

Worthing 20 mph Results Report

Overall Response Rate

The consultation area of Worthing Borough included 50,365 unique addresses. In total 11,130 eligible response forms were received, representing an overall response rate of 22.1%

Results by address

This count is for the total number of addresses in the consultation area. This includes both private household and other non-residential addresses. Each address within the consultation area received one consultation form with each form containing space for up to six individual responses. Although this allowed for different responses from an address only a minority of addresses recorded split votes with this number being represented by the 'mixed' category.

Yes 3,510 (31.5%)

No 7,471 (67.1%)

Mixed 149 (1.3%)

Responses by Address

	Addresses	Responses	Response rate	Yes	Yes (%)	No	No (%)	Mixed	Mixed (%)	Total %
Broadwater	6120	1231	20.1	419	34.0	798	64.8	14	1.1	99.9
Cissbury	4627	1370	29.6	416	30.4	929	67.8	25	1.8	100.0
Durrington & Salvington	5743	1349	23.5	343	25.4	984	72.9	22	1.6	99.9
Goring	5020	1377	27.4	385	28.0	973	70.7	19	1.4	100.1
Northbrook	4792	1016	21.2	173	17.0	837	82.4	6	0.6	100.0
Tarring	5792	1386	23.9	410	29.6	957	69.0	19	1.4	100.0
Worthing East	5534	1010	18.3	378	37.4	620	61.4	12	1.2	100.0
Worthing Pier	7106	1004	14.1	465	46.3	524	52.2	15	1.5	100.0
Worthing West	5631	1387	24.6	521	37.6	849	61.2	17	1.2	100.0
Overall	50365	11130	22.1	3510	31.5	7471	67.1	149	1.3	99.9

Key points:

- Just over two-thirds of addresses returned a no vote
- Northbrook had the highest proportion of addresses voting against the scheme with 82.4% of addresses voting no.
- The greatest level of support for 20mph was shown in Worthing Pier where 46.3% of addresses returned a yes vote.

Individual responses

This figure represents the votes of individuals within the survey area. Among the 11,130 eligible forms returned there were 18,911 individual votes cast in the consultation.

Yes 5,796 (30.6%)

No 13,115 (69.4%)

Individual Responses

	Responses	Yes	Yes (%)	No	No (%)	Total %
Broadwater	2066	693	33.5	1373	66.5	100
Cissbury	2554	734	28.7	1820	71.3	100
Durrington & Salvington	2258	557	24.7	1701	75.3	100
Goring	2426	636	26.2	1790	73.8	100
Northbrook	1669	264	15.8	1405	84.2	100
Tarring	2447	728	29.8	1719	70.2	100
Worthing East	1680	613	36.5	1067	63.5	100
Worthing Pier	1453	665	45.8	788	54.2	100
Worthing West	2358	906	38.4	1452	61.6	100
Total	18911	5796	30.6	13115	69.4	100

Key points:

- Over two-thirds of individuals who responded to the consultation voted against the 20 mph scheme (69.4%)
- Northbrook had the highest proportion of individuals against the scheme, with 84.2% voting no.
- The highest proportion of individuals in favour of the scheme was, again, in Worthing Pier where 45.8% of individuals voted yes.

Under 18's

There were no age restrictions in place for responding to the consultation or voting in the consultation with responses welcomed from those residents under the age of eighteen. In total 485 Worthing residents under the age of eighteen responded to the consultation. The breakdown of these responses is as follows:

Yes 224

No 261

Under 18s

	Responses	Yes	Yes (%)	No	No (%)	Total %
Broadwater	70	37	52.9	33	47.1	100
Cissbury	61	17	27.9	44	72.1	100
Durrington & Salvington	40	12	30.0	28	70.0	100
Goring	47	10	21.3	37	78.7	100
Northbrook	33	8	24.2	25	75.8	100
Tarring	92	53	57.6	39	42.4	100
Worthing East	40	20	50.0	20	50.0	100
Worthing Pier	28	18	64.3	10	35.7	100
Worthing West	74	49	66.2	25	33.8	100
Total	485	224	46.2	261	53.8	100

Key points:

- A majority of those aged Under 18, who responded to the consultation, were against the 20 mph scheme with 53.8% voting no.

Non-residential addresses

The consultation included all addresses within the specified area including business and other non-residential addresses. This figure represents the results from addresses which were identified as being non-residential. The results are presented at the address, not individual, level.

Yes 44

No 137

Mixed 1

Non Residential Addresses

Addresses	Responses	Response rate	Yes	Yes(%)	No	No(%)	Mixed	Mixed (%)	Total
2553	182	7.1	44	24.2	137	75.3	1	0.5	100

Key points:

- Three-quarters (75.2%) of known non-residential addresses voted against the 20 mph scheme

Undelivered, Late and Non-attributable Returns

A small proportion of the 50,365 consultation forms which were sent out were returned undelivered. Other forms which had been returned were unable to be attributed to an address on the database, mostly due to missing information on the form, whilst a further number of forms were missing any indication of voting preference, and in some cases were missing names. The breakdown of these is as follows:

Returned undelivered 287

Received after deadline 76

Unable to attribute to an address 58

Missing voting intention 40

Comments

Participants in the Worthing 20 mph consultation exercise were provided with an area on the voting form in which they could write any comment they wished. In

total 5,885 of returned eligible forms contained comments, representing some 53% of forms.

The comments were analysed thematically. A coding frame was developed by conducting a preliminary analysis of returned forms to identify the range of themes raised by residents (see appendix B). This was then used to count the frequency with which each theme occurred amongst the response forms with comments.

In total five over-arching themes were identified

Positive impact: These were comments that described the scheme as having a positive impact, for example in terms of improving safety for vulnerable road users.

Negative impact: These comments referred to negative aspects of the scheme, for example congestion, or the visual impact of extra signage.

Limited impact: These comments referred to the scheme as having a limited impact, for example suggesting the scheme would not change driver behaviour

Issues with the scheme: These comments included specific issues with the scheme as presented in Worthing, for example issues with roads which were included, or excluded, or with the overall cost of the scheme.

Other: This included all comments not in the above classifications. Examples include generalised comments of support, or disagreement, issues with parking, and issues with HGVs.

Positive impact

These comments pointed to the perceived benefits of the scheme, in particular for vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, cyclists, children and the elderly. In total this was included on 3.7% of the forms with comments

"I am 87 years old & treasure my freedom, being able to walk slowly but unaided. My freedom is threatened by speeding motorists, so my safety is proportionate to the speed of the vehicles. Therefore the slower the vehicle, the safer I am."

"I think that a 20 mph speed limit will benefit the whole community. Motorists may be inconvenienced at first, but will grow accustomed to the slower speed and we will all (pedestrians and motorists) be safer."

"Less speed, less accidents, less deaths."

"Some drivers drive as on the motorway."

Agenda Item No. 6 Appendix B

A number of comments expressed support for 20 mph near schools, hospitals, or other specific locations such as residential care homes. In total this theme was included on 11.1% of response forms with comments

"20 mph is fine near schools but too slow for general"

"Only areas outside schools and hospitals should have the restriction."

Negative impact

These comments regarded the scheme as having a negative impact and could be broken down into four sub-areas. The first of these represented the perceived environmental impact of the scheme in terms of increased pollution from vehicle exhausts and the impact on the visual environment of the additional signage required. In total this was included on 10.4% of forms with comments.

"The 20 mph limit would cause drivers to select lower gears than either 5th or 4th. This would mean increase in fuel consumption and hence pollution."

"All of the signs and road markings will spoil the street scene."

A second negative theme identified in the comments was the impact on journeys in terms of congestion and the potential impact of this on local business and the wider local economy. In total this theme was included on 8.1% of the forms with comments

"I believe a 20 MPH speed limit should be used very sparingly – only in a few key places. Overuse will cause immensely more congestion in & around the centre of Worthing – it is bad enough now! Free flowing traffic conditions are critically important for businesses and private people alike, as passing trade is vital to the economy. Once congestion arises people will avoid coming to the town – devastating."

The third negative theme covered comments stressing the difficulty with driving at 20mph and concerns that this will impact on driver frustration leading to more aggressive driving behaviour, more rat-running and even more accidents. In total this was included on 9.3% of the forms with comments

"20 MPH would provoke more accidents with drivers becoming more frustrated than they feel at the moment"

"There may be confusion in switching from the main 30 mph to 20 mph with drivers getting distracted looking for speed signs & checking their speedometers, rather than driving with full awareness of road hazards and adjusting their speed to that."

Agenda Item No. 6 Appendix B

The final theme in this area concerns the perceived impact of the scheme on the local bus service. In total this was included on 9.2% of response forms with comments.

"We are in our late 70's and very much appreciate the compass 8a bus which stops in our road. There is a possibility that this service would cease if a 20mph was introduced."

"Local bus routes will be badly affected – i.e. we only have one bus per hour currently which in all probability will reduce to 2 hourly! Bus operator income will be badly affected & traffic delays will result."

Limited impact

A significant number of comments expressed the view that the scheme, as proposed, would have only a limited impact in terms of meeting its main objectives. Whilst some felt that the existing 30mph speed-limit was adequate others raised possible issues around adherence to and enforcement of any changed speed limit. Some also pointed to what they felt was a limited impact of a 20mph scheme in Brighton & Hove. Such concerns were often linked to the cost of the scheme. In total this theme occurred on 19.7% of the response forms with comments.

"It doesn't work in Brighton, it won't work here!"

"I strongly object to spending such a vast sum on a scheme which a lot of people will ignore."

"I am all for safer roads but I feel this would be a waste of money. Most residential roads in Worthing prove difficult to drive above 20 mph anyway, also, I feel no-one would observe it and no-one would enforce it."

"It's a waste of public money which is aimed at solving problems that simply don't exist."

Issues with the scheme

The largest theme within the comments related to the proposed cost of the scheme with many residents stating that they found this too costly, or that the money would be better used on alternatives – particularly maintaining the road surface. In total this theme was present on 35.8% of the response forms with comments.

"..Is this really necessary and will it justify the expenditure which could be put to good use elsewhere i.e. pavements, which would benefit everyone and pot-holes."

"What a complete waste of money. It is not long since we were asked what services we wished to cut as the council was short of money. Now we are asked

Agenda Item No. 6 Appendix B

to support the waste of £400,000 to install signs which will be largely ignored. If there is money to spare it would be better given to the police to enforce the existing limits which are already ignored."

"I think the expenditure involved in instigating this scheme could be better spent in maintaining some of the poor road surfaces in this area."

A number of residents stated their opposition to what they regarded as a 'blanket' approach to the 20 mph limit as proposed in the scheme outline. Often these same respondents stated their support for more limited schemes, such as near schools and hospitals. In total this theme was present on 5.0% of response forms with comments

"I do not support a blanket approach just for the sake of it"

"While 20 mph restrictions are suitable near schools wide schemes will have many detrimental effects."

Within the comments some residents raised issues with particular roads included or excluded in the scheme plans. Such requests featured in 11.9% of the forms with comments.

Other

A number of responses contained reference to other issues such as HGV's or parking, along with suggestions for what they would like, including schemes such as speed bumps or cameras. In total this theme was present in 16.3% of response forms with comments on.

"Consider one way streets and facilities for bike lanes please"

"I think repaired pavements would save more pedestrian injuries. Uneven pavings are a nightmare for the elderly, partially sighted and those using walking aids."

A large number of forms contained a statement of general agreement or disagreement. Along with other comments not covered by the other categories these featured on 35.2% of response forms with comments.

"No comment except: Great idea"

"No, do not support the scheme"

Frequency of Themes Present on 20 mph Consultation Response Forms¹

Theme	Frequency of occurrence	Per cent of forms ²
1. Scheme will improve safety for drivers and other vulnerable road users (e.g pedestrians/ cyclists/ children/ elderly)/ highlighting existing issues with speeding and rat-running.	217	3.7
2. Support for 20 mph near schools/ hospitals or other specific locations (e.g care homes)	651	11.1
3. Environmental impact: Pollution/visual impact of signage	611	10.4
4. Negative impact on journeys: Congestion/ lengthened journey times/ Impact on local economy/ business/ commerce	479	8.1
5. Difficult to drive at 20 mph/ frustration/ driver behaviour will worsen e.g more aggression/ Will result in more accidents/ more rat-running	547	9.3
6. Negative impact on bus service	544	9.2
7. Doubts over need for scheme and effectiveness of scheme in achieving its objectives	1157	19.7
8. Too costly/ better alternatives	2107	35.8
9. Opposition to a blanket 20mph limit.	294	5.0
10. Issues with particular roads included or excluded/ would like more (or different) roads included	699	11.9
11. Other issues e.g HGV's/ Parking/Cyclists/Pedestrians/Potholes or would like other schemes e.g Speed bumps/ Cameras	961	16.3
12. General agreement or disagreement/ all other comments	2072	35.2

¹Total of 5885 forms with comments

²Per cent of forms *with* comments