

## **APPENDIX A**

### **Support all of the proposals**

231 responses have been received.

### **Support some of the proposals**

50 responses have been received.

### **Other**

5 responses have been received which did not specifically indicate support or objection.

**The following are summaries of the comments or questions which have been submitted in the 281 responses indicating support or partial support for the proposals:**

1. Lack of footways, footways too narrow or not adequate, improvements required.

*Officer response:*

*New or improved footways are beyond the scope of this speed limit review, although it is recognised that there are lengths of the A368 where the footway provision is either inadequate or missing, and that this can influence pedestrian activity.*

*The funding which is available to introduce new and/or improved footways is very limited, and there are many competing demands placed on this limited funding. Footway schemes are, however, progressed as often as possible through the Council's annual Local Active Travel and Safety Programme, and other opportunities are taken, such as through development and larger transport initiatives.*

2. Extension of the 20mph proposal at Bishop Sutton requested beyond the proposed extents.

*Officer response:*

*It is considered that an extension of the proposed 20mph speed limit at Bishop Sutton is likely to reduce compliance with the reduced speed limit, as the characteristics of the road in that particular location do not lend themselves to a 20mph speed limit.*

3. Physical traffic calming measures requested (priority systems, speed cameras, speed bumps, road markings and signage).

*Officer response:*

*These measures are beyond the scope of this speed limit review. However, if the speed limit proposals are introduced, their impact will be monitored and, if necessary, the possibility of introducing further traffic management measures will be investigated.*

*Improved signing and road markings are incorporated into these proposals where it is considered necessary and/or appropriate.*

4. Support the reduction of speed limits within the villages and built-up areas, no support for speed reduction beyond this.

*Officer response:*

*The main objective of the proposals is to improve road safety along the whole of the A368 within B&NES. It is considered that the proposed speed limits are appropriate, having due regard for the characteristics and topography of each section. It is also considered that the proposed reduced speed limits will establish a more proactive approach to road safety.*

5. Support the speed reduction on the roads between the villages, no support for the reduction of 30mph to 20mph in the villages and built-up areas.

*Officer response:*

*The main objective of the proposals is to improve road safety along the whole of the A368 within B&NES. It is considered that the proposed speed limits are appropriate, having due regard for the characteristics and topography of each section. It is also considered that the proposed reduced speed limits will establish a more proactive approach to road safety.*

*The proposed 20mph speed limits could encourage greater walking, wheeling, and cycling activity within the village environments, which would provide a number of benefits, including for road safety.*

6. Extension of the 30mph proposal at Ubley requested beyond the proposed extents

*Officer response:*

*It is considered that an extension of the proposed 30mph speed limit at Ubley is likely to reduce compliance with the reduced speed limit, as the characteristics of the road in that particular location do not lend themselves to a 30mph speed limit.*

7. Lack of pedestrian crossing at Bishop Sutton; improved crossing facilities needed at Bishop Sutton Primary School.

*Officer response:*

*Measures have recently been introduced to raise awareness of pedestrian crossing activity adjacent to Bishop Sutton Primary School. Unfortunately, it was not feasible to introduce a formal crossing facility or significantly modify the road layout, although this was investigated.*

8. Further speed reduction requested at the Stanton Wick junction including Stanton Wick Village.

*Officer response:*

*The proposed reduction of the existing derestricted speed limit (60mph) to 40mph at Stanton Wick is a significant and appropriate reduction in the speed limit along this section of the A368. It is also considered that a further reduction in the speed limit in this particular location is likely to reduce compliance, as the characteristics of the road in that particular location do not lend themselves to a lower speed limit.*

*Physical modifications to the junction are beyond the scope of these speed limit proposals, but it might be feasible to improve the signage and road markings in the immediate vicinity. This will be investigated further and incorporated into the proposals as necessary.*

9. Extension of the 20mph speed limit at Stowey Village requested beyond the proposed extents.

*Officer response:*

*It is considered that an extension of the proposed 20mph speed limit at Stowey Village is likely to reduce compliance with the reduced speed limit, as the characteristics of the road in that particular location do not lend themselves to a 20mph speed limit.*

10. Further speed reduction on the junction of Redlands Lane and the A368 (Bishop Sutton) requested.

*Officer response:*

*The proposed reduction of the existing derestricted speed limit (60mph) to 40mph at the junction with Redlands Lane is a significant and appropriate reduction in the speed limit along this section of the A368. It is also considered that a further reduction in the speed limit in this particular location is likely to reduce compliance, as the characteristics of the road in that particular location do not lend themselves to a lower speed limit.*

*Physical modifications to the Redlands Lane junction are beyond the scope of these speed limit proposals. This has also been investigated previously, with no appropriate solution being identified.*

*A feasibility study has recently been undertaken into the possibility of introducing a footway between Redlands Lane and the tennis club, the results*

*of which will be published in due course. Any footway works are beyond the scope of this speed limit review.*

11. Extension of the 20mph at Compton Martin requested beyond proposed extents.

*Officer response:*

*It is considered that an extension of the proposed 20mph speed limit at Compton Martin is likely to reduce compliance with the reduced speed limit, as the characteristics of the road in this particular location do not lend themselves to a 20mph speed limit.*