

HOLT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – DRAFT 1.5 CONSULTATION

SECTION 2 TRAFFIC – FEEDBACK COMMENTS & RESPONSES

Objective no	Feedback comments	Response	Action
General	There continues to be a large volume of traffic which is not local to the village but just passing through.	Probably, but more information from a survey is awaited,	None
	The main priority should be to keep this traffic moving at a suitable (realistic maximum) steady speed with minimum obstruction to its smooth flow	Disagree – the main priority is to divert it elsewhere	None
	There is a thread running through this section which seems to assume that anything which reduces traffic speed is good. I understand that recent surveys have shown that in fact exceeding the speed limit is not a serious problem.	Whether or not the limit is exceeded, it is a fact that villagers feel intimidated by both speed and size of vehicles.	None
	I feel that the few who do so will not change their habits or behaviour if new restrictions, inconvenient and irritating to everyone, are introduced.	Which “everyone”? Not villagers. This is a matter of enforcement which is mentioned elsewhere in the Plan.	None

	<p>I would not, in principle, be against a speed limit of 20mph right through the village, although I seem to remember that such is not allowed on a road of B grading. Such a limit would have very little effect on passage times through the village.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the general perception, especially with people just passing through, would be that it is an annoying and unnecessary restriction and, unless very strongly policed, would be widely ignored bringing the regulation into disrepute</p>	<p>How to reduce speed is to be determined, whether by signage or environment changes.</p> <p>Wilts Council will have to determine whether a limit can be introduced, if the Plan finally suggests one is necessary.</p> <p>People “just passing through” should be reduced by other proposals in the Plan.</p>	<p>To be considered</p>
	<p>Page 5 – Traffic, Parking etc. This should be adjusted to match the vision that requires adequate parking for residents and workers as well as visitors. It seems to me that following the opening of the Glove parking lot the real growing problem is parking for residents</p>	<p>Agree, but not sure the Glove parking lot will entirely solve the visitor parking problem.</p>	<p>TBC</p>
	<p>Page 15 The last PC vehicle count registered over 10K vehicles per day. The Kingston Farm traffic assessment has been done and plans approved. Earlier you said that 20mph restriction required at the zebra – here it says that the zebra slows the traffic.</p>	<p>Not sure why Kingston Farm is mentioned.</p> <p>Check this alleged contradiction</p>	<p>Amend if necessary</p>
	<p>Pages 15, 16, 17 and 18 are a long description of problems some of which have tackled earlier. No solutions are proposed.</p>	<p>It’s because these pages are <u>supposed</u> to be a description of the problems, not the solutions!</p>	<p>N/A</p>

T.1	<p>In general, improve pedestrian footpaths throughout the village – many are in a very poor state of repair. Also need to consider disabled access and use of pavements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasise improving pavements and footpaths. • Raise pavements on B3107 where traffic regularly mounts them – e.g. between junctions of The Gravel and Station Road 	<p>Already in the Plan</p> <p>Ditto</p> <p>May not fit in with general idea of a new streetscape</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>TBC</p>
T1.1	<p>OR – cutting away some of the encroaching bank and building up a proper pavement. Also, reducing the width of the opposite pavement to accommodate parking and give more for the Recreation side pavement.</p>	<p>Considered but rejected</p>	<p>None</p>
T1.1	<p>With the proviso that removing existing pavement does not increase the speed of vehicles through the village.</p>	<p>Speed limit will remain</p>	<p>None</p>
T1.1	<p>Provided it does not significantly reduce the overall area for games etc, and does not impinge on existing trees</p>	<p>Will not affect games area, but some trees may have to be cut down</p>	<p>None</p>
T1.1	<p>Keep the footpath but with the grass bank cut back to make the footpath the original width.</p>	<p>Considered but rejected</p>	<p>None</p>
T1.1	<p>Have traffic lights at Ground Corner and outside the (United Reformed) church so traffic knows when to travel safely. (Alternate single carriageway working?)</p>	<p>In general, traffic lights were rejected within the village as not in keeping with the village ambience</p>	<p>None</p>

T1.1	Moving the stretch of footpath on the north side of The Street into the Recreation Ground is a good idea. General impression is that this footpath is rarely used by pedestrians (who can use the footpath on the other side of the road). The extra width of carriageway would improve the flow of traffic along that stretch, provided, of course, that parking was not allowed on the north side of the road.	Agreed	TBC
T1.1	Not sure I would use it on a dark winter night.	Entirely up to the respondent, but lighting would be part of the move!	None
T1.1	This has been tried and failed and not for lack of money. This stretch of road also has major problems with vehicle damage for resident's parked cars. Therefore it would be sensible to approach the problem from a different angle. This was looked at before and the survey then revealed a BT cable duct under the footpath on the recreation ground side. BT quoted quite a large sum to re-locate the duct (£75K I think). Despite that there is an opportunity to move the road over that footpath (£75K is not a lot in road building terms), build out proper parking refuges beyond a full width pavement on the Walk side of the road. Alternate one way traffic flows could be considered as per Bradford on Avon.	Considered but rejected See above re traffic lights	None

T1.1	<p>I disagree with the proposal at T1.1. No statistic in the background and rationale for this section suggests that this path is dangerous. The path was constructed 3 feet wide in the early 1960's alongside a widened carriageway on land acquired from the Parish Council. Fifty years of neglect by the highway authority has resulted in a grossly overgrown hawthorn hedge containing flourishing example of ash, field maple, hazel and elder as well as cultivate briar pushing its way onto the foot way which is severely overrun by motor vehicles. The original 5 inch kerb face has been reduced to 10mm by successive resurfacing without raising the path level. An established ash tree planted in the memorial field overhangs and is damaged daily by tall goods vehicles with the resulting debris further hindering the few pedestrians who use the path. The path is not for the faint hearted and single file is recommended. I use the path twice daily and have been touched by a passing wing mirror on one occasion in the last ten years. There is a currently safe alternative route called "The Walk" where the pedestrian is protected by a No cycling Order which is not well signed yet seldom disobeyed. It cannot be very attractive to cyclists!</p>	<p>It may not be "dangerous" in recorded statistics, but it is intimidating, hence few people use it.</p> <p>Agreed</p>	None
T1.2	<p>Only allow 2 way traffic at the western end of the Midlands as far as Dawes Pond. All traffic leaving the Glove Factory and the new development to leave via the eastern end by the traffic lights.</p>	<p>Traffic management in The Midlands will be part of the Planning Application for the Tannery</p>	<p>Make this clear in the NHP</p>
T1.2	<p>My proposal for one way working would obviate the need for this "improvement". The prospect of increasing traffic through the heart of the village goes against all planning principles.</p>	<p>Ditto</p>	<p>Ditto</p>

T1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any informal crossing should not restrict parking outside Holt Superstore, as to do so would affect the viability of the store. Provided it doesn't affect passing trade for the shop! Only if it does not affect Superstore 	Agree	TBC
T1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is not clear to me what defines an 'informal' pedestrian crossing. In fact, given the difficulty crossing at this point as a pedestrian, and the difficulty negotiating the stretch of road between this point and the Ham Tree Inn as a driver, I think a formal Pelican crossing could alleviate both problems with one solution. What is an informal crossing? What we do now? Try it as an experiment if there is a history of road accidents involving pedestrians at this point. 	<p>See above re "streetscape" proposals and undesirability of traffic light solutions</p> <p>None as far as I know – experiments</p>	None
T1.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restriction to cars only is not realistic. What about one way? 	Not popular with Midlands residents	None
T1.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restriction to cars only impacts on residents of The Midlands. 	Not so	None
T1.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have traffic lights at this junction, with the one set of lights set back by the telephone exchange so there is only one way working at the eastern end of the Midlands at one time. The perceived problem could be overcome with signal control – see below. 	See above – rather not have traffic lights – but may depend on Tannery planning	None
T1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not sure this is necessary and could be the "thin end of the wedge" with everyone wanting a 20mph limit. 	Maybe	TBC

T1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce speed limit to 20mph throughout the village.(x3) • 200yd speed limit causes confusion – 20mph through village preferable. • I am against short sections of road with different speed limits. They are a source of irritation to motorists, who should be spending their time concentrating on driving safely, not looking out for yet more road signs. I am not convinced there is a significant hazard at this crossing and, in practice, conditions at the northern end of Station Road already limit the speed of cars there. • Don't think this would be observed as some ignore 30mph. • Why not 20mph through the whole village. Other communities are doing it and the whole of Bristol is going 20mph. WC just keep saying no so we need to be more positive. 	<p>There are rules about imposition of 20mph speed limits which are difficult to fulfill in Holt at present. However, a new streetscape may make it easier.</p> <p>Enforcement is a problem – the police do not have the resources to do it.</p>	TBC
T1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Last winter my wife and I circumnavigated the village just after a snowfall. The only point at which there was any danger was the “new” pedestrian crossing. Had it not been for the alertness of the driver of a westbound car she would have been killed as she was thrown into the road by an uncontrollable slide down the long, steep, pimpled slope from the footpath to the crossing. This approach is potentially dangerous as it has both endfall and crossfall and is quite the worst approach to a crossing I have ever seen. The preferred drop-off zone for the school should be at the grass play area in Little Parks. I have made a suggestion below which would cure this problem. The piecemeal introduction of 20mph lengths of a classified road is hardly likely to be approved and would certainly not be respected. 	<p>Not sure residents would like it</p> <p>Agreed – see above</p>	TBC

T1.6 & 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will protected parking be for residents only? (named residents/residences) . • Not sure! 	To be determined – requires a Traffic Order	TBC
T1.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Altering the layout of the Little Parks junction could have a benefit for parking. However it should not have the object of reducing the carriageway width below two clear lanes, thus impeding the steady flow of through traffic. If extra parking is essential in that area there is a large space a short way down Little Parks, which could be taken over for parking. But, say I, perish the thought 	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Presumably the green – not agreed</p>	None
T1.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is the first mention in the plan of reducing speed for traffic LEAVING the village. It should travel at less than 30mph until it leaves the built up area. 	Agreed, but it is a matter of streetscape and enforcement – see above	None
T1.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not a good idea. This will cause much revving of engines, much braking, increase of pollution and long traffic queues. This was proven when the three houses at the end of Melksham Road were being built recently and traffic lights caused queues of vehicles, including heavy lorries, reaching from the lights past the entrance to Little Parks. Build-outs would have the same effect. Bear in mind also these chicane-type obstructions do depend on the “good?” will of the driver. Many drivers do tend to accelerate when approaching these obstructions if traffic approaching from the other end. 	Part of streetscape plan	TBC

T1.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I would be very much against this one. It sounds as if the proposal is to have build-outs (chicanes) which would restrict the carriageway to a single lane, to provide parking spaces when, in fact, parking along this stretch is not (yet?) a significant problem. I wonder how many parking spaces would be provided when suitable access requirements to all the properties on both sides of the road were addressed? More pertinently, the proposed arrangement would seriously affect the flow of traffic. Vehicles would be braking to an unnecessary halt, with revving engines as they started away again giving increased noise and pollution. Such single lane working can and does cause significant tailbacks, with their consequent delays, as experienced during Monday rubbish collections and when repairs necessitate the use of traffic lights. To increase such delays, noise and pollution by design is a seriously bad move. There is an added problem with these chicane-type obstructions which does nothing to add to the safety of the roads. 	See above	None
T1.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would need to see plan before passing opinion. 	OK!	None
T1.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This proposal will reduce the available roadside parking. 	Depends on final design	None
T2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 40mph signs on the lane Tollgate to Staverton are too high considering bends and visibility. 	They are at statutory height	None
T2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A system of chicanes – as at BoA, Bathford, and Coronation Avenue in Bath (it works very well) – should be considered 	Part of streetscape planning	TBC

T2.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I disagree with the Proposal at T2.2 To renew and maintain all white painted road markings in the village. On the section of main road abutting the playing field there is one short line marking out the centre of the carriageway. There was once a series of such lines forming a continuous pattern but fortunately these have not been replaced after subsequent resurfacing and patching. To put them back would indicate that traffic heading towards the shop from the Green should always take precedence over opposing traffic which should always wait until the road is clear. There is barely sufficient width for two moving cars to pass and the present 'give and take ' arrangement works well. It would work better if the 'courtesy' white line at the entrance to the Church were extended to include the length opposite the main entrance to the Playing Field. There is sometimes a car parked on this section of road which obstructs the entrance of large vehicles into the field and, more importantly obstructs the view of vehicles approaching from opposite ends of the line of parked cars. The Highway code recommends that vehicles should not be parked on the inside of a bend. There is space on the straight section west of this point for thirteen cars to park. There are thirteen properties fronting the road between the Church and the Green. Several have ample off-street parking. The best practical solution would be the provision of light controlled shuttle working which could probably cost less than the extensive tarmacking of yet more of the Playing Field. A single white line 2 metres long should be laid where the path from the Tollgate crosses to the War Memorial to deter the thoughtless motorists who obstruct the footpath and force pedestrians onto the grass. The Objective T2.2 should be "Review periodically the requirements for white lines." 	Agreed	TBC
------	---	--------	-----

T2.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• This would affect residents on the Lions Orchard development facing on to The Midlands by removing the option of being able to park a second vehicle outside their property. (Only one designated parking space is allocated to each of these properties.)• Double yellows are for towns not villages.• I disagree most strongly with the proposal in T2.3 on several grounds. First it is misusing a useful traffic restriction intended to increase the capacity of a carriageway. There is insufficient space for traffic to travel on the carriageway at this point in two directions simultaneously, with or without the restriction. Vehicle parking with one set of wheels on the single foot way is obstructing the safe route for pedestrians, If the problem of parking on this section is not resolved by the building of the massive car park now under construction and a few sharp words from the Community Policeman I should be astonished. If all else fails the replacement of the current kerbing with the standard half battered urban design at the recommended level above the carriageway would certainly achieve the objective required. The cost of the necessary signs and lines and their maintenance is a waste of public funds. The effect of introducing yellow lines on side roads is to encourage parking on main roads. Bradford on Avon at Springfield is a fine example of this error of judgment. The only yellow lines in the village were introduced to provide a safe environment for the school crossing patrol to operate. The school crossing patrol no longer operates at this point and parents are actively discouraged from allowing their charges to cross the road at this point. The introduction of yellow lines throughout the main road would increase the speed of traffic travelling through the village.		Despite the comments, this will be done shortly
------	---	--	--

T2.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is just as likely to move the parking problem into the Gravel where the residents already have parking issues. Introduction of white lines in Station Road just exacerbate the problem in The Gravel – I acknowledge the problem of parking, but this just moves the problem somewhere else. Include the junction between The Gravel and Station Rd 	Everybody wants to park all their cars where it is convenient to them – not possible!	None
T2.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Considering the number of residences either side of the B3107 in the Leigh Road area with no off-road parking facility, more thought is needed to assist current residents in the conservation area. ?Provision of secure parking at Manor Farm for residents, OR perhaps it is time to consider a compromise by sacrificing some “green” areas for layby parking. 	Who will buy the field and make a car park? <u>Unpopular!</u>	TBC
T2.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents should be consulted on this point before any lines are painted 	Part of implementation process	None
T2.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst single white lines are an appropriate deterrent for undesirable parking (e.g. at the junction of Beckerley Lane with the B3107) they should be implemented with careful consideration so as not to push parking further into residential areas 	Part of the planning and implementation process	None

T2.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The introduction of yellow lines at the junctions of the main and side roads would invite motorists to park at the ends of the restrictions. The white courtesy lines at Station Road seem to work quite well. <p>The words "where this is particularly undesirable" is a subjective and unprofessional phrase and should be replaced with "where it regularly occurs and causes obstruction or material reduction of visibility." The clause should end at this point as "such as" and the detailed spots mentioned are inappropriate in a document of this nature.</p>	See above Agreed	None TBC
T2.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The signage on a highway is a matter for the Highway Authority and as such is outside the control of the Parish Council. An illustrative booklet of approved designs is available on-line. The style and size of approved lettering is closely defined. The use of unauthorised signs is a potential cause of accidents on the Highway. The latest example is that advertising the School function held on Friday 27th June, still obstructing visibility at the junction of Leigh Road and the B3107 on the morning of the 28th. The lettering on the sign is too small to be read by passing motorists making it useless for its intended purpose. The erection of the sign was irresponsible and illegal. 	PC is currently considering an "unofficial" signage policy which covers this	TBC
T3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Doubt if this is possible Ban all 6-axle lorries from the village! Most important part of the whole plan. Strongly agree. 	Being investigated by PC	TBC
T3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ban shouldn't be necessary once the gap road is open This road may never be built. 	Construction started August 2014	None

T3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why not try for 7.5t? Environmental weight restrictions are imposed to prevent large vehicles from using inappropriate roads, routes and areas. They are legally enforceable but allow access to property within the restriction. The restrictions aim to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o reduce danger to pedestrians and other road users o prevent damage to buildings, roads and bridges o preserve the character, amenity and environment of an area o reduce and manage congestion on the roads. 	Sounds worth trying	TBC
T3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would be more useful if less specific. Replace the ending from “once the etc.” with “by supporting any proposal in the surrounding area which would supply a more attractive alternative route for such traffic currently on B3107 	Worth adding	TBC

T4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would probably be too expensive to be considered. • Not if this means losing green field areas. • Include any impact future changes to major roads e.g. A36, A350 & their HVG traffic being pushed through Holt. • But not to be ransomed by large housing developments! • A bypass could affect the viability of the shop – no shop and the village dies – Beckington is an example of this. • No bypass – it will kill off the village – look at Beckington! Passing trade keeps the village shop and PO alive. • Sorry, but this issue created a great deal of bad feeling in the village when it was last looked at, before our time here, and we cannot see any point in resurrecting the issue which was rejected previously – after a lot of heated discussion. Can we just respect the conclusion they came to then?? • I am not particularly in favour of a bypass, I think it reduces the vitality of a village but anything that could be done to reduce the number of large lorries should be pursued. • Is almost certainly pie in the sky. Once the County Council had elected to improve the A350 route from M4 to Warminster and Somerset had constructed the Frome by-pass any small hope of a strategic route to take through traffic out of the village faded. The only other option is to accept a material increase in the size of the settlement as was done at Chippenham which obtained a western bypass of sorts at the expense of the purchasers of house in the extended residential area. When this option was tried a few years ago in Holt it met with strong opposition which is unlikely to have changed - yet. 	Is it worth leaving this proposal in?	TBC
----	---	---------------------------------------	------------