

APPENDIX C – The Objections and Response.

1.0 Introduction and Background

The consultation period took place between Friday 8th January and Monday 1st February 2021. At the end of the consultation period, a total of 132 responses were received. 84 responses were received in support and 48 were objecting.

Below is the list of the objections.

Such a broad brush of 20mph roads is not the right approach at all. KCC consistently green light more housing development in terms of never objecting to a new developments highway impacts (kcc responsibility). KCC barely ever object to a development because of road network impact. If you want to improve air quality and safety then make a tougher test for new development and road network impact. As this is the real problem. The proposed changes are simply window dressing and worse have a negative effect.

20mph is too slow for a good number of these roads. Especially the larger roads in the area. 20 is bad for the economy and quality of life of people being able to get home and about at a reasonable speed. There is also evidence that slower moving traffic can release more particulates.

30 is a perfectly safe speed and has been proven safe. The logic of 20 is flawed. 10 is obviously safer than 20, 5mph is obviously safer than 10. Except it only leads to more people breaking the law when they don't need to be criminalised. 30 is perfectly safe. If concerned 30 should be enforced.

No 40 or 50 or national should be reduced at all.

I support the scheme in principle, but object to speed humps being installed in New Hythe Lane. The road surface is already very noisy with existing flaws in the surface and the fact that HGV's are prominent in the lower part of the lane due to Industrial sites. By installing speed humps the noise will be significantly louder. It is also fair to say that the speed limit will not be policed in any regular way as my past knowledge of these installations have witnessed, so all the humps will do is cause problems for the occupants as speeders will race over them as they do elsewhere and HGV's will bounce on them. Humps are not the answer, cameras and policing are, but I understand neither is likely.

I believe 20 mph on roads such as Leybourne way, Lunsford Lane & New Hythe Lane is too slow. I do not exceed the current 30 / 40mph speed limits and certainly travel at far lesser speeds on the housing estates in this area. I do not however support a generic 20mph speed limit.

Thank you.

I agree with restrictions around Schools and Shopping areas but feel that a blanket 20MPH is taking things to far.

Leybourne Way carries a huge amount of commercial traffic, reducing the speed to 20mph

will just add to the difficulties that local residents already face because of this traffic.
I would support a reduction to 20mph if a Bellingham Way slip road was opened onto the M20

Whilst I can see the advantage of introducing 20mph speed restrictions around the Brookfield Schools and Lunsford Primary school to increase the potential safety benefits for the school children, it won't stop parents parking behaviour being completely thoughtless and, at times, beggars believe. 20mph limits won't mitigate this senseless behaviour when parents are taking/collecting their princes and princesses at school.

Thinking about Kingfisher Road, New Hythe Lane, Lunsford Lane, Leybourne Way and Bellingham Way, how will you control the 20mph limit on these roads without speed humps or chicane islands? How will the residents react to vibrations caused by the potential speed humps? Will any speed humps be compliant with current regulations as the majority of existing speed humps don't comply.

Perhaps the sensible option would be to send teams out to clear the overgrowth on many of the footways detailed in you plan so that pedestrians can use them safely. Have a look at the footway (both sides) on New Hythe Lane between Kingfisher Road and Albion Drive to see just how badly they have been maintained, or not as the case may be!

It may also be beneficial to re-paint the road markings just to highlight to inconsiderate drivers what they should be observing. The mini roundabout at Larkfield Leisure Centre is a good example. I have yet to see a driver on New Hythe Lane slowing down and using this as a roundabout. Cars exiting the leisure centre or Albion Drive are taking their lives in their own hands.

In summary I believe better options are available rather than blanket 20mph speed limit, but no doubt haven't been considered due to cost or ease of implementing.

It is not cleaner/greener. To slow vehicles from 30mph to 20mph requires cars to drop down a gear which results in higher revs. This pushed more carbons in the air. It also increases fuel consumption by 11 to 15%.

Your objective can NEVER be achieved - it is not a healthier option.

It does not reduce accidents as your general objective makes out. You have no benchmark stats on ALL these roads. The risk of traffic accident can only be reduced where high levels of pedestrians exist - which are mainly High Streets/ Car Parking/Shopping areas.

Recent introductions of these 20 mph limits in Tonbridge have failed.

80-90% of traffic DO NOT adhere to these limits. Those that attempt to maintain these speed limits on main roads - even when there are NO pedestrians available to 'endanger' are frequently overtaken by drivers, who do not wish to drive slowly, which creates extra safety issues, rather than reduce them as your objective seems to look for.

These 20mph installations DO NOT WORK

Reduction to 20mph on residential roads (mainly marked as blue on map) is acceptable but on roads that are for through traffic (mainly marked as red on map) does not appear to make sense.

The information provided does not include:

- impact on journey times and congestion
- impact on air quality
- current levels of accidents on these routes and impact

How can a consultation operate without this information being provided?

Speed reduction to 20mph will increase pollution due to inefficient engine running and increase wear and tear as vehicles are not designed to be used at low speeds.

I understand that for a speed limit to be legally enforceable 95% of vehicles need to travel below the limit, the proposal admits that a large percentage exceeds 28mph.

I also would question how the data regarding existing speeds was obtained, where were the measurements made over what time, the through routes have sufficient traffic flow for say an hours sample but the cul de sacs must be an assumption so would have no legal basis. Please publish or produce data.

Gig hill for its entire length is suitable for a higher speed limit rather than lower due to the way pedestrians are separated.

Speed control measures such as ramps cause noise and vibration damage to property and services as well as unseen damage to tyres and vehicles which lead to later accidents and costly repairs. They and other travel calming measures also create hazards and disincentives for cyclists travelling within the legal limit. The existing bus cushion ramps in Gig Hill are probably already illegal as you could not travel over them at the current legal limit without causing damage to a vehicle.

Speed control measures and any subsequent traffic bunching also causes delay to emergency vehicles which is particularly relevant with the fire station.

As both a walker to local shops and a cyclist any increase in these activities will be marginal, as a driver you should be looking at the road ahead not the speedometer or avoiding unnecessary hazards.

Many people need to use a vehicle to travel to multiple places in a day, speed restrictions over excessive areas lengthen the working day.

The double yellow lines outside Tesco have actually increased the speed on Chaucer Way rather than speed restrictions why not have alternating double yellow lines so parked vehicles slow the traffic.

20mph is far too slow on Leybourne Way, New Hythe & Lunsford Lanes. I am already tailgated sticking to the 30 & 40 mph limits. 20 mph is probably the speed I stick to on housing estates anyway. Overall limit of 20 mph will be a total nuisance on the surrounding roads. I do not support this. Thank you

I object to the proposal because speeding vehicles is not an issue on the majority of roads listed. I have lived in Southey Way for over 10 years, which, like many of the roads, is a no through road with parked cars and used almost entirely by residents and their deliveries. It

would be an abhorrent waste of time, effort and MONEY to put signage and road markings on every single road on the list when it is so blatantly unnecessary. Additionally, the only collisions I have witnessed, or seen the debris from, in this locality have occurred on Leybourne Way (usually in the vicinity of either set of traffic lights) and also the mini roundabouts - especially Kingfisher Road j/w Lunsford Lane - not speed related, usually confusion as to who has right of way/lack of observation. I believe this money could be far better spent.

I object to the majority of these planned roads.
However I do support reducing speed by Schools, crossings, playgrounds etc where children are.
The plan to reduce every residential road in Larkfield needs to have/provide justification for it.

As seen in many other areas that have implemented these measures, the desired effect doesn't work. The issue comes down to how it is enforced. Some areas that have done this before seem to think that speed bumps could of been the answer however this again dose not work. You either still get people speeding and just flying over them without a care, or people slow down to go over them then accelerate up again till they reach the next one only to slow down . This actually causes more pollution than steady state driving. This blanket style proposal seems rather dramatic to try over come a potential problem with few roads used at rat runs. Personally when I moved into the area the fact it wasn't littered with speed bumps everywhere was taken into consideration. Areas that where I ruled out. Therefore this proposal would also be having an impact on the potential sale of property's in the area.

There is no related data published as part of this consultation supporting this decision. What data is available for the affected roads in the following categories: RTCs on the affected roads; RTCs resulting in injury; RTCs whereby speed was a contributing factor; injury exacerbated by speed.

There's also no projection of what the expected outcome of these measures are, or if future reviews would be carried out. e.g. If there is an expected percentage decrease of RTCs, resulting in injury, compared with the previous 10 year average, and, if this is not met, would the changes be reversed? What would the timeframe of this review be?

The speed limits enable (on the whole) the traffic to flow in the area, due to the large number of lorries going to New Hythe industrial estate down Lunsford Land a reduction in the speed limit would cause more disruption. Some days when there is an issue at J4 it is already very difficult to get out of Lunsford Lane.

The current speed is perfectly appropriate for the area. The 20mph is ok for roads around the schools or maybe just for peak times. The problem is more that the speed restrictions are not policed well enough lowering the limit will not stop the boy racers and idiots from speeding. Speed cameras and traffic calming work much better.

There is no need to reduce the limit below 30 mph, instead the current limits should be enforced. There is no evidence that injuries are reduced by 20 mph limits. The problem is excessive speeding.

Leybourne way is already a traffic nightmare let alone if they are all trying to do 20mph along it. New hythe lane should have the church parking removed as this is far more dangerous creating a blind spot over the crest of the hill.

New Hythe Lane is a wide enough road to be set with a 30mph limit however I do support traffic calming measures to ensure traffic does not exceed 30mph especially when approaching Larkfield Leisure Centre from the South. A 20mph limit is too extreme for the length and width of the road.

The proposal is also trivial to include Albion Drive whereby the average traffic speed has never been recorded (i.e. no known safety hazard with the current speed limit) and Albion Drive effectively is a cul-de-sac that naturally has traffic calming measures i.e. narrow road with cars parked on the road.

Snails go faster than that. It's redicoulus.

I don't believe there is any requirement for a reduction in the speed limit. As a walker/runner/cyclist as well as a driver I have never felt unsafe with current 30mph limit.

I do not agree with this proposal fora number of reasons. The main problem is reducing the speed to 20mph on Lunsford Lane/Gighill Road, Leybourne way and New Hythe lane. These roads should be a 30mph zone at least. I don't mind all the small off roads and closes being made a 20mph zone as I live in one of these and there are a lot of turnings and parked cars that cause obstruction. However making those three main roads also 20mph makes no sense. Leybourne way for example comes straight from an A road so you are dropping down from 50mph to 20 which is likely to cause more problems than going down to 40. Leybourne way is also a straight road with no parked cars and very little roads off of it at all to worry about. In all the years I've lived here I have never seen a crash occur on Leybourne way with the current speed limit, whereas I believe that halving this would have the reverse desired effect and would cause more damage due to the sudden drop in speed of 30mph. As I say certain parts of this proposal could be good but those 3 main roads should not be made 20mph, they have no reason to be made the same as a small close when it has none of the same hazards.

Another thing is that it states on the map that as the average speed is over 28mph on those three main roads that traffic calming measures will be put in place. I presume this means that speed bumps will be put on these roads to force you to do 20. This will make the road more dangerous as people leaving the A road at 50mph who aren't aware of this will come down Leybourne way doing 40 and crash into a speed bump which is much more dangerous than the current state of the roads.

I hope you take into account my objection and I would be very interested in knowing the reason that all of these roads have been requested to change to a 20mph zone when there is currently little danger.

I do not think a 20mph speed limit is necessary for all roads in Larkfield.

| |
|--|
| <p>It may be appropriate for certain roads such as New Hythe Lane but not for all roads.</p> |
| <p>I am objecting as the 20mph limit should be brought in across all of the roads. I am on the lower half of New Hythe Lane and we suffer constantly from vehicles of all sizes exceeding the speed limit. It is dangerous when you are trying to cross the road but the most dangerous is the roundabout with Bellingham Way / Laybourne Way and New Hythe Lane this is for both crossing as a pedestrian and as a car driver. Without the speed limit being consistent across all of the roads your proposals will no help the current situation at all.</p> |
| <p>The roads marked in blue on the map I have no objection to. And I dont feel that lowering the limit on the red roads would be particularly problematic either. So for both of these aspects, I support. However, the 'traffic calming measures' cause me to be hesitant. What will these consist of? Bumps would be fine, but the island things that block one lane would be an absolute disaster. The traffic getting out of larkfield is horrific enough without slowing it down even more.</p> |
| <p>I agree with the notion to reduce the speed limit on roads through housing estates to 20 mph but object to including main roads as highlighted by the red lines on the plan to this limit. They should remain at 30 mph or 40 mph unless evidence of accidents or numerous near misses support a lower speed limit.</p> |
| <p>Because it would be impossible to police as a lot of other traffic problems are not addressed now, ie yellow lines at rear of tesco larkfield ,,car and vans parking opposite the junction of marlowe road which makes it dangerous as the traffic is on your side of the road,i did ask for yellow lines to be put there but no luck. Plus there are cars and vans parking on the grass verge and on the pavement obstructing it for prams and dissable people making them walk on the road on these narrow roads.i would support it if some of these other problems were addressed before hand.</p> |
| <p>I travel on these roads daily. The conjestion at this time is already almost unbearable in peak hours. This is going to increase congestion and the possibility of assault and aggression related incidents. These roads are not at a high risk of pedestrians, I also walk them almost daily. I think the proposal is unnecessary and unjust and I don't think it is in the best interests of the community or any benefit to their safety.</p> |
| <p>Whereas i have no objection to most of the proposal the 2 roads i am concerned about are New Hythe Lane & Leybourne Way Because of the distance in these roads i can see some drivers getting frustrated and trying to overtake and possibly causing more accidents than currently happens. They seem to flow reasonably well accept when all the Vans stream out of the industrial estate. I personally be inclined to leave these roads alone.</p> |
| <p>I support the plan for the blue roads, no question. I object strongly to the plan for the red roads, with the engineered speed limiting features. I have no objection to a 20mph limit on lunsford lane and new hythe, but 20mph on leybourne way does not make sense - and a 40mph limit that suddenly drops to a 20mph</p> |

outside Tesco(as per map) is asking for accidents. Having chicanes etc will make already terrible traffic getting out of larkfield horrific in every direction. My brother was involved in a very near fatal accident on new hythe lane a few years ago and the zebra crossing has been changed to a pedestrian crossing outside the fire station since. I would support fixed speed cameras on new hythe and lunsford instead of the engineered traffic calming, but I would like the revenue to be paid back to the larkfield community.

Because 20 mph as far as I'm concerned is the most stupid idea I've heard in ages. It will turn the whole area into a nightmare place to travel anywhere, I suppose we could all purchase hearses and act like funeral directors in procession. After all it will be like driving round a graveyard. Plus just to add who's going to abide by it? Unless you erect a camera in every street I and 95 percent will carry on as normal what a total way to waste tax payers money. Thinking of elsewhere West Malling how many go up there at 20 I've not seen many it doesn't work.???????

For some roads in this area 30mph is applicable as safe and sensible limit. The problem is not the speed limit it is the drivers speeding at 40-50+ mph who do so with impunity. Lowering the speed limit will simply punish and slow the majority who will observe the limit whatever it is but do nothing to curb the dangerous drivers. I suggest better to keep current speed limits but enforce them. This no doubt costs money so will not happen, you'll just lower the limit, inconvenience the majority and claim you have taken action.

My concern is not with the speed limit but the absence of enforcement, the traffic calming measures on the lower part of lunsford Lane and Gigg Hill do little to discourage those whom choose to speed. The reduction will just change the speeders doing 10mph over the designated speed limit to 20mph if not more over the limit. There is a need for greater enforcement across the areas highlighted and this will endeavour to help reduce speeding. If 20mph is imposed then there also has to be increased presence for enforcement with community service part of the prosecution.

My Objections to the introductions of the 20mph speed limit on roads in Larkfield.

Its not right that the KCC should be spending money on this scheme when their budget is already stretched with the cost of the pandemic and Brexit.

To introduce the scheme it will mean new road signs, 20mph signs on the roads and chicanes being built.

Its a waste of money for the below reasons.

- Its impossible to police a 20mph speed limit. Theres not enough Police officers due to budget cuts. Not enough speed traps or Officers to operate them.
- In North Tonbridge where I have visited relatives, very few drivers keep to the lower speed limits. 20mph means 30mph and 30mph means 40mph to them.
- The lower speed limit will not make the mini roundabouts safer in Lunsford Lane. Its not because they approach the roundabout too fast, its because they don't have any intention of stopping. They don't respect other drivers or follow the Highway Code.
- On many side roads its impossible to do more than 20mph now because they are clogged

with parked cars and are usually only a single lane. So why impose a lower speed limit on these roads?

- Chicanes on Lunsford Lane and New Hythe lane will only make it worse for local residents. Vehicles stop at the first chicanes, then when they move onto the next one they accelerate and then probably have to stop again. This means that the vehicles produce more pollution because they are stopping and starting. If they just continued at a constant speed, pollution levels and noise levels would be lower. Watch the traffic along Castle Way. Just ask the residents of Cox Heath. Traffic calming chicanes were introduced there and because of the extra noise and pollution, they asked that the chicanes be removed. The road noise from a moving vehicle was less.
- Installation of the square speed humps does little to slow some vehicles down. It only slows down smaller cars. Larger vehicles such as white vans and buses are able to pass with their wheels either side of the square hump.

Wide sweeping reductions in speed for the majority of roads are over the top. During busy times it's impossible to travel above the current speed limits. There are also many pinch spots that slow traffic well below the speed limit. Traffic flowing to and from the motorway would likely be negatively impacted as a lower speed limit will not decrease the volume of traffic, rather slow it down and increase congestion. On open stretches of New Hythe lane reductions in speed could be achieved through the addition of zebra crossings to break the flow of the traffic. The stretch of New Hythe Lane from the junction of Bellingham way that runs past the bricklayers arms would benefit from a reduction in speed due to the volume of heavy goods vehicles that frequent that route from the industrial estates. Joyriders also frequent this stretch and it would help to deter this. Bellingham way also sees lots of heavy goods travel, but is not a densely populated with homes. The scale of the overall speed limit proposal presents concerns for how the volume of traffic in the area will flow without causing excessive congestion, which already occurs during peak travel times. A more targeted approach to the problematic areas would be more optimum solution rather than reducing speeds on all roads in the area.

In the residential roads traffic is already below the current speed limit of 30 mph. Resident parking provides natural restrictions to excessive speed. This negates the need for a 20 mph limit.

Lunsford Lane and New Hythe Lane are the traffic arteries for the housing estate roads. Restricting speeds to below 20 mph would cause traffic tail backs. Increased enforcement of the current 30 mph limit would achieve the desired safety effect.

I fully support implementing a 20mph limit on the residential roads in blue including Leybourne Lakes which already has traffic calming. New Hythe Lane and Lunsford Lane however are main roads carrying a lot of traffic at peak times with many people having to drive out of the area due to a lack of local schools. Traffic calming will increase damage to vehicles, pollution and other road users making dangerous overtaking manoeuvres for those sticking to the limit which may result in more accidents. Speed cameras or more traffic islands to enforce the 30 limit would be a much better option in these areas.

I see that this proposal includes the possibility of additional traffic calming measures to be

introduced on Gighill Road. The lower part of Lunsford Lane is already a rat run providing a faster route to traffic travelling between the A20 and the M20. Additional traffic calming measures on Gighill Road will have the affect of increasing this traffic. This is an incomplete proposal so I have no choice other than to object.

I have no particular objection to a 20 mph speed limit on roads in Larkfield, but feel that without enforcement it is largely a waste of money and a clutter of paint and road signage. The speeds on most of the roads included are already low due to parked vehicles. I doubt that it is possible to reach 20mph on many of the roads included. Is there evidence of a high rate of injury to Larkfield residents resulting from incidents with motor vehicles? If not, this scheme is not necessary. Quoting broad averages is not really sufficient to justify the expense when other services need the money so desperately.

I support a 20mph restriction outside schools, old peoples home etc but not just as a general rule everywhere houses are which is what this proposes. If everywhere it will not be observed as it will frustrate drivers and cause congestion in some places. More warning signs that light up pointing out the speed limit when approached will be better and oin some places 'sleeping policemen' to slow traffic as long as not too high so as to cause damage to the underside of a vehicle. Some sports cars are low. Certainly no barriers that stick out in the road and limit passing to one vehicle at a time. That causes speeding to beat oncoming vehicles and causes accidents.

Whilst I agree that 20mph is practice for 90% of these residential roads I would object to New Hythe Road and Leybourne way being included. Leybourne Way has existing traffic lights that help calm the roads already and NewHythe Rd has enough difficulties with poor parking along a lot of its length to also calm the traffic with the exception of the small descent past the Leisure Centre.
Any funds would be better spent on repairing the potholes - especially on the estate roads.

Note justified expense at this time. Very limited data around these roads being a hazard to pedestrian. Traffic won't be improved and money should be spent on improved access not wasted on these gimmicks.

With a short time spent on research is is easy to find many articles referencing studies that show 20mph limits do not achieve the desired effect and in many cases lead to a rise in minor accidents, largely due to driver frustrations. In addition many traffic calming measures lead to a rise in local pollution due to the inefficient manner in which they requires a vehicle to operate (i.e. a much slower speed than they are generally designed for and excessive stop/start actions). Combine this with the fact that the roads named in the proposal do not even have an accident problem, it is clear the money would be better spent on other projects. I imagine this project will gain a lot of ill-informed support from people who simply see "20mph" and automatically think slower is better. In fact the current speed limits pose no real problem and the reduction is not only unnecessary but any changes it is likely to produce in the real world would be wholly unnecessary/undesirable for the area. I have lived in the area for 10 years and the local roads are fine as they are.

Most of these roads are too small to do much more than 15mph let alone 20mph! It would

be a waste of money to implement this on all of these roads and it would just frustrate drivers like myself when it really isn't needed. I have lived in Larkfield for nearly 6 years and I cannot see the point. Whenever I drive in 20mph zones that are not required I get frustrated and annoyed especially when there is a car up my bumper making it unsafe for myself and my children in the car.

I do approve of the idea of this around the schools to keep the children safe but in all the other roads I cannot see how it is necessary. I think the money should be spent on improving footpaths and potholes.

I don't know where to start. This is unnecessary and restrictive and a waste of public money. The speed of travel has a large impact on the capacity of a road network. Ease of movement is essential to modern everyday life. This proposal is not only restricting general movement but includes major through routes such as Leybourne Lane, Leybourne Way and New Hythe Lane. Vehicles diverted from one route must therefore use another longer route, causing congestion somewhere else, so not even the virtue signalling green argument has any validity. This is madness, harking back to the days of the red flags. Nowhere do I read of any evidence that the present system is causing any problems, but the new one certainly will. Very few vehicles travel at excessive speeds in most of these roads and there is absolutely no enforcement activity apparent. The minority of drivers who do drive irresponsibly do not care what nominal speed limit is posted so this will have no effect on their behaviour. These proposals all seem fine in the middle of a pandemic but eventually people are going to have to earn their living again. These proposals are driven by a vocal minority of people who are lucky enough not to have to do this.

I support the 20mph speed restrictions for the majority of roads where these are small residential roads often in intimate settings and close to homes. On the majority of these roads it is difficult to exceed 20mph due to the parked cars anyway.

I fully object to the reduction in speed limits on New Hythe Lane, Lunsford Lane and Leybourne Way. These roads are main local routes that connect smaller residential streets to local destinations which such as transport nodes, employment areas and essential shops. by reducing the speed limit this will increase journey times significantly on roads suitable for 30mph driving. This is likely to result in a build up of traffic at junctions on the A20 and A228 as traffic cannot travel at sufficient speeds to disburse into the local highway network.

Specifically, Leybourne Way is a key route for HGVs, vans and other employment traffic. A change from 40mph to 20mph is a significant and dangerous drop in travelling speed which may result in increased collisions. Leybourne Way has no dwellings fronting onto the road and 40mph is a suitable speed although the road is suitable for a 50mph speed limit. A reduction to 20mph is an inappropriate speed limit for the type and condition of the road.

Having reviewed Crashmaps.co.uk, it appears that the majority of incidents appear to occur at junctions which indicates it is either human either or highway design that is the main cause of the incidents and a reduction in speed is unlikely to reduce the number of incidents.

whilst i support some of the changes, the reduced speed on the three main routes through Larkfield will result in significant inconvenience, increased journey times, potential to increase traffic on the primary road network and an increase in potential collisions.

I am concerned, especially taking into account the evidence from TFL about the rise in environmental pollution from vehicles travelling slowly after they introduced 20mph areas as it created more exposure to pedestrians from exhaust fumes, as seen in the pollution monitoring equipment statistics. There is a further problem with electric or hybrid vehicles where pedestrian, vehicle collisions have increased where these vehicles are driven slower as the noise emitted from the vehicles is reduced to a level below a safe volume for pedestrians to hear, all data available from International surveys published to date. There is also the cost of implementing this scheme. The road signs, consultation, implementation and public notices will be a cost that is deserving of serious question at a time when public coffers are bereft. The chair warmers who are involved in this scheme could be seen as creating a reason to keep their chairs warm for an extended period while they carry out all functions connected with such an implementation, while so many of the public in Kent are suffering severe financial hardship and will continue to do so long after this scheme and its huge costs are spent and fed into our projected uncomfortable rises in Poll Tax. I do support the principle of reducing speeds, provided they are enforced in a cost-effective way, on the major routes through the area, to bring them in for every individual road where it would not be possible to get up to more than the suggested 20mph in the length available, is ridiculous overkill. The lack of facts presented in this consultation to show the details such as I have listed above is not a true consultation where all sides of the argument should be clearly laid out. In case this is not covered further down this consultation, I have been pushing through our Parish Council, for the part of Lunsford Lane, north of Leybourne Way, to be reduced to 20mph as I have been personally hit by vehicles and nearly run into, causing a literal dive into the hedgerows, numerous times from the drivers who drive at considerable speed in this road which has no footpaths, is extremely constricted and more often than not has pedestrians walking legitimately though its length. Three years I have been pushing for this but the KCC say it cannot be supported, yet you come up with this over-the-top hammer to crack a nut. Highly questionable.

This is a waste of our money. The proposed speed limit reduction if introduced will only be adhered to by safe motorists that already obey the rules of the road and they are not the ones that unduly endanger others. Those that currently disregard speed limits will continue to do so, with very little risk, or no risk of prosecution and consequences as the police do not have the motivation or resources to administer this change.

If there is surplus tax payers' money available it should be spent on far more pressing needs such as pot hole repairs and roadside drainage works rather than 'vanity' projects'.

I think this is a bad idea. Not only will the majority of road users totally ignore this, but in a town where road traffic and pollution are increasing it is only going to make the air quality worse.

You would be better off putting speed cameras on New Hythe Lane, Lunsford Lane and London Road both ways just after New Road Esso garage.

Following the consultation, the following response has been issued to the objectors.

National and international studies show that lowering the speed limit from 30mph to 20mph reduces the number of casualties. This is recognised by bodies such as the World Health Organisation and the UN General Assembly recently mandated 20mph as the right speed limit where people and motor vehicles mix.

The reduction from 30mph to 20mph is already being implemented across many towns in the country.

To exclude a road from a scheme, the highway authority must show that it has considered the needs of pedestrians and other vulnerable road users. Other schemes have found:

- casualty figures fell by 23% specifically in Bath, along with other reductions in Edinburgh, Brighton and other towns
- drivers have observed the 30mph limits more as well as the 20mph in Bristol
- implementing 20mph speed limits leads to a general reduction in speeds. On faster roads, speeds are reduced more than 4mph in Bristol and 7mph in Portsmouth
- a 1mph reduction in speeds on urban roads is recognised as leading to 6% fewer casualties
- two out of three people surveyed supported the reduction before and after implementation.

Studies have shown that 20mph schemes helps to encourage active travel by increasing walking and cycling levels.

Walking and cycling can make a very positive contribution to improving health and tackling obesity, improving accessibility and tackling congestion, and reducing carbon emissions and improving the local environment.

Traffic calming measures are not always needed when reducing the speed limit. Where calming measures are needed, there are many alternatives that can be used:

- bolted down bollards
- lines
- orcas and wands
- posts
- planters
- parklets
- signs
- staggered parking bays.

Whilst speed bumps reduce the speed of motorised vehicles and are commonly used, studies have shown they are not often required. NICE recommends 20mph without speed bumps for; better air quality, less noise, vibration and road wear.

There is also no significant increase in the time it takes to cross these zones. Many bus companies have found no difference in their journey times.

As with all speed limits the police can enforce 20mph. Speed assistance technology in new cars by 2022 will automatically increase the compliance.