

Summary of Consultation Responses

Controlled Motorways

M25 J2 to 3



December 2011





CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Purpose of this document.....	1
1.2 Background	1
1.3 Document structure	2
2. CONDUCTING THE CONSULTATION EXERCISE	3
2.1 What the consultation was about.....	3
2.2 How the consultation was conducted	3
2.3 Government’s code of practice on consultation	4
3. SUMMARY OF RESPONSES.....	5
3.1 Number of Responses.....	5
3.2 Support for the Proposed Scheme	5
3.3 Comments About the Proposed Schemes	8
4. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	20
4.1 Summary.....	20
4.2 Recommendations	20

Appendix A – List of Consultees

Appendix B – Letters to Consultees regarding current policy on the Dartford Crossing

Executive Summary

The Highways Agency is committed to building upon the success of the existing Controlled Motorway Scheme which has been operational on the M25 motorway between junctions 10 and 15 since 1995, and was extended to junction 16 in 2002. The Controlled Motorway Scheme involves the use of Variable Mandatory Speed Limits (VMSL). It is expected that the Controlled Motorway scheme will:

- Reduce congestion;
- Provide more reliable journey times;
- Reduce the frequency of accidents;
- Reduce carbon emissions; and
- Reduce driver stress.

Regulations made under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 ('the 1984 Act') are required in order to operate VMSL between junctions 2 to 3 of the M25.

A consultation paper was issued to over 70 consultees and was open to public participation via the Highways Agency website. The consultation encouraged representative organisations, businesses and the general public affected by the proposed regulations to make contact with the Highways Agency to communicate their views.

The 12 week consultation closed on 28th July 2009 and this paper provides a summary of the consultation responses and details how the responses have been considered and taken forward. A total of 22 responses were received during the course of the consultation and generally the consultees who responded gave their support to the Controlled Motorways scheme.

Following the consultation it is recommended that the Secretary of State proceed with making the Regulations necessary to operate VMSL as part of the Controlled Motorways scheme.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of this document

The purpose of this document is to provide a summary of the responses received during the Controlled Motorways M25 Junctions 2 to 3 scheme (“the Controlled Motorways scheme”) consultation. The consultation took place between 5th May 2009 and 28th July 2009 to provide an opportunity for stakeholders, such as road user groups, and other interested parties to comment on the proposal to introduce the Controlled Motorways scheme.

This document provides a summary of the responses received. The Highways Agency have considered the comments raised by consultees and in this document explains its reasons for the selected option to be implemented as outlined within the scheme Impact Assessment.

1.2 Background

The Highways Agency is committed to building upon the success of the existing controlled motorway scheme which has been operational on the M25 motorway between junctions 10 and 15 since 1995, and was extended to junction 16 in 2002. It is expected that the Controlled Motorway Scheme will:

- Reduce congestion;
- Provide more reliable journey times;
- Reduce the frequency of accidents;
- Reduce carbon emissions; and
- Reduce driver stress.

Regulations made under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (‘the 1984 Act’) are required in order to provide for VMSL on those particular parts of the M25 motorway. The Controlled Motorways scheme requires the following Regulations to be made:

- The M25 Motorway (Junction 2 to 3) (Variable Speed Limits) Regulations 2011.

1.3 Document structure

Section 1 provides a background to the consultation.

Section 2 describes how the consultation was conducted and how responses from consultees were considered.

Section 3 contains a summary of the consultation responses and analysis of each response.



Section 4 contains a summary of the consultation period and the recommended way forward.

2 CONDUCTING THE CONSULTATION EXERCISE

2.1 What the consultation was about

The consultation paper described the policy underlying the proposed Regulations necessary to enable the operation of Variable Mandatory Speed Limits (VMSL) between junctions 2 to 3 of the M25.

The project aims to build upon the success of the existing M25 Controlled Motorways Scheme, currently operational between junctions 10 and 16.

2.2 How the consultation was conducted

A consultation paper including the scheme Impact Assessment was issued to over 70 consultees and a 12 week consultation period commenced on 5th May 2009. The consultation documents were also available on the HA website allowing the public to comment on the proposed legislative changes. All parties affected by the proposed legislative changes were encouraged to make contact with the HA to communicate their views. The consultation closed on 28th July 2009 and this paper explains how the responses have been considered.

2.3 Government's code of practice on consultation

The consultation was conducted in accordance with the Government's code of practice on consultation (see below).

1) When to consult Formal consultation should take place at a stage when there is scope to influence the policy outcome.

2) Duration of consultation exercises Consultations should normally last for at least 12 weeks with consideration given to longer timescales where feasible and sensible.

3) Clarity of scope and impact Consultation documents should be clear about the consultation process, what is being proposed, the scope to influence and the expected costs and benefits of the proposals.

4) Accessibility of consultation exercises Consultation exercises should be designed to be accessible to, and clearly targeted at, those people the exercise is intended to reach.

5) The burden of consultation Keeping the burden of consultation to a minimum is essential if consultations are to be effective and if consultees' buy-in to the process is to be obtained.

6) Responsiveness of consultation exercises Consultation responses should be analysed carefully and clear feedback should be provided to participants following the consultation.

7) Capacity to consult Officials running consultations should seek guidance in how to run an effective consultation exercise and share what they have learned from the experience.

Further information about the Government's Code of Practice can be located on the Department for Business Innovation and Skills (BIS) website:

<http://www.bis.gov.uk/policies/better-regulation/consultation-guidance>

3 SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

3.1 Number of responses

During the consultation 22 responses were received including correspondence from the following stakeholders:

- County Surveyors Society (CSS)
- Institution of Civil Engineers (ICE)
- Ministry of Defence (MoD)
- Bromley Borough Roads Action Group (BBRAG)
- Dartford Borough Council
- The Justices' Clerks' Society
- Kent Police
- Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety (PACTS)
- Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee (DPTAC)
- The RAC Foundation
- Chief Fire Officers Association (CFOA)
- Kent Highway Services
- Essex County Council
- Road Rescue Recovery Association (RRRA)
- The Association of British Drivers (ABD)
- The Magistrates' Association
- Six members of the public

3.2 Support for the proposed scheme

During the consultation period there was general support for the overall scheme with the majority of consultees who responded broadly supportive to the development and implementation of VMSL. Table 3A contains some selected extracts from letters and emails received to give an indication of the level of support for the scheme.

Organisation	Quote of Support
Dartford Borough Council (DBC)	<p>“The Council welcomed the aims of the consultation proposal as set out in the Executive Summary of the document, i.e.</p> <p>Reduce congestion</p> <p>Provide more reliable journey times</p> <p>Reduce the frequency of accidents</p> <p>Reduce carbon emissions</p> <p>Reduce driver stress.”</p>
Kent Police	<p>“Kent Police would agree with the assessment contained in the Consultation Paper that the impact of a controlled motorway scheme on the M25 between junctions 2 to 3 would be similar to that found when the controlled motorway scheme was introduced on the M25 between junctions 10 and 15.”</p> <p>“From the current information available it is not felt the introduction of the Controlled Motorway Scheme will negatively impact upon Kent Police, and particularly the Roads Police Unit.”</p>
RAC Foundation	<p>“The Foundation strongly supports the proposed Controlled Motorway Scheme and would press for its implementation as soon as possible.”</p>
Chief Fire Officers Associations (CFOA)	<p>“The Chief Fire Officers Association (CFOA) supports the principles of the consultation outlined in the document Controlled Motorways M25 J2 to 3. CFOA also recognises the steps and measures being put in place regarding this specific project to improve the reliability of journey times for road users of this particular stretch of the M25.</p> <p>CFOA also recognises the good practise that has been taken from other parts of the strategic road network and the intention to use these schemes between J2 and 3 is supported. CFOA also supports the active use of enforcement to ensure that the scheme is fully regulated and effectively managed.”</p>

Organisation	Quote of Support
Non affiliated individual	“I fully support the proposed changes between junctions 2 and 3 of the M25. I believe that traffic flow will be more consistent and therefore there will be fewer 'waves' and resulting tailbacks. I also believe that the environmental benefits cannot be ignored at this time when climate change is an issue for us all.”
County Surveyors Society (CSS)	“In principle, the CSS supports the introduction of controlled motorways and of Highways Agency Traffic Officers” “The CSS is keen that innovative ways are developed to use the transport infrastructure of the country.”
The Justices' Clerks' Society	“A similar scheme on the western section appears to work well and the Justices' Clerks' Society has no objection to such a scheme being introduced subject to regulations being drafted under section 17(2) and (3) of the RTRA 1984 for implementation.”

Table 3A: A selection of supportive comments about the scheme

3.3 Comments about the proposed scheme

There were a number of comments raised regarding the proposed operation of VMSL. The general comments are included in Table 3B along with a summary response to each of the comments. The comments received focused on a number of key points:

- The effect of speed cameras upon the number of incidents;
- The impact upon future works e.g. road widening, alternative crossings;
- The use of speed cameras and how they might effect privacy;
- The relevance of reducing emissions and noise;
- The timing of the consultation;
- The possible benefits to safety;
- The coordination of Controlled Motorways with the Dartford Crossing;
- The importance of improving journey times is undersold for the scheme; and
- The possible effects of VMSL on surrounding local roads.

Organisation	Responses – Comments about the scheme	
	Comments Received	Response to comment
Dartford Borough Council (DBC)	<p>“Concern that the proposals appear to be unrelated to proposals for the future management of the Dartford Crossing, or for the provision of an alternative crossing, both of which are intended to address similar aims, and could render the proposed scheme unnecessary.”</p>	<p>The Highways Agency have considered future road capacity and predicted future traffic flows and concluded that the introduction of Controlled Motorways on the M25 motorway between Junctions 2 and 3 will provide operational and safety benefits to the road user. The expected reduction in congestion and improvements in journey time reliability will support any new scheme implemented for the future management of the Dartford Crossing.</p>
	<p>“Possibility of further structures being introduced along this section of the M25, which passes close to residential areas, and any construction disturbance and traffic disruption which may accompany this. The Council were mindful that the lengthy and disruptive widening contract for this section of the motorway has just finished. The Council would therefore expect to be consulted on the details of any controlled motorways scheme, including the siting, design and construction of any new gantries and other structures, any lighting impacts whether from new or existing unused gantries, and any other environmental impacts which may arise during the construction and operation phases of the scheme.”</p>	<p>We appreciate your comments regarding delays to users on the M25 motorway following a period of disruption for motorway widening and note that the Council would like to be consulted before the implementation of any new scheme.</p> <p>The introduction of Controlled Motorways on this section of Motorway will look to achieve a reduction in congestion without the need for further widening. The concept of Managed Motorways now being introduced around the country will also make best use out the of the existing land within the highways boundary before considering more expensive widening schemes that may have a greater and undesirable impact on the public and environment, particularly during the construction phase. Further delays will be kept at a minimum as the scheme moves to final commissioning.</p> <p>The environmental impact of the scheme was considered as part of the M25 J1b-3 environmental statement and it should also be recognised that no new gantries are proposed.</p>

Organisation	Responses – Comments about the scheme	
	Comments Received	Response to comment
Non affiliated individual	“I would like to understand why the consultation period has been released at this time when the infrastructure has already been put in place at the cost of the tax payer?”	This is a traffic management scheme which has already received wide support from local stakeholders. Given the support already in place for the scheme and the benefits it will provide, we consider it appropriate to continue with the technical preparations for the scheme.
The Justices' Clerks' Society	“This will result in more fixed penalty notices and a consequent increase in activity for HMCS in enforcing them. Is it intended that one of the gateway courts for road traffic matters be designated as the court to hear any prosecutions for speeding and other RTA violations?”	Obtaining an acceptable level of compliance with the speed limits displayed is key to the successful and safe operation of the scheme. Discussions with the Police and courts service will advise how traffic prosecutions are to be dealt with. The Highways Agency suggests that a consistent approach for the level of enforcement is needed and we would hope that consistency across the UK can be achieved through the delivery of the Managed Motorways programme.

Organisation	Responses – Comments about the scheme	
	Comments Received	Response to comment
Non affiliated individual	<p>“As an HGV driver I spend much of my working day on the country’s roads and have noticed that speed cameras cause mass braking and almost panic in some drivers who are desperate to avoid a fine and points on their licence. This inevitably causes danger as you must concentrate on both speedometers and gantries instead of the road.</p> <p>I also dispute the fact that speed cameras reduce accidents and congestion. I believe that various surveys have concluded that speed is a contributory factor in only a small percentage of accidents. In short, I believe the public view speed cameras as a means of indirect taxation and in effect something which takes their concentration away from the actual act of driving safely.”</p>	<p>The Department of Transport (www.dft.gov.uk) has published a number of reports that demonstrate the effect that speed cameras have in reducing fatal accidents.</p> <p>Obtaining an acceptable level of compliance with the speed limits displayed is key to the successful and safe operation of the scheme. The provision of enforcement will result in a high level of compliance and along with the interactive nature of the mandatory speed limits will mean that there are a number of operational and safety benefits to the travelling public. The benefits will include a reduction in congestion and will also reduce the impact of accidents.</p>
Bromley Borough Roads Action Group (BBRAG)	<p>“We are opposed to these proposals. The justification given for these proposals is to “achieve the best use of road space”, “responding more quickly to accidents” and “reducing congestion”. The use of variable message signs may be justified to assist drivers, but the imposition of speed cameras is yet another step in the constant monitoring of our every step and is totally unjustified. Instead of drivers being able to use their own common sense about what is a reasonable speed for the traffic conditions, we are going to have someone else’s thoughts on the subject</p>	<p>The Department of Transport (www.dft.gov.uk) has published a number of reports that demonstrate the effect that speed cameras have in reducing fatal accidents.</p> <p>Obtaining an acceptable level of compliance with the speed limits displayed is key to the successful and safe operation of the scheme. The provision of enforcement will result in a high level of compliance and along with the interactive nature of the mandatory speed limits will mean that there are a number of operational and safety benefits to the travelling public. The benefits will include an reduction in congestion and will also reduce the impact of accidents.</p>

Organisation	Responses – Comments about the scheme	
	Comments Received	Response to comment
	imposed on us. Constant monitoring by cameras is also an invasion of our privacy.”	
Non affiliated individual	<p>“I wish to register my objection to the proposed variable speed limits on the M25, junctions 1B to 3, as part of an active traffic management scheme. I am an occasional user of this part of the M25 and, while I agree it sometimes suffers from congestion, this is due to lack of capacity. No amount of tinkering with speed limits will solve this fundamental problem. If, as the Prime Minister says, we should spend our way out of recession, perhaps some of this borrowed money should be used to either widen the M25 or build a Lower Thames Crossing, thus providing an alternative route and making travel between Essex and Kent less prone to disruption of the current single crossing.</p>	<p>The CM scheme will operate between M25 J2-3 only. A number of sections of the M25 have already been widened from three to four lanes and large scale projects are ongoing to widen further stretches or introduce a system to allow use of the hard shoulder by traffic during peak times (otherwise known as Hard Shoulder Running).</p> <p>The Department for Transport (DfT) report ‘Dartford River Crossing’ issued in April 2009, highlighted the need for improved crossing facilities in the Lower Thames area. This is expressed in various transport policy documents and specific references to the need for a new study to investigate these issues in detail are included in the key regional growth strategy documents,</p> <p>There is currently a feasibility study under way to look into whether an additional crossing should be constructed at or close to the existing crossing in order to provide additional capacity.</p>

Organisation	Responses – Comments about the scheme	
	Comments Received	Response to comment
	<p>Some of the claims for lower, camera-enforced speed limits are risible. Even if they succeeded in reducing emissions, noise and vehicle-operating costs, why are these considered relevant and why should drivers risk being penalised for exceeding speed limits imposed for any other reason than safety? As for 'emissions', I assume these refer primarily to the emission of carbon dioxide, a trace atmospheric gas essential for life on Earth that has been ludicrously branded as a 'pollutant' by the green lobby. As an engineer (which I assume you are) I suggest you check the facts for yourself before swallowing this nonsense."</p>	<p>Obtaining an acceptable level of compliance with the speed limits displayed is key to the successful and safe operation of the scheme.</p> <p>The reduction of emissions refers to not only carbon dioxide but also carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxide, hydrocarbons and particulate matter, all of which are potentially polluting the environment and having a negative effect on the environment and also on the health of the general public.</p>
Non affiliated individual	<p>"The scheme if approved will provide a new and steady cashflow stream for the Kent and Medway Camera Partnership from the large traffic volumes passing the cameras"</p> <p>"This stretch of road is probably safer than the approach or run-off from the Dartford Crossing Tolls toward the A2 and A13 junctions with the southbound and northbound funnelling of accelerating traffic from several lanes into four lanes, then three."</p>	<p>Obtaining an acceptable level of compliance with the speed limits displayed is key to the successful and safe operation of the scheme. Neither the police nor local councils make any money from speeding fines. They can only claim back their running and administration cost for the scheme, and any surplus goes to Treasury.</p> <p>Analysis has shown that the impact of the Controlled Motorway Scheme on injury accidents is estimated to be a reduction of 15%. This scheme will therefore help to improve traffic flow and reduce the impact of accidents in the area.</p>

Organisation	Responses – Comments about the scheme	
	Comments Received	Response to comment
Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety (PACTS)	<p>“What is not clear from the paperwork is why this particular stretch has been chosen and the extent to which this is a one-off implementation or whether other sections will be included at a later date. PACTS believes that, in the interests of consistency around the network, it will be important for road users to know what to expect from the motorway network”</p>	<p>The development and implementation of a technology scheme will be considered for locations where there are congestion and safety issues and the Highways Agency has a programme to implement both Controlled and Managed Motorways. It was recommended that the M25 J2-3 Controlled Motorway scheme be implemented to improve the traffic flows in this area and reduce the impact of accidents. The introduction of Managed Motorways to the network will make journeys more reliable by controlling traffic flows more effectively through the use of this new technology such as overhead gantries, lane specific signals, and driver information signs. They will also help us to manage the environmental impact of current motorway use.</p>
County Surveyors Society (CSS)	<p>“The CSS’s only concern in regards to the introduction of variable mandatory speed limits and their enforcement is the potential for drivers to choose to leave the strategic road network because of the imposed speed limit and add to the congestion on the local road network.</p>	<p>The Controlled Motorway scheme will improve journey reliability and traffic flows and therefore make the motorway more desirable to motorists. The Highways Agency does not anticipate that motorists will choose to use the local road network as an alternative.</p>
Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee (DPTAC)	<p>“We would be concerned if detailed impact assessments were only to be carried out in the event of potential <u>adverse</u> impacts. In fact, the claimed benefits of the proposals in terms of reduction in the impact of incidents; allowing faster responses to incidents and; the provision of more reliable journey times are likely to have a disproportionately <u>beneficial</u> effect for the interests of disabled people.</p>	<p>The needs of disabled people has been and will continue to be a key consideration when designing and implementing technology schemes. Adverse impacts and beneficial effects for disabled people will be considered in the development of future schemes.</p>

Organisation	Responses – Comments about the scheme	
	Comments Received	Response to comment
	<p>Reliability of journey times and confidence in quick responses to emergency situations can be vitally important for many disabled travellers and make a huge difference to their quality of life. We accept that with only a small length of motorway involved, the quantified effect may be small but to omit any reference to this is to undersell the potential benefits of the proposals.”</p>	
Essex County Council (ECC)	<p>“The Dartford – Thurrock Crossing concession area is effectively, in so far as the motorist is concerned, a controlled area already and it may appear confusing to southbound drivers to pass through a controlled area, into an uncontrolled area between the Crossing and M25 Junction 2 and then pass through the controlled area proposed under this scheme. This will become even more significant if the southbound toll plaza is removed. Similar confusion may also arise for northbound traffic although there is no apparent suggestion that the northbound toll plaza will be removed. Should this scheme be extended northwards to the Dartford – Thurrock Crossing to reduce driver confusion?”</p>	<p>The Highways Agency do not anticipate that the introduction of Controlled Motorways will cause any confusion to motorists. The Dartford toll plaza is situated several kilometres from junction 2 and therefore there will be sufficient distance for motorists to acclimatise to the traffic conditions. The Controlled Motorway will help to control the traffic flow and will help to reduce the impact of any incidents.</p> <p>The feasibility of the removal of the southbound toll plaza to create one way tolling is being considered in the Department of Transport (DfT) report ‘Dartford River Crossing Study’ issued in April 2009. In addition to Controlled Motorways, it is intended to install digital speed cameras (SPECS) from Junction 2 to the toll plaza.</p>

Organisation	Responses – Comments about the scheme	
	Comments Received	Response to comment
	<p>“It would appear essential for the success of the scheme that enforcement measures are included and it is noted that HADECS 2 is to be deployed. Is this technology known to work in very heavy traffic conditions and does it include photograph(s) of the speeding vehicle to support the evidence/vehicle identification/confirm distance travelled?”</p>	<p>The HADECS 2 system has undergone Home Office Type Approval process and is appropriate for use in congested traffic conditions when Variable Speed Limits are on display. Photos will be taken to support prosecutions.</p>
Non affiliated individual	<p>“Road markings and gantries are already in place, which surely suggests this “consultation” is a sham and you have already determined to proceed with the scheme.”</p> <p>“Most of the traffic ends up doing largely the same speed and therefore “holding station” compared to the surrounding lanes.”</p> <p>“Capacity could be massively improved and stress levels (a significant indirect cause of accidents) reduced through a programme of driver education and by enforcing lane discipline.”</p>	<p>This is a traffic management scheme which has already received wide support from local stakeholders. Given the support already in place for the scheme and the benefits it will provide, we consider it appropriate to continue with the technical preparations for the scheme.</p> <p>The intention of Variable Mandatory Speed Limits is to smooth traffic flow and prevent the breakdown of traffic flow. The Controlled Motorway scheme will provide protection to queuing traffic.</p> <p>The Highways Agency agrees that driver education will key to the success of schemes such as this. The DVLA recently completed a consultation which included the education of drivers for all road conditions.</p>

Organisation	Responses – Comments about the scheme	
	Comments Received	Response to comment
	<p>“Traffic police have an amazing ability by their mere presence to improve lane discipline, adherence to speed limits and they can achieve many other benefits.”</p>	<p>Police enforcement is and will continue to be a core element of motorway enforcement. Obtaining an acceptable level of compliance with the speed limits displayed is key to the successful and safe operation of the scheme. The provision of enforcement cameras provides a full-time enforcement presence in support of traditional police enforcement.</p>
Road Rescue Recovery Association	<p>“The opinion of our members who cover the M25, J2/3 on a regular basis is, forget the speed limiters. Drop the bridge and toll charges at Dartford during peak times, which should improve the traffic flow to a more acceptable drive time.”</p>	<p>The feasibility of the removal of the southbound toll plaza to create one way tolling is being considered in the Department of Transport (DfT) report ‘Dartford River Crossing Study’ issued in April 2009.</p>
Magistrates Association	<p>As this section of the M25 has been subject to continued road works over recent years, it is doubtful whether any accident figures can be taken as representative of its normal usage. This casts doubt on the economic justification for the scheme. However the similar scheme on the Western section appears to work very well, so we have no objection to the scheme being introduced.</p> <p>We got the impression that little enforcement action is taken on the Western section, certainly cases do not appear in the court as we would expect. We should like to know whether this as a matter of policy, defective equipment, universal compliance or some other cause. Will the same apply to</p>	<p>Although there have been road works on this section over recent years the accidents statistics were taken over a period of 2002-2006 and the accident rate was recorded as 18.2 PIAs/100m veh km (stats19 database). The national average is 9.8 PIAs/100m veh km, so there are nearly twice as many accidents on this section as on a typical motorway. The scheme will smooth traffic flows on this section and an accident saving of 15% on the current accident rate is predicted with a 30-year monetary saving of £23.1m.</p> <p>Obtaining an acceptable level of compliance with the speed limits displayed is key to the successful and safe operation of the scheme.</p> <p>Discussions with the Police and courts service will advise how traffic prosecutions are to be dealt with. Enforcement equipment</p>

Organisation	Responses – Comments about the scheme	
	Comments Received	Response to comment
	enforcement on the Eastern section.	is installed on both the Western section as well as the Eastern Section (M25 J2-3).
The Association of British Drivers	<p>“The problem here is caused by the tolls, nothing to do with speed”</p> <p>“The volume of traffic on these roads means thousands of pounds in fines could be generated”</p> <p>“Speed cameras, we believe have already been installed on and just before the crossing”</p>	<p>The feasibility of the removal of the southbound toll plaza to create one way tolling is being considered in the Department of Transport (DfT) report ‘Dartford River Crossing Study’ issued in April 2009.</p> <p>Obtaining an acceptable level of compliance with the speed limits displayed is key to the successful and safe operation of the scheme. Neither the police nor local councils make any money from speeding fines.</p> <p>This is a traffic management scheme which has already received wide support from local stakeholders. Given the support already in place for the scheme and the benefits it will provide, we consider it appropriate to continue with the technical preparations for the scheme.</p>

Table 3B: Comments about the scheme

4 SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Summary

The Controlled Motorways project team has consulted widely with over 70 key stakeholders including the Emergency Services and road recovery organisations.

In summary, the consultation has shown that stakeholders generally support the proposals to introduce VMSL on specified sections of the M25 motorway.

4.2 Recommendations

Responses from the Highways Agency have been sent to the organisations that provided comments on the legislative changes required to implement the scheme. None of the comments received from stakeholders will impact on the proposed policy or draft Regulations. Following the consultation, the Highways Agency recommends proceeding with making the necessary legislative changes by way of Regulations to provide for VMSL, for the Controlled Motorways scheme as shown in Table 4A.

Motorway	Extent	Carriageway	Feature
M25	J3 – 2	Anti-clockwise	VMSL
	J2 – 3	Clockwise	VMSL

Table 4A: Controlled Motorways M25 Junctions 2 to 3

It is recommended that the following Regulations be made in order to enable the implementation of the Controlled Motorways scheme:

- The M25 Motorway (Junction 2 to 3) (Variable Speed Limits) Regulations 2011.

Appendix A – List of Consultees

Hannes Webber Store Manager IKEA Lakeside Lakeside Retail Park Heron Way West Thurrock Essex RM20 3WJ	Bluewater Management Upper Rose Gallery Bluewater Greenhithe Kent DA9 9ST
Chief Officer Dartford Borough Council Civic Centre Home Gardens Dartford Kent DA1 1DR	Chief Officer Sevenoaks District Council Council Offices Argyle Road Sevenoaks Kent TN13 1HG
Chief Officer Thurrock Council Civic Offices New Road Grays Essex RM17 6SL	Chief Officer Essex County Council County Hall Market Road Chelmsford CM1 1LX
Chief Officer Kent County Council County Hall Maidstone Kent ME14 1XQ	Chief Officer Brentwood Borough Council Town Hall Ingrave Road Brentwood Essex CM15 8AY
Chief Officer South East Coast Ambulance Service Kent Office Heath Road Coxheath Maidstone Kent ME17 4BG	Chief Officer Kent Fire & Rescue Service Headquarters The Godlands Straw Mill Hill Tovil Maidstone Kent, ME15 6XB

<p>Chief Officer Kent Police Headquarters Sutton Road Maidstone Kent ME15 9BZ</p>	<p>Chief Officer East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust Regent House 110 Northgate Street Bury St Edmunds Suffolk IP33 1HP</p>
<p>Chairman (Traffic Committee) ACPO 7th Floor 25 Victoria St London SW1H 0EX</p>	<p>Mr Chris Cox Contracts Manager National Traffic Control Centre 3 Ridgeway Quinton Business Park Quinton Expressway Birmingham B32 1AF</p>
<p>DE&S Secretariat Ministry of Defence Spur 5, E Block Ensleigh Bath BA1 5AB</p>	<p>Chief Officer Chief Fire Officers Association 9-11 Pebble Close Tamworth Staffordshire B77 4RD</p>
<p>Chief Constable Ministry of Defence Police Building 66 MDP Wethersfield Braintree Essex CM7 4AZ</p>	<p>Regimental Secretary RHQ RMP Defence Police College Policing and Guarding Postal Point 38 Southwick Park Fareham Hants PO17 6EJ</p>
<p>Operating Director Britannia Rescue Britannia Rescue Freepost HF118 Huddersfield HD1 1JF</p>	<p>Chief Officer Ambulance Services Association The Secretary Ambulance Services Association Friars House 157-168 Blackfriars Rd London, SE1 8EU</p>
<p>Operating Director Association of Vehicle Recovery Operators 9, Railway Terrace Rugby, CV21 3EN</p>	<p>Operations Director RAC Motoring Services RAC House Brockhurst Crescent Walsall WS5 4QZ</p>

<p>Chief Executive Institute of Vehicle Recovery Operators Top Floor Bignell House, Horton Road West Drayton Middlesex, UB7 8EJ</p>	<p>Operations Director Green Flag Cote Lane Dawsons Corner Pudsey Leeds LS28 5GF</p>
<p>Graham Feest AIRSO 68 The Boulevard Worthing BN13 1LA</p>	<p>Operations Director Mondial Assistance Mondial House 102 George Street Croydon Surrey CR9 1AJ</p>
<p>The Chair Institute of Advanced Motorists I.A.M. House 359 Chiswick High Road London, W4 4HS</p>	<p>Chief Officer Road Recovery Association Hubberts Bridge Road Kirton Holme Boston PE20 1TW</p>
<p>Rebecca Lush Campaign for Better Transport 12-18 Hoxton Street, London N1 6NG</p>	<p>Chief Executive National Tyre Distributors Association 8 Temple Square Aylesbury Bucks HP20 2QH</p>
<p>The Chair RoSPA Edgbaston Park 353 Bristol Road Birmingham B5 7ST</p>	<p>Operations Director Automobile Association Ltd Norfolk House, Priestly Road Basingstoke Hampshire, RG24 9NY</p>
<p>The Chair Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety, 3rd Floor Clutha House 10 Storey's Gate London, SW1P 3AY</p>	<p>The Secretary Association of British Insurers 51 Gresham Street London EC2V 7HQ</p>
<p>The Chair Campaign to Protect Rural England National Office 128 Southwark Street London SE1 0SW</p>	<p>Operations Director Stansted Airport Enterprise House Bassingbourn Road Essex CM24 1QW United Kingdom</p>

<p>Communications Manager Kent & Medway Safety Camera Partnership Phoenix House 2-8 London Road Maidstone Kent ME16 8PZ</p>	<p>Chief Officer RAC Foundation 89-91 Pall Mall London SW1Y 5HS</p>
<p>The Secretary British Insurance Brokers' Association 14 Bevis Marks, London EC3A 7NT.</p>	<p>The Secretary Association of British Drivers P.O. Box 2228 Surrey CR8 5ZT</p>
<p>Trevor Whelan CILTUK Earlstrees Court Earlstrees Road Corby, Northants NN17 4AX</p>	<p>Ms Mary Williams Executive Director BRAKE P.O. Box 272 Dorking Surrey RH4 4FR</p>
<p>The Secretary The British Roads Federation Pillar House 194-202 Old Kent Road London SE1 5TG</p>	<p>Chief Executive Driving Standards Agency Stanley House 56 Talbot Street Nottingham NG1 5GU</p>
<p>Mr David Harvey President CSS County Hall Matlock Derbyshire DE4 3AG</p>	<p>The Director Civil Engineering Contractors Association Construction House 56-64 Leonard Street London EC2A 4JX</p>
<p>The Chair British Motorcyclist Federation 25 Warren Parkway Enderby Leicestershire LE19 45A</p>	<p>Chief Executive West Kent Chamber of Commerce Castle Lodge Castle Street Tonbridge Kent TN9 1BH</p>
<p>The Managing Director The British School of Motoring 1 Forest Road Feltham TW13 7RR</p>	<p>Operations Director Defensive Driver Training Ltd Douglas House 217 Long Lane Halesowen B62 9JT</p>

<p>The Chairman CBI South East Tubs Hill House London Road Sevenoaks Kent TN13 1BL</p>	<p>Douglas Campbell OBE Executive Director The Disabled Drivers' Association P.O. Box 7218 Great Holm Milton Keynes MK8 9XN</p>
<p>The Secretary Central Council of Magistrates Courts Committees 185 Marylebone Road London NW1 5QB</p>	<p>The Honorary Secretary District Courts Association P.O. Box 14 Civic Centre Motherwell ML1 1TW</p>
<p>Kent Regional Co-ordinator Friends of the Earth 26-28 Underwood Street LONDON N1 7JQ</p>	<p>Neil Betteridge Disabled Persons Transport Committee Department for Transport 1/14 Great Minister House 76 Marsham Street London SW1P 4DR</p>
<p>Rosi Edwards Health and Safety Executive 1 Hagley Road Birmingham B16 8HS</p>	<p>The Chief Executive Disabled Drivers' Motor Club Cottingham Way Thrapston Northamptonshire NN14 4PL</p>
<p>National Secretary Institute of Road Safety Officers IRSO Head Office Pin Point, Rosslyn Crescent Harrow, HA1 2SU</p>	<p>The Manager The Freight Transport Association Springwood House Low Lane Horsforth Leeds LS18 5NU</p>
<p>Director of Technical Affairs Institution of Highways and Transportation 6 Endsleigh Street London WC1H 0DZ</p>	<p>The Chair Local Government Association Local Government House Smith Square London SW1P 3HZ</p>
<p>The Chief Executive Kent Invicta Chamber of Commerce Ashford Business Point Waterbrook Avenue Sevington Ashford Kent. TN24 OLH</p>	<p>The Secretary Magistrates' Association 28 Fitzroy Square London W1P 6DD</p>

<p>The President Institution of Civil Engineers 1 Great George Street Westminster London SW1P 3AA</p>	<p>Chairman and Director Motorcycle Action Group Central Office Rugby CV21 3ZR</p>
<p>The Secretary Justices' Clerk Society Port of Liverpool Building Pier Head Liverpool L3 1BY</p>	<p>The Chair Motorcycle Rider Training Association 22-24 Clarendon Road Cambridge CB2 2BH</p>
<p>Chief Executive The Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport (UK) Earlstrees Court Corby Northants NN17 4AX</p>	<p>The Chairman Road Rescue & Recovery Association Hubberts Bridge Rd Kirton Holme Boston Lincolnshire PE20 1TW</p>
<p>The Chair Police Federation 15/17 Langley Road Surbiton KT6 6LP</p>	<p>The Chair Road Haulage Association Roadway House 35 Monument Hill, Weybridge Surrey KT13 8RN</p>
<p>Chief Executive VOSA Berkeley House Croydon Street Bristol BS5 0DA</p>	<p>Superintendents Traffic Association Cheshire Constabulary Clemonds Hey Oakmere Road Winsford CW7 2UA</p>
<p>The Chair The Wildlife Trust The Kiln Waterside Mather Road Newark Nottinghamshire NG24 1WT</p>	<p>RCC Supervisor Highways Agency South East Regional Control Centre Foster Down Godstone Surrey RH9 8PQ</p>
<p>RCC Supervisor Highways Agency East Regional Control Centre St. Albans Road South Mimms Hertfordshire. EN6 2XP</p>	

Appendix B – Letter to Consultees

Our ref:

Letter to all consultees

John Martin
Project Manager
4th Floor
Federated House
London Road
Dorking RH4 1SZ

Direct Line: 01306 878129
Fax: 01306 878483

M25 JUNCTIONS 2-3 CONSULTATION ON REGULATIONS TO ENABLE CONTROLLED MOTORWAYS

I refer to my earlier letter on the above. I am now writing to inform you that the Secretary of State has decided to enact the regulations for variable mandatory speed limits on this section of M25. This will enable the implementation of the controlled motorway scheme. Further details will be published ahead of the system going live.

Since my earlier letter Ministers have indicated that the current priority in considering improvements at the Dartford Crossing is addressing current levels of congestion through the use of newer technology to collect the charge at the crossing. The Highways Agency is currently developing a plan for the implementation of that technology.

Regarding speeding fines, since April 2011 the ring fence funding for road safety has been removed. It is for the highways authorities to determine funding for road safety based on local priorities. All monies received from fines goes to the Treasury.

A more detailed analysis of the consultation outcome and report, including responses to the issues raised by all consultees, has been published on the Highways Agency website at <http://www.highways.gov.uk/roads/133.aspx> . Please let me know if you require a copy of the report.

Yours sincerely

John Martin
Major Projects South (Dorking)
Email: john.martin@highways.gsi.gov.uk