

Objectors – Byway 20, Amesbury**Original proposal**

Name	Address	Objection/ Support
Mr. Bill Riley	Bath Road, Bradford on Avon, BA15 1SS	<p>The Draft Order does not meet the criteria of the RTRA 1984 Section 1(1) (d), or the Council's additional reasons in respect of the length of approximately 200 meters of Byway 20 between the new ring road and Stockport Road.</p> <p>This length has a sustainable concrete surface and a wide verge. The visibility in both directions at each end is excellent. There are no safety issues and no reason to believe that any will arise in the future. A weight limit could be imposed if deemed necessary.</p> <p>The above-described length should be removed from the final Order; otherwise objections are inevitable, necessitating a public inquiry in view of the Council's failure to apply the statutory tests correctly.</p>
Wendy Brown – Town Clerk of Amesbury Town Council	amesburyclerk@btconnect.com	Objection (between Stockport Avenue and Stockport Road)

Name	Address	Objection/ Support
Anonymous 1	Paul's Dene Crescent, Salisbury,	<p>Reference the proposal to close Byway 20 to cars, motorcycles and carriages, I OBJECT to its introduction.</p> <p>As a onetime user of this right of way, I am unaware of any incidents or accidents involving the above user groups on this right of way, therefore I was somewhat surprised to find a succession of "temporary" Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) placed on it on the grounds of "safety" several years ago leading to the present date.</p> <p>Fast forward to the present and we now have a permanent TRO application. Therefore please provide the evidence of accidents and incidents of these specific user groups which have led to this decision and details of the impact assessment into how potentially banned user groups will be disadvantaged and what safe alternative routes are available?</p> <p>Secondly, it seems at odds that vehicles and carriages are considered a hazard on this byway, yet there use on adjacent newly built estate roads is quite acceptable. The public should be reminded that a byway, is legally a road, so vehicles should be expected, not removed, because the public are ignorant of highway law.</p> <p>Thirdly, the reasons for removing selected user groups are somewhat puzzling. The surface, for the large part is a concrete / tarred road, so how vehicles and carriages are likely to damage it, yet part of the reasons for the TRO is to "preserve the surface condition" and to protect</p>

Name	Address	Objection/ Support
		<p>the amenity and local dwellings? The latter (a new housing estate) it should be remembered, is a recent edition which has, in the greater scheme of things, created far more negative impact on the local environment and amenity, which was originally fields, than a few vehicles on a minor byway, yet its continued advancement has been allowed to advance!</p> <p>Finally I see no reason to close the entire byway 20, as the part between SU168396 Stockport Road, to the junction to the "new" estate road at approx. SU166400, as it is concrete, with a field either side, can be used with little risk to anyone. Or is this too slated for further housing development, thus destroying the amenity of the area, needing the difficult "problem" of a byway resolving before proceeding further?</p>
Mr. Dobson	Resident of Abbey Lane, Amesbury, SP4	<p>I write to object to your proposed order, as a regular user of Byway 20 by motorcycle and as a pedestrian since the early 1990's.</p> <p>Referring to your statement of Wiltshire Council's reasons for proposing to make the order as advertised, referring to RTRA 1984 Section 1(1)</p> <p>"d. For preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property.</p> <p>To prevent the use of the Byway by cars, motorcycles and carriages in order to preserve the surfacing and</p>

Name	Address	Objection/ Support
		<p>condition, to secure the amenity of the adjacent residential dwellings and to mitigate the risk to the safety of pedestrian users of the Byway".</p> <p>Referring to the section of Byway that runs south from the A345 to the new ring road, from personal experience and that of fellow motorcyclists to whom I speak, a motorcycle is not of a kind which, nor is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property.</p> <p>Indeed, a motorcycle has for some considerable time been the only form of motor vehicle that has been physically able to use the Byway, throughout the period subsequent to the non-renewal of Temporary Traffic Orders. This has been due to various obstructions to the Byway that are still in place today.</p> <p>A Byway, as many of the roads on the newly built estate is a shared space and whilst walking along the Byway I have never felt that there was a risk to mine or my family member's safety when occasionally meeting a fellow motorcyclist. The closure of the Byway to motorcycles will do nothing to secure the amenity of the adjacent residential dwellings, built as closely to the various estate roads as they are.</p> <p>The use of my motorcycle has not and will not damage the surface or condition of the Byway, especially now that it is in the process of being metalled.</p> <p>Referring to the section of Byway that runs south from the new ring road to Stockport Road, none of the</p>

Name	Address	Objection/ Support
		<p>reasons given for the proposed order apply.</p> <p>The road has had a concrete surface ever since I first started using it. It has not deteriorated since it became the most commodious route to access the Stockport Road business units with a four wheeled vehicle since the new ring road was built preventing access to the western end of Stockport Road. Indeed, the use of the Byway by motor vehicles mitigates the risk of collision on the highway at the substandard junction access to Stockport Road adjacent to the MoD guard dog pens.</p> <p>Should you not wish modify your proposed order, I would be pleased to present evidence to support my objections to an inspector at a public enquiry.</p>
<p>Number of objections - names included but withheld - 35</p>	<p>Various addresses on the Stockport Industrial Estate</p>	<p>I the under signed object to the closure of Byway 20 from the new link road to Stockport Road. As Stockport Road was taken away in the original planning application the removal has made a long detour for businesses and customers alike who visit Stockport Park and other units on the estate. Thus using the concrete section of Byway 20 saves time, distance and in the long term reduces carbon footprint. The use of Byway 20 also is in line with Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act whereby it is everybody's duty to reduce crime, including the duty of councils to consider their impact on crime and crime reduction. By using the Byway natural surveillance by its users is crime reduction. In the original planning consent a map shows the concrete sections either</p>

Name	Address	Objection/ Support
		<p>side of a new link road to be re-instated. Please do not remove this vital link as it will impact on businesses that operate in the estate.</p>
Anonymous 2	Stockport Road Industrial Estate	<p>As above petition and: In addition it is my opinion as the holder of a class one license that the junction at SU1691940082 is dangerous when turning right onto Stockport Road because the vehicle has to move into the cornering path of oncoming large vehicles in order to see if the way is clear. This is due to the fence on the left and the corner being too tight. Since Stockport Road was cut off we have not had any gritting of the road during winter periods making the corner which we currently bypass dangerous. This company has had to recover an engine that had been dumped in the middle of the road leaking oil. We have also reported fly tipping on the By way. The business pays a substantial amount of rates for little support as it is, yet despite this we take on the additional responsibility to preserve this area because we use the Byway. Please do not remove this vital link as it will impact on businesses that operate in the estate.</p>
Anonymous 3	Stockport Industrial Estate	<p>As above and: Given the vat increase in public money generated from the new homes built across from the link road it would not cost a significant amount to re-open the Old Stockport Road at its junction with the A345. You could then close the old Stockport Road after turning into Stockport Park Estate thus keeping the original intent for Stockport Road to be discontinued as a through road.</p>

Objectors – Byway 20, Amesbury

Amended proposal – removal of length adjacent Stockport Road

Mr. Dobson	As above	<p>1st email .Thank you for your recent email in response to my objection to the above proposal. I am of course delighted that the Council is in agreement that the section of Byway between the recently street name signed Stockport Avenue and Stockport Road is to be excluded from the proposal to prevent usage by motor vehicles.</p> <p>With regard to the remaining section subject to the above proposal, I am pleased to note that you have now mentioned the safety of users of the byway. Motorcyclists, in common with pedestrians and cyclists are the most vulnerable of road users. As a motorcyclist, this is one of the reasons that myself and fellow riders prefer to use byways, the safest of all classes of road for all users. The physical characteristics of Byways vary significantly throughout the county, all are traversed more safely by motorcycles in the company of pedestrians and cyclists than are sealed surfaced roads. To my knowledge, throughout the period that obstructions to the Byway have prevented the legal use of all motorised vehicles with the exception of motorcycles, there have been no recorded incidents involving the safe use of this Byway by motorcycles.</p> <p>I can provide photographic evidence of the safe use of Byway 20 by motorcycle, since the increased use by pedestrians, despite the illegal physical obstructions that are currently in place, should they be required to assist with your report.</p> <p>I am not, therefore, willing to withdraw my objection whilst the proposal seeks to prevent the safe</p>
------------	----------	--

		<p>use of the Byway by motorcycles. 2nd email. Whilst I appreciate that I can only surmise the reasoning for PC Appleton's preference for the term MPV with regard to this proposed order, if I may, I would like to explain a common misconception about the use of 'scrambler motorbikes' on Byways. It is quite possible that the problems that PC Appleton is seeking to address is that of the use of unregistered, uninsured and non-type approved (quite possibly noisy) motorcycles by unlicensed riders. As we know, the use of this type of vehicle is already unlawful on any public road or public place. It is only lawful to use this type of vehicle on private property with the land owner's permission. The illegal use of this type of vehicle in the proximity of dwellings can be extremely anti-social and Section 59 of the Police Reform Act 2002 gives a PC or PCSO powers to seize such a vehicle if they reasonably believe that an MPV is being used in a manner causing, or likely to cause alarm, distress or annoyance to the public. There are of course many other road traffic offences that are being committed by the use of this type of motorcycle on a Byway. If it is the case that PC Appleton is seeking to prevent 'scrambler motorcycles' from using the Byway, unfortunately a Traffic Regulation Order is unlikely to have any effect. The users of this type of motorcycle are already ignoring or ignorant of the law. He already has plenty of laws at his disposal to deal with such a problem.</p> <p>The only motorcyclists who will be prevented from safely using the Byway are those who are completely legal. Their motorcycles will be registered for use on the road, clearly displaying a registration plate on the rear of the motorcycle. This process of course ensures that the vehicle is type approved, Ministry of Transport</p>
--	--	---

		<p>tested, and road tax is paid and insured. The rider will be licenced, having completed at least the necessary Compulsory Training or would have passed one or more Department of Transport riding tests. Many I know personally have passed an advanced motorcycle test by a Class 1 Police Motorcycle examiner. Please accept my apologies if you feel the above and previous emails do not help you in understanding the reasons for my objection. Whilst I appreciate that meetings are not normally held, if it was felt that I can be of any further assistance in explaining the problems faced by motorcyclists to any non-motorcyclist, please do not hesitate to ask.</p>
<p>Anonymous 1</p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>Please be advised that I am NOT prepared to withdraw my objection.</p> <p>Firstly my original objections still stand - (why else would I have objected originally) - the council still seeks to remove vehicular rights; on I feel somewhat shaky grounds, lacking real evidence of a significant problem. Secondly I am extremely unhappy about the way this proposal has been allowed to happen. Here we have a byway which has been in existence for a number of years, long before any housing development and when the land was green fields. Then several years ago a "temporary" traffic regulation order was suddenly and explicably placed on it, under the catch all of safety. At the time the local rights of way warden was unable to fully explain to my satisfaction precisely why it needed closure to vehicular traffic, as I had been using it without incident.</p> <p>Fast forward to the present, and following a continuous set of temporary TRO renewals, the truth has been revealed. That of making the order permanent following the</p>

		<p>construction of a housing estate, which now makes the existence of vehicles on the byway "awkward" in some eyes. You state that local development adjacent mitigates motor vehicle access which implies that vehicles are not a problem and are to be expected in the area, but clearly not on the byway, where vehicles ARE allowed and SHOULD be expected. From this we can conclude that the TRO is being introduced primarily because the public don't expect, or want to see vehicles on this right of way. We can also conclude that as equestrians will still be allowed to use the byway, then these sometimes unpredictable animals do not present a risk to the young and elderly, therefore it is reasonable to claim that a motorcycle and rider (which also have to be insured unlike equestrians) do not present any greater risk due of their size, being smaller than a horse and rider and under control of a qualified rider. Any concerns over speed can be addressed with a speed limit. An exemption for motorcycles should therefore be applied, has this been considered, and if rejected, I would like to know the reasons why? Any residual conflict could be further reduced if there was better EDUCATION of users of byways. Simple and low cost signage could be employed to alert users that vehicles are to be expected, rather than a draconian closure. Have these alternatives been considered and discussed with the effected user group representatives prior to this final course of action and has any survey been conducted to canvas opinions, prior to the formal consultation? TROs should always be seen as a last resort as I'm sure you are aware. Finally I am pleased to see that the lower part has been earmarked to remain TRO free as part of a further proposal, but saddened because this</p>
--	--	---

		also indicates that people ARE willing to accept vehicular access on this byway, but only because it is required to gain access to planned allotments as you point out below. If the allotments do not go ahead, would this still remain?
--	--	---