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Worthing 20MPH Consultation

Report by Executive Director of Communities and Public Protection and Director of Communities

Executive Summary

On 4 September 2013, the Worthing County Local Committee (CLC) agreed to progress a town-wide consultation on a proposed Worthing 20 mph speed limit.

The proposal excludes A and B class roads and some local distributor roads and in addition minimises the inclusion of residential streets not conforming to relevant design guidance.

In order to facilitate the consultation a project team was established from existing officers within West Sussex County Council (WSCC). The consultation was conducted using a paper-based voting form distributed to all residential and business addresses within the consultation area.

This report presents the results of the consultation, which was undertaken between the 23rd April and the 31st July 2014.

The consultation findings indicate that in response to the consultation question:

“Do you support the 20mph proposal for residential roads in Worthing?”

- 18,911 individual respondents voted
- 5796 (30.6%) individual respondents voted Yes
- 13,115 (69.4%) individual respondents voted No

Recommendation

That the CLC note the result of the consultation and on the basis of this majority response agree to not progress the proposed introduction of a town-wide 20 mph speed limit in Worthing.
1. **Background and Context**

1.1 A local campaign group had evidenced a level of support within the local community for 20 mph speed limit across Worthing. Through discussions with the community and stakeholders there was evidence of some opposition for such a scheme and an anti-campaign group formed.

1.2 On 4\textsuperscript{th} September 2013, the Worthing CLC agreed to progress a town-wide consultation to determine the level of public support in order to consider whether or not to continue developing a 20 mph scheme for Worthing to a detailed stage for delivery.

2. **Consultation**

2.1 In order to facilitate the consultation a project team was established from existing officers within WSCC.

2.2 Consultation materials were prepared and the pack included:
- introductory letter with a voting response form
- frequently asked questions document
- map showing potential areas of coverage with list of excluded roads
- Freepost response envelope.

Appendix A provides copies of the consultation pack.

2.3 The core element of the consultation, involved direct mailing to all residential and business addresses in Worthing using the Royal Mail database. The consultation began on the 23\textsuperscript{rd} April and concluded on 31\textsuperscript{st} July. Consultation materials were sent to 50,365 unique addresses.

2.4 The voting response form contained space for up to six individual responses. Respondents could indicate their preference by ticking either a box marked ‘Yes’, or a box marked ‘No’. Each respondent was also asked to indicate whether they were under the age of 18. Each form contained a section at the bottom to provide respondents with an opportunity to add any comments they had.

2.5 To prevent consultation packs being mistaken as junk mail the packs all featured a prominent Worthing 20 mph consultation label. A 20 mph email address was also publicised for anyone within the defined consultation area who had either not received or had misplaced their original pack. Around 400 of these additional packs were sent out. The email address also received questions and requests for more information which were answered promptly by the project team.

2.6 Only returns stating a name and full address in the catchment area were considered valid responses for inclusion.

2.7 An online version of the response form was not provided in order to avoid any potential irregularities such as multiple responses from individuals and also any false returns from people outside of the Borough.
2.8 The Worthing 20 mph web page created and hosted by WSCC provided details of the consultation and all relevant information and engagement opportunities. The site received 1398 hits during the consultation.

2.9 On the 9 & 16 May Officers held question and answer sessions within the community at St Pauls Café, Tesco Durrington and at Splashpoint. The venues were chosen as they are considered to have good local footfall.

2.10 On 27 May Worthing Library hosted a public information evening where Members and Officers were available to give a face-to-face overview and answer questions from residents and businesses. A total of 80 people attended. The questions and answers were captured on the WSCC Worthing 20 mph web page.

2.11 Information banners promoting the consultation were placed in all libraries across Worthing.

2.12 The results analysis was undertaken using a GIS mapping system to also enable results to be reported by division.

2.13 The consultations asked “Do you support the 20mph proposal for residential roads in Worthing?”

2.14 Two key result data sets are provided. Appendix B provides a full breakdown of the results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Responses</th>
<th>18,911</th>
<th>Yes 5796 (30.6%)</th>
<th>No 13,115 (69.4%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address Based Responses</td>
<td>11,130 (22.1%)</td>
<td>Yes 3,510 (31.5%)</td>
<td>No 7,471 (67.1%) (1.3 mixed response forms)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.15 The comments provided on the response forms were categorised by a process of coding as part of the analysis process and the criteria for this process is provided in Appendix C.

3. Additional Information

3.1 All state-run Worthing Schools currently have advisory 20 mph zones in place.

4. Resource Implications and Value for Money

4.1 The consultation cost £26k in total to provide the consultation documentation, postage costs and supporting promotional materials. The consultation budget was up to £50k. The inputting and analysis was done within existing officer resources.
5. **Impact of the Proposal**

5.1 **Equality Duty** – The consultation proposal was approved by the County Council Insight Team who provided a Quality Assurance assessment to ensure the consultation was inclusive to its target audience. An infrastructure planning Customer Focus Appraisal (CFA) formed part of the decision making process to proceed with this consultation at the CLC on 4th September 2013. Unless the project was going to progress to a formal consultation as part of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) it is considered an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) is not required at this stage. It is considered the lack of public support for a community-led scheme outweighs any benefits identified under the Equality Act.

5.2 **Crime and Disorder Act Implications** – None identified.

5.3 **Human Rights** – None identified.

5.4 **Social Value** – None identified.

6. **Risk Management Implications**

6.1 The methods used for carrying out the consultation were selected to mitigate against the risks inherent in large-scale consultations. Sending out hard-copy consultation packs by post enabled the consultation to be limited to addresses in the area affected by the scheme. This eliminated the potential for individuals or groups from beyond the area to influence the result and also for false returns from people outside of the Borough. It also avoided the opportunity for multiple responses from individuals within the consultation area.

6.2 The use of GIS software to record returns provided an additional layer of protection by enabling all returns received to be matched to a record of eligible addresses that had been sent forms. This reduced the risk that forms from persons outside the defined consultation area would be received and counted, or alternatively that multiple forms from individual addresses within the consultation area would also be counted. This method also enabled a calculation to be made of the proportion of addresses that responded - an important measure of the validity of the consultation exercise.

**Appendix A** – Contents of consultation pack
**Appendix B** – Full breakdown of results
**Appendix C** – Comments categorisation criteria
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