

Appendix D

Objection 1

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Hartshill - Church road, Castle road, Atherstone road speed reduction proposals

OFFICIAL

Dear Fiona

This is a consultation so your comments will be taken into account when any decision is being made. However, I will respond to some of your comments. First, to be clear, there are already speed cushions on Church Road this proposal is to continue those down Castle Road and Atherstone Road. Part of the proposal is to install a raised crossing where the school crossing patrol warden stands near Church Close. To answer your points in turn :

- A. As you say the traffic is already very slow during peak times so it is unlikely that cushions will have any impact. There are plans to increase air quality monitoring - more after Christmas.
- B. The speed cushions do not damage cars which are travelling at 30mph or below.
- C. There are already cushions on Church Road. There is no room to provide off road parking along Church Road without severely impacting on the pavement and making it impassable for pushchairs and mobility scooter.
- D. This proposal has been put forward because of requests from residents. The 30mph zone starts just before the junction with Charnwood Drive and Atherstone Road but there are no traffic control measure until you reach Church Road and cars tend to break the speed limit until they reach those restrictions.
- E, We requested a drop off area n the school grounds when the new high school was built but this was refused by the school / DfE. The turning circle outside Michael Drayton school belongs to the school, they do open it up for events such as funerals at the church but that is entirely at their discretion.
- F. The speeding is on Atherstone Road and Castle Road, see above.
- G. The repair of potholes will not be effected by this development, it comes out of a different budget allocation.
- H. Emergency vehicles would be able to straddle/avoid speed cushions.

I hope this helps clarify the position.

Best wishes

Margaret

-----Original Message-----

From: Fiona Wardle <fionawardle@btinternet.com>
Sent: 17 December 2023 09:42 [REDACTED]
To: Chris Round <chrisround@warwickshire.gov.uk>
Cc: Margaret Bell <margaretbell@warwickshire.gov.uk>
Subject: Hartshill - Church road, Castle road, Atherstone road speed reduction proposals

Dear Mr Round

I understand you are looking at installing 1 raised table and 11 sets of speed cushions along Church road, Castle road & Atherstone road.

Not sure if you frequent the road on a daily basis but I will raise my concerns so you have an understanding of the area.

A) 3 schools & now a doctors surgery within a small length of said road.

The volume of traffic at peak times is horrendous, do you believe by installing speed cushions you will be helping the traffic and more concerning the lungs of the children? naturally people slow down for speed cushions, then race to the next, (just see Witherley Road in Atherstone to verify this.) so this increases the emissions and pollutants from cars, buses and lorries in an area that has a very enclosed road due to the buildings either side of the road. I would be interested to see if a clean air study, at peak times, has been conducted in the area in question.

B) you will receive more compensation claims due to vehicle damage caused by these horrendous things. So is it cost effective? , probably not as it will cost us tax payers and motorists in the long run. Once again targeting the motorists with yet more damage to their vehicles, thus creating an issue with cars that makes them dangerous to be on the road, but these defects won't be addressed until an MOT, which is yearly. So again increasing the danger on the road not reducing the danger.

C) Having lived in Church road you may wish to spend the money you will be using for the table and speed cushions more effectively by providing off road parking for residents who don't have a drive way, thus making the carriageway free flowing and less emissions and pollutants being given off from the traffic that is held up trying to get through the village.

The noise from these measures will also affect the quality of life for those living near one of them, cars slowing down then revving to the next one, the noise of the cars going over these speed cushions. But of course this won't affect those making the proposal.

D) the village suffers with congestion on Church road and Castle road at most times of the day due to people using the carriageway to park as they have no drive way, WHY would you add to this congestion by installing speed cushions. I am beyond confused.

E) We have a car park at the local high school that was supposed to be for public use, but the school are allowed to lock the gates, maybe get this back to public use and help the parents who have to travel miles for school as there is no local school with space for them, again helping to reduce the emissions, pollutants and parking issues that snarl up the area. The turning circle at Michael Drayton could be used for parking in non term time and outside of school hours, but this is again not allowed, Why?

F) I am confused why a) you have chosen this road, no evidence to back up your proposal, the congestion on said road prevents speed at peak times so please explain why you are making such proposals b) you have not considered alternative ways of reducing speed through the village, something that confuses me as I have seen very little speeding along said route and very few serious accidents, there are better ways of reducing speed, ie 20mph around the schools / through the village, average speed cameras. There are other roads in the area that would benefit far greater from your proposals than the roads you are considering, ie Ansley common, Camphill road, Mancetter road. By proposing such measures you will be forcing traffic onto alternative local roads, ie Camphill road, Mancetter road which will then become a race track. Instead of moving the issue maybe consult the people in the proposed area to what they believe would help in their locality instead of someone in an office deciding what is installed. It has been evidenced that speed cushions are not effective throughout the country.

G) road surface .. with this being one of the better road surfaces in the area you are proposing to dig it up to install non effective speed reduction measures, I am confident that within 12 months this will make the road into a pot holed dangerous road surface that WCC won't maintain as " we don't have the money to repair it" or " there's building work being carried out so we will leave the road to become a pot holed, dangerous dirt track", again I can confidently say this will happen just take a look at the condition of the road surface in

Witherley Road/ Long street in Atherstone around said speed cushions, it's disgraceful and dangerous, the north of the county is the poor relation when it comes to road repairs, yes I can quantify that as I work south of the county and their roads are not like our 3rd world roads, even around building sites and speed reduction measures.

H) wow just wow, no consideration to the emergency service vehicles that may need to use this road, the 2 minutes losing momentum to get to an emergency can be the difference of saving a life or losing a life, this is the main arterial road through Hartshill.

If you have money to spend it needs to be spent more effectively than tables and speed cushions. I've said it for years and will continue to say it just because the EU said this was a good idea and used to provide money for the works to be completed, they don't live in the congestion of the UK. Of course I'm just a local resident who has to drive to work daily and ensure my elderly parent receives the care needed and my views mean nothing to WCC as THAT daily road user. Maybe we need to think outside of the box instead of being blinkered.

I look forward to your response with answers to the the clean air study and justification and evidence to back up such an absurd proposal and if you would consider a local consultation to discuss alternative measures.

Kind regards
Fiona Wardle

Sent from my iPad

Appendix D

Objection 2

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: [REDACTED]

Dear Mr Round

I am writing to raise concerns about the intentional speed hump on Castle road between my property number 75 and next door number 73. Whilst I realise there is a traffic speeding concern within the Hartshill area, I feel my property has been overlooked and the position of the intended speed hump will greatly increase noise pollution in my home. Traffic will be slowing down considerably within 3 metres of my front window causing air and noise pollution. With all due respect would you consider this to be acceptable within extreme close proximity of your property. I am sure there are other options available to reduce the speed of traffic control in Hartshill that will satisfy all concerned. I enclose my telephone number if you would like to discuss this further.

Yours sincerely

Karen White

75 castle road
Hartshill
Nuneato0SG

Appendix D

Objection 3

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: [REDACTED]

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: Proposed Speed Humps and Raised Table on Castle Road / Atherstone Road

Good morning,

I would like to present my objections to the proposed speed humps and raised tables on Castle Road, Atherstone Road and Church Road.

I assume the intention of these proposed measures is to reduce traffic speeds through the area, in particular by the schools.

If I am ever unfortunate enough to have to travel these roads around school start and finish time, 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.

Furthermore, the proposed works will add more delays to these roads which have only just returned to normal after a lengthy period of roadworks to support the work at the Hartshill Academy.

Speed humps and raised tables 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. It is very rough and rapidly disintegrating.

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.

Thank you for your time.

Kind regards
Bertie Bugden