

LIST OF OBJECTORS AND REFERENCE NUMBERS

OBJECTOR	COMMENT REF NO.
Mr D Curry – 69 Priory Street.	2, 4, 5
Mr K Hampton – 77A Priory Street.	2, 5, 6
Mr K Jones – 47 Priory Street.	1
Mr and Mrs Loake – 49 Priory Street	1, 6
Mr K Stephens – 97 Priory Street.	1,2,3,4,7, 8, 9
Resident of Priory Street	1,2

OBJECTION REFERENCE NUMBER AND OBJECTIONS

COMMENT REF. NO.	COMMENT	NO. OF TIMES COMMENT MADE	OFFICER COMMENT
1	<p>Concern that speed tables may cause excess noise and vibration and be a disruption to buses and large vehicles.</p> <p>Concern about noise from vehicles braking and accelerating whilst negotiating the speed tables</p> <p>Suggest build-outs instead of speed tables</p>	4	<p>It is accepted that any physical feature in the highway intended to slow vehicle movement has the potential to cause an increase in noise and pollution. However this needs to be balanced against the potential benefits and lower vehicle speeds that a 20 zone is intended to provide. The flat top ramps are proposed to be 75mm high with shallow approach and exit ramps.</p> <p>The overall scheme and the form of the features within the zone have been subject to extensive consultation. The regulations governing 20mph zones means that sufficient features must be provided within the zone to ensure compliance with the 20mph limit. The final form of the features is the minimum that can be used for a 20mph zone.</p> <p>The County Council's passenger transport section and the bus operators have raised no objection to the proposals.</p> <p>It is considered that the proposals will deter many larger vehicles from using Priory Street which will be to the benefit of residents.</p> <p>It is considered that horizontal deflections on their own are unlikely to provide the level of speed control necessary for a 20mph zone. Further horizontal deflections take up a greater amount of kerbside space and would have a greater impact in terms of loss of on-street parking.</p>
2	<p>A variety of concerns have been expressed about the proposed priority system at Goldney House Corner. These can be summarised as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Priority wrong direction. - 2 build-outs not needed. - Give way markings not needed - Inadequate visibility - Unnecessary and dangerous. - Difficulty of vehicle access to numbers 102 – 108 if build-outs are provided. - Concern about access to No. 69 for disabled passenger as vehicle will obstruct give way point for priority system - Suggests zebra crossing rather than priority build-outs 	4	<p>It is recognised that the proposed priority working with two build-outs has caused the most concern for the objectors. An alternative would be to use a single build-out and have no priority. The main build-out would be on the south side of Priory Street with a smaller build-out on the north side directly opposite it to facilitate sufficient visibility for pedestrians waiting to cross the road. This alternative may not provide as much speed control as the advertised proposal and would need to be monitored in use.</p> <p>A zebra crossing was considered during the consultation periods but dismissed by residents due to the impact of the associated zig-zag markings on on street parking.</p>
3	Speed tables hard for cyclists to travel over.	1	The proposed flat top ramps are 75mm high with 1 in 12 approach and exit ramps. It is considered that these will be easily negotiated by cyclists. The material choice is an imprinted asphalt and as such is more cycle friendly compared to other materials that could be used.
4	Signs on entry to 20mph zone will not be in keeping with the area.	2	The 20mph zone signs have been designed to meet regulations set out in "The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002" and are the minimum that can be provided. If the 20mph zone were not to be provided then all the traffic management features would have to be individually signed.

COMMENT REF. NO.	COMMENT	NO. OF TIMES COMMENT MADE	OFFICER COMMENT
5	Requests additional signs at Newlands Road directing traffic, particularly HGVs but not buses, away from Priory Street	2	Whilst a weight limit may help to remove through HGV traffic there will be an exemption for access so legitimate HGV movements would continue. The volume of HGV movements is unknown at this time and would require further study. A weight limit would require Police support, as the enforcement authority, and is unlikely to be a high priority for action. It is therefore considered inappropriate to pursue a weight limit at this time. It is considered that the proposals will deter many larger vehicles from using Priory Street which will be to the benefit of residents.
6	Supports 20mph zone but not traffic management features within it. Suggests high level of enforcement of 20mph limit is required. Suggests that priority systems either end of Priory Street are all that is required	2	The regulations governing 20mph zones mean that sufficient features must be provided within the zone to ensure compliance with the 20mph limit. However the proposed features have been designed to be the minimum required for a 20mph zone. It is not possible to introduce a 20mph zone without the speed reducing features.
7	Concerned at loss of on-street parking	1	No additional on-street parking restrictions are proposed at this time following feedback during the consultation stages. Some loss of parking may occur on the bend at Goldney House but this is likely to be minimal.
8	Suggests that the 20mph speed limit be part-time in operation	1	It is not possible for a 20mph zone to operate on a part-time basis.
9	Concern about vehicle suspension damage when accessing driveway	1	This comment relates directly to an access which is located by a proposed raised junction. With the level of the carriageway being raised it is considered that the access will become easier to negotiate than at present.