

Comments Received

<u>Ref</u>	<u>Comments Received</u>	<u>Support/ Objection</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
1.	<p>Supports the proposal, stating “will make the area safer and more pleasant for people walking, wheeling and cycling”.</p> <p>Resident By email Postal address not supplied.</p>	Support	Comment in support of the proposal is noted.
2.	<p>“I am in full support for these proposals”.</p> <p>Wilts Councillor</p>	Support	Comment in support of the proposal is noted.
3	<p>“I fully support the proposal as it stands”.</p> <p>Asked if additional roads to include Shelburne Road, Horsebrook Park and Churchill Close could also be included in this proposal.</p> <p>Wiltshire Councillor</p>	Support with comments	<p>Comment in support of the proposal is noted.</p> <p>The additional roads did not feature on the original list agreed with the Town Council and have therefore not been assessed against the criteria.</p> <p>An expansion to the area currently under consideration will require a new assessment.</p>
4.	<p>“I object to you wasting council taxpayers money on a project that clearly does not work”!</p> <p>The objector cites his personal experience when regularly walking along Woodsage Way which is within a 20 mph Zone and has physical calming features such as full width ramps. The objector alleges that drivers regularly exceed 30 mph on Woodsage despite the signs and features provided.</p> <p>The objector is also concerned about enforcement: “Importantly, there is also NO enforcement, no deterrent so what is the point”?</p> <p>Resident By email Water Mint Way, Calne</p>	Objection	<p>Speed enforcement is the responsibility of the Police. The Police have been consulted upon as a Statutory Consultee to the Traffic Regulation Order and have not raised an objection.</p> <p>The proposal will lower the maximum permitted speed by 10 mph, and with new speed limit signs in place, at the commencement and as repeater signing throughout its length, it is anticipated that the vast majority of drivers will respect this change.</p> <p>Further traffic management measures can be considered following a period of adjustment and monitoring.</p>

<p>5.</p>	<p>“The roads subject to the order are not suitable for vehicular travel in safety at any speed greater than the proposed speed restriction of twenty miles per hour, even that speed is too great for most of the length of the roads mentioned in the schedule to the order. Most users of these roads are aware and do not need a sign informing them of the speed restriction, this being the case renders the provision of the numerous signs unnecessary and they would be an unwanted intrusion into the visual street scene”.</p> <p>“It is noted that no part of Low Lane is subject to the order as the part of Low Lane from its junction with Priestley Grove in an easterly direction is not mentioned in the schedule to the order, I think that the omission of that part of the road from the intended restriction is a good idea as it should enable cyclists and white (other colours are also applicable) van drivers emerging from the lane should be able to reduce their speed before arriving at a road subject to speed restriction”.</p> <p>“Why is the upper part of Low Lane identified in green on the drawing no.2021-003-SJA-D002.0 as "not public highway" given that designation as it is currently in public use without any impediment, and has been in such use for as long as sixty years, and furthermore has in recent time become part of the National Cycle Network”?</p> <p>Resident via on-line portal Low Lane</p>	<p>Objection</p>	<p>The intention is to target drivers who do not currently drive to the conditions found as reported by residents and local councillors.</p> <p>There is a requirement to display signs at the entry point to the new speed limit, with repeater signs and / or carriageway roundels placed in a sympathetic manner to limit the impact on the street scene environment. Existing street furniture, such as lamp columns will be utilised where possible to display signs.</p> <p>It was our intention to include the section of Low Lane recorded as public highway within the Order as was shown on the plan of the public notice. Unfortunately, due to a clerical error, this was omitted from the written schedule. It is our intention to correct this in due course.</p> <p>However, speeds are unlikely to change here as an earlier survey found that the average speed was 17.9 mph, at the junction with Priestly Grove.</p> <p>The label is correct. The extent of public highway ends at the boundary of properties 11 and 13 Low Road, with the remainder of the lane being in private ownership.</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>Resident confirmed that Sandy Ridge was in private ownership and that the owners did not wish this to be included within the Order.</p> <p>Resident By email Sandy Ridge, Calne</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>Officers have apologised to the resident for this oversight and confirmed that Sandy Ridge will be omitted from the Order schedule.</p>