

COMMENTS

Ref	Comments Received	Officer Comment
	<u>C9</u>	
1	<p>Comment 1 Having discussed the proposals with the Town Council’s Community Services Committee and local residents, as the Chair of the Community Area Transport Group, I request the 40 mph limit be extended to just beyond the junction of Lambdown Terrace (Tidworth side) on the grounds of road safety for the residents of that road and the house on the opposite side of the road on the C9.</p> <p>Comment 2 Responding to the idea of a new speed limit being put in place. It should be 40 on that road, too many accidents have happened and people have died. There are lots of people horse riding on that road and are at risk of being hit at 60mph, even 50 is too fast. I have only been riding my motorcycle for 3 months and I've witnessed too many idiots speeding, I have never done 60 on that road, especially with it being the route to and from the army camp any pedestrian, cyclist or equestrian on that road is at risk of being hit and it'll be too fast for them to recover from it.</p> <p>Comment 3 I am writing in support of the reduction of speed limit on the above road to a 50 mph limit. I would also like to raise the question of a reduction on the speed limit further along the road from a 40 mph limit to a 30. Many people do not bother to slow from a 60mph at the moment despite it being a 40mph limit through the village and I am sure there will soon be an accident as people turn either into or out of the village and into Poppies day nursery. Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Comment 4 Your proposal to change the speed limit on the Tidworth to Perham Down road in the vicinity of Lambdown Terrace is outrageous.</p> <p>The description on the website and the picture on the planning notices on the road itself, identify that the speed will change to 50 mph from the eastern Lambdown Terrace Road, in a westerly direction for 968 metres. A large part of this section is currently 40 mph and since I moved here in June this year I have already witnessed one accident, probably due to speeding. Either you have got your junctions wrong or your planning is poor.</p> <p>The 40 mph speed limit should be extended to the western junction with Lambdown Terrace in the interest of public safety. The area of Lambdown Terrace is a residential area and the footpath connecting the westerly to easterly Lambdown junctions in the area of the proposed speed limit change are narrow and close to the traffic, added to which is a sharp bend. Any increase in speed limit would expose pedestrians to more danger than they already are.</p>	<p>Response to comment 1 The request would require an extension of the existing 40 mph speed limit at Perham Down in a westerly direction over a distance of approximately 280 metres. The presence of the side road and the single property on the southern side of the C9 are in themselves insufficient to justify a reduction in the speed limit on the C9. Rather, it is the available visibility from the side road and the property driveway that needs to be commensurate with the driven speeds on the C9 to enable safe access to be achieved. This is considered to be the case. See response to comment 2.</p> <p>Response to comment 2 The section referred to is C9-04 where a 50 mph limit is proposed. The commenter wishes to see this section as a 40 mph limit to match the existing 40 mph in place on C9-05. In comparison with section 05 the alignment and available forward visibility along section 04 is considered to be substantially better. On site observation and the recorded mean driven speed indicates that a 50 mph limit aligns with the actual driven speed of the majority 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>A study of the recorded collisions on C9-04 shows little commonality to the causations or the locations. The major influence in the collisions being road and weather conditions at the time along with driver error. It is not considered that either the existing or proposed speed limits would have had a material impact on the collisions.</p> <p>Response to comment 3 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 C9 subject to the existing 40 mph speed limit the number of frontage properties does not meet the above criteria.</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 30mph restriction.</p>

Ref	Comments Received	Officer Comment
	<u>C9</u>	
	<p>Given the number of accidents on this stretch of road, when I heard rumour of proposed speed limit changes I presumed this would be a reduction not an increase as that would be a logical course of action. I am therefore extremely dismayed at your proposal and demand an explanation and/or revisions to these plans.</p>	<p>Neither the number of frontage properties nor the density criteria are met over the length requested and therefore a 30 mph limit cannot be recommended.</p> <p>Response to comment 4</p> <p>The length of the C9 proposed to be 50 mph is currently subject to the National Speed Limit (60 mph) and not 40 mph as stated. There is no proposal to increase the speed limit on the length of the C9 currently subject to a 40 mph limit.</p>

Ref	Comments Received	Officer Comment
	<u>C32</u>	
2	<p>Support 1 At our Parish Council meeting last week we discussed the proposed speed restrictions in the local area. Any initiative to reduce vehicle speeds on our roads is most welcome. It would be even better if Wilts Police could enforce them at regular intervals! Thank you for email and detail on this matter.</p>	<p>Comments are noted.</p>

Ref	Comments Received	Officer Comment
	<u>C42</u>	
4	<p>Comment 1 It would be very dangerous to increase the speed limit from 30 to 40 on the hill and junction to Stonehenge Road the whole area should be 30mph especially the junction there are so many near misses on this section someone will get killed here very soon if the whole green area is not 30mph too. Give West Amesbury the 30 but by agreeing to do this you are saying that on Stonehenge road where the problem of speeding is a thousand times worse that we should have it too.</p> <p>Comment 2 I live in Stonehenge Road, Amesbury 50 metres from its junction with the C42 Woodford Valley Road and have been studying the above proposal to impose a 40mph limit from the junction towards West Amesbury. It is a dangerous proposal and I object to it. At present this stretch has a 30mph limit. This very short stretch of road is blind approaching from Amesbury, runs through a narrow cut with a very sharp bend, has no pavement and has high banks on both sides. There is also an entrance to a bungalow with a registered disabled occupant (Hunter's Hill) on the bend. This is the only sensible pedestrian route from Amesbury to Hunter's Hill and the eastern end of West Amesbury. It is <i>the</i> most dangerous stretch of road the whole way through West Amesbury. On several occasions I have had to throw myself against the side bank in the short narrow cut as vehicles have approached around the blind bends at each end. The fields of view are very short. The rest of West Amesbury has better visibility and a grass verge for evasive action. Traffic on the C42 has increased with the advent of the satnav and the increased congestion on the A303 following the recent closure of the A344. Attached are photographs taken at the Stonehenge Road junction showing the current 30mph sign (1) that has been in place for many years, and the reverse (2) for traffic approaching Stonehenge Road from West Amesbury. Also shown are the 30mph signs (3) approaching along the C42 from the West Amesbury end, de-restriction signs on the reverse. Presumably, under the new proposal, vehicles from Stonehenge Road will see no change of speed limit or warning as they approach the dangerous cut. And vehicles from West Amesbury will be invited to increase their speed from 30mph to 40 mph as they approach the blind bend outside Hunters Hill. The whole short stretch of the C42 from the Stonehenge Road junction to the south west side of West Amesbury should have a 30mph limit. And the dangerous stretch approaching the Stonehenge Road Junction should also have warning signs both ends: 'Pedestrians in the Road' or 'No Pavement'. The 30mph Proposal for the Rest of West Amesbury. (Please note there is a misprint in the proposal should say north east not north west.) I do not object to the 30mph proposal for the remainder of West Amesbury. It is long overdue. The reason for both proposals is stated as 'In the interests of highway safety'. The proposal to the increase the limit on the C42 from 30 mph to 40mph near the</p>	<p>Response to comment 1 Stonehenge Road was not part of the speed limit review. The review only covered the length of the C42 up to its junction with Stonehenge Road. See response to comment 2,3 & 4</p> <p>Response to comments 2, 3 and 4 The existing length of 30 mph speed limit from Stonehenge junction towards West Amesbury is substandard in length and does not meet current criteria in terms of the number of frontage houses or property density for a 30 mph limit. DfT Circular 01/13 states that '<i>speed limits should not be used to attempt to solve the problem of isolated hazards, for example a single road junction or reduced forward visibility such as a bend. Other measures such as warning signs are likely to be more effective in addressing such hazards</i>'. 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. On the length of the C42 from the Stonehenge Road junction to West Amesbury there is one frontage house. 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. Neither the number of frontage properties nor the density criteria are met. An investigation of the Police collision database shows that there have been no recorded personal injury collisions at the bend or at the Stonehenge Road junction in the last 10 years The funding to pay for the changes to the speed limits will come from the Community Area Transport Group. The use of the descriptor 'In the interests of Highway Safety' is a requirement of the statutory process used for the introduction of or change of any Traffic Regulation</p>

Ref	Comments Received	Officer Comment
	<u>C42</u>	
	<p>Stonehenge Road junction, clearly, is <i>not</i> in the interests of highway safety. This is also a registered National Cycle route.</p> <p>Comment 3 I am sure there is some sort of convoluted explanation as to why you are removing the 30 mph limit from outside Hunters Hill where I am resident in West Amesbury. I can't think that it would be a valid one.</p> <p>There have been many accidents on this corner with the 30 mph limit in place as it is. This 30 mph limit encompasses the lead in and lead out of a very dangerous blind corner.</p> <p>So, using simple common sense there cannot possibly be any convincing or logical explanation as to how you've come to the decision to increase this limit to 40 mph on the grounds of "Highway Safety" before lowering again to 30 mph for the rest of West Amesbury almost immediately afterwards. The latter 30 mph is of course a very sound and long overdue public safety measure.</p> <p>Please reconsider and extend the 30 mph limit from the junction of the C350 all the way through West Amesbury before somebody gets killed on this corner, pedestrian, cyclist, car or lorry driver or even me!</p> <p>Comment 4 I have been a resident of West Amesbury for over 30 years. After many years of trying to have the speed limit reduced from 60 to 30 mph It would appear that part of the road through West Amesbury is to be designated as a 30 mph zone. However, the C42 currently 30 mph is to be increased to 40 mph! You have acknowledged that there is no provisions for pedestrians in West Amesbury so your reasoning for this decision is not understood and an explanation would be appreciated.</p> <p>The extensive study on the C42 carried out at the behest of Wiltshire Council recommended a speed of 40 mph throughout West Amesbury from the C350/C42 Junction. It was not clear to me, or other residents of West Amesbury, why the existing speed limit of 30 mph was to be changed. It has existed to my knowledge for 30 years and probably originates from the time Stonehenge Road (C350) was the A 303 trunk route. Use by motorised traffic, cyclists, equestrians, pedestrians and wheelchair users has increased enormously since I arrived in West Amesbury.</p> <p>The 40 mph section in the subject TRO starting at the C350/C42 Junction has an exceedingly dangerous S bend on a steep slope with high banks and hedgerows which limit visibility. It is the narrowest part of the road, on which is situated the entrance to the dwelling called Hunters Hill, which incidentally, houses a motorised wheel chair user who is unable safely to use this section of road to get to Amesbury.</p>	<p>Order. When used for speed limits it can be used to describe either an increase or lowering as both scenarios can in individual circumstances be deemed to be in the interests of Highway safety. For example where a speed limit is set unrealistically low it may be ineffective and achieve poor compliance and an increase in the limit can be seen to be a positive step.</p>

Ref	Comments Received	Officer Comment
	<u>C42</u>	
	<p>In addition, over the past year or so after heavy rain. the road East of West Amesbury House is covered by water and traffic coming from Amesbury is forced to cross onto the opposite side of the road to avoid the deep water. A potentially dangerous action due to the restricted visibility caused by the bend in the road and high hedge</p> <p>I object most strongly to proposal to INCREASE the permitted speed from 30 mph to 40 mph on the most dangerous bend in West Amesbury. IN THE INTERESTS OF HIGHWAY SAFETY for ALL users of the C42 road from the C350/C42 junction to the South West of West Amesbury, the speed limit should be restricted to 30 mph.</p> <p>I am sure the Council is very keen as am I to reduce expenditure of taxpayers' money and yet the subject plan creates unnecessary expenditure from the public purse which could be put to repairing pot holes in the C42 road in West Amesbury and preventing flooding of the road East of West Amesbury House.</p> <p>The cash savings would be :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. C350/C42 junction – do not replace existing 30 mph sign with a new 40 mph sign. b. Do not install new 30 mph/40 mph signs to the East of West Amesbury House. c. Have only one 30 mph/derestricted sign on the western boundary of West Amesbury. Do we really need two, after all, there is only one 30 mph sign at the C350/C42 junction? <p>Comment 5 Firstly, we are very pleased to learn that, after very many years of our making numerous detailed representations, the Authority is now proposing to impose traffic speed restrictions here in West Amesbury where only the National 60 mph speed limit applies at present. But we would also make the following COMMENTS:</p> <p>1) We still feel that the proposed 30 mph limit should prevail throughout the whole highway length from the West Amesbury Village signs at the approach from the South West (Salisbury) direction and also at the C42 junction with Stonehenge Road (C350). It would appear to be more logical to have the speed limit signs very adjacent to the Village name signs so that they are read together slightly in advance of the actual residential areas and thus giving all traffic due timely warning.</p> <p>2) The Public Notice confirms that the Authority considers the adoption of a new speed limit and increase to 40 mph of the existing short length of 30 mph limit to be "IN THE INTERESTS OF HIGHWAY SAFETY". Being regular users day to day as Pedestrians, Cyclists and/or Motorists we cannot comprehend how such a recommendation can be reconciled with the prevailing topography and daily traffic conditions. In particular, there are high embankments, very narrow carriageways, no</p>	<p>See response to comments 2,3, and 4</p> <p>See response to comments 2,3, and 4</p>

Ref	Comments Received	Officer Comment
	<u>C42</u>	
	<p>footpaths and very sparse street lights. These all contribute to extremely hazardous conditions for pedestrian and cyclist/equestrian movements in particular and that have little or no refuge they can take from motorised vehicles regardless of their size and speed. Potentially dangerous incidents occur virtually daily throughout the whole year. We have one particular long-term Resident who, regrettably, has only a "mobility" mode of transport but is no longer able to use it because of the hazards identified in 2) above. (Following several such "incidents" he no longer enjoys the personal freedom or has the confidence to freely enter onto the Highway from his home). Whilst the existing 30 mph speed limit no longer affords him (or can guarantee) reasonable safeguards, even if and when accompanied, a proposed 40 mph limit can only exacerbate the situation. We do therefore urge the Authority to give this particular point very serious re-consideration. Alternatively, we request that the Authority provide us with an explanation as to why the existing 30 mph speed limit (in being for several decades) should now be raised to 40 mph, and considered to be more appropriate, because highway safety issues on that specific stretch of the C42 Highway have significantly receded (this being the only obvious conclusion)?</p> <p>We appreciate that the Highways Authority will be devising a detailed scheme to cover the implementation of whatever the ultimately approved works are to encompass. Accordingly, we make the following OBSERVATIONS for your consideration: Signage at the junction of C350 Stonehenge Road with C42 could be considerably improved at this key position where traffic first enters C42 before making its journey towards "The Woodfords" and Salisbury - whilst encountering the numerous hazards with which it is likely to be confronted on route.</p> <p>A) The large directional (or finger) sign comprises (stacked in this sequence) WOODFORD, LAKE, WILSFORD, W. AMESBURY and a small box (white on Blue) 45 with Bicycle illustration. The sign is mounted on two posts. The Village names are in the opposite order to that which they occur along the Valley Road when approached from C350!</p> <p>B) Below the sign in "A" there is a White on Brown sign "HEALE GARDEN" (<i>in Upper/Middle Woodford</i>) with flower motif.</p> <p>C) Below this again is a White on Blue "Wiltshire Cycleway" sign with directional arrow indicating access to C42 from C350.</p> <p>D) A single post is the position of the WEST AMESBURY village sign (currently removed) but is presently solely used for display of the TRO 14 Public Notice. The missing sign has been absent for many weeks and because of the sequence/inadequacy of information on "A" might constitute a "hazard" in its own right (by causing some confusion to drivers/visitors to the area).</p> <p>E) A single post with 30 mph indication towards C42 and 40 mph towards C350 and white on blue arrow to Left direction (towards C350) at traffic island. This together with Wiltshire Cycleway and arrow to right (towards C350 - but might be construed to mean enter slip-road from off C350)! Traffic is often</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>Comment noted</p> <p>Comment noted</p> <p>Comment noted</p> <p>Comment noted</p>

Ref	Comments Received	Officer Comment
	<u>C42</u>	
	<p>spotted being confused and using the junction in an in-appropriate and generally un-safe manner. F) White Lining is badly worn and needs to be reviewed. Perhaps an opportunity to consider appropriate changes? It seems clear that C42 has been defined by the Authority(ies) to be essentially for access to all properties and for recreational purposes - specifically Heale Garden and as a primary National Cycle Route. Surely, it logically follows that, any conflict between individual usages must be considered first so as to be able to decide upon priority requirements before any agreement upon practical solutions and their Implementation.</p> <p>The traffic island at the C350 road junction provides an ideal location for siting appropriate and comprehensive signage so that C42 usage by Pedestrian, Cycle, Equestrian and such slow moving "traffic" does not find itself unnecessarily in conflict with large and often fast moving vehicles using C42 either as a short-cut or alternative means for avoiding traffic hold-ups around A303 and Stonehenge (which are likely to considerably worsen if and when the infamous "TUNNEL" ever gets given the full go-ahead). On occasions it is also used as an "informal" relief road when accidents or road works occur on A345 and/or A360. New signage might bring advance notice to drivers regarding the narrowness of the carriageway at its minimum point between C350 and Upper Woodford (where probably less than two small family cars can pass safely and very few convenient manoeuvring locations exist in which to overcome traffic flow problems arising there-from). A sign or signs regarding pedestrians on road, horses, cyclists, please drive slowly through our village(s), thank you! etc. etc.- all of which are to be found elsewhere as you drive around the UK. And further, being placed upon the traffic island at C350/C42 Junction could not be argued to be detracting too much from the scenic value placed upon C42 and its rustic route alongside the River Avon as it winds its way towards Salisbury. The Authority will also need to consider the positioning of such signage from the opposite (C42 Woodfords/Wilsford) direction. From C350 all along the Valley via C42 until you reach Upper Woodford the Properties are "access land locked" (the next option being towards A345 via Netton and High Post Traffic Lights). Hence, this is a special case requiring careful thought and planning in order to achieve a satisfactory balance between the various conflicting uses both currently and for the future. Hence we are always prepared to enter into constructive discussions if this will help to achieve an outcome for the common good and specifically "IN THE INTERESTS OF HIGHWAY SAFETY" for all users of C42 and not just for "motorists".</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>Comment noted</p>

Ref	Comment Received	Officer Comment
	<u>C155</u>	
1	<p>Objection 1 I do not believe there is any need for these proposed limits and so applying them would be a waste of public money. I have lived at Court House on Gastard Lane for nearly 20 years and regularly walked along the lane and have never had a problem with speeding traffic. Indeed, for much of the route proposed to be covered, the road itself limits all traffic to speeds significantly slower than the proposed limits, so the limits could encourage motorists to go faster than they do now. The proposed limits are pointless and, potentially counter productive.</p> <p>Objection 2 1. Many thanks indeed for sending through these consultation documents. I have some comments on the proposal which I am keen to register before the 3 November deadline, and these follow below. But I also wanted to alert you to the fact that the consultation page on the Wiltshire Council website still hasn't been corrected, and still contains the wrong attachments. It would seem to me that that may have a material effect on the thoroughness of the consultation. Should not the period of consultation, be extended beyond its current deadline of 3 November) as a result, allowing people to access, once they are put correctly in the website, the correct documents?</p> <p>2. On the proposals themselves, our views are: - a crucial factor which needs to be addressed as part of this decision is the need to preserve the character of the road and area it serves, which is rural in nature and large parts of which are designated as being in a conservation zone. It is important to avoid taking any steps which lead to urbanising the road and the area it serves (for example, by placing speed signs which, either in number or nature, jar or contrast with the essential nature of the road and area, or by installing additional lighting);</p> <p>- that the proposed division of the length of road in question into separate 30 mph and 40 mph speed zones doesn't make a great deal of sense, in that the part of the road designated for the 40 mph zone still contains a fairly sharp "S" bend. It would be more logical to apply a 30 mph limit to the whole length of road in question (or to a version slightly shortened at the Lacock end of it). Dividing the length of road into two separate speed zones also seems to over complicate the issue and would increase the risk of additional signage altering the character of the area</p> <p>- one way to address these various concerns might be to designate the whole length of road in question (slightly shortened at the Lacock end) as a 30 mph zone, but with a minimum of signage - ie one speed limit sign at each end of the zone, so that drivers know when they are entering and exiting the zone.</p> <p>3. I hope these views make sense to you and are helpful. I would very much welcome, in addition to</p>	<p>After consideration of the comments made and representation from the Corsham Town Council and the local elected Wiltshire Councillor, the Corsham Community Area Transport group recommended to the Area Board that the proposed speed limit not be pursued.</p> <p>At its meeting of 19 March the Corsham Area Board recommended that the proposal to change the speed limit on the C155 is not supported and that this recommendation be sent to the Cabinet Member to be considered with other responses from consultees.</p>

Ref	Comment Received	Officer Comment
	<u>C155</u>	
	<p>your views on my question in para 1 above, your guidance on what the next stage in the process is, and how we can stay looped into the assessment of the results of the consultation, and be part of the subsequent decision making process.</p> <p>Objection 3 I am just back home from Africa and discover from neighbours that Wilts CC plan to erect a series of road signs with the rural speed limit on outside my house. I object strongly to this for a number of reasons. 1. They are NOT necessary. The roads are such that you can't break the speed limits anyway. 2. they are a waste of money and material - does Wilts CC really have nothing better to spend our money on....schools? 3. The signs will be utterly ugly and in any case redundant. 4. They will make the countryside look ugly. 5. Please spend the money on something we need that is worthwhile.</p> <p>Support 1 The proposed 30 mph speed limit for Lanes End, Chapel Hill and Gastard Lane, and the 40 mph limit for Gastard Lane/Folly Lane is long overdue. The proposed 30 mph section of road has a very active builders yard (Travis Perkins), a quarry, a private parking lay-by, three farm entrance points, a private road, a road junction (a secondary element of Gastard Lane), and twelve private house driveways. The proposed 40 mph section has four private house driveways (one of which is shared by a bridleway) and two workshop/storage entrances. All use these exits/entries as primary access onto a narrow, twisting and contoured country lane that currently has an unrestricted speed limit. On initial examination it may seem that the nature of the width and severity of some of the corners would impose a speed restriction in itself, indeed the investigating officer from the council expressed that view during a discussion he had with me during his initial fact finding visit. This was quickly dispelled however when a Range Rover (who's driver was using her mobile phone) shot past us at a speed that clearly surprised him. This impromptu meeting took place in the driveway of our home (No 6 Lanes End), a section of the lane that is slightly wider than others and clearly represents to some drivers a challenge to accelerate to such an extent that the potential exists for someone in the future to have a major accident. This situation is magnified many times over as it is used as a "rat run" by drivers travelling to and from work. A similar situation exists when traffic heading out of Gastard towards the A350 at Lacock accelerate from the last bend in the proposed 40mph zone. The lane here is very narrow and passes two private cottages, the entrance to "Sandpits" and the bridleway. The fact that the lane is straight here seems to indicate to some drivers that any speed can be justified. The other issue is the safety of pedestrians, the area is a conservation area with several public footpaths leading from the lane across the adjacent farmland and consequently many local people use the lane to walk their dogs and generally enjoy the countryside. Parents pushing child buggies are also commonplace. The lane has no pedestrian pavements and very few</p>	

Ref	Comment Received	Officer Comment
	<u>C155</u>	
	<p>grass verges wide enough for safe refuge so people are directly exposed to the speed of unrestricted traffic. Horses also feature heavily in the lane and have often to run the gauntlet of some of the more inconsiderate drivers. The upper section of the proposed 30mph restriction has two farms which means that the lane is used by very large (often contract) farm vehicles presenting yet another hazard to unwary or thoughtless motorists. As with any speed restriction everyone understands that the provision of mandatory speed restrictions will not stop some drivers ignoring them, however knowing that these limits have been put in place does at least give us the assurance that our concerns have been understood and formal action has been taken. It also gives us formal backing when some of these drivers are confronted. For drivers that are new or merely passing through the area the proposed 30mph and 40mph speed limits will give prior warning of the dangers/hazards of the road ahead and hopefully will alert them to the need to proceed with care. We understand that there will be a requirement for an increased level of both primary and secondary level signage, however these should represent a minor issue when compared to the primary concern of safety. The timing of this proposal coincides with the latest Government statistics relating to the safety of rural roads and their high death rates, so to ignore this proposal means that not only is the Health and Safety of the people living in the lane being ignored, but that advice from Central Government is as well. This proposal represents the bare minimum that can be done and as I have said earlier, it does at least give some legal boundary to an area that is clearly full of potential hazards for pedestrians and drivers alike. We would urge that it be implemented as soon as is practicable.</p> <p>Support 2</p> <p>We are in favour of the proposals for the reduced speed limits in Lanes End, Chapel Hill, Gastard Lane and Folly Lane. We have seen the letter sent to you on this issue by our neighbours, Mr & Mrs Marshman of 6 Lanes End . That sets out very eloquently and clearly the case for the reduced speed limits, and we agree in all respects with what they say in it. We have always been aware of the dangers posed to us and our four children and indeed to anyone else who is a pedestrian, cyclist or horse rider in these lanes. The lanes are narrow and marked by lots of dangerous corners, some of which are blind ones, as well as driveways and entrances, and non-vehicle road users share the lanes with vehicles and are thus exposed to the dangers of meeting vehicular traffic moving at speed. Besides going for walks from our house along the nearby lanes and paths, for 14 years we have had our children walking to and from the end of Lanes End to meet the school bus to Neston Primary School during term time. We have been especially aware therefore of the need to ensure that we and our children are well versed in the dangers of meeting traffic, and our instinct was always to make sure that we accompanied our children given the dangers. Fortunately we have suffered no more than</p>	

Ref	Comment Received	Officer Comment
	<u>C155</u>	
	<p>occasional near misses. Reducing the speed limits in these lanes will not prevent all drivers from going too fast, nor will it prevent all accidents. Even at speeds within the reduced limits there will always be the risk of accidents given how narrow the lanes are and how dangerous many of the corners on them are. But reducing the speed limits will remind sensible drivers to moderate their speed to meet the new limits, and will be a general warning of the dangers posed by the condition of the lanes. This speed limit reduction is long overdue and cannot come soon enough. We hope it can be implemented as soon as possible.</p>	