

OBJECTIONS

<u>Ref</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>No of Times Made</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
1	<p>'Dilton Marsh Parish Council has made repeated representations regarding the road safety at Dilton Marsh, with particular reference to the speed of traffic at Tower Hill. The Parish Council considers that the preservation of safety at Tower Hill is paramount. The Parish Council strongly objects to the proposal to introduce the higher speed limit of 40 mph on the stretch of road defined in the order as follows:</p> <p>This stretch of road should remain at 30 mph, especially when the proximity of the existing road calming measures is considered that were introduced to address the road safety issues. A change to 40 mph would exacerbate an existing problem'.</p>	1	<p>The assessment has been completed using the Department for Transport Circular 01/06: Setting Local Speed Limits. This provides guidance to Highway Authorities on the factors which need to be taken into consideration when appraising an appropriate limit.</p> <p>As outlined in the main body of the report, one of the key aims of the guidance is to ensure an improved degree of consistency in setting speed limits.</p> <p>When selecting the most appropriate speed limit for a particular location it is imperative that the limit is conducive to the surrounding environment. It is this primary factor which reinforces the purpose and need for the restriction. If a speed limit is set in isolation, or is unrealistically low, it is likely to be ineffective and lead to disrespect for the speed limit, as well as requiring significant and avoidable enforcement costs. This may also result in substantial numbers of drivers continuing to travel at unacceptable speeds, thus increasing the risk of collisions and injuries.</p> <p>The criterion for a 30 mph limit is detailed in Traffic Advisory Leaflet 01/04; Village Speed Limits, and is based on the amount of frontage development, with a requirement for 20 or more houses over a minimum length of 600 metres. This length may be reduced to 400 metres when the level of development density over this shorter length exceeds the 20 or more houses criterion and in exceptional circumstances a reduction to 300 metres is permissible. If there are just fewer than 20 houses then the Highway Authority is able to make extra allowance for key buildings. The measurement of frontage development is based only on those houses that front onto the main road. It does not include groups of houses that access the main road from a side road. Frontage development density has to achieve an average of three houses per 100 metres throughout the length but particularly at the entrances to the limit. This</p>

<u>Ref</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>No of Times Made</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
			<p>ensures appropriate reinforcement of a village environment to the motorist.</p> <p>The guidance recognises there will be locations where the level of development does not satisfy these circumstances and in such scenarios outlines consideration should be given to other restrictions lower than the National Speed Limit, i.e. 40 mph or 50 mph.</p> <p>The proposal seeks to retain the existing 30 mph restriction through the area of Tower Hill where the residential development and traffic calming is located. The proposed change to 40 mph relates only to the length of the A3098 where no residential develop is present. By relocating the existing 30 mph terminal location to a point more akin with the residential development, it is considered this will provide a greater emphasis to motorists of the speed limit change and need to modify their driving accordingly.</p>
2	<p>B3414 From a point 84 metres north west of its roundabout junction with Roman Way, Warminster to a point 30 metres east of the entrance to Home Farm, Bishopstrow.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could this be extended to past Bishopstrow Farm and Bishopstrow Mill and Norton Bavant-Yew Tree and Middleton farm area/entrances please? – this is an stretch of road that includes access/exit to Rights of Way and Bridleway paths so has lots of pedestrians and horse usage, two bends at vehicular entrances/exits and a blind hill (towards Yew Tree and Middleton area) (sorry I can't give metres for reference!) 		<p>The proposed changes which have recently be advertised are a result of Wiltshire Council's countywide review of speed limits on A and B class roads undertaken in 2008 and 2009, followed a request by the Department for Transport following the publication of its revised guidance on speed limits - Circular 01/06; Setting Local Speed Limits.</p> <p>Wiltshire Council completed its review during 2009/10 and the results were subsequently published to all Town and Parish Councils for their comments during early 2010, and simultaneously the information was published on the Wiltshire Council website for general perusal.</p> <p>The review concluded the existing restriction remains appropriate for the environment. During the subsequent consultation period with Town and Parish Councils, no formal response to this recommendation was received from the Parish Council.</p>
3	<p>C10 Bishopstrow Road - From its junction with the B3414 Boreham Road, Warminster to a point 275 metres south of its junction with Cobbett Rise, Bishopstrow a distance of approximately 865 metres</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could you confirm that this is the 		<p>Wiltshire Council has given a commitment to undertake review of all C and Unclassified roads upon completion of the implementation of changes to the A and B network.</p> <p>The prioritisation of routes for review is being</p>

<u>Ref</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>No of Times Made</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
	<p>current road length (sorry again – I’m not good at gauging metre lengths as described!) – ie the current speed limit ends near the entrance to Eastleigh Court so this is not a change to reduce the road length currently in use? For info, I have on record a request via the Warminster Area Transport Group/Highways for the speed limit between this exit and Sutton Veny to be reduced to 40 mph to have a positive effect on reducing speeding into/through Bishopstrow.</p> <p>Whilst I appreciate the restrictions/considerations/criterion you’ve outlined, I’m a little nonplussed that, in a time when ‘localism and community involvement’ are being championed and encouraged, local knowledge of the road situation and conditions I mentioned are not considered of being any relevance. All the rules and regs doesn’t address that the locality would benefit from a better decision than that being proposed.</p>		<p>managed via the Community Area Boards. The process on how this is being managed and the mechanism for route prioritisation is provided in a Cabinet Member Decision which is available for viewing at: http://cms.wiltshire.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=438 .</p> <p>The C10 has not been prioritised by any of the Community Area Transport Groups (CATG) for review during 2012/13, and remains available for prioritisation by the Warminster (CATG) for review in 2012/14 should it so wish.</p> <p>The assessment and identification of the appropriate level of restriction must be completed in accordance with the guidance provided to Highway Authorities. The review has been undertaken by Engineers experienced in the setting of speed limits, and in a way which ensures consistency across both the county and nationally.</p> <p>The development of the Community Area Transport Groups has been a key element in improving community involvement within the Highways function of Wiltshire Council. This has allowed the various communities to identify and prioritise issues on local basis, however the application of the regulations and guidance must conform to the necessary standards.</p>
4	<p>Please find enclosed my comments on this proposal and recommendation for improvement. I speak as an interested party living on the B3414 (Bath Road)</p> <p>Firstly, I support a reduction in speed limit, but don’t believe your proposal meets the needs of the road, nor will it be effective. My prime observation (voiced previously with the Warminster Area Board) is that the 30 mph limit is located in the wrong place, and should be moved further up the road in line with the Town boundary. My reasoning is two-fold (a) the current gateway signage is not clearly visible due to a slight bend in the road, and therefore ineffective, and (b) the urban element of this road stretches further than the current limit suggests.</p>	3	<p>The assessment has been completed using the Department for Transport Circular 01/06: Setting Local Speed Limits. This provides guidance to Highway Authorities on the factors which need to be taken into consideration when appraising an appropriate limit.</p> <p>As outlined in the main body of the report, one of the key aims of the guidance is to ensure an improved degree of consistency in setting speed limits.</p> <p>When selecting the most appropriate speed limit for a particular location it is imperative that the limit is conducive to the surrounding environment. It is this primary factor which reinforces the purpose and need for the restriction. If a speed limit is set in isolation, or is unrealistically low, it is likely to be</p>

<u>Ref</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>No of Times Made</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
	<p>Feedback on my previous comments was that the positioning of the current signage meets ‘the rulebook’, and there have been insufficient deaths and accidents to warrant a higher priority. I am in favour of a common sense approach to spending the Council’s money wisely, and having a positive effect on safer driving conditions in Warminster.</p> <p>I will demonstrate my reasoning with some photographic evidence, and comments concerning speed limits and their application learned on a very informative Speed Awareness course taken last year.</p>  <p>As you cross the Town boundary, only one of the 30 mph gateway signs is visible. A pair of gateway signs with a hi-viz yellow surround is used, according to the police, to indicate risk – so making both visible would seem to be a sensible approach. There are also several concealed entrances on the left hand side (driveway access to my property) which are very dangerous to use.</p> <p>Visibility is further reduced with spring/summer foliage on both sides of the road.</p> <p>The two options to overcome this would be either straightening the road, or moving the gateway signs (and therefore the limit) to a more visible location.</p>		<p>ineffective and lead to disrespect for the speed limit, as well as requiring significant and avoidable enforcement costs. This may also result in substantial numbers of drivers continuing to travel at unacceptable speeds, thus increasing the risk of collisions and injuries.</p> <p>The criterion for a 30 mph limit is detailed in Traffic Advisory Leaflet 01/04; Village Speed Limits, and is based on the amount of frontage development, with a requirement for 20 or more houses over a minimum length of 600 metres. This length may be reduced to 400 metres when the level of development density over this shorter length exceeds the 20 or more houses criterion and in exceptional circumstances a reduction to 300 metres is permissible. If there are just fewer than 20 houses then the Highway Authority is able to make extra allowance for key buildings. The measurement of frontage development is based only on those houses that front onto the main road. It does not include groups of houses that access the main road from a side road. Frontage development density has to achieve an average of three houses per 100 metres throughout the length but particularly at the entrances to the limit. This ensures appropriate reinforcement of a village environment to the motorist. Whilst this guidance predominantly relates to village environments, the need for residential housing density can also be applied to the extremities of urban areas such as this scenario, as it enforces the purpose of the restriction.</p> <p>The guidance recognises there will be locations where the level of development does not satisfy these circumstances and in such scenarios outlines consideration should be given to other restrictions lower than the National Speed Limit, i.e. 40 mph or 50 mph.</p> <p>When assessing the length of the B3414 from its current terminal location to the roundabout junction with the A36 / A350, it is considered there are only four residential properties fronting the highway, albeit heavily masked from view by foliage, which have direct frontage access to the B3414, within a length of approximately 635 metres.</p>

<u>Ref</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>No of Times Made</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
	 <p>Whilst the road has also been painted at considerable cost, again to flag up the risk of reducing to a 30 mph limit prior to the mini-roundabout, this again does not negate the fact the signs are not clearly visible.</p>  <p>According to examples studied during my Speed Awareness course, a 30 mph urban limit is put in place (1) in an urban location, (2) where positioning and location of street lamps dictates, and (3) the number of dropped kerbs suggests a level of vehicle movements.</p> <p>Given these criteria, then the current 30mph limit is in the wrong place, and should be placed at the Town boundary. There are 15 dropped kerbs for vehicle access between the two roundabouts on this stretch of road, which is sufficient in to deem the road a 30 limit from the Town boundary onwards?</p>		<p>Consequently, this level of development is substantially below that advised in the guidance and will be insufficient to reinforce the need for motorist to accept and adhere to a 30 mph restriction.</p> <p>When assessing the length of the B3414 from its current terminal location to the location of the town nameplate signs, there is only one residential property fronting the highway, again heavily masked from view by foliage (as shown in the commentators photograph). This is within a length of approximately 100 metres. Again this level of development is below that advised in the guidance and considered insufficient to reinforce the need for motorist to accept and adhere to such a 30 mph restriction.</p> <p>It is acknowledged the visibility to the nearside terminal sign is restricted and below the desirable distance. This is due to a combination of its locations and the effect of foliage growth in advance of the sign. The physical nature of the sign requires it to be located substantially within the verge. The replacement of the sign without the 'Warminster' nameplate will allow the terminal sign to be repositioned closer to the carriageway and therefore improve the forward visibility to approaching motorists.</p> <p>Foliage growth in some circumstances can have a detrimental effect on a sign's visibility, where this growth originates from third parties neighbouring the highway, the responsibility to ensure such growth does not impinge on to the highway remains the responsibility of that land owner. Where there is foliage growth in the highway boundary this remains the responsibility of the Highway Authority and is subject to routine cyclic maintenance.</p> <p>The use of backing boards (either yellow or grey) has been devised to improve the conspicuity of signs in particular environments, and aid the mounting of the signs upon its supporting posts, as outlined in the Traffic Signs Manual – Chapter 7: The Design of Traffic Signs (2003). The presence of a sign on a yellow backing board does not indicate any form of additional risk.</p>

<u>Ref</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>No of Times Made</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
	<p>I fully support the reduction in the speed limit, particularly as I have to live with the constant threat of cars and trucks driving at speeds up to 70 mph before jumping on the brakes for the mini-roundabout. It is also particularly dangerous exiting my drive for the same reason, not helped that the gateway signs are not clearly visible. Not to mention the boy racers and motorcyclists who take the National Speed Limit sign exiting the mini-roundabout coming out of Warminster as the green light in a Formula One race and accelerate hard up the hill.</p> <p>I also do not believe purely changing the speed limit from the National Limit to 50 mph just off the main A350 roundabout would have show any significant change in driver behaviour and associated increase in safety.</p> <p>Given my arguments above, I would propose moving the current 30mph limit to be aligned to the Town boundary where the road is straight and the signage would be clearly visible. It would also be an excellent piece of PR to associate Warminster Town with a clear 30mph limit, thus encouraging safer driving throughout the town.</p> <p>I would go further still, and support the option of a 30 mph gateway off the A350 roundabout, with repeater signage along Bath Road down towards the mini roundabout.</p> <p>— — — — —</p> <p>In reference to the above proposal, I would refer to my neighbour John Ellis letter. I entirely agree with his reasoning and conclusions and support the removal of the 30 mph sign to the town boundary, or preferably back to the A350 roundabout.</p> <p>— — — — —</p> <p>Bath Road, the B3414 into Warminster has always been a fast road. Drivers are either speeding down the hill or accelerating up it, regardless of entry into or out of the 30 mph speed limit. I agree that reducing the limit from the national speed limit to</p>		<p>Speed limits cannot be introduced or retained on the basis that individual properties have accesses which may cause difficulties for users. The onus on ensuring access to the highway from a third party property can be achieved safely remains with the property owner / user. This can be achieved in a number of ways; common examples of improvement include the widening of an access, removing adjoining vegetation or the setting back of boundary wall to open the visibility splay. These measures also have the additional benefit of allowing motorists on the highway to become more aware of the potential for vehicles to emerge onto the highway.</p> <p>The level of speed limit applicable to a road is determined by its terminal signs. In a 30 mph restriction, a system of Street lighting lanterns is used to remind motorist of the restriction in force. The regulations laid out in the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002 do not permit the erection of additional repeater signs in such locations. Street lighting can be, and is often installed on roads which are subject to restrictions greater than 30 mph. Where this is the case, the regulations dictate that additional repeater signs must be provided to remind motorist of the level of restriction in force, i.e. 40 mph, 50 mph or the National Speed Limit. The presence of street lighting does not dictate that a 30 mph restriction is the appropriate level of restriction for that road.</p>

<u>Ref</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>No of Times Made</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
	<p>50 mph would be an improvement, however why not reduce further to 30? Half way between the roundabout and the current 30 mph limit, just before the brow of the hill is where the footpath ends and there is no safe way of getting out towards the roundabout or indeed, the Travelodge on that roundabout. I frequently see people walking down the footpath towards town, knowing that they have traversed down the road, much of it without footpath and over the brow of a hill with fast traffic in both directions.</p> <p>It would be most excellent if the reduction in speed from the roundabout would encourage the speed limit not to be exceeded further down Bath Road and into Church Road; there are no more speed notifications once you are inside the 30 mph limit by the Sydenhams roundabout are there any plans to put these up?</p>		
5	<p>In the interests of consistency and clarity, the word "south" should be added after the words "35 metres" in the proposed Schedule to Order 3 - The County of Wiltshire (A350 and C49, West Ashton) (50 mph Speed Limit) Order 2013.</p> <p>Furthermore, I object to the proposal in that Order (not shown on the corresponding Indicative Plan) to retain a 50 mph speed limit over a short length of the C49 road From its junction with A350 to a point 25 metres north west of that junction. It would be more satisfactory and save on signage costs arising from the proposed reduction of the speed limit to 40 mph over the length of the A350, West Ashton road specified in the proposed Schedule to Order 2 - The County of Wiltshire (Various Roads, West Ashton, Westbury and Dilton Marsh)(40mph Speed Limit) Order 2013 - to add that length of the C49 road to the proposed Schedule to Order 2 instead.</p>	1	These comments have been considered and the proposed orders amended to include these comments.

<u>Ref</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>No of Times Made</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
6	<p>Upton Scudamore Parish Council has discussed these changes and unanimously objects to any change in the speed limit on the A350. At the North end of the village the Parish Council are helping to finance safety improvements by slowing down traffic by putting double white lines at the junction. This proposal would undo all the work the Parish Council is trying to achieve. The turning at the southern end of the village where traffic seems to pick up speed from the traffic lights is again an accident waiting to happen and many villagers have had near misses joining the A350.</p> <p>By putting these speed limits on the A350 this will reverse the safety work the Parish Council and Wiltshire Council are trying to achieve on this road, and we as a Parish Council object strongly to these proposals.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">— — — — —</p> <p>In support of the Upton Scudamore Parish Council, I would like to request that the 50 mph speed limit is not altered as proposed for the following reasons:-</p> <p>At the southern end, moving the limit would take it beyond the Upton Scudamore junction which is well used and is particularly hazardous when traffic is turning right into the village – a common occurrence despite the fact that the signage from Warminster sends traffic to the northern junction.</p> <p>At the northern end, the proposed alteration would give traffic more opportunity to speed up before the Upton Scudamore junction which is already causing problems to the extent that the Parish Council and Area Board are contributing to enhanced road markings.</p> <p>For the above reasons, I would request that the proposed new speed limits are not implemented.</p>	2	<p>The assessment has been completed using the Department for Transport Circular 01/06: Setting Local Speed Limits. This provides guidance to Highway Authorities on the factors which need to be taken into consideration when appraising an appropriate limit.</p> <p>As outlined in the main body of the report, one of the key aims of the guidance is to ensure an improved degree of consistency in setting speed limits.</p> <p>When selecting the most appropriate speed limit for a particular location it is imperative that the limit is conducive to the surrounding environment. It is this primary factor which reinforces the purpose and need for the restriction. If a speed limit is set in isolation, or is unrealistically low, it is likely to be ineffective and lead to disrespect for the speed limit, as well as requiring significant and avoidable enforcement costs. This may also result in substantial numbers of drivers continuing to travel at unacceptable speeds, thus increasing the risk of collisions and injuries.</p> <p>The criterion for a 50 mph limit outlines that...</p> <p><i>Lower quality roads which may have a relatively high number of bends, junctions or accesses. An accident rate higher than 35 per 100 million vehicle kilometres and/or mean speed already below 50 mph.</i></p> <p>During the assessment process it was identified the existing 50 mph restriction extended beyond the traffic signal junction of the A350 and the C360, and consequently there was poor recognition by motorists of the terminal point and overall purpose of the restriction.</p> <p>When assessing the length of the restriction where the 50 mph is being removed, they relate to a high quality section of road (constructed to Design Manual for Roads and Bridges standards). There is one junction within the southern section of the proposal, which provides excellent visibility to vehicles approaching from either direction when exiting the junction.</p>

<u>Ref</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>No of Times Made</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
			<p>For both sections where the removal of the 50 mph limit is being proposed, the collision database has shown that both sections have no recorded personal injuries collisions in the preceding six year period. However, in recognition of the concerns raised it is recommended that the existing restrictions remain unchanged.</p>

SUPPORT

<u>Ref.</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>No of Times Made</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
S1	Warminster Town Council's Town Development Committee met last night and discussed the traffic regulation orders listed below. They have no further comments to make on the proposals.	1	Comments in support of the proposal are noted.
S2	I would like to confirm that West Ashton Parish Council fully support the proposal to reduce the speed limit on the indicated section of the A350 (West Ashton) from 50 mph to 40 mph.	1	Comments in support of the proposal are noted.