

**APPENDIX 2**

**Easton Lane / Byway 108 - Prohibition of Driving**

**TABLE OF OBJECTORS AND SUPPORTERS**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Objection/ Support</b>
RESIDENT	Email	<p><b>Objection</b>            I'm writing to object to proposed TRO to the above lane , my reason for objection is the historical value of the lane should not be taken away due to housing development if said developers are investing in building in the area surely they should be accountable to provide access to their development without further closing of diminishing byways as I'm sure you are aware the green lane network is under attack from all angles as is and further deminishment only adds to lack of byways and more traffic on remaining networks leading to more closures.</p>
RESIDENT - Chippenham	Online Form	<p><b>Objection</b>            By trying to make the area safer for new residents, this would adversely affect the existing residents of Easton/Gastard, for whom the nearest alternative would be to use the Biddestone Lane which then intersects the A4 at a very dangerous junction, where accidents will probably occur and be likely to have severe consequences. This scheme is therefore counterproductive as it will increase risk of death or serious injury.</p>
CHIPPENHAM TOWN COUNCIL	Email	<p><b>Support</b>            Please note the Town Council has no objection to the proposed traffic regulation orders.</p>
MICHELLE DONELAN MP	Letter	<p><b>Comments: Letter to Cllr Bridget Wayman</b>            I have written to you before, on behalf of concerned constituents, regarding the closure of Easton Lane. Aforementioned in previous letters, my constituents have expressed the same concerns about the imminent closure of the lane, citing that many vehicles use the lane as an alternative to safely avoid heavy traffic on the main A4 roads. There are real concerns that closing the lane could increase traffic congestion on the main road from Corsham to Chippenham. I would be most grateful if you could provide us with an update on the situation, more specifically the results of the consultation that you discussed in the previous response.</p>

Name	Address	Objection/ Support
RESIDENT	Email	<p><b>Objection</b></p> <p>I object to the proposed TRO on the basis that it does not address the current issue of fly tipping and anti-social behaviour on Easton Lane which is likely to increase. The closed sections should be dug up to prevent access, with only footpath remaining. The remainder of the former road from bypass construction should be included in the works to prevent use as a rubbish dump and car trails course.</p>
RESIDENT	Email	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p>I'm imploring you to close Easton lane to cars and keep it a safe route for walkers, cyclists, and horse riders. My son used to cycle that way to Sheldon school and then the station and with the new Bloor home developments he decided it was easier to take the A4 from Corsham rather than pull out at the bottom of the hill. Unfortunately, the A4 cycle was very stressful and subsequently he had an accident at the Pheasant roundabout that caused him post-traumatic stress and months off work.</p> <p>A safe cycle route that goes from Corsham to Chippenham is required and would mean that so many more students and commuters would enjoy cycling to work and School. How are we going to become greener if we don't start changing the road infrastructure, so it becomes the norm to walk or cycle and not get into the car?</p> <p>Local councils have to start doing more to infiltrate new ways of supporting people to change the way of thinking about driving short distances. A fitter, healthier community will also put less pressure on the NHS!!</p>
RESIDENT	Email	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p>I strongly support closing Easton lane to motor traffic. We desperately need more infrastructure to support and empower people to make journeys by human powered and electric assisted human powered transport. Our transport infrastructure should ensure that human powered transport is the safest most efficient personal transport option.</p> <p>I know that closing Easton Lane to motor traffic has the potential to save lives and encourage more people to journey between Chippenham and Corsham ( for example) without the need to use the A4. This stretch of the A4 is currently not particularly inclusive of cyclists, for example.</p>

Name	Address	Objection/ Support
RESIDENT - Corsham	Email	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p>My grandson, who is a cyclist, and has had two very bad experiences whilst cycling on the A4, advises me that it would be very good to have a safer route to cycle when visiting me in Corsham, and says that the prohibition of motor vehicles on Easton Lane would be a desirable and possibly life-saving measure to take. In an ideal world the A4 would be widened to include cycle lanes, but so far I have not heard of any plan to do this.</p>
RESIDENT	Email	<p><b>Objection</b></p> <p>I wish to object to the proposed TRO for Easton Lane and Byway 108.</p> <p>It is not necessary to close this byway to motor vehicles. The reasons given, safety, are a situation that has/will be created by the lack of thought given when approving the planning application for Hunters Moon and the closing of Easton Lane at the junction with the road to the Hunters Moon development.</p> <p>Nationally motor vehicles have access to less than 3% of the public rights of way network. The closure of byway 108 would be further erosion of this small percentage.</p>
RESIDENT- Corsham	Email	<p><b>Comment</b></p> <p>I do not understand the value of what this TRO consultation is as it seems to be implementing what is already there in place. I thought that this was about the reallocation of road space for active travel as fully closing Easton Lane to motorised vehicles would greatly enhance active travel into Methuen Park and Chippenham.</p> <p>The chicanes on the existing routes are a terrible idea and serve no purpose.</p>
RESIDENT - Gastard	Email	<p><b>Objection</b></p> <p>I am hereby registering my objection to the closure of Easton Lane to traffic</p> <p>It is a terribly thought out scheme that will effect my daily travel from Gastard to Chippenham and also many other of my fellow villagers. It will make us travel further through Corsham. (Not very green) Or increase the village traffic of Gastard and Thingley travellers site out onto the Bath Road at the very dangerous Chequers Hill junction (stupid idea!). Eventually the council will have blood on its hands. It is time that Wiltshire Council considered all its constituents and not just "town-dwellers"</p> <p>I am very angry with the council and its half-baked ideas!</p>

Name	Address	Objection/ Support
RESIDENTS (2) - Gastard	Email	<p><b>Objection</b></p> <p>We wish to object to the above proposal and specifically, the proposed changes to Easton Lane from its junction with Methuen Park, 27m west of that junction.</p> <p>The reasons we object are as follows:</p> <p>This proposal will, in effect, deny access to Chippenham from the junction at Two Ponds through to Methuen Park. This will mean that the main options for travelling from Gastard to Chippenham by car will be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. joining the A4 (turning right against the traffic) at the junction at the bottom of Chequers Hill; or</li> <li>2. travelling the additional distance via Corsham.</li> </ol> <p><b>Option 1- Road Safety</b></p> <p>Turning right to join the A4 at the bottom of Chequers Hill is a dangerous option, particularly at busy times of the day. The A4 is an extremely busy road and traffic descends from Corsham down Chequers Hill at considerable speed, as does the traffic from the Chippenham direction. This prospect raises very real road safety issues with the current lay out. We trust this junction has been or will be carefully monitored to assess this very serious aspect of the current proposal. No one could reasonably recommend this proposal if they have not personally negotiated this junction at a busy time of day - which many users of Easton Lane will have to do on a daily basis travelling to work in Chippenham if they are denied safe access via Methuen Park.</p> <p>We have used Easton Lane to access Chippenham since 1978 and 1984 respectively and have grave concerns about the road safety aspects of this proposal.</p> <p><b>Option 2 Environmental Impact</b></p> <p>The environmental impacts of the alternative option of travelling the additional distance through the town of Corsham is obvious and no doubt the Council will do the calculation of the additional emissions and congestion of Corsham Town Centre and carry out the appropriate costs benefits analysis of all additional costs associated with this proposal.</p> <p><b>Monitoring</b></p> <p>We have noticed recently what appears to be an attempt to monitor vehicular use of Easton Lane. Again, it will be obvious that relaying on monitoring of current road</p>

Name	Address	Objection/ Support
		<p>usage is wholly unreliable. Vehicular use of Easton Lane is currently much less than in normal times, as people work from home, leisure travel to Chippenham has been extremely limited, as has attendance at Church services and travel for other Church activities etc.</p> <p>Compromise</p> <p>Rather than denying access to Chippenham in this way, we suggest a reasonable (both safe and avoiding the significant negative environmental impact) would be to make Easton Lane one-way from Two Ponds to Methuen Park so that this section of Easton Lane is at least open for travel from Gastard to Chippenham. Turning left at the bottom of Chequers Hill for the return journey would not present road safety issues/additional travel via Corsham.</p> <p>We trust you will give the above representations careful consideration in the deliberations and decision making on this issue.</p>
RESIDENT - Gastard	Letter	<p><b>Objection</b></p> <p>I would like to express my opposition to the proposed closure of Easton Lane. The alternative route for me is an extra two miles through Corsham or joining the busy A4 at the dangerous junction at Chequers Hill. Both routes mean joining the ever-present waiting traffic at the McDonalds roundabout. I hope common sense will prevail.</p>
RESIDENTS (2) - Gastard	Email	<p><b>Objection</b></p> <p>I am registering our objection to notice of the imminent closure of Easton Lane. This is a very foolish move as we know that many light vehicles use this lane on a daily basis to avoid the heavy traffic on the main A4 road. Cars travelling from Gastard and beyond would have to turn left at Two Ponds to get to the A4 at the bottom of Chequers Hill. To cross the main road there to travel into Chippenham is extremely dangerous and many accidents have occurred there.</p> <p>Also, the main road to and from Corsham to Chippenham the traffic appears to be always back logged. The queues reach back to beyond The Pheasant and the other side of the bypass.</p> <p>We use the lane regularly and so do many others as we count the vehicles each time. It is keeping many vehicles out of the build-up of traffic on the main road. We also know that cars come along from the bottom of Chequers hill and turn into the lane to avoid this build-up of traffic and then are able to cross the traffic at the Sainsbury</p>

Name	Address	Objection/ Support
		<p>roundabout at Methuen Park to cross easily and so continue to Chippenham safely.</p> <p>It appears you have never taken a traffic census. This is a fundamental requirement.</p> <p>Walkers and cyclists on this stretch of lane are few and far between. we see no reason for you to be closing it to general traffic.</p>
RESIDENT - Corsham	Email	<p><b>Comment</b></p> <p>My comments are: Motorised traffic should keep this area for their use: 'Easton Lane from its junction with Methuen Park for a distance of 27 Metres in a SW direction'. It would be pointless and a waste of money to put in place another tiny isolated area for cyclists and pedestrians. It would create an unwanted barrier for cyclists (chicanes and bollards and then to stop at the end) and doesn't add any safety because cyclists are familiar with using hand signals and pedestrians would already be walking on the Easton Lane so why provide them with such a tiny space when they can simply continue on the road to the junction? The fact that there is a junction is enough reason for the pedestrian to stop. But progressive measures in this tiny area, that may add something to a sustainable future, would be to implement a prioritised pedestrian/cyclist crossing where the two proposed traffic free parts face each other at the Methuen Park junction. This means that the cyclist and pedestrians have free-flow of movement and safety, motorised vehicles will travel slowly in preparation for people crossing and measures like this can inspire people to move out of their cars.</p> <p>As a regular cyclist I wouldn't use that proposed area: Easton Lane traffic-free part (27metres SW from Methuen Park). I would stay on the road because it's easier.</p> <p>The Saltersford Lane proposal looks good apart from the chicane. Chicanes would be troublesome for cargo bikes, bikes with trailers and trikes. One can see that most chicanes in Chippenham, from the marks on the grass, that cyclists go around them and don't bother to shimmy through.</p> <p>The Byway 108 looks like a good proposal apart from having to share the by-way with motorbikes. I wouldn't want to share a path with motorbikes. Why is it consistently so hard for pedestrians and cyclists to get to their destination safely and pleasantly? When one arrives at the M&amp;S car park there's no pedestrian access apart from a muddy path that people have created</p>

Name	Address	Objection/ Support
		<p>themselves and there's a polluted crossing to wait at to access Cepen Park. All this is hard and unconnected as usual and it's easier and safer to be in a car. Please prioritise cyclists and pedestrians. People will then walk and cycle more and there could be a shift away from the socially degrading saturation of motorised vehicles.</p>
<p>REMOTE: Faringdon. Oxfordshire</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p><b>Objection: To Byway 108 TRO</b>  Byway 108 was once quite a major road into Chippenham, being part of a historical route - the old Bath to London turnpike road (together with Corsham Byway 122), and also awarded as a Public Carriage Road. Historically it was a country road, but over the years the town has expanded and enveloped the byway. Yet for all this, it's still there. It has a recorded width of over 20 feet, and I reckon it could be 30 feet along this section and its continuation westwards.</p> <p>I would like to object to banning 4x4s from driving this old road and would like to see them exempt from the order, like motorcycles. It would be easy to deter normal traffic by putting a ditch (or mound) across the byway at either end of the proposed TRO section. You've already done this on the other side of the road opposite the bollards. The small number of recreational vehicular users will then still have access, should they want to use it.</p> <p>Considering the width, I think there should be sufficient room to fence off and surface a separate path for walkers and cyclists along one side (horse riders would normally prefer an unmetalled surface). There is no need to put it down the middle (like Amesbury 20).</p> <p>Please accept this email as both an official objection to the order, and alternative suggestions on how to manage the process without preventing recreational 4x4 access.</p>