

Consultation responses summary: A44 Steensbridge 50mph speed limit proposal (Feb 2019)

Consultee	Response
Susan Hanson Clerk to Hatfield & District Group Parish Council	The members are in complete agreement that the speed limit should be reduced on these roads and have no objections to the proposals.
Philip J Brown Clerk to the Council Humber, Ford and Stoke Prior Group Parish Council	<p>The Council resolved at a meeting on 16 May 2018 to propose that the 50mph limit be extended westwards past the Fairmile turning and also the Drum crossroads, and on 19 September 2018 resolved to support the proposed eastwards extension of the 50mph limit on the A44 from Steens Bridge. The Council therefore supports the proposed extensions of the 50mph limit on the A44, but considers that 50mph limit should also be extended further westwards past the Drum crossroads with the C1055, as this turning is locally notorious for having limited visibility and there have been numerous accidents and near-misses here.</p> <p>Concerning the proposed speed-limit on the C1059 through Fairmile, the Council resolved at a meeting on 19 September 2018 to support residents' requests for a 30mph limit on this stretch of road. The Council therefore supports the proposed reduction to 40mph insofar as it goes towards addressing concerns about speeding on this road.</p>
Cllr Bruce Baker	<p>I have no objection to the proposed changes to the speed limits on these roads.</p> <p>However, It would also reduce the confusion experienced by drivers using the A44, and improve safety, by regularising the speed limit to 50mph along its entire length from the junction with the A49 at Leominster, to the commencement of the 40mph limit at Bredenbury.</p>
Ian Connolly West Mercia Police	<p>I have examined the proposals as shown on the drawings you provided, and visited the area last year following ADL's initial enquiry regarding a reduction to the speed limit, and can confirm I have no objection to this proposal.</p> <p>These comments are based on the speed limit being routinely complied with, especially the section of 40mph proposed for the C1059. The proposed section is relatively short and there is no suitable hard standing location to enforce from, so it will not be possible to conduct speed enforcement here if we subsequently receive requests from residents to do so.</p>
Philip J Brown	Further comment

<p>Clerk to the Council Humber, Ford and Stoke Prior Group Parish Council</p>	<p>I am sure that the Parish Council would not agree with the conclusion in the report that the Drum crossroads represent an isolated hazard which would not be mitigated by the extension of the 50mph limit (there is no argument presented which logically links those two statements), but, as was made clear in my earlier email, this would not affect the Council's stated support for the measures which are being proposed, as they will go some way to addressing the concerns on the A44.</p>
<p>"Hugh"</p>	<p>Well done on your reply expressing the PCs support of the proposal whilst pointing out the key flawed point 13 statement viz ' Further, The Drum crossroads junction (junction with the C1055) is considered to be an isolated hazard and it is not advisable to reduce the speed to mitigate such hazards.'</p> <p>Who writes this stuff ? How come isolated hazards do not benefit from speed reductions ?!</p>