every street. We support you and the Council. Please add our names as among your supporters.
33	I am writing to express my disappointment regarding the Thorpe Ward Traffic Calming Pilot 'Consultation'.

At the Place Scrutiny Committee meeting on 22 February 2022, where many residents came to object to this pilot scheme, the council agreed in 3.1.2 of their minutes 'That the proposals for the 20mph Neighbourhood in the areas within Thorpe Ward be subject to FULL consultation with residents before considering whether the scheme SHOULD progress in these areas.'

Councillor Woodley then tried to muddy the waters with his fake consultation, and now residents have been presented with an incomplete consultation without an option (C) to vote against plans A or B until further data has been gathered to support the implementation of such measures.

This is totally unacceptable as many residents have been left confused as to how they should respond if they do not agree with either option. Given the previous behaviour of the local ward councillors, many feel that merely submitting a comment will mean their view is ignored and a plan is forced through against the will of the residents.

There is no data to support the installation of either scheme A or B. In fact, none of the roads in Thorpe Bay fall into the top 150 most dangerous roads in the Southend area. If funding is available for making roads safer, there are many roads in the borough where money should be spent, and schemes installed, before Thorpe Ward is even considered. Whilst I am happy to admit there are some speeding and antisocial driving issues locally, neither scheme offers a remedy to these issues.

Burges Road, Thorpe Hall Avenue and Maplin Way all suffer from these issues but neither plan will address this in a satisfactory manner. Thorpe Hall Avenue and Maplin Way are completely excluded from any plans.

If we consider the need for action in Burges Road, we are granted absolute proof that these schemes cannot be justified.

Burges Road is one of the few roads in the ward where any data has been collected.

As recently as November 2020 a report was presented to the council in response to a residents' petition requesting speed calming measures in Burges Road.

The findings of the council were as follows:

'Speed monitoring was carried out and the results ranked Burges Road as 152 in the list of roads that have been monitored and that in the last three years there have been 4 accidents which does not meet the councils intervention criteria. Taking into consideration all of the evidence on file, the safety criteria that is needed to be met, the other roads which have a higher percentage of vehicles exceeding the speed limit and with a greater accident history, it would be an inappropriate use of the council's resources and funds to currently intervene with the matters raised in the petition.'

Burges Road is a busy road and does have issues with speeding and antisocial drivers and yet, in their own words, it does not meet the criteria for council intervention and appropriate use of councils resources and funds. The inner roads on the estate are extremely quiet and are frequently used by local driving schools who can often be seen practising manoeuvres without any impact on traffic due to the quiet and calm nature of the roads.

I respectfully request that all councillors and council officers fight for the residents of Thorpe Ward and the wards they themselves represent by ensuring that any available tax payers money is spent only in areas where it is needed and justified.

The Nolan principles require councillors to display Objectivity, Selflessness, Integrity, Openness, Accountability, Honesty and Leadership. These principles have clearly been ignored by Councillor Woodley and to allow him to force through this project would mean that the council as a whole has endorsed such behaviour. It would be totally immoral and a dereliction of duty to ignore roads in the borough with proven statistical needs for such measures while spending a huge amount of tax payers money on an unnecessary project in Thorpe Ward against the will of the residents.

34	I had understood that the public consultation would have included a 'not wanted' option. I was unaware that the decision had been made to introduce the scheme and that it was just the type of scheme that was to be reviewed.
----	---

	<p>I would like to record here that I am not in favour of the introduction of any 20 mph restriction . Additionally I consider the significant cost of implementing the proposed scheme is disproportionate to any advantage and that such monies could be far better utilised elsewhere in the Borough</p> <p>I am a resident of Thorpe Bay , living in Elm Grove</p>
35	<p>I guess you have been inundated with emails from those in the Burges estate and I apologise for sending another email.</p> <p>Most residents in the area with proposed traffic calming on the Burges Estate are horrified at the absolute waste of money in these dire times, in an area where speeding is not an issue. Where is the data to say that our roads are where speeding occurs hence needing traffic calming measures? Why haven't we been given the option to request ."Please do nothing ?" Obviously our street signs could do with attention as in most of the City.. Stop signs could be made more visible. White lines painted more clearly.. I dare say we're going to be told this money is ring fenced for traffic calming purposes, then please spend it in areas where Councillors are pleading for safer roads...if it's not ring fenced then please spend it within social care or in the terrible plight of looked after children in Southend... I do hope all those in control will listen to our pleas.</p>
36	<p>Please note on record that I chose option B under duress. I was not aware that comments which indicated my opposition to either, could be regarded as option C . I am not against road safety but there are many much more dangerous roads which would benefit from this funding. There is no need for a blanket imposition of measures when a targeted approach based on clear reliable information is needed.</p> <p>Mr Woodley clearly has his own personal agenda and refuses to entertain any alternative plans.</p>
37	<p>I write to you as your name appears on the information sheet re the above.</p> <p>As a long time resident of Southend (50+ years, the majority living in the Thorpe Ward) I am saddened by the proposals to introduce a 20 mph speed limit in Thorpe.</p> <p>I have filled in the consultation paper but it appears that the decision to introduce a 20mph limit has been already made.</p> <p>These speed limits will drive more traffic on to the seafront as cars seek to avoid the 20mph limit with all the added implications for families enjoying Thorpe Bay's amenities. Speed humps will damage cars and the severe speed limits add to driver frustrations again with possible negative implications.</p> <p>And yet, despite the consequences of these draconian limits it still appears many in Thorpe Bay remain unaware of the proposed changes.</p> <p>We all accept that there are some who at times drive at speeds that are unacceptable. I am sure we have all witnessed that. The answer has to be a strict enforcement of the current 30mph limit and yet this alternative is not presented.</p> <p>Please don't let those few in the area who hardly drive restrict the vast majority of law-abiding motorists but introduce speed cameras on Station Road, Burges Road and Thorpe Esplanade at a fraction of the cost.</p> <p>I find it very sad that the decision to impose a 20mph limit has been made and the public consultation is purely to see in which way it should be enforced.</p> <p>I would be very grateful if you could forward this email to the relevant people and I look forward to your response.</p>
38	<p>Option C</p> <p>I have under protest voted for option B. I do not want either option.</p> <p>A further option should have been given and that is none of these proposed works should be undertaken until a thorough assessment of each individual road's needs are studied and evaluated.</p> <p>There is no need for this proposed pilot, there already exists sufficient evidence of such schemes.</p>

	There are roads and junctions in Southend and Thorpe Ward that would benefit from specific tailored measures, a blanket approach as suggested in the 2 options given is not necessary, not required and a waste of taxpayer money.
39	<p>The roads under consideration for the scheme are only judged as the 150th worst roads in the city of Southend. There are roads and streets in much greater need of control.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I consider that there is a lack of data to support any measures • I see no funds available to remove the measures following the pilot • I see no funds available to maintain the measures • There is no information on how the success of the pilot will be measured • Many roads within the city are in far greater need of measures • Proposal for completely unnecessary measures by SBC in the midst of a cost of living crisis • There has been a lack of collaboration with blue light services • There has been no consideration for non physical traffic calming measures • There is a lack of consideration on impact on those with disabilities • There is evidence of a number of local authorities removing such measures as proven these measures do not work. • There are no plans to police the speed restrictions <p>I urge the Council to reconsider these proposals and focus their efforts on supporting projects that can be proven are needed with statistical evidence.</p>
40	<p>I do not agree with a 20mph speed restriction & I do not agree with a 20mph zone however there is no option within this form to “Have my Say”</p> <p>I am very worried that by not choosing either option with advice of Cllr Wakefield that all comments will be fully taken into account, will result in those votes not being counted at all. In which case an independent audit of the votes would be necessary as it remains a small proportion of councillors that seem to have undue influence on proceedings that are in favour of this scheme!</p> <p>The cabinet meeting in Feb this year said a full consultation would take place and this by no means meets that criteria as it requests a choice between a 20mph speed limit or 20mph zone. There is no opportunity for any other choice eg. keeping a 30mph limit & using much cheaper measures such as improved signage & road markings. Or indeed, clearer Give way signs or changing the Give Way priorities along the major routes.</p> <p>The Thorpe area has not been surveyed as requiring any 20mph measures whereas there are other areas within the city who have been identified as requiring action and whose residents and councillors have requested action.</p> <p>It would also appear that if these proposed measures are to be undertaken under an Experimental Order they do not fulfil the precise legal criteria.</p> <p>Please note my complete dissatisfaction with the proposals and with the “pseudo” consultation process.</p>
41	<p>In response to the speeding traffic in most of the roads in and around Thorpe Bay. In my opinion Burges Road needs ‘humps’ or ‘bumps’ as some drivers go really fast down there. It is a wide road with hardly any parked cars to hinder speeding drivers. If bumps could be installed as quickly as they were in Thorpe Bay Gardens that would be amazing and probably unlikely! It is quite a long road. Ideally cameras, but obviously too expensive. Maplin Way is also a very fast road but nothing can probably be done as it is a bus route! The same goes for Acacia Drive/Station Road. I live in Marcus Avenue and even there we get drivers going faster than they should. I’m sure the same applies to Parkanaur, St. Augustines and St. James. Short of painting large circles with 20 in large letters or putting up very large speed limit signs, I’m not sure anything can be done. Without cameras or some form of flashing speed limit signs I’m not sure how any limits can be applied. Be interesting to see how the Council works this out.</p>
42	<p>Please note that even though this email is addressed to you, I understand that some of the items I will be discussing are outside of your remit. I will also add that I believe it was</p>

entirely correct that the Leigh Scheme was separated from the Thorpe Scheme; the Leigh scheme is supported by residents and is there for a particular reason.

EASIER SAVINGS THAN STREET LIGHTS – this was the title of the letter Cllr/Mr/Chairman Woodley wrote to the Echo (Published 17/10/22). He spoke about cost savings in terms of fees and salaries paid to consultants.

So imagine my surprise when I find out that £40,000 has been spent on the Thorpe Bay Bump consultation, especially when no further investigative work about the area has been done. Indeed this would have been better spent on more worthy causes such as keeping lights on, SAVS, additional police workforce, or several other things. Or an additional pedestrian crossing in Eastern Esplanade now that there is a playground?

I will not go into the history of this particular saga – the cabinet was first told the Burges Estate residents wanted it, then the cabinet was told that in 2006 some of us wanted it. Then BERA members were informed via a newsletter (no mention of speed humps, cushions, tables, etc.), only to be told that it was not BERAs fault if no one read the newsletters. Suffice it to say, very few were aware. I know you know of the May consultation that wasn't a consultation and was done without the council's knowledge. A Burges Road Petition was also used as evidence (but this expressly indicated residents did not want speed humps, and the council initially dismissed it as not warranting any further work on Burges Road) Not even in top 150 problematic roads So let's get to where we are and the current proposal.

Option A – speed tables at some junctions, not all – speed humps on most roads

Option B – speed tables at some junctions – different placements to Option A – and additional speed tables in Station Road (not lined up with the junctions – so come over one, turn a corner, and go over a second one) and Burges roads (at least these line up with the junctions)

Then we have the actual consultation process –

No option C was included as previously discussed in the council, i.e. not agreeing with either of the proposals until further investigation has been done. FULL AND FAIR CONSULTATION was what had been promised and assured publicly by both Cllr Terry and Cllr Wakefield. The three ward councillors (Terry, Woodley and Stafford) had the third option removed.

When the mandatory option A/B was removed – the consultation was not updated to say that if people did not want this, then they should leave it blank – I just completed it (19/10/22), which is still the case. Therefore, the consultation is invalid and will produce skewed results as the removal only happened after it was released, and the instructions are incorrect.

Only one side of Maplin way was consulted via the letter drop. Do cars only drive on one side of the road?

None of the residents in Barnstaple Road were consulted either. There is a school there. Where do you think the traffic will go?

The Southend Testing Authority, the blue light services, and the bus services were not consulted. I believe many would have seen the emails from SADIA.

Several other 20mph areas exist, so the scheme is NOT a pilot.

No information on what would be measured during the consultation process and how it would be measured?

More importantly, no data supporting this measure had been included, presumably because it had not been collected since the inadequate data that was used previously. The 85% is misleading, and none of the average speeds (25 to 32 mph) is included.

Now the last point for me is fundamentally crucial – how can you ask residents, your highways department, and councillors to decide on schemes when the information is not there? Surely, this is against our City Council Corporate Governance Guidance. Now at the scrutiny committee meeting in February, several questions were raised by residents

about the scheme. The then Portfolio Holder (Cllr Woodley) refused to answer any of those questions. The questions covered:

- What data was collected to show where the problem areas are?
- What was the cost of the scheme?
- What were the funding requirements of the grant?
- How would the scheme be monitored?
- How would the scheme be managed?
- What were the plans for removing the scheme, including budgets?
- How long would the scheme take to install and remove?
- How does the scheme meet the definition of a pilot?
- What would the impact be on residents during the installation?
- What is the impact on disabled people in the area?
- Why did Cllr Woodley not declare a conflict of interest given that he lived on one of the roads, and further that estate agents' data has proven that house prices are negatively impacted by such schemes, thereby potentially opening up a question of financial impact to him of the scheme? Or is he saying his financial interests belong to Mr Ron Woodley, a local resident? Confusing when BERA, of whom he is the chairman, was used as the primary basis for the scheme and even more confusing when Cllr Mulrone did declare an interest and left the discussion.

There were many more questions, but these were the main ones – that, to this day, are still not answered. The closest we had was an interview with Cllr Woodley with Sonia Watson (BBC Essex radio 22/3/22), that the scheme was £450k over budget at that time. (the now infamous skeleton interview)

I would highlight one thing that others can confirm who attended the meeting on the 14th of October. The number 1 question that came up six times (and these were from BERA members) was, is this consultation going to go the same way as the BERA AGM, where miraculously, additional votes were produced?

My preference would be for the council to focus on the real issues rather than following what appears to be the whims of one councillor. I would have preferred the council to have taken that £40,000 and employed even a single person to walk the entire City to see where the real issues are. How often have residents not complained about potholes, poor pavements, or speeding cars? The first time I met Cllr Hyde was at that same scrutiny meeting where she asked for measures in her ward only to be turned down by Cllr Woodley. I remember Cllr Cowan saying at a meeting that if the Burges Estate did not want it, he could use it in his own ward. So why have they not spoken up about this?

Let us assume for the moment that the Council has an unlimited amount of funds. Does the scheme on the Burges Estate make sense? Will it achieve what it is trying to achieve?

Most accidents occur at junctions (even in Burges Road) due to poor road signage, the sun in drivers' eyes at some junctions, and poor visibility due to vegetation. Surely a more cost-effective method would be first to paint the junctions. Secondly, why has the council not considered changing the yields to a different location (breaking up the long straight roads such as Burges – thereby also eliminating, without removing our beautiful trees, the issue of visibility), as well as changing some of them to stop signs? This would be a much cheaper option than currently proposed without the additional problems that humps bring, such as noise pollution, increased particulate pollution and the ongoing costs of maintaining the humps. We have all seen some of the humps in disrepair in other areas of the City. And on the Broadway, the buildouts there are falling apart. Pedestrians crossing from the Retirement flats to the shops – a pedestrian crossing has been asked for on numerous occasions and always turned down. No provisions have been made for these in Station Road or an additional crossing at the end of Station Road.

Maplin Way and Thorpe Hall Avenue have not been addressed. On top of this, Thorpe Hall Avenue has many potholes and dips in the road. These roads need additional pedestrian crossings.

Bournes Green, has not been addressed either. Bournes Green will become more problematic as more houses are built in that area. I somehow doubt that speed humps in Parkanaur will solve that issue.

Now I have to ask why none of the above has been considered. Why has this been allowed to even get to this point? Why has none of the officers stepped in to say that this proposal is a complete and utter waste of money, a ridiculous idea? Should the Trinity of Woodley now be known as CEO/Council Leader/Councillor/Mr/Chairman Woodley?

What amazes me, even more is the support this appears to be receiving from councillors whose wards are in dire straits, where this money could have been used to make a real difference.

What about the councillors outside of Thorpe Ward?

What will your residents say when they hear that this money could have been spent to solve real issues that currently exist and that the council's highways department had recommended, but the council decides to spend this money on the safest roads in the City to satisfy the pride of one person?

How will you explain to residents that there is no money for SAVs, but money was available for a needless consultation when no additional work was done to justify it?

How will you justify when the costs to install these unnecessary humps are more than the grant? Given current supply chain issues, I would say its' probably likely that it would. But to be fair, I wouldn't know because the costs have not been included in the consultation.

How will you justify the legal costs when this goes through a Judicial Review?

I will be quite blunt here – of the many people I speak to both in and outside the ward, there is a distinct lack of trust at the moment – you saw the reaction to the lights. Do you honestly believe voting for these measures disregarding your own wards, will increase confidence, especially when there is no need and the Southend Licensing moves to Basildon or Chelmsford?

In summary, I'm afraid I have to disagree with both options A and option B. I would like to see a review of the actual issues in the area and, more importantly, for the money to be spent where it is needed. I am more than happy for any councillor to contact me, and we can take a walk around the area to look at the real issues.

43 I am against either Option A or B but believe that no further action should be taken until further statistics have been gathered. Funding should then be allocated to the roads in the city where evidence shows the most need and where these funds would have a greater impact on road safety. I do not believe that funds should be spent on Thorpe Ward where no such case has been made. I would therefore urge the Council to reconsider these proposals and prioritise this funding on the worst performing roads in Southend.

44 I am against either Option A or B but believe that no further action should be taken until further statistics have been gathered. Funding should then be allocated to the roads in the city where evidence shows the most need and where these funds would have a greater impact on road safety. I do not believe that funds should be spent on Thorpe Ward where no such case has been made. I would therefore urge the Council to reconsider these proposals and prioritise this funding on the worst performing roads in Southend.

45	<p>Like fellow residents in the Thorpe Ward we have received the letter from Neil Hoskins regarding the above consultation.</p> <p>I hope by now you have understood the weight of opinion locally that is totally opposed to the installation of a 20 mph zone or limit with other traffic calming measures in our Ward</p>
46	<p>I wish to raise an objection to the “Thorpe- Traffic Calming Pilot Consultation” on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ground 1: The consultation isn’t in accordance with that authorised by Cabinet on February 22nd. According to the meeting minutes, Cabinet resolved to undertake a consultation on “the proposed scheme for a 20mph zone in Thorpe” (Item 3). However, the published consultation is a choice between a 20mph Zone and a 20mph Limit. I can find no formal authorisation for the change in the consultation objectives or that a 20mph limit scheme for Thorpe was ever ‘proposed’ at Cabinet. Are officers ignoring Cabinet resolutions? If the proper authorisations haven’t been given, then the consultation is invalid and could be subject to legal challenge. • Ground 2: The information provided in the consultation is inaccurate and misleading. There is no School Street pilot in Thorpe. The Greenways School ETRO expired in May. The much-touted compatible objectives between the pilot schemes does not exist. This error will materially influence the results of the consultation.
47	<p>Please, please, please stop the madness represented by the proposals to squander £500,000 of taxpayers' money on traffic calming measures in Thorpe ward.</p> <p>I live in St. Augustine's Avenue and know from experience that there is hardly any traffic passing down my street. I also previously lived in Marcus Avenue for 10 years and the same applies there. Indeed, the Burges estate in particular has the least frequented and safest roads in the city and the roads throughout Thorpe ward generally are nowhere near as busy as other roads in the city. The residents of Thorpe ward are vehemently opposed to these proposals not only because the measures will have no impact on road safety but also that it diverts monies that could be better used for the protection of road users and pedestrians in other parts of the city.</p> <p>The roads in this general vicinity that may benefit from some improvements would be; Thorpe Hall Avenue (the road surface is breaking up badly), Maplin Way (some reports of excessive speed) and Bournes Green Chase (congestion at various times of the day). The irony is that none of these roads feature in these proposals.</p> <p>The stated primary objectives of these proposals are to improve air quality, reduce accidents, and encourage more walking and cycling. Can I ask:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • what data has been taken (by each road in the trial) on; speeding frequency, road traffic convictions, road accidents (by type and location), and accidental deaths and injuries that warrant the implementation of either of these proposed schemes? If you cannot provide this information it will be sought through a freedom of information request • has provision been made to repeat the data collection exercise to compare with pre-trial data and over what period will this information be gathered? If you cannot provide this information it will be sought through a freedom of information request • how will data on pre- and post- trial pedestrian and cycling activity be gathered? If you cannot provide this information it will be sought through a freedom of information request • what criteria have been set (for all of the above) to deem any "trial" a success or failure? If you cannot provide this information it will be sought through a freedom of information request

- has budgetary provision been made for the removal of speed bumps should the benchmarks not be met or if, as promised, residents request their removal? If no provision has been made it suggests that this trial is a sham.

I am a member of both BERA (circa 500 members and shrinking) and the TBRA (circa 1000 members and growing). Ron Woodley has used his position as BERA chairman to claim the support of BERA members for these proposals. He presents a gross misrepresentation of the views of BERA members. I will not renew my BERA membership until it ceases to be his personal fiefdom and political mouthpiece.
In closing, take note that these proposals will be opposed by all means at our disposal.

48

I would like to comment further on the consultation on traffic calming in Thorpe Ward.

I have not chosen option A or B because I think both proposals are unsuitable. This 'consultation' is over simplified. The area under discussion does not have any 'unsafe' roads by the council's own standards. This is an area of very low traffic. So much so that it's used extensively by motoring schools.

The consultation asks if we would walk or cycle more. Local people already walk to the local shops. I am not anti 20mph speed limits if they can be proven not to increase air pollution. Reducing the speed in these roads would not change their behaviour. Most cars driving 'east to west' cannot get up to 30mph in the short distance between junctions. Cars driving 'north to south' are perhaps slightly faster but most drive prudently because of the frequent junctions.

I do not see why we should have a 'pilot scheme' when there are plenty of examples of similar schemes in Southend already. It's completely disingenuous to suggest that this is simply a 'pilot'. No parameters have been set to assess the success or failure of the scheme but then the data to support the scheme has not been provided in the first place. How can the success be measured without a base point?

There are no costings for installing the scheme let alone for removing it should the 'pilot' be deemed a failure.

Nowhere has the issue of other wards in the City been discussed. If it has cost, as rumoured, £40,000 to create this consultation may I politely suggest that this is also a waste of money given the depth of feeling already expressed by residents in the area earlier this year.

Some comments on the objectives:

- Compatible objectives of the pilot 20mph Speed Limits or Zones and experimental Schools Streets Initiative
- Reduce average vehicle speeds, thereby creating safer streets and more vibrant communities for those who live, work and visit.
- Do we know what the average vehicle speeds are currently in the roads where it's proposed that these measures are installed?
- Through creating safer streets and more vibrant communities, encourage everyone to use active and sustainable transport options for local journeys in preference to private vehicles.
- Has anyone looked at the number of pedestrian visits to the hub of the community already taking place? I would suggest that be investigated. What are the transport options for residents in the roads directly affected? Bus routes go round the outside of the area in the main. Would the local demographic be safe on bicycles? What is the local demographic
- By reducing private vehicles journeys, and encouraging the right vehicle on the right road, improve congestion and air quality.

- Has it been proven that air quality is improved when cars are driven at 20mph? What is the affect of driving over bumps, the stop/start nature rather than consistent output on a flat road?

I understand that this grant from central government is ring-fenced for road safety but it does not need to be spent in Thorpe Ward. There are aspects of our roads that require attention. Namely Station Road/Acacia Drive, Maplin Way, Burges Road and Thorpe Hall Avenue. On Station Road it would make sense to convert the zebra crossing to a traffic light controlled pelican crossing. It would also make sense to put in another pelican crossing closer to the retirement properties to allow residents to safely cross the road to the post box for example. Both of these would slow traffic on this road. On Maplin Way, Thorpe Hall Avenue and Burges Road, average speed cameras would be a great boon. In Burges estate roads, change the 'give way' signs at junctions to 'stop' signs and ensure that the road markings are maintained and foliage that can obscure vision is removed/kept low. These are low cost options.

One of the questions in this consultation asks about current restrictions. I am one of the people affected by the '11-12 no parking outside my house rule' which was originally brought in to stop commuters parking close to the station. I have asked my local councillor several times over the years to suggest a 'parking permit scheme' that I would gladly pay for that would allow residents to park outside their own homes or to invite a guest to park. Cars parked in the road automatically slow down traffic - it's a simple fact. Of course the restriction is not enforced on tradespeople either which is unfair on residents. The current options for visitors, which in any case are over-subscribed, do not allow for the fact that they might have limited mobility for example.

We have off-road parking for 3 cars and have deliberately retained some garden. I am strongly of the opinion that converting my front garden into a car park, as has been done by many on this estate, is not eco-friendly and contributes directly to problems with localised flooding. One councillor boasted that Thorpe Ward is a good option for electric vehicles since we have so much off-road parking allowing us to charge electric vehicles more easily!

Surely the council can look at this whole situation in a joined up manner rather than rushing to spend a central government grant on an area that doesn't need it simply because the ward councillors shout loudest. There should be a bidding process across the City with each ward putting forward a proposal to deal with traffic problems in their ward. All this should be based on data, not biased perceptions.

There are also issues of conflict of interest with one particular councillor claiming to represent the views of the Burges Estate Residents Association. Some would probably support a 20mph speed limit, particularly in the roads that border the estate but that has been rolled into a scheme that is overkill.

We know too that blue light services, particularly ambulances and fire engines are adversely affected by speed bumps/humps/tables/pillows not just in terms of their ability to arrive quickly but also in terms of the impact on patients in an ambulance and, in the case of the fire service, the effect on the equipment inside the fire engine. Please ensure that these services are consulted. It's not clear that this has been done.

A final thought - it has been touted around by one councillor that the air pollution discussion of 20 vs 30mph is irrelevant since 'everyone will be driving electric cars soon'. Again this is a naïve statement. The fuel that cars use and the emissions from those cars is but one part of their carbon footprint. My understanding is that it takes about 7 years for a current electric car to be more eco-friendly than a petrol/diesel one. This takes into account the manufacturing/disposal processes as well. In addition we are in an energy crisis at the moment which will affect the take-up of electric cars because it will be more expensive to charge them than to fuel a conventional car that is if

	<p>the electricity is even available for charging. This may be a short term phenomenon but will slow down the change to electric vehicles.</p> <p>Please look at the whole picture when considering this soi-disant 'pilot scheme'. It's taking a sledgehammer to crack a nut, a nut that doesn't even need cracking. Please do not waste this money simply to satisfy the vanity/legacy project of one councillor.</p>
49	<p>Many roads within the city are in far greater need of measures including Thorpe hall Avenue, Maplin Way, Burgess Road & Station road</p>
50	<p>Good afternoon everyone,</p> <p>I have just had the chance to read through these and many other comments on the various groups including copies of the emails sent Councillors too. Cllr. Moyies sums it up perfectly but what appears to be baffling most is that those who have dared to answer these emails are still happy for this expensive charade to continue. The Conservatives never forced anyone to have a consultation. The Portfolio Holder could have just easily decided not in the current climate. We have far more important issues than wasting money on yet another pet project. Instead like a marionette he has allowed this complete waste of money to play out to satisfy the whims of one man.</p> <p>Even if the consultation was a resounding victory for Cllr. Woodley and Co. how is it remotely justified compared to all the roads in our city that are crying out for help and assistance?</p> <p>How is it remotely possible to even consider wasting so much money on some of the safest roads in the City regardless?</p> <p>As far as the residents are concerned and especially one particular chap who said "They need to give their heads a good shake and use some common sense." I have to admit Councillors I'm in agreement. Road safety has to be a priority but roads need to be addressed in the correct order. Starting with worst and work systematically through.</p> <p>Cllr. Terry might I suggest that if you find this topic divisive then you only have to look at yourself for allowing this proposal to see the light of day yet again. You yourself have had, according to yourself, arguments with Cllr Woodley over this yet still signed this off. Why?</p> <p>You and the other Ward Councillors have continually ignored the wishes of the majority of residents over this matter. Again we have to ask why?</p> <p>Cllr. Wakefield were you bullied into this charade? I'm struggling to find a credible answer as to why you allowed this situation to even begin, yet alone continue and sign it off.</p> <p>Please don't blame the Conservatives or anyone else, you and you alone are the Portfolio Holder. The butt stops with you.</p> <p>For those of you involved up for re-election next year how do you think this is going to look to your residents? It's not a good look.</p> <p>I for one understand how the Council works even if I am new to the scene. Blaming officers for the poor design and attempted implementation is just preposterous. That may wash with some of the public who have no idea of the nuances of this council. Take responsibility, this is nothing to do with the officers they are merely following your instructions. Using them like pawns is probably one of the reasons why we have the staff shortages we do but that's a matter for another day. Be under no illusion this will be fought all the way to the bitter end. We are not having our Estate ruined by one man's vanity project.</p>
51	<p>I cannot believe I am the only resident in Thorpe Bay who has been unable to access to complete the online survey - I registered as requested but cannot gain access. accordingly please accept this as my comments as a resident</p> <p>Why I ask is there no option to reject outright the proposal. There are issues that need to be addressed but the current proposal has a scatter gun approach and does not</p>

	<p>address the issues specific to each road on the estate. Certainly the issues in no way warrant the level of expenditure proposed particularly at a time when financial restraint is imperative but in any event there are other roads in our city that have much greater need and urgently require action. Any spare funds should be directed to them.</p> <p>i am a member of BERA and despair that there is any suggestion the Association memberships as a whole supports any of the proposals put forward in their present form.</p>
52	<p>I have lived in Thorpe Bay all my life and I am now 95 years old. I do not remember any major accidents or injuries to pedestrians, I think they should just leave things as they are.</p>
53	<p>I have received your letter about the above and I have reviewed the questionnaire . The questionnaire is entirely bogus as it does not include the none of the above options. This is a totally unnecessary scheme which is a waste of the councils money it will include permanent infrastructure in the form of speed bumps which will damage cars. Can you please swap the pilot or at least resend the question. I have an email from Ron Woodley promising that there will be no speed bumps.</p>
54	<p>RE: Proposed 20mph speed limits.</p> <p>Firstly we have no objections to the 20mph speed limit.</p> <p>What we do object to is the speed humps which if the painted road signs were prominent at the road junctions and signs that said STOP instead of 'give way' all these humps would definitely not be necessary.</p> <p>We have lived here for 19 years and speeding has not been a problem, I thought from previous meetings there was going to be a consultation on a road by road basis and we were all going to have a say and to be involved. It looks like the consultation has already taken place and we are now being given an ultimatum on 2 choices that we have not had any input whatsoever.</p> <p>Where is the most popular 3rd choice of having the 20mph without the speed humps ?? .</p> <p>When we had the meeting about this in the Council Chamber on a cold damp evening the 'chair' said he had never had such a big response for a local issue, full and standing room only. As far as I am aware the only person in the Chamber in favour of all these humps was Ron Woodley, Referring to the Southend Echo (Thursday 22nd) it appears we are far from alone in thinking these humps are not necessary and a complete waste of money. If there are one or two area's/junctions that are causing you concern attend to them and not throw humps/tables/cushions all over our estate get the road markings painted. You say vehicle noise will be less prevalent I can _assure you that vehicles going over speed humps will make a lot more noise than going along a flat road, especially lorries and trucks.</p> <p>We live in a very nice quiet residential area and do not want it spoilt by living with all these speed humps. 20mph speed limit is fine but all these speed humps are absolutely ridiculous.</p> <p>We trust all the comments above will be taken into consideration but as everything else has been done in an underhand manner we will have to wait and see.</p>

We received the duplicate letter below from **34** individuals

Re: Thorpe Traffic Calming Proposals

I am writing to express my dissatisfaction of the consultation process for the proposed traffic calming measures in Thorpe Ward. Residents were previously assured in Open Council, by Steve Wakefield that the consultation would be open and fair and include an option to 'take no action until further data has been gathered to support any measures'. There is no such option included in the Thorpe Ward survey, as promised.

Under duress, I selected Option B when completing the survey, in the absence of a third option. I would like to stress that I do not agree that any traffic calming measures are required in Thorpe Ward and the funds could be much better utilised elsewhere. Some of my main concerns are:

- Lack of data to support any measures
- No funds available to remove the measures following the pilot
- No funds available to maintain the measures
- No information on how the success of the pilot will be measured
- Many roads within the city are in far greater need of measures
- Proposal for completely unnecessary measures by SBC in the midst of a cost of living crisis
- Lack of collaboration with blue light services
- Lack of consideration for non physical traffic calming measures
- Lack of consideration on impact on those with disabilities
- Number of local authorities removing such measures as proven these measures do not work

I urge the Council to reconsider these proposals and focus their efforts on supporting projects that can be proven are needed with statistical evidence.