

COMMENTS

| <u>Ref</u> | <u>Comment Received</u> | <u>Officer Comment</u> |
|-------------------|--|--|
| | <u>C19</u> | |
| 1 | <p>I have seen your notice re the new speed restrictions on the Edington Road, Steeple Ashton, and strongly feel that they are not sufficient. I live at Home Farm Close, and every day experience traffic racing down from the Bratton direction, and don't see the 30 m.p.h. sign until they hit it on the bend to the entrance of Home Farm Close. Many drivers use Home Farm Close to turn back into the village and back onto the main road, right by the 30 m.p.h. sign. (Very dangerous). I myself have been involved in an accident caused by someone backing into me as I turned into the Close from the Edington Road. I urge you that the 30 m.p.h. sign should be positioned at least 120 yards further back before the bend to give drivers a chance to slow down before the junctions of Home Farm Close and Silver Street. I am quite happy with the proposed positioning of the 40 m.p.h. sign, although perhaps it would be better before the junction of Smallbrook Lane and Spiers Piece.</p> <p>We consider that the 30 mph limit is inadequate, and needs to be moved 200 yards South to the Keevil Airfield turning. This will minimise the dangers at the Home Farm Close / Silver Street crossroads where visibility is poor, with heavy vehicles leaving Browns Transport Yard. Very heavy MOD vehicles and farm machinery also exit the Keevil airfield turning into Edington Road.</p> <p>We believe the new 40 mph signs should therefore be placed on the Steeple Ashton boundary, near Drove Lane, approaching the village from Edington. This is a natural spot as that's where housing starts, so motorists are already aware of the start of a village, especially after a long fast straight road from the Bratton junction.</p> | <p>The criterion for a 30 mph limit 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 3 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.</p> <p>On the length of the C19 to the south of Home Farm Close over the suggested distance of between 120 to 200 yards there are no frontage houses.</p> <p>As set out above there is a requirement for the frontage development to be consistent throughout the length of the restriction to reinforce to motorists of the appropriateness of a 30 mph restriction.</p> <p>Neither the number of frontage properties nor the density criteria are met at Steeple Ashton and therefore an extension of the 30 mph limit cannot be recommended.</p> <p>The proposed 40 mph limit does start near to Drove Lane</p> |

| <u>Ref</u> | <u>Comment Received</u> | <u>Officer Comment</u> |
|------------|---|---|
| | <u>C42</u> | |
| 2 | <p><i>"It is Government Policy that a 30MPH speed limit should be the norm in villages. It may also be appropriate to consider 20MPH zones and limits in built-up village streets".</i></p> <p>We write with our comments relative to the above. It is our understanding that C350 (Old A303 Trunk Road) is to retain the existing 40MPH speed limit and that, "in the interests of highway safety" C42 (Historic Cart Track) is to have the existing length of 30M PH speed limit withdrawn and replaced/extended through West Amesbury, to a point just SW of the Culvert outside of "Half Acre", by a 40MPH speed limit. The extension to replace the current National Speed Limit of 60MPH. By implication, therefore, C350 and C42 would, in the eyes of Wiltshire Council (the Authority), have broadly very similar characteristics in terms of "highway safety" (risk assessment undertaken to determine this?) when that is patently not the case. C350 largely retains the features associated with a single carriageway Urban Trunk Road including street lighting, footpaths, road markings and an existing 40MPH speed limit. On the other hand C42 largely retains the features of an ancient Rural Cart Track (albeit having a metalled surface) with very limited street lighting, footpaths and road markings. From the SW (after leaving Upper Woodford) sight lines become very restricted due to high embankments, overhanging trees/foliage and with repetitive tight bends and twists. Erosion at verges with very few convenient passing "bays" provided by field access points and entrances to premises add to the hazards on this very narrow road which, at certain "pinch points", is barely 150% of a family car in width. The 40MPH limit through Wilsford-cum-Lake appears inconsistent.</p> <p>We appreciate that Wiltshire Council may have adopted OFT's circular 01/06 "Setting Local Speed Limits" and Traffic ADVISORY Leaflet 01/04 "Village speed limits" as the basis for the Council's speed limit strategy. We also agree that it is highly desirable for a consistent approach to the setting of speed limits nationwide provided all relevant aspects are taken into account in each and every individual instance. However, we suggest it is very wide of the mark "in the interests of highway safety" for C350 and C42 to be considered very closely comparable when respective traffic (foot, equestrian, cycle, motor cycle and the complete range of motorised vehicles at various times) usage and conditions vary widely.</p> <p>We received no official feedback from our submission on 18th. January 2012 regarding TRO 2011 (subsequently not progressed). However, we did receive some "ad hoc" comment that West Amesbury did not have enough houses to justify 30MPH (As per the DfT definition in TAL 01/04). However, Traffic ADVISORY Leaflet 01/04 also states "Where the character of a village falls outside this definition, local authorities are encouraged to use their discretion in deciding whether a lower speed limit is appropriate."</p> | <p>This statement is contained in Circular 01/13 setting local speed limits. However, Traffic Advisory Leaflet 01/04 Village Speed Limits contains a definition of a village based on the number of frontage houses and the density along the length.</p> <p>The criterion for a 30 mph limit 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 3 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.</p> <p>On the length of the C42 from its junction with the C350 to the southern side of 'Coneybury House', a distance of 810 metres there are 13 frontage houses. The density criterion of 3 houses per 100 metres is met over a length of approximately 280 metres.</p> <p>As set out above there is a requirement for the frontage development to be consistent throughout the length of the restriction to reinforce to motorists the appropriateness of a 30 mph restriction.</p> <p>Neither the number of frontage properties nor the density criteria are met at West Amesbury over the length requested by the objector and therefore a 30 mph limit cannot be recommended.</p> <p>As an alternative, a shorter length of the C42 running from West Amesbury House to 'Half Acre' has been considered to establish if this meets the 30mph criteria. This being the developed length of West Amesbury. On this length of the C42, a distance of 435metres there are 11 frontage houses with the density criterion being met over approximately 280metres. This again is considered to fall short of criteria.</p> <p>However both the point speed readings taken by static traffic counter and the driven speeds recorded as part of the review indicate average speeds of 31 to 32 mph through the developed length of West Amesbury. These speeds are conducive with a 30mph limit.</p> <p>The position of West Amesbury within a Conservation Area and the Stonehenge World Heritage Site is also noted together with the lack of footway provision and the close proximity of property to the carriageway edge.</p> <p>Within the guidance issued by the DfT there is flexibility given to the local Highway Authority to use their discretion in setting speed limits to accord with local circumstances. It is therefore considered that this discretion can be used on this occasion to provide a 30 mph limit over the</p> |

| <u>Ref</u> | <u>Comment Received</u> | <u>Officer Comment</u> |
|------------|--|---|
| | <u>C42</u> | |
| | <p>And we have received a communication direct from DfT, dated 6 June 2014 (copy enclosed) which confirms this to be the case "where local needs and conditions suggest a speed limit which is lower than the national speed limit".</p> <p>We feel that there are a number of hazards prevailing in West Amesbury that do not exist on C350 and, therefore, it would be much simpler (in practical terms) for the 30M PH signs to be re-sited from outside "Hunters Hill" to their new location to the SW where the Village boundary lies.</p> <p>Amesbury Town Council fully supported Residents in this respect (Agenda Item 20- FULL COUNCIL MEETING 7 June 2011) and this was recommended to the Area Board. Subsequent to TRO 2011 the Highways Department undertook further field survey works and on 10 May 2012 Mr Tom Gardner, Senior Engineer, Salisbury Transport Group, Wiltshire Council issued an e-mail which states "The assessment will allow us to put forward speed limit recommendations that are consistent within the built-up areas along the full length of the C42. Given that the survey figures above suggest a 30mph speed limit in West Amesbury may be appropriate"</p> <p>Whilst we do not consider that the introduction of a lower speed limit through West Amesbury will provide a total solution to the traffic problems on C42 and the various hazards being daily experienced, it should contribute to a safer environment for all Residents and users alike.</p> <p>We therefore trust that the Authority will take cognisance of the Conservation Area and Stonehenge World Heritage Site location in which this length of C42 is situated and adopt the necessary measures in order to help conserve its unique environment as set out in its related Policies.</p> <p>In the light of this representation we seek re-consideration of the TRO 2014 as in the following counter proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30MPH to encompass the whole of West Amesbury from its junction with C350 to a point close to the Village Sign (Extend to SW near to "Coneybury House" thus providing more satisfactory safe braking distances before entering the Village hazardous areas). • Position of Speed Limit Signs to be carefully planned so as not to impede SIGHT LINES for traffic emerging from Properties. • Simultaneously the West Amesbury Village Sign (SW) to be repositioned for clarity as it is often semi-concealed by foliage. <p>There are numerous other Highways matters taken up with the Authority over the last 12 + years without significant progress. These remain extant and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planned maintenance to be more consistent so as to keep drain channels, gullies etc. clear and thus storm water drainage effective so as to avoid "flooding" in the slightest of rain. | <p>developed length of the C42 through West Amesbury running from West Amesbury House to 'Half Acre'. The length to the north up to the junction with the C350 should be 40 mph as originally proposed.</p> <p>It should be noted that both the 30 and 40 mph limits will require the provision of repeater signs which some may view as having a negative impact on the environment.</p> |

| <u>Ref</u> | <u>Comment Received</u> | <u>Officer Comment</u> |
|------------|--|------------------------|
| | <u>C42</u> | |
| | <p>We believe our comments to be constructive and in the spirit of COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT. C42 represents a very significantly over used and abused non-strategic highway with high recreational and local access priorities. This is the view of numerous Residents and regular users.</p> | |

| <u>Ref</u> | <u>Comment Received</u> | <u>Officer Comment</u> |
|------------|---|--|
| | <u>C70-06</u> | |
| 3 | <p>Many thanks for your proposal to reduce the current speed limit to 50mph on the road that runs outside our house (the road that joins Newth's Lane with B4553/Tadpole Lane), it is very welcome. We saw the overview of the proposal affixed to a lamp post today.</p> <p>We have lived at the property for 2 ½ years now and would like to make our views known during this consultation. We feel that although the recommendation is welcome and well overdue, it does not go far enough for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We don't feel safe to allow our children out on the road to cycle as cars and heavy goods vehicles travel too fast and too close to cyclists due to the width of the carriageway. 2. Our neighbour who lives on the Farm has had a recent road traffic accident whereby he was travelling on the connecting road to Purton Stoke in his tractor and a car attempted to overtake, however they clipped the tractor which caused it to flip over and landed in the roadside ditch. 3. Last winter, we took a lady refuge as she was travelling on the road in the icy conditions and span the car into the roadside ditch, with the car landing upside down, endangering her life. As the road is, as we understand it, unclassified, it does not get salted or gritted thereby making it treacherous at times in the winter months. 4. We have personally witnessed a number of "near misses" with cyclists travelling along the cycle way – it is just a matter of time until a serious accident or fatality occurs along the road if matters are not addressed satisfactorily. <p>Please would you consider the following proposals as part of your consultation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Making usage of the road "Access Only" but remain as a cycle way i.e. to residents and cyclists only. This would reduce the traffic flow along the road and stop it being used as a "rat run". This would have the added benefit of making the cycle way safer for cyclists, both adult and children alike. 2. Implementing a weight limit on the road, this would prevent usage of the road by heavy goods vehicles and other large vehicles reducing pot hole damage but furthermore making it safer to children and residents. 3. Reducing the speed limit further to 30mph. As the road is home to residents, farms and regularly has farm vehicles travelling along it, it would be considerably safer if this was reduced to a speed limit commensurate with a residential area. We do live in a rural area but we are not protected by the same road laws that are in force in a built up residential area which we consider to be unfair. We are not being unreasonable here. The road in places is barely wide enough for 2 cars to pass | <p>The criterion for a 30 mph limit 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 3 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.</p> <p>The C70 at the requested location does not meet the above criteria and therefore a 30 mph speed limit cannot be recommended.</p> <p>The other suggestions for change are outside the scope of</p> |

| <u>Ref</u> | <u>Comment Received</u> | <u>Officer Comment</u> |
|------------|---|--|
| | <u>C70-06</u> | |
| | <p>safely and reducing the speed would increase the safety aspect.</p> <p>4.Implementation of traffic calming measures such as speed bumps, chicanes, digital speed warning signs, speed cameras etc would be a deterrent and help considerably with regards to road safety.</p> <p>Please would you give the above due consideration and let me know what your proposed actions would be as soon as possible, so as to prevent further road traffic accidents and protect the safety of other road users and cyclists.</p> | <p>this report and as such should be raised as an item for consideration by the Cricklade and Royal Wootton Bassett Area Board. The request will be passed from the Area Board to the Community Area Transport Group (CATG) for further detailed analysis. The CATG is a sub group of the Area Board that specifically deals with highway issues. Representation at the CATG is through the local Parish Council and it would be for a parish representative to attend the group and endorse the concerns and suggestions being made. Further investigation would then be prioritised along with other received requests and if a suitable solution is identified, a funding allocation made to allow the solution to be delivered. Further details can be found at http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/council/areaboards.htm</p> <p>The correspondent has been advised of this process.</p> |
| | <u>C70-03</u> | |
| 4 | <p>Happy with this but it doesn't really make sense, there is a 1 mile-ish section from Manor Farm easterly to the B4040 crossroads that is 50mph. In my view it too should be 40mph it makes no sense to all the speed to increase here going towards the crossroads, when traffic has just gone the previous 2 miles from Ashton at 40mph. The section opposite the crossroads into Chelworth is then back down to 40mph. So traffic approaching the crossroads from one way is at 40 and from the other 50. Also means more road signage to increase / decrease the speed restriction. To my mind it makes no sense whatsoever for this short length of road.</p> <p>I would be interested to know what has prompted this proposal and also why they need to change the speed at Manor Farm. Presumably the bends by the bridge and the junction with Waterhay Lane are considered to be more of a hazard than the properties further on, but the entrance to Bournelake Park and Chelworth Lodge take a lot of traffic and are major hazards on their own. So I agree that if it is going to be 40 it should be 40 all the way.</p> | <p>The section referred to is C70-03 where a 50 mph limit is proposed. The objectors wish to see this section as a 40 mph limit to match that proposed for C70-02 and C70-03. In comparison with sections 02 and 04 the alignment and available forward visibility along section 03 is considered to be substantially better. On site observation indicates that a 50 mph limit aligns with the actual driven speed of motorists and provides a restriction that will provide a greater degree of adherence. The introduction of any restriction which does not provide correlation between the environment and the posted restriction will result in poor levels of compliance.</p> <p>At the crossroads mentioned the main road (B4040) is subject to the national speed limit (60 mph). Terminal signing for the side roads is therefore required. The number of signs is the same whether the speed limit on the side roads is 40 or 50 mph.</p> <p>The properties mentioned, Bournelake Park and Chelworth Lodge, are private establishments, and as such the access points are the responsibility of the owners not the Council. The presence of these isolated access points is insufficient to justify a lower level of limit on the main road itself.</p> |