

Local Area Committee

Petitions & Responses – April 2005 to present

Princes Risborough

Date	Petition	Ongoing	Action	Cleared
<p>July 08</p>	<p><b>Petition received from residents along Main Road, Naphill requesting improvement to the road surface and pavement along Main Road, Naphill</b></p> <p>‘Please find enclosed herewith signatures collected from residents along Main Road, Naphill from Hunts Hill Lane up to the Stocking Lane crossroads regarding the improvement of the road surface and the pavements especially on the side from the Village Hall down to the local shop.</p> <p>One or two comments have been made i.e. to jog or walk at a brisk pace is impossible along the mentioned path, also a quiet afternoon in the back garden is out of the question because of the constant rush of traffic passing. Peak time (starts at approx. 6.30am) especially noisy.</p> <p>There are still a number of residents whom I did not find</p>		<p><i>Footways are being dealt with in the Autumn Footway Slurry Sealing programme.</i></p> <p><i>At present no works are planned for the Main Road carriageway however when works are required SMA will be used.</i></p>	<p><i>It should be noted that the main cause of traffic noise within a 30mph speed limit comes from the vehicles engines and not road surface conditions.</i></p> <p><i>At the same time the carriageway was inspected and the following noted. The majority of the surface is Hot Rolled Asphalt, which has good consistent surface texture and although some localised minor defects are present, it is considered that no treatment is necessary.</i></p> <p><i>It should be noted that Stone Mastic Asphalt will be used as resurfacing material at such point that treatment is necessary</i></p>

Date	Petition	Ongoing	Action	Cleared
	<p>available when I called but would like to mention that only two out of all approached for comment did not wish to sign. One of these two worked for the Council which is understandable.</p> <p>If I am correct I believe that a quietening surface has been applied to both Coombe Lane and the Walters Ash roads and wonder why the Main Road section above has been excluded?’</p>			
September 07	<p><b>Although a petition was not received for consideration by the Local Committee, following the death of a 5 year old boy along Cockpit Road, Great Kingshill</b></p>		<p><i>The Cabinet Member for Transportation and the Head of Transportation agreed to the construction of a new footway on the northern side of Cockpit Road, to create a continuous footway along the full length of the road.</i></p> <p><i>The construction works took place in August / September 2008</i></p>	
April 07	<p><b>Ellesborough Parish Council have submitted a petition from the residents in North Lee Lane - re Speed Limit Reviews in Ellesborough Area</b></p> <p>“We, the residents of North Lee Lane, wish to inform you that a</p>	<p><i>The above petition will be taken into consideration by the Area 5 Speed Limit Review Working Group at its next meeting, which is likely to take place in early Summer 2007.</i></p>		

Date	Petition	Ongoing	Action	Cleared
	<p>SID speed check took place on the road on 6 July 2006 from 4.15pm to 6.30pm, and following the results wish action to be taken in relation to the speed traffic is allowed to travel on this road.</p> <p>Approximately 186 vehicles travelled the road at that time – of those:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 30 travelled at 50 – 54mph</li> <li>• 43 travelled at 55 – 59mph</li> <li>• 16 travelled at 60+mph</li> <li>• 1 car and 1 motorbike did not register because they were travelling over 70mph</li> </ul> <p>The remainder were travelling mid to high 40s.”</p>	<p><i>The Working Group consists of all County Councillors within Area 5; a District Council representative; Thames Valley Police Traffic Management Officer ; Bucks County Council speed limit review and traffic management officers and Local Area Co-Coordinator. The Area Group Manager may also attend some meetings.</i></p> <p><i>The Working Group will evaluate all the new speed limits introduced in April 2006 ,( to include a review of public feedback , speed measurements and crash records), and decide whether to recommend any modifications or additions to these speed limits in the light of this information/requests.</i></p> <p><i>Any changes recommended by the Working Group would then need to go through the legally required public consultation process , which includes advertising Public Notices in local papers, and on site, before any new speed limits can be put in place.</i></p> <p><i>It may be possible for installation</i></p>		

Date	Petition	Ongoing	Action	Cleared
		<p><i>of any subsequent new limits in Area 5 to be put in by March 2008 . However, at the time of writing, it has not been decided whether Speed Limit Review Areas 3-7 should receive their 'extra' speed limit modifications before Areas 8-14 have received their initial speed limit changes , or for these to be put in place only after the initial review has been completed countywide. To put this in context, Areas 8 &amp; 9 are timetabled for new speed limits by March 2008- the last Area (Area 14) is currently scheduled to have its new speed limits by 2010.</i></p>		
<p>April 07</p>	<p><b>Terry Mackintosh, Chairman of Magnum (Marsh Action Group) - Speed and Volume of Traffic in Marsh Area</b></p> <p>"I present to you a petition signed by over a hundred residents and friends of Marsh, over 98% of the residents of Marsh have put their name to this petition to express their deep concern over the increase in speed and volume of traffic now using this quiet backwater as a commuter rat run.</p> <p>Over the past 5 years we have been active in campaigning not</p>	<p><i>The above petition will be taken into consideration by the Area 5 Speed Limit Review Working Group at its next meeting, which is likely to take place in early Summer 2007.</i></p> <p><i>The Working Group consists of all County Councillors within Area 5; a District Council representative; Thames Valley Police Traffic Management Officer ; Bucks County Council speed limit review and traffic management officers and Local Area Co-Ordinator. The Area Group Manager may also attend</i></p>		

Date	Petition	Ongoing	Action	Cleared
	<p>only to reduce the speed limit through our village to 30mph but to also restrict volume.</p> <p>Our campaign is supported by our local representatives of Wycombe District Council, Buckinghamshire County Council and the local Parish Council all of whom recognise the need to deal with this problem quickly and decisively to avoid the situation becoming intolerable.</p> <p>Our hopes of a further reduction of the speed limit to 30mph or possibly 20mph were firmly pinned to the Tranquil project that was to be the vehicle to help communities such as ours, this we now understand has been shelved with no plans to introduce at a later date.</p> <p>This we feel is a loss of an ideal opportunity!!</p> <p>Our request is simple, a 30mph would help the people of Marsh to live the life they have chosen in peace and safety and although they recognise there will always be the few who will flout the law the majority will abide by it, in doing so they will be helping not only Marsh but many other communities and themselves</p>	<p><i>some meetings.</i></p> <p><i>The Working Group will evaluate all the new speed limits introduced in April 2006 ,( to include a review of public feedback , speed measurements and crash records), and decide whether to recommend any modifications or additions to these speed limits in the light of this information/requests.</i></p> <p><i>Any changes recommended by the Working Group would then need to go through the legally required public consultation process , which includes advertising Public Notices in local papers, and on site, before any new speed limits can be put in place.</i></p> <p><i>It may be possible for installation of any subsequent new limits in Area 5 to be put in by March 2008 . However, at the time of writing, it has not been decided whether Speed Limit Review Areas 3-7 should receive their 'extra' speed limit modifications before Areas 8-14 have received their initial speed limit changes , or for these to be put in place only after the initial review has been completed countywide. To put this in context, Areas 8 &amp; 9 are</i></p>		

Date	Petition	Ongoing	Action	Cleared
	enjoy the benefits of the countryside in safety.	<i>timetabled for new speed limits by March 2008- the last Area (Area 14) is currently scheduled to have its new speed limits by 2010.</i>		
July 2005	<p><b>Speed Camera Request - Speed Camera along Thame Road, Longwick</b></p> <p>At the Council meeting held on 28 April 2005, Mr Rogerson presented a petition on the need to a speed camera along Thame Road, Longwick.</p> <p>Mr Rogerson has also requested that the petition for a camera at Bledlow that was considered three years ago by this Committee be raised again.</p>			<p><u><b>Speed Camera Request - Longwick</b></u></p> <p><i>The petition was passed onto the Thames Valley Safer Roads Partnership (TVSRP) for consideration. Having informally discussed the petition with them, it is apparent that the collision and casualty record through Longwick is such that the criteria for a safety camera will not be met. In the last 3 years there have been 1 serious and 4 slight collisions in the 40mph stretch. The serious accident was speed/alcohol related, 1 slight was speed related and 2 slights were defined as “in a hurry”. The site does not come under the rules for a core site, but could well be considered for exceptional enforcement as a Community Concern Site.</i></p> <p><i>TVSRP have logged this site onto its community concern database and they are waiting for responses.</i></p> <p><i>For your information, Community Concern Sites are a new initiative where TVSRP will undertake speed camera enforcement at sites which do not meet the usual criteria. The Handbook allows for 15% of enforcement time to be undertaken</i></p>

Date	Petition	Ongoing	Action	Cleared
				<p><i>at exceptional sites. One of the Department for Transport's requirement for carrying out enforcement at "exceptional sites" is that,</i></p> <p><i>'a clearly-documented case exists with sound evidence supporting the view that there is a well-founded speed-related risk to road-users' safety at each of these sites, including consideration of the level of non-compliance with the speed limit and suitability for enforcement.'</i></p> <p><i>In conclusion - we will need to await the full results form TVSRP's investigation into this request though it appears that the site does not meet the criteria for a safety camera.</i></p> <p><b><u>Speed Camera Request - Bledlow</u></b></p> <p><i>This petition was considered at the Local Committee on 14 October 2003 and it was concluded that the criteria for a safety camera was not met. If this issue is still of concern, TVSRP can be asked to re-assess the site and it could be considered as a Community Concern Site.</i></p> <p><i>It should be noted that TVSRP undertake regular monitoring of all sites and collisions with a view to identifying problems areas and this site has not been identified recently.</i></p>

