

Tel: 08456 009 009
Fax: 01483 517506

Mr M Tolley
51 Kingfisher Walk
Ash
Hants
GU12 6RF

Surrey Highways
Local Highways Team
Guildford

South West Area Office
Grosvenor House
London Square
Cross Lanes
Guildford
GU1 1FA

Your ref:
Our ref: KB/7/303

28 January 2008

Dear Mr Tolley

B3206 SHAWFIELD ROAD, ASH
OBJECTION TO PROPOSED TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES

I am writing to you in relation to your letter of 4 January regarding the above mentioned.

Firstly, may I apologise for an error, which has occurred, in respect of my reply to you, which was wrongly addressed. Due to receiving a letter from a resident of Ash, with similar surname, (Mr R Tolley), this led to my reply to your letter to be sent to him instead of you.

Again, I am sorry for this misunderstanding and I have reproduced the letter below replying to the points raised in your letter as they are listed for the ease of reference.

1. Insufficient public notice & Insufficient public consultation

I am sorry to say that I disagree with this aspect of your comments, as it is not correct. As you are aware, the consultation was carried out on many levels well above the requirements set out. These were:

- Dropped letters by Ash Parish Council on behalf of Surrey County Council of the public exhibition,
- Poster prepared by SCC and which was on display at Ash PC office and Ash Centre
- An article in Parish news letter informing of impending exhibition
- Exhibition held at Parish Hall on 27 March 2007
- Following finalising of proposals and seeking approval from Surrey County Council Committee for Guildford, where some residents attended the meeting and expressed their views on this matter.
- Public Notice in Newspaper informing public of intended proposals and objection period of 28 days
- Erection of notices along the road affected and intended proposals & period of objection.
- The detail proposals and statement of reasons were on display at Ash Library, Surrey Highways Local Office

As you could see there has been a comprehensive consultation and public notice, and therefore I do not believe that we have not carried appropriate consultation or insufficient public notice as stated in your letter.

2. Erroneous representation of personal views as fact

With regard to individuals presenting their views to the public, this does not constitute misrepresentation on behalf of Surrey County Council. The individual you are referring to has no direct connection with us and therefore his views or those of the author of the article in the local newspaper are personal to them.

As a County Council officer I am unable to accept this as a failure of SCC as stated in your letter. However in relation to your comments in relation to Dft trials, I am not sure to which ones you are referring or what were the circumstances of those trials. The cushions are designed for a vehicle to travel at maximum design speed of 30mph. I refer you to Dft, Traffic Advisory Leaflet 1/98, page 3 tables 1 and 2 which shows the 85%ile (25mph) of traffic travelling on the feature and also between these features (30mph).

3. Inappropriate road for use of traffic calming

I am surprised to see that you do not see Shawfield Road as a residential road. To my knowledge, this road amongst residential properties has two Elderly residential properties, Recreational ground, shops, public house and a school (Winchester Road, off Shawfield Road). Further to all this there have been 30 Personal Injury Accidents (PIA's) over a period of 10 years. Our records do not support your statements that the accidents, which you have witnessed, were all alcohol related and therefore I must disagree with your statement. Therefore, all of the above makes Shawfield Road a prime candidate and suitable for traffic calming.

4. Insufficient detail in plans

I am sure you agree that as an authority we cannot deviate for the Dft guidelines in designing such measures. As stated in your letter the minimum required distance is 750mm. The Shawfield Road scheme is designed over this figure and in varying gaps to 1.2m depending on the alignment and width of the carriageway at each specific location.

It is not usual for the construction drawing to be put on display as these drawings have a huge amount of information, which is required by the contractor when it comes to construct these. The simpler version is used as a norm. In respect of Cushion gradients on approach which is 1:8 +/- 5mm and not as indicated in your letter as 5. This 5mm is standard variation used in all construction and when laying the materials which is negligible.

With regard to other features such signing, road markings etc are not required by law to be advertised and therefore are not shown. Again any traffic calming measures require these by design guidelines, otherwise make such measures illegal.

5. Waste of public money

The latest estimated cost of construction following the detailed design is estimated at about £60k-£65k. The figure of £130k you are stating was the initial estimate before any feasibility was carried out. However now the scheme is fully designed and priced it is much less than anticipated.

As to appropriate use of the money, the play ground equipments and other predications in relation of a child being killed etc in this paragraph, I reserve the right not to respond to these as they are your personal views of the situation in Ash.

6. Environmental impact

I must disagree with your statement as you have based your comments on the assumption that no reduction of through traffic would be achieved. Contrary to your view, where such measures have been introduced elsewhere in Guildford, there has been an overall reduction in volume. This is also supported to some extent by TRL studies from past surveys carried out.

7. Noise and vibration

I do agree that some noise and possibly vibration may occur, however all of this is dependent on type of measures introduced, type of soil, distance from properties, foundation and type of construction etc. I do not believe that in this case it would be much noticeable detrimental affect if any would occur. I refer you to Dft Traffic Advisory Leaflet 10/00 and TRL report 235 and 180.

8. Reduced response time for emergency

As you maybe aware, it is a requirement that we consulted with emergency services and on this occasion we have just done so.

There has been no objection to the proposals, as the proposals have no impact on their services. Therefore, I must disagree with your statements about possible delays etc.

9. Lack of parking restrictions & location of bus stops in relation to speed cushions

There are no plans for any restrictions to be introduced. The purpose of the scheme is to reduce speed, reduction in PIA's and safer environment for all concerns. Therefore, at this stage there are no plans to introduce such measures. If a driver wishes not to wait for a clear path to proceed and chooses to go around other vehicles, then it is their choice and acceptances of possible uncomfortable way of driving over the cushions.

10. Ingress and egress to Young's Drive

With regard to proximately of cushions near junctions, these have been considered carefully to achieve the desired result. In case of Young's Drive, this is the shortest of the other side roads due to pedestrian islands being present. The measured distance from the centre of Young's Drive to start of the cushions is just about 10m in length (taking two large cars length). Any vehicle exiting the junction should find no problems to get the ramp "square on".

I do understand that some find such measures as inconvenience, however from past experience such measures have achieved great reduction in PIA's, reduce traffic volume and a safer environment for pedestrians, especially children.

Any objections to the proposals would need to be resolved before we could proceed. If objections could not be resolved, then these would be considered by the Surrey County Council Committee in Guildford, which consists of elected members of both the County Council and Guildford Borough Council. Following consideration of such objection, the committee will decide to uphold the objections or not. If objections are upheld, then we could not introduce the proposed traffic calming. Furthermore, the Surrey County Council Committee for Guildford will consider your objection on 12 February 2008 and you may attend this meeting if you wish to do so. The details of this meeting can be obtained from Mr Diccon Bright on the telephone number referred above.

Yours sincerely


Kaz Banisaied
Principal Engineer Local Highways Team - Guildford

Mr M. Tolley
51 Kingfisher Walk
Ash
Aldershot
Hants
GU12 6RF

Ms J Isaac
Head of Highways
South-West Area Office
Cross Lanes
Guildford, GU1 1FA



4th January 2008

Reference: BF/LEGAL/MISC/GLD/AK

(Gu)

Dear Ms Isaac,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed traffic calming scheme in Shawfield Road, Ash.

My objections are on the following grounds.

1. Insufficient public notice, and insufficient public consultation

The Parish council did hold a consultation session; however this was poorly advertised to the affected residents of Ash, with only residents of Shawfield Road and "one or two houses in" on connected roads being leaflet dropped. The reason given by Nigel Manning was one of cost, although it is worth noting that no such financial restraint was exercised with the pre-election newsletter drops! Sizeable numbers of people in Kingfisher Walk, Young's Drive, Grange Farm Road, Ashdene Road and Crescent, Longacre etc, who exit their estates via Shawfield Road are likely to be completely unaware of the proposals. Conversations with a limited number of other residents of some of these roads supports this view.

It is telling that, of the entire population of Shawfield Road and its adjoining roads that only 60 responses were received. The number of responses received from roads off Shawfield Road at 17 is relatively high given that hardly anyone in these roads was advised of the consultation. All the response rates really indicate is that insufficient people were involved in the consultation. 34 favourable responses seems hardly sufficient to warrant expenditure of £130,000. A more meaningful measure of the effectiveness of consultation would be a measure of the number of people responding versus the number advised, and the number advised versus the total of residents in the area.

In addition regular users of the road who are not residents, have not been consulted. In similar situations other authorities have posted signs about the proposals which are visible to all affected motorists.

An A4 poster must have been displayed somewhere in the vicinity of Shawfield Road at some point. I know this is likely because today I found the notice on a grass verge behind a tree in Shawfield Road. It is debatable whether the posting of such a small notice and in a location such that it was able to be displaced was "Appropriate" as required by the Highways Act 1980 Section 90(C) Subsection 2(b). On a technicality this notice also fails to meet the requirements of the notification process since the act requires that the dimensions of the speed cushions are stated. Two of the most relevant dimensions the side gradient and off/on ramp gradient are not detailed in the notice and were only available on the plans.

There is no mention of the proposed scheme and the associated deadline for objections on either the Ash Parish or Surrey County Council websites. This is very poor communication and it is worth commenting that Hampshire County Council's website seems generally more professional in this regard. I also do not understand why the Parish

Council failed to carry out a second leaflet drop about this latest stage of the process. It suggests that the council is more concerned with going through the motions of a process than in trying to ensure that all views are captured. The timing of SCC's Notices and objection deadlines, whilst within guidelines, was not ideal given the Christmas build up and break.

To summarise, a wider consultation needs to be carried with specific targeting of all affected residents and generally greater publicity before this proposal can be judged to be "accepted" by a majority of funding tax payers who reside in the area.

2. Erroneous representation of personal views as fact.

At the public consultation session I attended, Chairman of the Parish Council Nigel Manning was advising residents that the speed cushions proposed were negotiable at 30mph, hence would not slow traffic below the limit but would prevent speeding motorists from travelling above 30mph. He gave the same explanation to me personally and in the Surrey Advertiser also made the following comments

"I'm convinced from some of the comments I have seen, people do not understand what's proposed and comments have been mixed.

"Some have said it will make it more difficult for them to access Shawfield Road but the cushions are not road humps that stretch the entire way across the road.

"Cars travelling at 30mph or less will be able to go over them without noticing anything or need to change down gear. Anyone doing more than 30mph may hit their head on the top of the car."

The full article can be accessed with the following hyperlink.

http://www.surreyad.co.uk/news/guildford/99/99311/residents_wary_over_traffic_calming_plans

My reading of published DfT trials has indicated that speed cushions of the dimensions proposed are likely to result in traversing speeds of 15 to 20mph. This means that residents have been misled about the impact of the scheme on their daily travel. This inability to maintain a constant 30mph will also mean that acceleration and braking cycles will occur between the cushions with the associated, noise, vibration and environmental impacts.

A key fact which should be publicised is the actual traversable speed of the cushions by cars. Residents will have a completely different view of being forced to travel at 20mph as opposed to just being prevented from travelling at over 30mph.

3. Inappropriate road for use of traffic calming

The usual aims of a traffic calming scheme are two-fold. Firstly to reduce traffic speeds, and secondly to encourage traffic to use alternative roads. Shawfield Road is not a residential "rat-run", it is a main road which was only downgraded from A to B status with the opening of the A331. It is still used by a number of commuters with little alternative but to use this road, and when accidents occur on the A331 (a relatively frequent occurrence) then a significant volume of traffic diverts along this road. To avoid the 5 sets of speed cushions and resultant 20-25mph speed limit between Star Lane and the Greyhound roundabout it is possible that some speeding motorists may decide to divert up Star Lane and along the Ash Street, past the infant and primary schools. Ash Street was the location of the only recent pedestrian fatality in Ash, and given that there are areas where children walk where there is no kerb, and lorries often mount the pavement this does not make sense.

The concerns of residents in Star Lane regarding diverting traffic have been noted following the public consultation, however the Highways Managers report is incomplete as

it fails to highlight that any traffic diverting along Star Lane would also have to use a section of the A323 from Ash library to the Greyhound roundabout. Hence if additional traffic calming was required in Star Lane it would also be needed on the section of the A323.

The majority of accidents in Shawfield Road I have seen the aftermath of, and which are included in the statistics quoted by the council as justification, have been as a result of dangerous driving, and in some cases driving while under the influence of alcohol. Speed cushions will do nothing to avert this kind of behaviour, and in fact in some cases may contribute to accidents.

If a driver is capable of crossing the road across a traffic island and parking a car up a tree outside Young's Drive, or turning a car on its roof exiting the Greyhound roundabout as has happened then I'm sure that to such drivers a speed cushion is just as likely to be a launch pad off the road as a speed reducing agent. Effective policing, but ultimately a change in society, is needed to address such minority behaviours. The answer is not to put down obstacles which will impede the majority to progress below 30mph but which will make little difference to those who don't care enough about themselves or others to slow down anyway.

If the main purpose of the speed cushions is to reduce vehicle speeds such that a zebra crossing can be used safely at Japonica court then their use should be confined to just that stretch of road. A "sledgehammer should not be used to crack a nut". However if the speed cushions are linked to the zebra crossing plans as has been stated then I am not sure why the schemes are subject to separate Notices?

4. Insufficient detail in plans

The drawings available for inspection at Ash Library did not show what width will be maintained between cushion and kerb to allow for cyclists. DfT states that the minimum should be 750mm with 1m preferred. Sustrans recommends 1.6m to allow for disabled cyclists. Presumably this will be specified rather than left to contractor's discretion and so it seems to be a failure of planning process that this information was not available for public viewing.

In addition the stated cushion gradients are 1:8 ⁺/. 5. The ⁺/. 5 makes no sense in this context. Further, the maximum recommended gradient is 1.8 so there should be no tolerance of gradients greater than this.

Apart from indicated SLOW markings the plans gave no indication of improved signage and warning signs for the speed cushions. I am sure that these are included but clearly the public viewing process has been flawed by this lack of detail in the plans.

5. Waste of public money

The proposed works are likely to cost £130k or upwards. In contrast Surrey County Council can clearly not afford to maintain roads to an appropriate standard. Please see attached photographs of Shawfield Road. Personally I consider that roads of this standard are of great risk to cyclists and to motorists whose tyres may blowout after repeated exposure to holes in the road

As previously mentioned I consider it more likely that a child will be injured on the Ash Street, where there is no proposed traffic calming, by a lorry driving on the pavement trying to make progress up the road against the oncoming traffic forced over by parked cars as often happens today when I walk my child to school

The play equipment in the recreation ground adjacent to Ash Football club is a joke compared to what is available in Hampshire parks, and is often filled with broken glass which I've cleared up myself.

These are just examples, and there are dozens of things in Ash/Guildford/Surrey I would like the Council (County/Borough/Parish) to spend my money on ahead of traffic calming in Shawfield Road. (I appreciate that Ash Parish Council and Surrey County Council budget's are separate but it's all government money and paid for through my taxes one way or another).

5. Environmental impact

DfT own guidance (TAL 04/96) suggests that some increased HC, CO emissions and fuel consumption is to be expected. This is offset in the Department's view in that (due to the usual two fold aim of traffic calming schemes as mentioned in 3.) that traffic levels typically reduce by around 24%. No such reduction can be expected for a major thoroughfare like Shawfield Road however – unless more traffic does divert from Ash village via Ash Hill Road and Ash Street past three schools. Hence it must be accepted by the Council that there will either be an environmental impact, or a safety impact on other roads. This therefore cannot support both the Environment and Safety objectives of SCC's LTP as recorded in the Highways Manager report on the scheme for the 14th June Guildford Local Committee meeting

6. Noise, Vibration

It is a known fact that traffic calming measures generate additional noise and vibration, depending upon the type of obstacle used. Cushions are better than humps, narrower cushions are better than wider ones etc.

Whether because of the construction of the road adjacent to Young's Drive/ Kingfisher Walk, or the nature of the foundation of the properties (pile and raft on reclaimed gravel pit) but properties not even immediately adjacent to the road are subject to noticeable vibrations from passing HGVs and mid-size vehicles. TAL 08/96 notes that these effects are more pronounced on longer speed cushions with steeper side gradients

"Based on typical crossing speeds, for the various road hump types the longer wider cushions with the steepest side ramps (1:3) gave the highest maximum and mean vibration levels for commercial vehicles, followed by the long flap top hump. The round top hump gave the lowest maximum and mean vibration levels for commercial vehicles. Vehicles with GVW over 7.5t were found to generate the highest levels of ground-borne vibration.

For buses, the flat top road hump gave the highest maximum and mean vibration levels. The round top hump was next highest. The short (2m) length, 1.9m wide speed cushion with 1:4 side ramp gradients gave the lowest maximum and mean vibration levels".

At 3.7m the proposed cushions are long and likely to generate more vibration which will have to be endured by the residents. In addition it seems likely that articulated lorries (which don't use residential roads where speed cushions are designed to be used) are likely not to pass cleanly over a speed cushion with the trailer wheels even though the cab wheels could be steered cleanly over them without any reduction in speed. i.e. it would be possible for a lorry to traverse the road at speeds well in excess of 30mph and then bounce the load over a speed cushion with resultant "crashing noise".

7. Reduced response time for Emergency vehicles

Speed cushions are used rather than speed humps on roads likely to be used by ambulances as the discomfort caused by travelling over them can be minimised

DfT TAL01/98 - *"Ambulance operators were generally supportive of speed cushions" (as opposed to humps presumably). "One preferred the use of straight ramps with 1:8 off/on ramps to the curved ramps which had steeper gradients overall. Views on appropriate widths of cushions varied with some finding 1900mm wide cushions acceptable whilst others found narrower cushions around 1600mm wide preferable. However, if there was a*

route which ambulances used frequently, then it would seem advisable to use cushions no wider than 1600mm".

As Shawfield Road is the main thoroughfare to Ash from the A331 and A31 and from Tongham ambulance station then the use of 1700mm speed cushions should be agreed with the ambulance operators.

The impact on police vehicle response times will be much more significant since police cars are not able to straddle cushions to the same extent that ambulances and fire engines can. Shawfield Road is the major response route into Ash, and several times this year the Police have had to be called relating to drunken incidents originating from Ash Football club. On the last occasion, which could only be described as a small riot, approximately eleven police vehicles were in attendance. Although such issues are ultimately a police / licensing matter and not the concern of Surrey County Council I am concerned about anything that affects the Police's response time to such incidents.

8. Lack of parking restrictions and location of bus stops in relation to speed cushions.

There is no evidence that double yellow lines either side of the speed cushions form part of the plan. This has the undesirable effect that buses, cyclists etc could be forced to go over the humps rather than follow their design routes. For similar reasons I am also concerned that the location of bus stops will force motorists to have to drive across the cushions in a non optimal, and potentially uncomfortable way.

9. Ingress and Egress to Young's Drive

Assuming that the traffic calming scheme was to progress (and in my view this can only be after more comprehensive and inclusive consultation) there is a specific objection I would like to raise about the positioning of the cushions either side of the pedestrian island between Young's Drive and Longacre junctions. When turning right out of Young's Drive the speed cushion on the Southbound road (Longacre side) is positioned such that it will require very great care and skill to both exit the Young's Drive junction at an appropriate speed so as not to impede traffic but also to get to the ramp "square on". I imagine a similar situation will exist at Longacre, and also at Grange Farm Road. In my view a pedestrian island is considered a sufficient "speed reducer" in other 30mph zones so the provision of speed cushions either side seems over the top as well as being inconvenient to residents of the affected side roads.

I would be grateful if you would acknowledge receipt of this letter. Please consider the objections made and provide a detailed response within 28 days.

Yours sincerely,



M. Tolley

Tel: 08456 009 009
Fax: 01483 517506

Mr Richard Tolley
27 Grange Farm Road
Ash
Surrey
GU12 6SJ

Surrey Highways
Local Highways Team
Guildford

South West Area Office
Grosvenor House
London Square
Cross Lanes
Guildford
GU1 1FA

Your ref:
Our ref: KB/7/303

08/01/2008

Dear Mr ~~Royster~~ ^{TOLLEY}

B3206 SHAWFIELD ROAD, ASH
OBJECTION TO PROPOSED TRAFFIC CALMING

I am writing to you in relation to your letter of 19 December regarding the above mentioned.

I am sorry that you feel you are unable to support the proposals. The scheme was supported by majority of residents who attended the exhibition or wrote in (63% of the total respondent), especially those in Shawfield Road following the public exhibition, which was held in the village. Following the consultation some changes were made to the scheme to accommodate the residents views. The scheme is designed to accommodate various requirements of emergency services and to reduce the high number of personal injury accidents. I would refer you to the report, which was presented to the Surrey County Council Committee for Guildford on 14 June 2007, item 15. This report is available on Surrey County Council web site or a hard copy can be obtained via Committee Support Services at County Hall.

Any objections to the proposals would need to be resolved before we could proceed. If objections could not be resolved, then these would be considered by the Surrey County Council Committee in Guildford, which consists of elected members of both the County Council and Guildford Borough Council. Following consideration of such objection, the committee will decide to uphold the objections or not. If objections are upheld, then we could not introduce the proposed traffic calming.

I would like to take this opportunity of informing you that the Surrey County Council Committee for Guildford will consider your objection on 12 February 2008. You may attend this meeting if you wish to do so. The details of this meeting can be obtained from the Mr Diccon Bright on the above mentioned telephone number.

Yours sincerely

Kaz Banisaied
Principal Engineer Local Highways Team - Guildford

yes/objcted.

Ms J Isaac
Head of Highways,
South - West Area Office,
Cross Lanes,
Guildford.
Surrey.
GU1 1FA

27 Grange Farm Road,
Ash,
Surrey,
GU12 6 SJ
(01252) 321215

19th December 2007.

Reference Public notices : BF/LEGAL/MISC/GLD/AK
: 4304/GLD/AK

With regard; 4304/GLD/AK the Zebra Pedestrian Crossing.
I have no objections at all and would welcome further such crossings by the
Shawfield recreation ground and Culverlands Crescent.

However with regard; BF/LEGAL/MISC/GLD/AK

The proposed speed cushions, as stated in my previous response to the original
consultation I feel these are a complete overkill. This road as I am sure you are a
well aware is a major route for many people travelling to our Village, as well as
those who use it to travel from Aldershot, Tongham and Farnham to work in
Frimley, Guildford and Woking.

There are occasions when the A331 is blocked due to an accident, the volume of
traffic then using Shawfield Road, can some times create queues of traffic which
can be as much as a quarter of a mile to half a mile long.

Having seen the proposed plans, which I was appalled to find were only available
for inspection on request at the Ash Library, I still feel they are not the answer to
the problem; some of the cushions are badly sited and will only aggravate traffic
problems on this road. In particular the one positioned opposite Young's Drive and
the two by the southern junction of Grange Farm Road. This incidentally has very
poor site line visibility when leaving Grange Farm Road.

I also have grave concerns that the proposals will increase the flow of traffic
through Star Lane which already is a major problem to its residents.

In conclusion I fail to see why vehicle speed activated signage similar to that used
in Frimley can not be used.



Richard Tolley (Resident of Grange Farm Road, ASH. for 43years)

Tel: 08456 009 009
Fax: 01483 517506

Mr P A Monk
Ashwood
Foxhurst Road
Ash Vale
Surrey
GU12 5DY

**Surrey Highways
Local Highways Team
Guildford**

South West Area Office
Grosvenor House
London Square
Cross Lanes
Guildford
GU1 1FA

Your ref:
Our ref: KB(91015169)/7/303

15/01/2008

Dear Mr Monk

**B3206 SHAWFIELD ROAD, ASH
OBJECTION TO PROPOSED TRAFFIC CALMIMNG**

I am writing to you in relation to your letter of 10 January regarding the above mentioned.

Firstly please accept my apology for addressing you as Mr Monks instead of Monk. However, as you may be aware by now, there were two replies, one of which was addressed to you as Mr Peter Monks and the other one to Mrs M J Monks and not as stated in your letter Mr M J Monks. I believe that you may have read the wrong letter.

With regard to your points, I must correct your assumptions, which are misleading. Firstly, we presented the actual number of residents who responded to our consultation, and this was made clear in our report, that from the total replies received there was a majority in support of the scheme. We cannot assume that those who have not responded are against and for that matter they are in support of the proposals. With regard to the 77% figure in favour of vehicle activated sign, for your information these who responded, were supporting the proposed vehicle activated sign already included within the scheme and not as suggested by yourself for replacement of cushions with these devices. It is unfortunate that we have accidents on our road regardless of their causation, however your argument that they are more deserving sites in the county and therefore, we should not deal with Shawfield Road. For your information the latest records shows that there has been four additional accidents since the exhibition records were presented.

Finally, in respect of the cost, the latest estimated cost of construction following the detailed design is estimated at about £60k- £65k. The figure of £130k you are stating was the initial estimate before any feasibility was carried out taking into account the worst case scenario. However now the scheme is fully designed and priced it is much less than anticipated.

As you could see, we have tried to present the facts as we have them and not make assumptions.

Yours sincerely

Kaz Banisaied
Principal Engineer Local Highways Team - Guildford

Ms. J Isaac,
Head of Highways,
Surrey County Council,
South – West Area Office,
Cross Lanes,
GUILDFORD GU 1 1 FA



Ashwood
Foxhurst Road
ASH VALE
GU 12 5 DY

Tel. 01252 326 131
E-mail : peter@foxhurst.plus.com

10 January 2008

Your Ref KB/7/303

Dear Ms Isaac,

Shawfield Road, Ash -- Proposed Traffic Calming Measures.

I refer to your letters dated 8th January 2008 to my wife and myself written on your behalf by Mr. Banisaied under the above reference.

For your information our surname is MONK not MONKS and my initials are P. A. not M. J. as used in your reply. If you cannot be relied upon to address your letters correctly.....!

The statistics quoted in the report to the Guildford Local Committee do indeed show that 12 of the 19 replies from residents with Shawfield Road addresses wish for traffic calming measures but this cannot be construed that they are solely in favour of speed cushions although it does confirm that they are in favour of one of the many forms of traffic calming, Vehicle Actuated Signs included.

Actually your own figures show that 77% of all residents who responded are in favour of Vehicle Activated Signs, presumably having observed the success of the installation in Frimley Road and having become aware of the expense of and potential disruption to public and emergency services from speed cushions.

Your letter is in serious danger of being misleading by being so selective with the survey results.

Your report also states that a total of 30 accidents have been recorded over a TEN period i.e. an average 3 per year and of these 6 were categorised as 'serious' i.e. less than 1 per year. Whilst any injury from an accident is unfortunate, to be regretted and hopefully avoided, it would not surprise me to learn that there are other sites in Surrey with a worse 'per mile' accident record and therefore in much greater need of remedial measures.

The figures, and arguments advanced, do not justify spending £130 000 on speed humps which very few residents want, bearing in mind that a cheaper solution would leave money from the budget to be spent on another worthwhile project in the area – elimination of some of the many potholes which currently plague road users in Surrey, for example.

It is, after all, our money that is being spent.

I look forward to your early reply.

Yours sincerely

Peter Monk . Margaret Monk .

P. A. Monk & M. J. Monk (Mrs)

Cc Ash and Farnham Mail.

Tel: 08456 009 009
Fax: 01483 517506

Mr Peter Monks
Ashwood
Foxhurst Road
Ash Vale
Surrey
GU12 5DY

Surrey Highways
Local Highways Team
Guildford

South West Area Office
Grosvenor House
London Square
Cross Lanes
Guildford
GU1 1FA

Your ref:
Our ref: KB/7/303

08/01/2008

Dear Mr Monks

B3206 SHAWFIELD ROAD, ASH
OBJECTION TO PROPOSED TRAFFIC CALMING

I am writing to you in relation to your letter of 31 December regarding the above mentioned.

I am sorry that you feel you are unable to support the proposals. As you are aware we had a comprehensive discussion at the exhibition and I am fully aware of your views on this matter. As you aware, a report on this matter went to the Surrey County Council Committee for Guildford on 14 June 2007, item 15, and you had the opportunity to raise your concerns on this matter to the committee directly.

Therefore, I cannot see any benefits to discuss this matter further to persuade you to withdraw your objection and therefore, I would bring to your attention that any objections to the proposals would need to be resolved before we could proceed. If objections could not be resolved, then these would be considered by the Surrey County Council Committee in Guildford, which consists of elected members of both the County Council and Guildford Borough Council. Following consideration of such objection, the committee will decide to uphold the objections or not. If objections are upheld, then we could not introduce the proposed traffic calming.

I would like to take this opportunity of informing you that the Surrey County Council Committee for Guildford will consider your objection on 12 February 2008. You may attend this meeting if you wish to do so. The details of this meeting can be obtained from the Mr Diccon Bright on the above mentioned telephone number.

Yours sincerely

Kaz Banisaied
Principal Engineer Local Highways Team - Guildford



yes/objected

Ms. J Isaac,
Head of Highways,
Surrey County Council,
South - West Area Office,
Cross Lanes,
GUILDFORD GU 1 1 FA

Ashwood
Foxhurst Road
ASH VALE
GU 12 5 DY

Tel. 01252 326 131
E-mail : peter@foxhurst.plus.com

3 January 2008

Your Ref BF / LEGAL / MISC / GLD / AK

Dear Ms Isaac,

Shawfield Road, Ash -- Proposed Traffic Calming Measures.

I write in response to the notice posted recently in the Surrey Advertiser regarding the above.

Shawfield Road is a heavily used main road serving the village and is used by a half-hourly bus route and also by the emergency services - notably ambulances originating from Tongham - to access a large part of the village and further north to Mytchett and Frimley.

Hitherto, these services have had unfettered access to the main body of the village and nothing should be done that might impede these essential services.

During the earlier 'consultation' it was argued that speed cushions do not impede buses or ambulances, but by the same token they are also ineffective in slowing most 'white vans', larger lorries and even some larger cars, because the wheels of these vehicles also can straddle the cushions. Furthermore a vehicle parked near a 'speed cushion' would force ALL vehicles to deviate from the 'ideal' track and therefore, inevitably, the passage of buses, ambulances and other essential vehicles will be adversely affected.

The earlier proposal for a chicane near Japonica Court was strongly criticised because it was likely to cause traffic to re-route using Star Lane and this is still very likely when drivers attempt to avoid the inconvenience, discomfort and delays that will be caused by the cushions between Star Lane and 'The Greyhound' roundabout.

The excellent and very effective scheme incorporating vehicle actuated signs as installed in Frimley Road, Mytchett should be applied in Shawfield Road. These, together with the proposed pedestrian facilities will combine to reduce the speed of traffic without impeding emergency vehicles. This will have the coincidental effect of improving crossing opportunities over the whole length of Shawfield Road.

The previous consultation demonstrated that a significant majority of residents prefer traffic calming, as in Frimley Road, rather than by speed cushions or humps which are quite inappropriate for Shawfield Road.

Yours sincerely

M. J. Monk.

M J Monk (Mrs)

Tel: 08456 009 009
Fax: 01483 517506

Mrs M J Monks
Ashwood
Foxhurst Road
Ash Vale
Surrey
GU12 5DY

**Surrey Highways
Local Highways Team
Guildford**

South West Area Office
Grosvenor House
London Square
Cross Lanes
Guildford
GU1 1FA

Your ref:
Our ref: KB/7/303

08/01/2008

Dear Mrs Monks

**B3206 SHAWFIELD ROAD, ASH
OBJECTION TO PROPOSED TRAFFIC CALMING**

I am writing to you in relation to your letter of 3 January regarding the above mentioned.

I am sorry that you feel you are unable to support the proposals. As you are aware, the scheme was supported by majority of residents who attended the exhibition or wrote in (63% of the total respondent), especially those in Shawfield Road, following the public exhibition, which was held in the village and you were also present at. Following the consultation some changes were made to the scheme to accommodate the residents views. The scheme is designed to accommodate various requirements of emergency services and to reduce the high number of personal injury accidents. I would refer you to the report, which was presented to the Surrey County Council Committee for Guildford on 14 June 2007, item 15. This report is available on Surrey County Council web site or a hard copy can be obtained via Committee Support Services at County Hall.

Any objections to the proposals would need to be resolved before we could proceed. If objections could not be resolved, as in this case, then these would be considered by the Surrey County Council Committee in Guildford, which consists of elected members of both the County Council and Guildford Borough Council. Following consideration of such objection, the committee will decide to uphold the objections or not. If objections are upheld, then we could not introduce the proposed traffic calming.

I would like to take this opportunity of informing you that the Surrey County Council Committee for Guildford will consider your objection on 12 February 2008. You may attend this meeting if you wish to do so. The details of this meeting can be obtained from the Mr Diccon Bright on the above mentioned telephone number.

Yours sincerely


Kaz Banisaied
Principal Engineer Local Highways Team - Guildford

RECEIVED

02 JAN 2008

yes / o h j . det .

Ms. J Isaac,
Head of Highways,
Surrey County Council,
South - West Area Office,
Cross Lanes,
GUILDFORD GU 1 1 FA

Ashwood
Foxhurst Road
ASH VALE
GU 12 5 DY

Tel. 01252 326 131
E-mail : peter@foxhurst.plus.com

31 December 2007

Your Ref BF / LEGAL / MISC / GLD / AK

Dear Ms Isaac,

Shawfield Road, Ash -- Proposed Traffic Calming Measures.

I write in response to the notice posted recently in the Surrey Advertiser regarding the above.

Shawfield Road is a heavily used main road serving the village and is used by a half-hourly bus route and also by the emergency services - notably ambulances originating from Tongham - to access a large part of the village and further north to Mytchett and Frimley.

I, for one, have good reason to be glad that, hitherto, these services have had unfettered access to the main body of the village.

NOTHING SHOULD BE DONE THAT MIGHT IMPEDE THESE IMPORTANT SERVICES.

During the earlier 'consultation' it was argued that speed cushions do not impede buses or ambulances, but by the same token they are also ineffective in slowing most 'white vans', which are constructed with similar width wheel tracks, larger lorries and even some larger cars, because the wheels of these vehicles also can straddle the cushions. Furthermore a vehicle parked near a 'speed cushion' would force ALL vehicles to deviate from the 'ideal' track and therefore, inevitably, the passage of buses, ambulances and others will be adversely affected.

To achieve the desired objective the adopted measures should be effective for all types of vehicles.

If, as is alleged, there is a speeding problem in Shawfield Road, then the excellent and very effective scheme incorporating vehicle actuated signs as installed in Frimley Road, Mytchett should be repeated in Shawfield Road. These allied with the proposed pedestrian facilities will combine to reduce the speed of traffic without impeding emergency vehicles thereby improving crossing facilities over the whole length of Shawfield Road.

The previous consultation demonstrated that a significant majority of residents prefer traffic calming, as in Frimley Road, rather than by speed cushions or humps.

The proposals, as tabled, are quite inappropriate for Shawfield Road and should be re-thought in conjunction with one or more pedestrian crossings in order to provide a comprehensive package of measures.

Yours sincerely,

Peter Monk
Peter Monk MICE.

Tel: 08456 009 009
Fax: 01483 517506

Mr Peter Royston
208 Shawfield Road
Ash
Surrey
GU12 6SQ

Surrey Highways
Local Highways Team
Guildford

South West Area Office
Grosvenor House
London Square
Cross Lanes
Guildford
GU1 1FA

Your ref:
Our ref: KB/7/303

08/01/2008

Dear Mr Royston

B3206 SHAWFIELD ROAD, ASH
OBJECTION TO PROPOSED TRAFFIC CALMING

I am writing to you in relation to your letter of 18 December regarding the above mentioned.

I am sorry that you feel you are unable to support the proposals. The scheme was supported by majority of residents who attended the exhibition or wrote in (63% of the total respondent), especially those in Shawfield Road following the public exhibition, which was held in the village. Following the consultation some changes were made to the scheme to accommodate the residents views. The scheme is designed to accommodate various requirements of emergency services and to reduce the high number of personal injury accidents. I would refer you to the report, which was presented to the Surrey County Council Committee for Guildford on 14 June 2007, item 15. This report is available on Surrey County Council web site or a hard copy can be obtained via Committee Support Services at County Hall.

Any objections to the proposals would need to be resolved before we could proceed. If objections could not be resolved, then these would be considered by the Surrey County Council Committee in Guildford, which consists of elected members of both the County Council and Guildford Borough Council. Following consideration of such objection, the committee will decide to uphold the objections or not. If objections are upheld, then we could not introduce the proposed traffic calming.

I would like to take this opportunity of informing you that the Surrey County Council Committee for Guildford will consider your objection on 12 February 2008. You may attend this meeting if you wish to do so. The details of this meeting can be obtained from the Mr Diccon Bright on the above mentioned telephone number.

Yours sincerely


Kaz Banisaied
Principal Engineer Local Highways Team - Guildford

"Greenside"
208, Shawfield Road,
Ash,
Aldershot,
Hampshire
GU12 6SQ

yes/objected



18th December 2007

Ref.: Proposed traffic calming measures for Shawfield Road Ash

Mr. J. Isaac

Dear Sir

I wish to register my blanket objection in the strongest possible terms to the proposed installation of the 15 speed cushions in Shawfield Road. (I think the name "Speed Bump" is a more appropriate and descriptive term for them) In particular I am concerned about Speed bumps numbers 13 and 14. My bedroom is at the front of my bungalow, about 4 metres from Shawfield Road. Bumps 13 and 14 will be straddling either side of this room. I feel that the noise caused as traffic goes over these bumps will seriously disturb my sleep at night. The road is used throughout the night and at the moment the slight noise of passing traffic is tolerable. Imagine if you will a constant "Bump Bump" through out the night.

Having recently read the article in the Ash and Farnham Mail (18th Dec issue), about the "Row over speed cushions", I must say I agree with Mr. Scard's comments about the Damage to my car and it's suspension, not to mention the damage to my lower spine.

I disagree that these bumps increase road safety. On other roads locally where they are present (in Ash Green and above Manor Park Aldershot), I have noticed that they encourage an increased danger. Motorists obviously concerned about grounding up their sumps and silencers, move across to the centre of the road to go between the humps. I have had several experiences of cars coming at me in the centre of the road in this way, to avoid the bumps. A rather frightening experience!

As to larger vehicles being able to straddle the bumps: Well these are among the ones who go too fast along this road, so the humps aren't going to affect them, are they?

This whole scheme seems to be one driven by a tight budget, rather than a scheme sympathetic to the residents.

I think that there should be two traffic light controlled crossings. One for the Japonica court residents and one for Culverlands Crescent, Although with reference to the latter, I do not see much evidence of old folk, who live there, trying to cross as mentioned in the newspaper article. Most of them come out from this estate in their cars.

The other safety measure I would like to see is two fixed "GATSO" type speed cameras.

One placed just after the railway arch, somewhere near proposed speed bump number 15, facing up towards Grange Farm Road.

The other near Japonica Court somewhere between speed bumps 2 and 3, facing towards Shawfield Lane. These I feel would slow traffic in the critical areas.

I must admit I am very dismayed at the prospect of these speed bumps. Having lived at 208 Shawfield road for more than 35 years now and despite attending the presentation at Ash centre earlier this year and now sending this letter, I feel that Surrey County Council will just "Bully" this scheme through. A cheap fix attitude regardless of the views of the residents.

I await your written response with interest

Yours Faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of several overlapping loops and a trailing line, positioned below the text "Yours Faithfully".

Peter Royston



West Area Highways Office
Sent by: Chris Baker

11/01/08 15:52

To "Judith Mee" <judith.mee@rushmoor.gov.uk>

cc

bcc Kaz Banisaied/COM/SCC

Subject Re: FW: Proposed traffic calming in Shawfield Road, Ash

Our ref: 91015102 (7/303)

Dear Mrs Mee,

I refer to your email below and to your objection to the traffic calming measures proposed as part of the above minor improvement scheme.

With regard to the specific reasons for your objection, I would comment as follows:

1. As reported to the Guildford Local Committee on 14 June 2008, over the ten year period 1997 to 2006 there were 30 personal injury accidents (6 serious, 24 slight) between the Greyhound Roundabout and the railway bridge at the northern end of Shawfield Road. You may also be interested to know that since that assessment was undertaken, there have been three more accidents (1 serious, 2 slight) up to the end of October 2007. In addition to this accident record, we received telephone calls and letters from local residents who were concerned with both high traffic speeds and road safety in general along Shawfield Road.
2. I do agree that some local increase in vehicle noise and ground vibration may occur as a result of the proposals. However, such changes are dependent on a number of variable factors, such as the type of measures introduced, the ground conditions, the distance from properties, the foundation and type of construction etc. Whilst it may be a subjective judgement, I do not believe that in this instance there would be any significant detrimental affect from these proposals. If you wish to read further on this subject, I would refer you to Department for Transport Traffic Advisory Leaflet (TAL) 10/00 and also TRL Report Nos. 235 and 180.

If you are happy with the explanation given above and wish to withdraw your objection, I would be grateful if you could confirm this in writing by return of email.

For your information, any objection that we receive to the proposals needs to be resolved before we can proceed. If an objection cannot be resolved, then it is reported to the Guildford Local Committee, which consists of elected members of both Surrey County Council and Guildford Borough Council. Following consideration by the Committee, they then decide whether or not to uphold or overule an objection. If upheld, the proposals would not be implemented.

I can confirm that, if not withdrawn prior to the meeting, Guildford Local Committee will consider your objection to the proposed traffic calming measures, on 12 February 2008. If you wish to attend, the meeting will take place at Pirbright Village Hall, starting at 7.00pm. Further details may be obtained from our Local Committee and Partnership Officer, Mr Diccon Bright, on the telephone number shown below.

 Chris Baker
 Engineer
 Surrey Highways
 Local Highways Team - Guildford
 Tel: 08456 009 009

please do not use the reply button to reply to this email the full address as below should be used

WAH@surreycc.gov.uk

"Judith Mee" <judith.mee@rushmoor.gov.uk>



"Judith Mee"



<judith.mee@rushmoor.gov.uk>

03/01/08 15:58

To <wah@surreycc.gov.uk>

cc <jenny.isaac@surreycc.gov.uk>

Subject FW: Proposed traffic calming in Shawfield Road, Ash

From: Judith Mee
Sent: 03 January 2008 15:48
To: 'wah@surrey.gov.uk'
Cc: 'jenny.isaac@surrey.gov.uk'; 'Jayne.Hewlett@guildford.gov.uk'
Subject: Proposed traffic calming in Shawfield Road, Ash

I am writing as a local resident to object to the proposed traffic calming scheme at the above location.

I am not aware of any record of accidents or road safety problems that would warrant public expenditure on the traffic calming measures proposed. If there is a localised issue with elderly residents at Japonica Court, provision of a pedestrian crossing outside the Court may be appropriate and I would have no objection to this. However, traffic calming along the whole length of Shawfield Road cannot be justified. It would be totally inappropriate, would cause inconvenience and noise nuisance to residents including myself and would contribute to the increasing urbanisation of what is currently a pleasant road with a semi-rural feel, particularly around the allotments opposite which I live.

In my view a much better road safety measure to benefit pedestrians would be to carry out improvements to the footway along Shawfield Road, which in some areas is very narrow and overgrown. In fact this is particularly evident beside the bus stop opposite Japonica Court, restricting the area available to stand in safety to wait for a bus.

I trust you will take residents' views into account, bearing in mind that the current proposal has not been well publicised and the period for comment is very short, particularly having regard to the intervening Christmas & New Year holiday.

Please acknowledge receipt of my comments.

Many thanks

Judith Mee
146 Shawfield Road, Ash GU12 6SG

CONFIDENTIALITY & DISCLAIMER NOTICE

This email and any attachments are intended only for the individual or entity to which they are addressed and may be confidential.

If this email has been sent to you in error, please accept our apologies and inform the sender, delete the message and destroy all copies. Unauthorised copying, distribution or other use of the information it contains is strictly prohibited.

The content of email to and from the Council may be monitored for reasons of good business

practice and for monitoring compliance with the Council's staff policies. Email monitoring / blocking software may also be used.

Please note that under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and related legislation, the Council may be required to disclose information contained in any email or other correspondence and that complete confidentiality cannot be guaranteed.

This footnote confirms that this email has been swept by the MessageLabs Email Security System for the presence of computer viruses. We advise that in keeping with good ICT practice you should confirm for yourself that this email and attachments are virus free.

Rushmoor Borough Council
<http://www.rushmoor.gov.uk>

Tel: 08456 009 009
Fax: 01483 517506

Mr R L Scard
127A Ash Hill Road
Ash
Aldershot
GU12 5DN

Surrey Highways
Local Highways Team
Guildford

South West Area Office
Grosvenor House
London Square
Cross Lanes
Guildford
GU1 1FA

Your ref:
Our ref: KB/7/303

08/01/2008

Dear Mr Scard

B3206 SHAWFIELD ROAD, ASH
OBJECTION TO PROPOSED TRAFFIC CALMING


I am writing to you in relation to your letter of 12 December regarding the above mentioned.

I am sorry that you feel you are unable to support the proposals. The scheme was supported by majority of residents (63% of the total respondent), especially those in Shawfield Road. The scheme is designed to accommodate various requirements of emergency services and to reduce the high number of personal injury accidents. I would refer you to the report, which was presented to the Surrey County Council Committee for Guildford on 14 June 2007, item 15. This report is available on Surrey County Council web site or a hard copy can be obtained via Committee Support Services at County Hall.

If any objections were received to the proposals they would need to be resolved before we could proceed. If they could not be resolved, then these would be considered by the Surrey County Council Committee in Guildford, which consists of elected members of both the County Council and Guildford Borough Council. Following consideration of such objection, the committee will decide to uphold the objections or not. If objections are upheld, then we could not introduce the proposed traffic calming.

I would like to take this opportunity of informing you that the Surrey County Council Committee for Guildford will consider your objection on 12 February 2008. You may attend this meeting if you wish to do so. The details of this meeting can be obtained from the Mr Diccon Bright on the above mentioned telephone number.

Yours sincerely


Kaz Banisaied
Principal Engineer
Local Highways Team - Guildford



R.L.Scard
127A Ash Hill Road
Ash
Aldershot
Hants
GU12 5DN

December 12 2007

MS J. Isaac
Head of Highways
South-West Office
Cross Lanes
Guildford

Proposed Traffic Calming Shawfield Road Ash

Dear MS J. Isaac

I would like to register my opposition to the introduction of the above Safety Measures, Speed Cushions damage tyres and the Tracking on cars, a person who has to use this road every day would eventually be effected by them.

Surrey Heath have used a method on the A321 which is much more car friendly, Square Rumbles and road painting combined with illuminated 30 MPH signs I suggest that this would be a better solution

A extra crossing could be provided just north of Culverlands Close.

Yours Sincerly

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "R.L. Scard". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above a long, sweeping blue line that extends across the page.

R.L.Scard.

Tel: 08456 009 009
Fax: 01483 517506

Mrs R Munn
39 Grange Farm Road
Ash
Surrey
GU12 6SJ

Surrey Highways
Local Highways Team
Guildford

South West Area Office
Grosvenor House
London Square
Cross Lanes
Guildford
GU1 1FA

Your ref:
Our ref: KB/7/303

08/01/2008

Dear Mrs Munn

B3206 SHAWFIELD ROAD, ASH
OBJECTION TO PROPOSED TRAFFIC CALMING

I am writing to you in relation to your letter of 31 December regarding the above mentioned.

I am sorry that you feel you are unable to support the proposals. The scheme was supported by majority of residents who attended the exhibition or wrote in (63% of the total respondent), especially those in Shawfield Road following the public exhibition, which was held in the village. Following the consultation some changes were made to the scheme to accommodate the residents views. The scheme is designed to accommodate various requirements of emergency services and to reduce the high number of personal injury accidents. I would refer you to the report, which was presented to the Surrey County Council Committee for Guildford on 14 June 2007, item 15. This report is available on Surrey County Council web site or a hard copy can be obtained via Committee Support Services at County Hall.

Any objections to the proposals would need to be resolved before we could proceed. If objections could not be resolved, then these would be considered by the Surrey County Council Committee in Guildford, which consists of elected members of both the County Council and Guildford Borough Council. Following consideration of such objection, the committee will decide to uphold the objections or not. If objections are upheld, then we could not introduce the proposed traffic calming.

I would like to take this opportunity of informing you that the Surrey County Council Committee for Guildford will consider your objection on 12 February 2008. You may attend this meeting if you wish to do so. The details of this meeting can be obtained from the Mr Diccon Bright on the above mentioned telephone number.

Yours sincerely


Kaz Banisaied
Principal Engineer Local Highways Team - Guildford

39 Grange Farm Road
Ash
Surrey
GU12 6SJ



31 December 2007

Ms J Isaac
Head of Highways
South-West Area Office
Cross Lanes
Guildford
GU1 1FA

Dear Ms Isaac

Ref: BF/LEGAL/MISC/GLD/AK – Proposed Traffic Calming Measures in Shawfield Road, Ash

I am writing with reference to the above proposal for 15 speed cushions to be installed along Shawfield Road, Ash. Earlier in the year we were notified of a proposal to install traffic calming measures adjacent to Japonica Court, where elderly residents had complained of difficulties in being able to cross the road safely. Having heard nothing since then, I assumed the proposals were not going ahead and was surprised on finding your notice attached to a lamppost during a Christmas Day walk.

Having lived at the above address for 16 years I am aware of the occasional vehicle exceeding the speed limit on Shawfield Road. However, I would be interested to know what percentage of accidents occurring on the road has excess speed as a contributing factor. Many of the junctions abutting Shawfield Road are poorly designed, including our own exit from Grange Farm Road, with limited visibility, caused by low, encroaching vegetation of oak trees and laurel which is not maintained. The exit from Star Lane is exceptionally awkward, again due to lack of visibility to the left which could be rectified with a suitably sited mirror to aid drivers at the junction.

I would like to register my objections to the proposal for the following reasons:

1. Speed cushions are potholes in reverse. There are already several unrepaired potholes along Shawfield Road which cause drivers to take avoiding action. I have no doubt that installing cushions will see more of this behaviour. Potholes damage cars. Speed cushions will be no different, causing damage to vehicles; even driving over with both tyres on the cushion will wear the inside edges of tyres.
2. As a resident, I will not be able to leave my road without driving over these cushions in either direction. My husband suffers from a bad back. He has already has two prolapsed intervertebral discs and has been warned that he is likely to lose a third. He takes pain suppressing and anti-inflammatory medication. Any jolting action, as felt by driving over speed cushions will be uncomfortable and damaging. These speed cushions are therefore discriminatory.

3. Slowing traffic causes more, not less pollution. Our own Transport Research Laboratory, based in Crowthorne found CO emissions increased by 70-80%, carbons by 70-100% and CO₂ by 50-60%. Noise will also increase, simply because the noise generated by tyres moving over bumps is always greater than on a flat road surface.
4. Residents with limited or no driveway space will find parking for their own or visitors' cars very difficult. This has the potential to block the road or cause further problems by indiscriminate parking. Speed cushions in the vicinity of a house will reduce its market value and potential buyers will be put off by the associated problems.
5. Emergency vehicles apparently have the capacity to travel over these speed cushions at normal speeds without being affected. Living close to the ambulance station at Tongham, emergency vehicles are a regular sight on Shawfield Road. I, for one, would not want to be a patient suffering from any form of spinal injury travelling down this road.
6. Local traffic, will, of course, seek to avoid Shawfield Road. Many vehicles will divert to Ash Street, with its three schools, Walsh C.E. Memorial Infants, Walsh C.E. Junior School and Ash Grange School, no doubt putting considerably more pressure on what is an already very congested road at rush hour. Those whose journeys have been held up by travelling on Shawfield will seek, on exiting it, to make up for lost time. This phenomenon is easily observed in Lakeside Road, which is populated by speed bumps, and then merges into Government Road, where all traffic far exceeds 30 miles per hour in an attempt to make up for lost time.

I am not against action being taken to reduce the speed of drivers who use Shawfield Road, but feel there are other ways. For example, the speed sensitive signs along the B3411 through Mytchett, along with rumble strips, coloured tarmac and road markings seem a far better way of reducing speed **and** keeping life tolerable for residents. I would recommend that you visit this speed reduction scheme, as it really does work and surely would cost less money to install than your proposal.

I urge the council to strongly reconsider the proposal and await your comments with interest.

Yours sincerely

R. C. Munn

Mrs Rowena Munn