


Summary of Comments

APPENDIX 2

Summary of Comment Received	Officer Response
<p>Shrewton Parish Council representing the residents of Shrewton strongly objects to the change proposed to the Weight Restriction Order for the village citing the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The weak river bank along the High Street which already shows signs of fatigue due to the amount of traffic using the road• The deteriorating condition of the roads throughout Shrewton• The lack of pedestrian footpaths for the safety of walkers• The disintegrating condition of the drainage system in the streets <p>It has been stated that the current signing of the weight limit does not meet the current version of the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions stating they should have been removed in 1990. The current signs were erected at the earliest in 1992 hence it can only be presumed that the current weight limit was required for a specific reason.</p> <p>The lack of evidence maintained by Wiltshire County Council as to the justification for this weight limit should not give reason to increase it.</p> <p>Without any evidence to the contrary this council is concerned that the increase in weight limit will damage the structure of the road, adjacent properties and the River Till.</p> <p>Therefore, an equivalent sign to the current regulations should be considered until full justification to the contrary is provided.</p> <p>Furthermore, the increase in light commercial vehicles, small lorries and MOD vehicles will create further damage, particularly in the High Street, which is clearly in a state of repair from use of vehicles restricted by the 2T weight limit. We also do not see any reason why coaches should be allowed to travel via the High Street without having to pick-up or drop off passengers, thus using the High Street as a 'rat-run'.</p> <p>It is unclear as to whether the proposed signs indicate that access is for 'loading or unloading' only.</p> <p>Additional traffic will only increase the potential risk of injury to pedestrians due to the lack of footways, in some areas of London Road and High Street highlighted in our recent vision for traffic in Shrewton. The increase in weight limit without other measures such as traffic calming, footway provision and speed management will create increased hazards for villagers already in fear from current traffic levels.</p> <p>When members of the Council and Neighbourhood Planning</p>	<p>It is suspected that the existing signs were erected in error in 1992.</p> <p>The justification for increasing the weight limit is explained in the report.</p> <p>Wiltshire Council's structures team does not believe that there is any structural reason that prevents the increase in weight limit.</p> <p>Maintaining a 2t weight limit is impractical as this would preclude many standard family cars such as 4x4's and People Carriers. Applying to the Department for Transport for a 3.5t is one of the options presented in the report.</p> <p>Coaches should not be using the High Street without picking up or dropping off passengers. Once the weight limit is amended this will be enforceable.</p> <p>It was proposed that the Order is access only rather than for 'loading and unloading'</p> <p>It is noted that the Parish Council is in discussion with officer with regards to the wider issues surrounding Shrewton and the A303, etc. however, the weight limit is being proposed to deal with the currently unenforceable illegal signs.</p>

<p>team requested a meeting with Councillors and Officers of Wiltshire Council it was to highlight the issues of the increased traffic using the B3086 following the closure of the A344 and the build of the new Stonehenge Visitor Centre by English Heritage.</p> <p>Although a special CATG meeting was convened and a 'vision for traffic in Shrewton' report submitted from the Parish Council outlining the concerns and offering measures to alleviate the problems, nothing has been offered by Wiltshire Council Highways to resolve them. More traffic is using the minor road through Shrewton each week with larger vehicles and lorries discovering that they can bypass the A303 this way.</p> <p>The revision of the current weight limit with an increased limit in isolation has raised significant objections in the village and shows Wiltshire Council to be out of touch with its public. Before altering the weight restriction, officers need to recognise that residents require action to alleviate the problems of the traffic using the village to bypass the A303 and work with the Parish Council to show that they are listening to their concerns.</p> <p>We see this as an opportunity to address a number of issues collectively, particularly in the High Street and our vision identifies appropriate, achievable and affordable solutions in the village to include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of an appropriate weight limit (including Salisbury Road becoming 'except for loading') • Resurfacing of High Street and resultant traffic calming measures (roadmarkings/colouring -Wilts. Council has already mentioned that this is soon to be carried out albeit surface dressing for which concerns have been raised) • Provision of a 20mph speed limit in the High Street/Tanners Lane (this should be discussed now to ensure there is limited sign clutter with a speed limit and weight limit being signed) <p>We see the only way forward being a collaborative approach; the Parish Council is keen to work with Wiltshire Council to resolve any objections to the proposals put forward.</p>	<p>As above.</p> <p>Whilst the current weight limit is being abused it is accepted that the signs may act as a deterrent to a small proportion of vehicles between 2t and 7.5t. Therefore, applying to the Department for Transport for a 3.5t weight limit is one of the options presented in the attached report.</p> <p>See above, Salisbury Street, however, does not have the same level of interaction as the High Street.</p> <p>Various measures have been suggested to the Parish Council by officers that could be explored further by the CATG.</p> <p>20mph speed limits are progressed via the CATG. It is recognised that Shrewton Parish Council put forward the whole of Shrewton for a 20mph for consideration and was unsuccessful in obtaining support from the rest of the group. Amesbury CATG has determined that it will not progress anymore 20mph limits until the outcome of the Bulford 20mph is known. An alternative option available would be for the Parish Council to fund the investigation and 20mph.</p>
<p>9 objectors made direct reference to the fact that a 7.5t weight limit is too high and we should apply to the Department of Transport to allow it to remain at the 2t tonnes or at 3.5t tonnes.</p>	<p>Maintaining a 2t weight limit is impractical as this would preclude many standard family cars such as 4x4's and People Carriers. Applying to the Department for Transport for a 3.5t is one of the options presented in the report.</p>
<p>30 objectors made comments regarding the amount of traffic that is using the road/road is already used as a rat run for traffic avoiding the A303/Traffic has increased through the village since the visitor centre was built/the closure of the A344 has increased traffic through the village.</p>	<p>The Atkins report concluded that whilst traffic was diverting from the A303 through Shrewton, this was primarily due to congestion on the A303 rather than closure of the A344.</p>

13 objectors made comment that the volume and size of traffic will increase bringing an increase in congestion.	Whilst the current weight limit is being abused it is accepted that the signs may act as a deterrent to a small proportion of vehicles between 2t and 7.5t. Therefore, applying to the Department for Transport for a 3.5t weight limit is one of the options presented in the attached report.
11 objectors made comment that traffic should be directed away from the High Street and onto the A360.	This is a matter that should be raised via the Amesbury CATG. It is noted that the Parish Council is already in discussions with Wiltshire Council.
40 objectors commented on the negative impacts on road safety, for pedestrians/cyclists/horse riders due to the increase in volume and or size of traffic. Reasons mentioned included the existing lack of pedestrian facilities in the High Street and/or London Road. The number of properties with door opening directly onto the carriageway was highlighted as were those of the Church and shop. Parked vehicles were commonly mentioned as causing difficulty for pedestrians.	Whilst the current weight limit is being abused it is accepted that the signs may act as a deterrent to a small proportion of vehicles between 2t and 7.5t. Therefore, applying to the Department for Transport for a 3.5T weight limit is one of the options presented in the attached report.
2 objectors commented on the negative impact the increase in vehicle size would have on horse riders. They felt that the High Street was the only option for travelling through the village after planning permission has been granted for a golf course in the vicinity of the bridleway.	Whilst the current weight limit is being abused it is accepted that the signs may act as a deterrent to a small proportion of vehicles between 2t and 7.5t. Therefore, applying to the Department for Transport for a 3.5t weight limit is one of the options presented in the attached report.
8 objectors mentioned that the existing 2t weight limit is currently abused and not enforced. 2 objectors mentioned specifically abuse by Army vehicles.	As explained the current 2t weight limit is unenforceable as the signs are no longer permitted by the Regulations. The purpose of this Order is to correct this so that enforcement may be undertaken where appropriate.
35 objectors commented on the characteristics/condition of road. That it was too narrow for two vehicles to pass in places several places. It is narrow and winding. Poor condition of the carriageway surface will deteriorate further. Existing traffic volumes are already unacceptable and cause long delays.	Whilst the current weight limit is being abused it is accepted that the signs may act as a deterrent to a small proportion of vehicles between 2t and 7.5t. Therefore, applying to the Department for Transport for a 3.5t weight limit is one of the options presented in the attached report.
7 objectors made comment referencing the River Till, either simply that it was a SSI or that the existing retaining wall/railings would not stand up to the increase in size and weight of traffic.	The Council's structures team has confirmed that there is no reason why the weight limit should not be increased. The existing barriers are designed to protect pedestrians from falling into the River, not vehicles.
5 objectors commented that there would be a negative impact on adjoining buildings (some of which are listed) either from the increase in size of vehicles themselves or the vibrations they caused.	Whilst the current weight limit is being abused it is accepted that the signs may act as a deterrent to a small proportion of vehicles between 2t and 7.5t. Therefore, applying to the Department for Transport for a 3.5t weight limit is one of the options presented in the attached report.

5 objectors commented that the weight limit should not be introduced in isolation. The entire package of measures listed by the Community in 'Shrewton – A Plan for Traffic and the Community' should be introduced.	It is noted that Shrewton Parish Council is in discussion with Wiltshire Council with regards to various requests throughout the Parish. The change in weight limit is to deal with the illegal signs currently erected on the highway.
3 objectors commented that a 20mph/Traffic Calming/width restriction should be introduced.	Noted; however, this is outside of the remit of the proposed restriction. Any proposals should be directed through the Amesbury CATG; however, it is noted that Shrewton Parish Council is already in discussion with the Council with regards to various requests throughout the parish.
2 objectors commented that the proposals were to alleviate congestion on the A303.	This is incorrect; the only reason for the proposals is to ensure that the weight limit is enforceable.
3 objectors make comment that if a 2t was acceptable in 1968 why is it now acceptable for it to be raised.	There is no evidence that the 2t weight limit was introduced due to a weak structure; therefore, the weight limit is for environmental reasons and the minimum weight limit permitted by the Regulations is 7.5t.
5 objectors comment that speeding traffic is a problem in High Street and or London Road.	Noted, however this is outside of the remit of the proposed restriction.
1 objector comments that permission is not needed from the Secretary of State for a 2t limit as 'To quote the Road Traffic Act; "The traffic authority for a road outside Greater London may make an order under Section 1(referred to in this Act as a "traffic regulation order") in respect of the road where it appears to the authority making the order that it is expedient to make for preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which, is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property"	<p>This is indeed what the Road Traffic Regulation Act states; however, for the Order to be legal it must be signed by the correct signs as set out in the Traffic Signs and General Directions 2002 (as amended). (TSRGD)</p> <p>The signs currently available to an authority to sign an environmental weight limit are those shown in TSRGD diagram no 622.1A as shown below and the only permitted variant is that 7.5t may be varied to 18t. Thus, in order to have a legally valid and enforceable weight limit anything other than the introduction of a 7.5t or 18t weight limit for environmental reasons must be submitted to the Department for Transport for authorisation.</p>  <p>622.1A</p>
<p>The owners of Shrewton Farm made the following comments:</p> <p>Whilst the farm borders the B3086, the access for road vehicles is from the South West, via Mills' Drove (Byway SHRE29). This means vehicles leaving/joining the weight limit</p>	Noted and agreed, any Order will be amended to accommodate vehicles requiring access to Shrewton Farm.

<p>at the junction of London Road and the High Street, in order to access the farm via Elston Lane and Mills' Drove. Theoretically, there is an alternative route: lorries can go North through Shrewton on the A360, then turn back down through Orcheston along Elston Lane. This alternative is undesirable both because of the nature of Elston Lane and because the road geometry at the bottom of Mills' Drove is too tight for many lorries to turn in from the North. Instead they have to continue along Elston lane and reverse into The Hollow to turn round, which has been found to be quite a hazardous manoeuvre. We would therefore be very grateful if THE COUNTY OF WILTSHIRE (B3086, HIGH STREET, LONDON ROAD AND THE PACKWAY, SHREWTON)(WEIGHT RESTRICTION) ORDER 2015 could be worded to make sure that vehicles over 7.5t can access Shrewton Farm via the London Road/Elston Lane route.</p>	
<p>The owners of Wiltshire Grain made the following additional comments that have not been dealt with above;</p> <p>Although we do everything within our powers to stop vehicles accessing our site from Shrewton it is not illegal as we are within the weight restriction and access is allowed. Surely it would be better if the start of the new proposed restriction was moved from Rolleston Cross Roads to the Shrewton side of our site entrance? Thus removing the existing loop hole?</p> <p>Add to this better signage around Shrewton would help; because Wiltshire Grain is a public weighbridge and for some reason unlike other council in the country; Wiltshire make no attempt to direct vehicles to these bridges with signs.</p>	<p>Agreed, any weight limit should commence to the west of the entrance to Wiltshire Grain.</p> <p>There is no Policy in existence that precludes the signing of Public Weighbridges within Wiltshire. This request should be progressed via the Amesbury CATG in the first instance.</p>