

**WESTBURY: WESTBURY LEIGH - OBJECTIONS TO
TRAFFIC ORDERS**

Objections		Comments
General (A)		
(i)	These proposals are a vivid illustration of lack of joined up thinking. The development should provide a distributor road that forms part of the link from the A350 through to the B3098.	The Traffic Orders deal with the layout at present under construction as a consequence of planning approvals.
(ii)	The deposited plans showed no scale.	There is no requirement within the Traffic Order Procedure Regulations to indicate a scale on deposited documents. The schedules in the Orders specify measurements.
Order 1 - Weight Restriction		
(a)	The existing 17.5 tonne order was introduced to safeguard Westbury Leigh. Now that will be bypassed, there is no need for a restriction throughout the length from A36 to A350.	The remainder of the route from A36 through Tower Hill is not ideal for heavy vehicles. Removal of the weight restriction would be likely to result in objections.
(b)	Oldfield Road should be used as part of the Distributor Road until it is extended across the railway. The 7.5 tonne restriction should thus not be imposed on Oldfield Road. Hillman's lorries from their depot on Oldfield Road should be able to use Oldfield Road to access the Distributor Road.	The Planning Inspector did not support routes through Oldfield Road. Traffic calming introduced to discourage through traffic. Local demand for the traffic calming. Not suitable for use by through traffic, particularly lorries. Hillman's use is relatively limited and is not appropriate through traffic calmed residential area.
(c)	Oldfield Road link road is wrongly described as an unclassified road.	The link road is <u>not</u> a classified road.
(d)	A description in Schedule 2 of the draft order refers to south <u>eastern</u> end and should be south <u>western</u> .	The draft will be amended prior to the order being sealed.
(e)	The structure and drafting of Schedule 3 of the order is flawed and could be construed in the future to infer the rural buffer and public open space are potential "development" areas.	The rural buffer and public open space are within the area outlined in the public permission for the complete "development". Lorries may need to access these areas.
(f)	The words "to which access is permitted... in article 4" are otiose.	This wording is considered necessary and not misleading.
(g)	There is no reference in the proposed 7.5 tonne order to the side road culs-de-sac off Westbury Leigh to which access may be required.	The description was taken from the previous 17.5t restriction which it is proposed will be 7.5t through Westbury Leigh. It was not the intention (nor has it been in the past) to prohibit access to the culs-de-sac and the wording will be amended to clarify this intention.
(h)	The wording for various lengths of the proposed A3098 route is confusing.	The District Council has not yet named a number of the roads. It was considered appropriate to separately list the various sections.

Objections		Comments
Order 2 - Prohibition of Driving		
(a)	The Local Planning and Highways Authorities were complicit in changing the original intended layout and there is no justification for allowing the developer to interfere with the existing highway.	The Traffic Orders reflect the planning obligations in relation to the permitted developments and the Highway agreements.
(b)	The lengths stopped up on either side of the new road are different.	The descriptions reflect the variations in layout on either side of the road.
(c)	The chicanes also shown on the plan relating to the prohibition of driving are not referred to in any paperwork.	The proposals shown for traffic calming in Tower Hill are indicative only. Details have previously been sent to the Parish Council and have been slightly modified following comments by residents directly affected. It is not envisaged that the proposals will require legal orders and therefore have not been advertised.
Order 3 - Waiting Restriction (Westbury)		
(a)	Objects to the removal of restrictions in Wellhead Lane.	There are no proposals to remove the existing restriction. The reference is for “administrative purposes” and removes a duplicate description.
(b)	As per objection (c) to Order 2.	Comment as per objection (c) Order 2.
(c)	The restriction should be longer on the north east side of Gooseland where there is more traffic and less on the south west side.	30m is considered sufficient to provide visibility on the north east side, 68m is necessary to cover the traffic-calming feature on the south east side of the junction.
Order 4 - Waiting Restriction (Dilton Marsh)		
(a)	The prohibition of waiting should extend further to prevent displacement parking being dangerous.	The proposal is considered sufficient but the matter will be monitored.
(b)	As objection (c) to Order 2.	As comment to objection (c) Order 2 above.
(c)	There is a discrepancy between the distances quoted and the plan.	The schedules specify the restrictions and the plans are indicative of the proposals. There does not appear to be a discrepancy between the plan and schedule.
Order 5 - 30 mph Speed Limit		
(a)	Treat the objections made in January 2001 in respect of the then proposed 50 mph order on the A3098 between Westbury Leigh and Chapmanslade as pari passu in respect of the current proposal.	The concerns regarding the proposed 50 mph speed limit on the A3098 between Westbury Leigh and Chapmanslade and the associated costs were dealt with at the time.
(b)	The draft order omits to mention lengths shown on the plan as proposed 30 mph restriction.	The restrictions on these roads, and the new housing estate roads, will be imposed by virtue of the installation of street lighting systems. Separate orders are not required.
(c)	The short new length of A3098 between Tower Hill and the adjacent roundabout should be restricted to 40 mph not 30 mph.	This short length could have been restricted to 40 mph but to avoid short lengths of 30 mph/40 mph/then 30 mph again it is considered appropriate to restrict it to 30 mph (as allowed for in current criteria).

Objections		Comments
Order 6 - 40 mph Speed Limit		
(a)	As per objection (c) to Order 5.	See 5 (c) above.
(b)	The design speed of the Distributor Road is 85 kph (53 mph) and the speed limit should be at a corresponding level (ie 50 mph). By restricting it to 40 mph it detracts from the time benefits of using the new route.	The time difference between 50 mph and 40 mph on the A3098 route between junctions 2 and 3 would be only about 4 seconds and is thus insignificant in journey times. If and when the route is extended across the railway, the matter will be reconsidered.
Item 7 - Speed Control Table		
The proposal is inappropriate and will discourage traffic from the Laverton Road/ Leigh Road/Eden Vale Road Route to avoid the town centre. The proposal should be deferred until the Canac Link is built. The finance should be used to bring forward the Canac Link.		The introduction of a mini roundabout at the Gooseland junction will set back the Give Way line. The traffic calming priority narrowing should ensure speeds are reduced to a level appropriate for the available visibility.
General (B)		
Can the County Council say when and what improvements to Tower Hill will be introduced following the report to Environmental Services Sub-Committee on 10 th January 2001 (Min No 6(1).		The payment from the Developer is now due. Details and programming of these proposed works will now be finalised and a separate response will be forwarded to Mr. Morland in respect of this question.