

Copies of written representations (redacted) received during the public notice period

I am contacting to you register an objection to PR0529 - Proposed 20mph speed limit to various roads in Sutton, and installation of speed cushions.

As a resident of Sutton for nearly 20 years I am very familiar with the roads in the proposal (I live in Lawn Land and travel along them on a daily basis) and would like to point out that:

1. The vast majority of Sutton residents drive in a considerate manner, taking into account the narrow street, obstructions such as parked cars and restricted views at junctions. Speed is naturally under the 30mph limit due to the nature of the roads, especially when navigating the sharp corner at the bottom of Church Lane. Due to the tightness of this bend and the slope of the hill, this has to be negotiated at dead slow speeds.
 2. I acknowledge that a small number of people do not drive considerately, often forcing their way passed parked vehicles, clipping the junction at the top of Lawn Lane or not demonstrating good observational skills. I feel that imposing a blanket 20mph limit will not make these people drive any more considerately or safely, and will almost certainly encourage them to tailgate or intimidate drivers who are proceeding at the proposed 20mph limit or slower.
 - 2a. Amusingly, the "30mph keep Sutton safe" and "twenty is plenty" brigade with their car and bin stickers are among the worst drivers. I was nearly run over last week by a resident purtaining to be a safer driver as he drove down Lawn Lane and pulled straight over the pavement into his driveway without looking. Again, I do not believe these people will slow down for a 20mph limit, so penalising the vast majority of drivers who repect the existing speed limit and adjust their speed to take into account the hazards on the road is not fair.
 3. 20mph will drastically increase engine emissions, pollution and noise from vehicles, as most will need to be in a lower gear (2nd, with much higher rpm, rather than 3rd/4th at lower rpm) to travel at 20mph without causing engine loading. There is a nursery, doctor's surgery and bus stops along the proposed routes, so an increase in air pollution and noise is not what we need here.
 4. Speed cushions are noisy and can damage a car's suspension, forcing cars to slow down even more which will also cause greater emissions and pollution. As an owner of a very rare classic car I take great care to avoid speed cushions and humps were possible. The vast majority that I have seen installed in other places are either too tall or too wide, forcing drivers who care about their cars to straddle both humps to prevent grounding or damage to sumps and steering/supension. As I will now have to navigate the humps to leave my property this will increase the risk of damage to my car, which if damaged by incorrectly installed or badly maintained cushions I will use all legal measures available to claim repair costs from the council.
 5. I fully support measures such as the flashing "smiley face/frowning face" sign while entering Sutton from the A142, and the "Your speed is.." signs which are in Haddenham and other villages nearby. I take great care and pride in ensuring that when driving I am always at or under the indicated limit, and travelling at a safe and suitable speed for the road ahead. I would fully support having more of these signs installed around Sutton, as I feel that they provide a much greater deterrent to speeding rather than a blanket 20mph limit which the vast majority of "bad" drivers will ignore anyway. Having a frowning face shown or your speed displayed in big red numbers is an embarrassment factor for all to see and actively shows the effects of inconsiderate driving.
-

I am e-mailing you with reference to your letter dated 25/02/2019, reference PR0529. This letter relates to Cambridgeshire County Councils intention to install 3 sets of speed cushions in Church Lane, Sutton, Cambs.

Whilst my wife and I recognise that, on occasions, the speed of individuals travelling in Church Lane can be excessive, this is not seen as a major hazard or safety issue that would require the installation of the cushions, despite losing two of our beloved cats in the last 18 months.

The plan drawing that accompanied your letter was very faint but we could make out that one of the intended sets of cushions is to be situated between our property, no xx, Church Lane and no xx, Church Lane and we would like to oppose your intention to install these for the following reasons;

1 - Driveway - We are intending to install a driveway to our property and the location of the cushions would hinder this as the entrance to the driveway would have to be where our existing front path is located, on the boundary between no xx and no xx, which is where the cushion would be situated.

2 - Vehicle Damage - We have 3 vehicles at our property belonging to myself, my wife and my daughter. All of us are employed full time and use our vehicles daily. According to your plan our vehicles would encounter at least one of the cushions twice daily which over a period of time is going to cause excessive wear to the tyres and suspension on our vehicles. This is something that would be enforced upon ourselves due to the proposed locations of the cushions.

3 - Main Drain - I am of the belief that there is a main drain located to the front of my property in Church Lane which runs on the boundary of our property and no xx, Church Lane. It runs from the road, entering my rear garden and then connects to the mains sewer which then exits right and out on to Sutton Court. I am sure that during your preliminary investigations you are aware of this but we have concerns that the constant pressure and vibrations due to the cushions will have an impact on the drain over a period of time affecting the neighbouring properties.

4 - Noise & Vibration - We are concerned that we will encounter constant 'Thudding' noises and vibrations due to the amount of traffic that uses Church Lane, something that we definitely do not want to endure and something that may affect our quality of life and possible damage to our property. We used to live in Suffolk and while we were not subjected to this, local residents on a nearby road did. The residents reported cracks and defects to their properties whilst enduring the noise, which resulted in Waveney District Council removing the offending cushions and having to pay for repairs to properties.

5 - Bus Route - Again, I will assume through your preliminary investigations you are aware that Church Lane is on the local bus route. The weight of the busses will only add to the noise and vibrations. Lorries also use Church Lane, making the issue worse.

6 - Pollution - I recently read an article that confirmed higher levels of pollution in areas where speed cushions are deployed. This is largely due to the fact that the vehicles travelling over such cushions slow down to a near stop, and, in theory, are releasing more vehicle fumes than they would do by continuing to travel unrestricted.

We would also like to know why the council has decided to look into these measures and why an initial consultation with the local residents to be affected has not taken place? I will assume that you have received complaints of excessive speeding but I have seen no evidence of the council having carried out any traffic investigations or monitoring on Church Lane. We are not situated next to any school nor are we aware of multiple accidents that require such a scheme in the 4 years that we have lived here. Has the council carried out any studies as to the impact the

installation of the cushions have with regards to noise, vibration and pollution and if so, why are we not informed of these?

I am of the personal opinion that there are other traffic calming measures that could be put in place which would not have such an impact for the local residents and road users alike, such as traffic islands or traffic calming 'Triangles' which could be placed on the other side of Church Lane. These would not cause damage to vehicles, would not cause noise, vibrations or damage and would have the same traffic calming effect.

My wife and I would also like an on site meeting please to discuss this further. Is this something that would be possible? It may be prudent to arrange this with the other residents that may also be opposed to your intentions.

I look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Objection to speed cushions on Church Lane, Sutton, ref PRO529.

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to object to the proposed introduction of speed humps into Sutton as part of the 20mph speed limit changes.

Speed humps cause additional noise and environment pollution.

Furthermore they contribute additional damage to every vehicle that passes them, regardless of the speed of that vehicle. The proposed type are the worst of all since they penalise smaller vehicles, while making no difference to larger vehicles.

Having previously lived on roads with speed humps, I suggest that while they may help reduce average vehicle speeds, they will make little difference to the outliers (which are the ones you should really be concerned about).

I note recent attempts to introduce speed humps in Rampton were ineffective and shortly after their introduction removed at additional cost.

At the very least can the council not trial the 20mph limit without the speed humps and introduce them later should the 20mph on its own be ineffective?

I'd also suggest that if the council has money to spend on roads they should spend it on fixing the very many potholes and other roads problems around the county, rather than introducing additional measures that will damage residents vehicles.

Yours in frustration,

I am writing to you as a lead person for Speedwatch in Sutton. A volunteer post I have had for approx 4 years. As such I have collected a lot of data on traffic movements in Sutton.

I am aware that the public notice of this TRO only requires objections or concerns. However, I am writing in favour of this TRO. I am conscious of the speed at which the High St in particular acts as a through route for cars and vans alike in trying to get to the junction of The Brook and High St where they get priority over the

traffic using the preferred route. At rush hours the ratio of vehicles using this route can be as high as 1 in 3 and such traffic tries to travel quickly to attain their goal!

I live on the High St and more than aware of this phenomena and it is easy to spot "through traffic" as opposed to local residents on genuine business.

The High St has many small businesses, a toddlers playgroup, food outlets, let alone a large Convenience store with HCV deliveries every day. There is also both a public and school bus route along the High St and all these factors, let alone the narrow width of some parts of the High St, make it unsuitable for fast vehicle movements. I have been approached many times about incidents of broken wing mirrors as cars have to be parked along the narrow part of the High St in the absence of garaging for the older terrace properties.

The slower speed limit will hopefully have two impacts. Firstly, a deterrent to "through traffic" using this route as the ability to get to the High St/Brook junction is significantly reduced. Secondly, a slower average speed will reduce the incidence of car damage and be more likely to prevent serious pedestrian accident. I accept that speed bumps are an integral part of the 20mph speed limit enforcement and provided the CCC Highways team are satisfied that they do not pose a local nuisance as far as noise and vibration then I am sure these will be beneficial.

Finally, Speedwatch now have new equipment which enables us to monitor traffic at 20mph and report violations to the Police.

I hope this helps in your consideration of other comments you may have received about this TRO.

Thank you for reading this.

I have received a letter advising me of the proposal to install speed cushions.

I fully support the proposal as I hope it will stop the speeding traffic and assist in deterring drivers from using Church Lane as a 'rat-run'. The Grade I listed church of St Andrew (after which the Lane is named) is suffering from increased traffic levels as the latest quinquennial inspection shows. Personally I would wish to see a weight limit of 20t and a speed limit of 20mph as well.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment.

Further to the proposed 20 mph speed limit in Sutton, I am writing to ask if consideration can be given to include "THE ROW" in the list of streets to be given this status. This road runs parallel to the high street all the way out to the edge of the village (Earith end). Failure to include this road will create a "rat run" of vehicles trying to beat the 20 MPH limit on the high street. There are some 300 houses along this road and its side streets, with no pedestrian pavement at one end. I notice in the proposal "Eastwood close" is included, this is a cul- de- sac of just 30 meters, surely a waste of money.

Thank you for your letter regarding the proposed speed cushions to be installed at Church Lane Sutton.

My view is that the cushions are a good idea as traffic does constantly speed in Church Lane.

My only concern is that if the cushions are similar to the current ones in Barton Road Ely they are completely ineffective due to vehicles being able to straddle them. Therefore should such a proposal be carried out then it needs to be fit for purpose in the first instance. Designed correctly to have the desired effect in slowing the speeding traffic.

My preference would be the 'table top' more severe speed reduction that is good enough to actually slow the traffic down. Design and install once rather than waste money and not achieve what it is meant to do.

The previous traffic calming as you enter Sutton from Ely springs to mind.

I've just seen the Public Notice go up for the 20mph speed restrictions in Sutton, and I have a few comments.

I've been a resident on Red Lion Lane for a little over a year, and since moving in the road has been dug up and patched back together by various teams from Cambs County Council, BT, Anglia Water and others. The patchwork approach to resurfacing the road has made the noise levels and vibration levels in our property increase drastically since we moved in, especially when large delivery lorries and speeding cars come down the narrow single lane.

Making the road a 20mph speed limit would be welcome, but the rough nature of the tarmac will still be an issue. People don't respect the road conditions at all at the moment, and we regularly have cars, vans and small lorries driving down the hill at much higher speeds than the road is safe for. With around 5-6 obscured driveways accessing the lane regularly, getting out of our own driveway can sometimes be tricky. Please can you take into consideration improving the condition of the tarmac to reduce noise and vibrations from road.