

Appendix 2: Discussion of Consultation Results

Action 1: Investigate the use of Urban Traffic Management Control to optimise traffic flows within Ashbourne town centre: There were 397 responses to this proposal, with 130 strongly agreeing with it, 78 agreeing, 43 undecided, 44 disagreeing and 102 strongly disagreeing. This proposal scored as follows:

Simple score = +15.63%
Weighted score = +22.69%
Most important = 31.36%

There were 202 free text comments received in relation to this proposal, with a wide variety of views expressed. The points that were expressed most frequently were the need for a bypass and the need to reduce the number of HGVs in the town.

Action 2: Investigate town centre priority or capacity changes to improve heavy goods and other vehicle flows on A515 Buxton Road, Ashbourne: there were 396 responses to this proposal with 98 strongly agreeing, 90 agreeing, 56 undecided, 57 disagreeing and 95 strongly disagreeing. This proposal scored as follows:

Simple score = +9.10%
Weighted score = +9.86%
Most important = 25.68%

There were 197 free text comments received in relation to this proposal. Again the need for a bypass and the need to reduce traffic in the town were frequently expressed views.

Action 3: Influence route election via live traffic information systems: there were 392 responses to this proposal with 87 agreeing strongly, 69 agreeing, 61 undecided, 70 disagreeing and 105 strongly disagreeing. This proposal scored as follows:

Simple score = -4.86%
Weighted score = -9.46%
Most important = 15.06%

There were 193 free text comments received in relation to this proposal. The need for a bypass featured strongly again, as did the lack of suitable alternative routes for traffic. Scepticism was expressed about the difference that this action would make in practice.

Action 4: Investigate improved tree canopy dispersal: there were 400 responses to this proposal with 79 strongly agreeing, 84 agreeing, 68 undecided, 56 disagreeing and 113 strongly disagreeing. This proposal scored as follows:

Simple score = -1.5%
Weighted score = -10.00%

Most important = 7.90%

It should be noted that this action was under the control of the district council and has been completed. This will be acknowledged in the action plan.

There were 185 free text responses received in relation to this proposal. Amongst them were concerns that removing trees would be detrimental to carbon capture and suggestions that this was a cosmetic measure. Again, a great deal of support for a bypass was expressed.

Action 5a: St John Street and Dig Street/Compton public realm: there were 399 responses to this proposal with 118 strongly agreeing, 104 agreeing, 56 undecided, 42 disagreeing and 79 strongly disagreeing. This proposal scored as follows:

Simple score = +25.31%

Weighted score = +35.08%

Most important = 15.31% (combined score for all proposals under action 5)

There were 185 free text responses received in relation to this proposal. The need to reduce the amount of traffic in the town was a common theme as was concern about the safety of pedestrians and cyclists.

Action 5b: Mobility Hub: there were 399 responses to this proposal with 78 strongly agreeing, 122 agreeing, 88 undecided, 45 disagreeing and 66 strongly disagreeing. This proposal scored as follows:

Simple score = +22.31%

Weighted score = +25.32%

Most important = 15.31% (combined score for all proposals under action 5)

There were 144 free text responses received in relation to this proposal. Whilst this proposal was broadly welcomed scepticism was expressed about its ability to impact on the air quality issue. Many comments were received about the need to reduce the traffic within the town.

Action 6: Electric vehicle charging points: there were 400 responses to this proposal with 108 strongly agreeing, 111 agreeing, 82 undecided, 34 disagreeing and 65 strongly disagreeing. This proposal scored as follows:

Simple score = +30%

Weighted score = +40.75%

Most important = 9.38%

There were 141 free text responses received in relation to this proposal. Whilst this proposal scored well, a variety of views were expressed with some respondents welcoming more provision and others expressing views about the constraints on electric vehicle uptake.

Action 7a: Workplace travel plans: there were 393 responses to this proposal with 82 strongly agreeing, 106 agreeing, 82 undecided, 52 disagreeing and 71 strongly disagreeing. This proposal scored as follows:

Simple score = +15.54%

Weighted score = +19.34%

Most important = 12.59% (combined score for all proposals under action 7)

There were 161 free text responses received in relation to this proposal. Again this proposal was broadly welcomed but scepticism was expressed about the amount of difference it would make to pollution levels. Concerns were also expressed about safety.

Action 7b: School travel plans: there were 397 responses to this proposal with 108 strongly agreeing, 111 agreeing, 90 undecided, 37 disagreeing and 51 strongly disagreeing. This proposal scored as follows:

Simple score = +32.99%

Weighted score = +47.34%

Most important = 12.59% (combined score for all proposals under action 7)

There were 134 free text responses received in relation to this proposal. Although the proposal scored well, many suggested that this would do little to reduce pollution levels, with support expressed for a bypass and for reducing traffic in the town.

Action 7c: School streets: there were 396 responses to this proposal with 92 strongly agreeing, 91 agreeing, 79 undecided, 54 disagreeing and 80 strongly disagreeing. This proposal scored as follows:

Simple score = +12.37%

Weighted score = +15.40%

Most important = 12.59% (combined score for all proposals under action 7)

There were 148 free text responses received in relation to this proposal. Many comments expressed the concern that this could just be moving a problem of congestion at school time from one place to another.

Action 8a: Bus priority: there were 393 responses to this proposal with 130 strongly agreeing, 105 agreeing, 66 undecided, 41 disagreeing and 51 strongly disagreeing. This proposal scored as follows:

Simple score = +36.41%

Weighted score = +56.49%

Most important = 14.57% (combined score for all proposals under action 8)

There were 144 free text responses received in relation to this proposal. Whilst the proposal was supported doubt was expressed about its impact, due to the relatively small numbers of buses in use.

Action 8b: Mobility Hub: there were 391 responses to this proposal with 95 strongly agreeing, 118 agreeing, 105 undecided, 28 disagreeing and 45 strongly disagreeing. This proposal scored as follows:

Simple score = +35.81%
Weighted score = +48.60%
Most important = 14.57% (combined score for all proposals under action 8)

There were 98 free text comments received in relation to this proposal. Again the proposal was broadly welcomed but doubt was expressed about the impact it would have on pollution levels.

Action 9: Engagement with minerals and logistics companies: there were 393 responses to this proposal with 155 strongly agreeing, 104 agreeing, 47 undecided, 35 disagreeing and 52 strongly disagreeing. This proposal scored as follows:

Simple score = +43.76%
Weighted score = +69.97%
Most important = 26.91%

There were 168 free text comments received in relation to this proposal. Overall this action was the most supported of all those put forward in the consultation. Many of the responses again referenced the need for a bypass and upgrading of HGVs was also frequently mentioned.

Removal of parking spaces: there were 395 responses to this proposal with 181 responding positively, 166 responding negatively and 48 answering don't know. This proposal scored as follows:

Simple score = +3.79%
Weighted score = not applicable
Most important = 17.04%

There were 181 free text comments received in relation to this proposal. Concern was expressed about the lack of free or cheap alternatives for people to park.

Clean Air Zone: there were 400 responses to this proposal with 108 strongly agreeing, 41 agreeing, 42 undecided, 50 disagreeing and 159 strongly disagreeing. This proposal scored as follows:

Simple score = -15.00%
Weighted score = -27.75%
Most important = 23.21%

There were 178 free text comments received in relation to this proposal. Although the proposal had a significant negative score it should be noted that many of those who supported it considered it to be amongst the most important actions, hence the significant positive score in the 'most important' category. Concern was expressed about the impact that this proposal might have on the town's economy. Again, the need for a bypass featured heavily in the comments made in response to this proposal.

20 mph zone: there were 402 responses to this proposal. Unfortunately, for reasons that are not understood the SurveyMonkey program allocated all 154 of those respondents making comments into a separate category to the regular Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree and Strongly Disagree categories, meaning that the scores do not take account of everyone who has responded. Nevertheless, the results have initially been analysed in the same way as the other proposals, as follows:

Simple score = +18.95%
Weighted score = +27.03%
Most important = 22.47%

Officers have also assessed all 154 of the comments made in response to this proposal to determine whether they can be viewed as positive or negative. In their opinion 48 of the comments could be viewed as positive and 64 as negative, with 42 where it was not possible to form a view.

In terms of the comments themselves, there were 154 free text comments received in relation to this proposal. Amongst the views expressed were the belief that the proposal would make little difference as traffic already moved slowly, that it would be beneficial for safety and the fear that it might make pollution worse. The need for a bypass also featured strongly in the responses.