

Dear Debbie,

Ref 1 - Rouncil Lane, Woodcote lane
Objection (1)

1. Although we were able to progress the matter further, I was indisposed on the evening of 11 Sep 14 and therefore did not attend the meeting. My deputy covered the meeting and Members have, asked us to update you on their views and resolution.

2. In general terms, Members fully support the measures but again draw your attention to their concerns over the implications of the diversion of Bridleway K14 (upon which there has been much correspondence). They reiterated their longstanding concerns, notwithstanding the improvement works undertaken in the area between bridleways K14 and K181, that horses/riders (especially young riders) and even a 50 mph limit are incompatible on that stretch of road. As previously raised, the incidence of speed creep on the road is known and seen personally by Members.

3. Accordingly, our Members view is that, allowing for inbound slowing and reaction time for traffic travelling from Beausale etc, is that the K14/W181 bridleway areas should be within a 40 mph zone. They suggest that this could most logically be achieved by expanding the 40 mph limit from the Rouncil Lane/Woodcote junction so that the transition point to/from the 50 mph limit is at least 150 metres to the west of Goodrest Cottages (situated just West of W181).

4. Please let us have your views on this proposal.

Yours sincerely,

Ref 1- Rouncil Lane,
Woodcote Lane

Objection (2)

Ms D Poynton
Traffic and Road Safety
PO Box 43,
Shire Hall
Warwick
CV34 4SX

| |
|-----------------------|
| RECEIVED - 9 SEP 2014 |
| COMMUNITIES GROUP |
| LEADERSHIP |
| |

Dear Ms Poynton,

I refer to the proposal to implement revised speed limits on Rouncil Lane Kenilworth.

Whereas I agree with extending the 30 mph limit (in fact I do not understand why the 30 mph limit is not limited as far as, and along, Woodcote Lane) the reduced limit of 50 mph further out towards Beausale does not make sense for the following reasons.

1. The obvious speed limit on this stretch of road is somewhat less than 60 mph and sensible road users will reduce their speed accordingly. Less sensible road users will speed along this section of road regardless of any official limitations. The net result in speed reduction will therefore be zero.
2. Additional speed limitation signage will be an eyesore and is not environmentally friendly. We can well do without even more road signs.
3. The cost is not justified (has it been quantified?). Can you furnish accident figures prior to the proposal and what you expect after the speed limitation? If these figures cannot be provided then you are working in the dark. I propose you don't try to solve a problem which I expect you do not have!
4. Is this a box ticking exercise? Like the hopeless introduction of useless and dangerous cycle lanes throughout the country, I suspect that this exercise is merely trying to meet badly thought out National targets. I don't suppose you will agree with this analysis but it would be nice to think that someone might consider a "do nothing" policy is sometimes better.