

Support 1

I would like to register my positive support for the traffic humps on croft road Nuneaton.

I think they will increase public safety, decrease pollution and improve the quality of life living nearby.

Thank you very much

Support 2

Dear Dana Loxley,

I would like to write in support of the suggestion for a planning application for 8 speed bumps on croft road Nuneaton;

1. Currently the speed of the traffic is too fast for the children who cross with their parents who go to Glendale and croft school upwards of 4 times a day. Statistics suggest 53-63% reduction of injury and death to children in the event of an accident involving a vehicle where road Humps are installed.
2. There is a large retirement complex on the road and the residents could cross the road more easily if the Humps were in place.
3. The air and noise quality would be better in the local area.
4. It would make the speed of the road slower and safer for cyclists.
5. It will make the junction coming off the Glendale safer.
6. Slower speed could help prevent collisions giving drivers more time to react.
7. Modern designs of road Humps causes no damage to car's.

I feel strongly about this and would positively support Warwickshire well thought out and suggested plan for road Humps on croft road Nuneaton.

All the best

Objection 1

Dear Sir/Madam

I wish to raise some objections to the proposed installation of 20 speed bumps along Croft Road. It is excessive, and unnecessary.

In my experience of driving along Croft Road I have not seen excessive speed, however, the addition of speed bumps will not help with this as the people who do speed take absolutely no notice of speed bumps, as proven in the many times I have been overtaken whilst driving over them myself.

I suffer from a bulging disc so for anyone with back or spinal problems they are a major problem as, especially the ones where the markings are worn, going over them is excruciatingly painful. As a result of the speed bumps I can no longer use public transport as the result of a bus journey over the bumps usually results in being unable to walk for 3-4 days as I'm in so much pain.

You state in your proposal 'The scheme will help improve the environment for residents, pedestrians and cyclists.' I stopped walking along these roads when speed bumps and cushions were installed as the pollution from the car exhausts was terrible! As drivers, the ones that do not career over them, slow down more exhaust fumes are released raising the levels of air pollution for exactly the people they you say it will help!

Having driven in Coventry where they have installed average speed cameras I have seen a vast improvement in the way people drive, it is so much more pleasant having people drive within the speed limit and the journey itself is better as you are not constantly jolting over bumps! I suggest the installation of average speed cameras would be a far better option all round. It would reduce speed, reduce pollution, and make the environment much more pleasant

In conclusion, I think that average speed cameras are a better long term solution, as lets face it the state of Nuneaton's roads with their many pot holes act as speed deterrents anyway.

Objection 2

To whom it may concern

I understand from the local media there is a proposal for 20 speed humps along Croft Road between the junctions of The Raywoods and Greenmoor Road, due to the number of accidents in a given amount of time. I have lived in this area my whole life (including Croft Road) and use these roads daily. I totally agree that there is a need to improve the safety of pedestrians using this road. Although, speed humps may be the option being proposed, I do not feel that they are the answer.

Sunnyside Court is a retirement complex situated on Croft Road. Residents (who often need walking aids), are able to safely get on the bus outside the complex to go into town or medical appointments. However, on their return they have to navigate traffic on the straight portion of the road between The Raywoods & North Street. In order to ensure their safety, there needs to be a pelican crossing. The one installed on Croft Road between Marsdale Drive & Northumberland Avenue has been a god send for all pedestrians, including the residents of Runnymede Gardens (retirement complex) and local children going to school. I feel it has slowed the speed of traffic to that piece of road.

The portion of road between North Street & Greenmoor Road is made worse by vehicles parking on double yellow lines and in the evening customers stopping at the fish & chip shop. At 07.45 a.m. last Thursday there were 8 cars and vans parked on double yellows, either fully or part on the pavement. Immediately beyond the mini roundabout there is a pelican crossing, a busy junction on the left handside (Tomkinson Road) and a hump back bridge with two lanes on the ascent. Traffic turning right out of Tomkinson Road cannot see traffic coming up and over the bridge. Traffic signalling would be the ideal scenario.

From 8.00-9.15 during term time the traffic queue is usually from Greenmoor Road beyond the Raywoods to Marsdale Drive and often to Denehurst Way. This scenario started after the installation of the mini roundabout at Greenmoor Road/Croft Road junction, as the traffic from Greenmoor Road has right of way. It can take 10 minutes to drive the proposed 500metres. The knock on effect is more traffic using Heath End Road to avoid the queues in Croft Road, which then blocks the road to the Hospital for ambulance staff aswell as other traffic. If the proposed speed humps are installed, I fear more people will try using Heath End Road.

I am not aware of how much observational research has been done by the parties proposing the speed humps, but feel the whole Croft Road/Heath End Road/Greenmoor Road triangle needs a complete re-think. The media reports you want comments on the proposals, I would ask that you please respect the opinions of the people who have to use these roads as pedestrians or motorists every day and don't base your decision on cost alone.

Objection 3

I write as a resident that walks daily into town via croft road.

There is no rationale for speed bumps to be installed in this road.

There is normally queues of traffic, I not seen any accidents in this stretch of road. I have made enquiries and there appears to no fatal accidents or serious injuries.

By putting in humps you will direct more traffic along Heathend road. Making this road far busier.

You be better to put this money and tarmac into repairing Greenmoor road, where cars drive to centre of road, to dodge the potholes and swerving back to avoid oncoming traffic.

Objection 4

I am writing to object to the proposed speed reduction measures on Croft Road, Nuneaton. I am a resident of the area and use that road frequently.

I believe the collision severity rate on this section of road is 17% which is in line with the County average and therefore no worse than most other areas.

The road in question is often a very slow moving line of traffic therefore not needing any extra speed control. Particularly so since the mini roundabout was installed at the junction with Greenmoor Road which leads to long queues of traffic waiting to go straight on or turn right.

I believe the junction at Tomkinson Road is far more dangerous with right turns being allowed at the exit of Tomkinson Road with this being a blind junction of traffic coming over the hill. I frequently see vehicles turning right from Tomkinson Road forcing other traffic to stop or blocking the road heading towards Sainsbury's until they can turn. Therefore better traffic control at the Tomkinson Road/Croft Road would be a much better option.

Thank you for your time.

Objection 5

Hi, I would like to voice my opinion on the Croft road speed jumps proposal. It is a stupid idea, coming from someone who lives in Nuneaton this is going to help target NOTHING. There are so many roads in Nuneaton which are in desperate need of repair. Take Queen Elizabeth road for example. The pot holes down that road are terrible. The money could be spent on that. But no, let's just Chuck more road humps out in a part of the town that doesn't really need them.

Not sure what else to say on the matter but I'm using my voice for a change and I'm opposing this proposal.

Objection 6

I agree we need urgent safety improvements to Croft Road but just adding speed humps creates new issues. The junction with Raywoods really needs to be a raised table. The road is very wide but has no safe crossing points. Adding controlled crossing will break up the flow of traffic and increase pedestrian safety. On the wider section (up from 128 Croft road) the running lanes should be narrowed by adding protected cycling lanes where possible. The biggest improvement would be to extend the Queens Road 20MPH zone all the way up to around 128 Croft road.

Objection 7

I would like to express my objection to this scheme, I live on Heath end Road, which is already busier than Croft Road, it will push more traffic onto Heath End Road.

There is no need for speedhumps, as there have been no fatal accidents and there is not a school.

As a resident of Nuneaton for 48 years I don't see why adding more road humps will do anything except add extra carnage to the roads that can't cope with the amount of traffic we have already.

I don't believe this road has had an amount of accidents to warrant speed humps. The traffic is often so bad along this road that you are lucky to get over 10mph anyway.

The potholes around this town slow down drivers enough, so maybe look to fix those instead of wasting money on installing pointless speed bumps.

The roundabout at the Raywoods is probably where most accidents have happened, purely due to poor visibility at the junction and careless drivers not giving way as required. I've never heard of a fatality on this road either.

Woodford Lane entering the A5 has claimed countless lives but yet nothing is done about that. Someone gets their facts and figures right and address the serious issues we do have on our roads rather than a vanity project due to using up budget.

Town centre roads such as Queens road in the town centre need desperate attention due to parking, not slowly down a major route out of the town causing more congestion that is not wanted.

Objection 8

I wish to object to the planned work for 20 new speed humps along Croft Road.

I don't believe these are required.

The Boroughs' roads need to be made driveable as currently there are a lot of potholes and the road markings are worn out or near invisible leading to confusion and unsafe driving.

The money would be better spent doing this work first.

Hoping this receives your considerations.

Objection 9

I am writing this email to complain and object about wasting my tax money on proposed speed bumps on Croft Road Nuneaton. Reference Croft Road, Nuneaton - Objections. Which will not benefit the environment, the residents or road users. If anything the money could be used more effectively fixing existing roads and potholes. I know of at least 50 people that are angry about this, and have no means to tell you as they have no access to computers as they are older, and if needs be i will gather a permission signed by these people. This is an utter waste of tax payers money and even worse so in a cost of living crisis that tax payers money is being wasted like this. I hope to hear a reply from you before the times up as i have only just found out about this and have been giving no warning about the plans until now, not everyone has internet access to find out what the council have planned and i have seen no where of the council having actually asking the people of Nuneaton if this is something they actually want our money spent on. I'm disgusted at the incompetence and insensitivity of wasting tax payers money like this in such hard times.

Objection 10

Good afternoon,

I would like to present my objections to the proposed speed humps on Croft Road, Nuneaton.

I assume the intention of these proposed measures is to reduce traffic speeds through the area.

If I am ever unfortunate enough to have to travel these roads around school start and finish time or at peak rush hour, traffic speeds are slowed to a crawl due to the volume of traffic and the many junctions along this road. Therefore, at school times, the traffic poses no additional risk to the students as the traffic is already well under the speed limit.

At all other times of day when I have travelled this route, I have never personally observed any speeding vehicles. This is due to the number of parked vehicles along the route, which force cars to slow down as they pass each other and the parked vehicles. Often, I am one of many people politely waiting for the cars coming in the opposite direction to pass before resuming my journey, due to these parked vehicles. It is rare to even reach the speed limit on most of this road.

Speed humps will however, lead to increased braking and acceleration for vehicles, which is worse for the environment as cars are not being driven efficiently due to constantly accelerating then braking.

It will also cause an increase in costs of car ownership in brake pad and suspension wear due to the increased requirement to brake and navigate speed humps.

This is at a time when motorists are already feeling the pinch, with the cost of fuel, car parts and car insurance being at record levels!

As it would seem we have plenty of spare tarmac and road repair resources, to enable such a proposal, I would suggest that a far better use of the Council's money would be to use this in repairing the roads in the area that are falling to pieces.

One example of a very poor road surface is Greenmoor Road, adjacent to the Jewsons site, between the B4102 and the Jubilee Sports Centre. This road surface has been patched many times and then had patches placed on the patches. Since the winter, this road is in an appalling condition and is in desperate need of repair.

Having driven through towns and cities in many parts of the country, I have rarely encountered a town with as many speed humps and traffic calming measures as Nuneaton. The raised tables are non-existent in other parts of the country and the traffic flows all the better for it.

I do not feel that the many Nuneaton speed humps adequately reduce traffic speeds as those who wish to exceed the speed limit, will do so regardless, instead bouncing over speed humps like they are driving a 4x4 on an off-road course.

In summary, adding further inconvenience to the many law-abiding motorists will not reduce the speed of the few who intentionally speed.

It will only serve to cost the ordinary motorist more money and as such, the focus of the council should be on maintaining roads to a higher quality before adding yet more unwanted speed humps.

Objection 11

My objections to the placement of "Speed Cushions" along the length of Croft Road from the junction of Greenmoor Road to The Raywoods are, having lived here for nearly 50 years the traffic has never caused myself any stress or anxiety. "Speed Cushions" will not slow down the traffic, It will not make it safer for cyclist because they use the pedestrian paths to the detriment of pedestrians. Could your plan not be revised, and make it a 20 MPH zone the same as Queens Road which seems to work quite well. You could also stop people parking their cars half on the path and half on the road in between Greenmoor Road junction and North Street junction (Chip Shop customers are the main culprits). A pedestrian crossing could also be installed near to The Raywoods adjacent to 190 Croft Road.

Could you please supply all collated personal injuries over the last over the last five years on Croft Road.

Objection 12

Hello Traffic and Safety

I disagree with more speed humps. Utilise the money for repairs to other roads rather than more speed humps. They create unnecessary wear and tear to law abiding motorists, and are uncomfortable to driver over, especially when they are too high or deteriorated years after installation (for example Edward street or many in stockingford). Those who wish to speed will simply speed between humps, or just hit them harder faster.

However, I expect you'll implement the speed humps regardless of public opinion as the consultations process of the public is generally a box ticking exercise and will make no difference to the pre determined decision made by the council or government. Once something is on your agenda or intention, you'll push it through regardless.

Congratulations on making Nuneaton worse, which is actually quite an achievement.

Objection 13

Hello

I seen the proposal for 8 lots of speed bumps along Croft road absolutely ridiculous idea how about objecting to all these houses being built instead so oh we have a lot more cars so let's put speed bumps in and will be traffic lights next

It is about time these houses get stopped because where are all the new roads being built there isn't any

No doubt the computer thinks that will solve the problems it won't it will make it a hundred times worse

A fed up council tax payer

Objection 14

As a “victim” of damaging speed humps within the Nuneaton area that have caused hundreds of pounds worth of damage to my vehicles despite me never going over them at more than 20 mph to try and prevent damage, I strongly object to even more in this town. They don’t slow people down as is evident all over the town and are the cheap option for the council over installation of average speed cameras which are needed on all the main roads in to and out of town and WILL slow people down without causing damage to the innocents vehicles and in addition the installation of speed humps WILL increase pollution from vehicles accelerating and braking both exhaust emissions and braking dust fibres. The simple matter of the fact is we need to follow Coventrys lead having travelled their average speed camera main roads they’re transformed into safer more peaceful roads for all the law abiding road users. Those that choose to ignore it or can’t control their speed will produce income to support the scheme anyway. Please, I implore you to reconsider this backwards method of speed “policing” and ask again ALL the main roads into and out of Nuneaton be fitted with average speed cameras.

Objection 15

Dear Dana Loxley,

I would like to make the following comments in objection to the County Council's proposal to install a series of speed cushions along Croft Road, Nuneaton.

Please be aware that this objection does not cover the general concept of traffic calming and improving the safety of the environment for all road users including pedestrians and cyclists, which is clearly important. This objection is specific to the speed cushion plan as it currently stands.

Speed cushions, as per the plans, do not cover the full width of the carriageway. As a result, they present as less of a hinderance for drivers of larger vehicles which can straddle the cushions. In the course of positioning a vehicle in such a manner to achieve this, a driver may put their vehicle into conflict with other road users, for example by moving nearside which may result in a dangerous close pass of a cyclist, or worse an actual collision.

Again noting that the cushion does not cover the full width of the road, this results in limited space for a cyclist to bypass the cushion, encouraging riders to either a) move too far to the nearside, encouraging close passes; b) attempt to bypass centrally in the carriageway which may present its own risks and challenges to the rider, particularly less confident cyclists; c) attempt to ride over the cushion which may be challenging to less confident riders and uncomfortable for those with certain disabilities, particularly if they feel the need to ride at speed to keep up with motor traffic.

Riders of tricycles and other similar cycles may be put at risk by the height difference between the trough and peak of the cushioned area, where the cycle may not fit entirely within the space between cushions, or the kerb and cushion. Cycling between cushions may be dangerous or challenging for some riders.

On this point, I refer you to a comment made by [Wheels for Wellbeing](#):

"Speed cushions - these can create unavoidable cambers which might cause three-wheelers (e.g. tricycles) to tip over. Cycling between speed cushions is the most stable solution, but this can force cyclists into dangerous cycling positions and out into the middle of the road."

This therefore may present as an accessibility issue under the Equality Act 2010 where disabled riders of non-standard cycles are unfairly disadvantaged.

There is no plan communicated alongside this proposal to make other, more meaningful measures (see below) to reduce speeds or vehicle use and improve safety on a residential main road that serves bus stops, is on a route to a nearby school, and has other local amenities nearby which may require the use or crossing of Croft Road.

As it stands, this scheme appears to be barely more than a token effort to reduce driver speeds while not making fundamental differences to the local environment that will meaningfully improve the area for walking, wheeling, and cycling. The area is extremely poorly served by genuine active travel connections where even the advisory on-road links as communicated on the Council's cycling map for Nuneaton offer no actual infrastructure, are dangerous particularly at peak traffic times, and in no way enable people to choose active travel for their local journeys.

As demonstrated, speed cushions can worsen dangers for cycling and this is therefore contrary to a clear stated objective of the scheme.

The Warwickshire Road Safety Partnership has adopted a *Safe Systems Approach* to road safety, whereby conflict and risk should be designed out as far as possible. Yet this proposal designs in the possibility of conflict and risk through increasing the chance of close passes at speed cushions, the hazards for three-wheeled cycles, and the risks incurred by some cyclists (including less confident and inexperienced riders of all ages) moving to avoid speed cushions.

As per the county's *Local Transport Plan (LTP4)* which was recently approved by county councillors, active travel modes are at the top of the transport choice hierarchy. This proposal does not align with LTP4 in a number of areas, including:

- It does not meet three of the four key themes (Environment, Wellbeing, Place);
- As an urban space, the route should be seen as important for increasing active travel, yet it does not contribute to enabling that choice and can worsen it;
- It does not seek to reduce motor vehicle usage;
- It does not meet a Safe Systems Approach (as also noted above);
- It fails to meet key priorities AT1 and AT2 for active travel.
- It does not significantly contribute to the Council's net zero goals;

This scheme should therefore be revisited as follows:

- Implement a formal 20mph speed limit.
- Reduce carriageway width and reallocate space to provide a safer route for cycling.
- Provide full-width speed bumps that drivers cannot avoid, while noting that if cyclists are expected to be in the main carriageway, these should be no more severe than is necessary to ensure comfortable transit for those riding any form of cycle.

I'd be grateful if you could please acknowledge receipt of these comments.

Please note that personal information is given below is on the basis that it is required solely for the purpose of submitting an objection. However, such personal information is not to be considered public information and must not be published.

Objection 16

I and my family live on Kiln Close at the top of Marsdale drive and already have numerous speed humps on Marsdale drive to contend with on a daily basis.

This I can see is justifiable as it is a residential no through route, with a park area and many children playing out – in this case it does work.

Croft Road however is a main through route in Nuneaton and I can not see the logic for the installation of speed humps on this main route.

The road is usually busy anyway with slow moving traffic, and also has parked cars usually on one side of the road.

There are already many pedestrian crossing points on this stretch of road and I think that the money could be better spent on other initiatives rather than some unwanted / needed speed humps on this main route.

Objection 17

To whom it may concern

I totally object to these new speed bumps . Every road in Nuneaton has either speed restrictions down to 20mph for no good reason . Outside schools yes but just an open stretch of road is ridiculous. And to put more speed bumps with the pretence to protect the public and cyclists is just rubbish. And shows no consideration for the emergency services. As most of Croft road has cars park each side the cyclists and motorcyclists will have to go them instead of round them which is very dangerous and unable siding . All that will happen is the council will be paying out more claims for damages from people eating more money from the councils funds which then means you put up the council tax up again to recoup the losses .

And like with the rest of the country that uses this traffic calming to supposedly safe life has proven to be incorrect and actually has the reverse effect as the public take more chances thinking they have more time to cross the road.

The better option if it's for public safety would be to add more crossing place apart from just the one by the jet garage

Objection 18

Hi, what a stupid waste of our money. Take a good, long drive to plough hill road then from there go to Ansley common. Then from there take a nice drive to Mancetter road and you will collectively find out if you cut out all of the potholes you discover and fill them in, this will use the same amount of tarmac you will slap down on Croft road for no reason whatsoever

Objection 19

Good morning

I would like to object against your proposed plan for speed bumps along croft road.

The restrictions put in place along other local roads like the raywoods are damaging to cars as they are too harsh.

As that road is usually congested with parked cars, I believe the plan is not necessary. Thank you for the letter telling me about the proposed traffic measures for Croft Road. One of the proposed measures is right outside my property

Whilst I whole heartedly agree with the measures having lived here for over 50 years and seen many accidents on this road, I feel that I have to ask you to rethink the positioning of this calming measure.

I am almost 76 years old and suffer from atrial fibrillation and sciatica. My daughter who is disabled and uses a wheelchair and crutches is my carer and she visits very often and needs to park right outside the house because of accessing my house.

It is not conducive to anyone for her to park elsewhere as she would be unable to drop me off with my shopping right outside my home.

I appreciate that the siting of the calming measure is because there is no dropped curb outside my property but I can't be the only house that doesn't have one.

I urge you to reconsider the siting of this one measure and look forward to hearing from you

Objection 20

Thank you for your letter that was posted through my door providing information about proposed traffic calming measures on the B4102 Croft Road, between the Raywoods and Greenmoor Road junctions.

I live on Croft Road in this area and my house is listed as one the properties where it is intended to install a speed cushion outside.

I fully support any reasonable and managed efforts to reduce the speed of traffic using this road. As I type this email numerous cars and motorbikes are clearly exceeding the speed limit as they pass by my window, most of which are heading in the direction towards Stockingford and away from Queens Road. Vehicles coming from Stockingford are typically slowing down as they approach the mini-roundabout at the Greenmoor Road junction.

I do have some concerns however about the effectiveness of using Speed Cushions as a solitary traffic calming measure, and the effects of speed cushions to the health and quality of life changes they will bring to myself and my neighbours.

Therefore I would like this email to be recognized as a formal objection to the proposal on the grounds that it would not be the most effective solution for the benefit of the main stakeholders - the residents of Croft Road.

While I do agree that generally we will see a reduction in the speed of cars using the road, I think a number of negative health and nuisance effects may outweigh this benefit.

From research it is recognized that there will be increased vehicle noise that residents will be exposed to, due to vehicles having to decelerate and brake on approach and then accelerate away from each of the speed cushions. Additionally vibration from vehicles passing over the speed cushions will also be evident for residents.

Additionally it is also known that vehicle exhaust pollution would increase with the engine changes, particularly so at the points where the speed cushions are installed.

as a result of installing speed cushions the Council would risk introducing new industrial nuisances, which will be new disturbances that residents are not currently exposed to and likely to have negative effects - noise, vibration and pollution - on the health of the residents in these houses.

I must also point out that residents who live in the terraced houses on the side of the road with even numbers between Greenmoor Road and North Street have very small front yard areas and because the footpath is also fairly narrow, the front rooms are very close to the highway, so these new health risks will likely be very evident to those inside those properties.

It is not detailed in the proposal the materials that the speed cushions will be made from. I believe that there could be different noise and vibration produced depending on whether they were made from concrete, asphalt or rubber.

Do you have any information about the proposed materials and the noise and vibration expected to be produced by each type and what type the Council are considering to install?

No matter the material type, buses, large trucks and motorbikes, which there are surprisingly a lot of, will be able to navigate the speed cushions without having to significantly alter their speeds, so there will still be vehicles moving at speed, if not speeding. So while the risks of speeding vehicles will be reduced by speed cushions, it will not be eliminated.

Have any other measures been considered?

What about installing Priority Narrowing / Priority Chicanes, which if placed in the correct locations between Greenmoor Road and North Street, could also create much needed defined parking bays for residents on the side of the road heading to Stockingford?

In my opinion this would be a win-win for the Council and those residents, who currently have to park their cars out of sight and in any available space in the already cluttered North Street and on the pavement verges close to the Raywoods.

Also has the Council considered installing CCTV and monitoring and controlling vehicles parking on the pavement restricting access for pedestrians using the pavements? This is particularly an issue when the Chip Shop on Croft Road is busy.

CCTV could also be a useful deterrent to discourage the numerous adults using bicycles and e-scooters on the pavements. It's only a matter of time before a pedestrian is seriously injured because of a collision with a bicycle or e-scooter. God forbid if they collided with a child or frail vulnerable adult.

In summary, I do strongly support traffic calming measures on this road, but for the reasons highlighted, I believe that speed cushions are not the most effective option for residents of Croft Road, who will be the most affected group of stakeholders.

This is a perfect opportunity to explore other options that would also alleviate the parking issue for those residents in the area of Croft Road I have mentioned between Greenmoor and North Street.

I would hope that my suggestions will be considered and I would be happy if they resulted in further discussions, including residents, that would lead to the best solution for the Health as well as the Safety of my neighbours and my family.

Could you please kindly acknowledge your receipt of my objection to the proposal contained in this email.