

**APPENDIX F****SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS AND OFFICER RESPONSES****ALTERNATIVE SCHEME/OTHER OPTIONS**

The following issues and objections were received; a number of comments relate to the implementation of alternative schemes as apposed the scheme presented. It should be noted that the planning condition is prescriptive in that any scheme must consider speed cushions and raised tables only. It should be noted that any alternatives to the scheme would not be deemed feasible and would not fulfil the requirements of the planning condition in any case. Alternatives to the proposed scheme which may have been considered include chicanes and/or build-outs at various locations, however these type of features require a consistent flow of traffic in both directions to be effective; the site in question has significant peak flows in one direction at the morning and evening peak hours and therefore would not effectively control traffic. These comments should be taken in context and in addition to the individual responses provided below.

**1. Issue/Objection Raised**

Traffic should be prevented from accessing the Maytree Drive/Barry Drive estate by banning some/all turns from the A47 Hinckley Road into the estate, and only allowing left turns out of the estate here. This would reduce the traffic cutting through the estate and be a much cheaper option. This would need to be via physical buildouts in addition to signs.

This option could be enforced with cameras. Improvements may need to be made to the Kirby Lane signalised junction to accommodate the diverted traffic. Alternatively, "access only" signs could be provided at the junctions of Maytree Drive/Forest Rise from the A47.

This option could be implemented with limited traffic calming on Maytree Drive.

This option should be implemented with a 15 mph speed limit enforced by speed cameras.

**Officer Response**

*All suggestions for alternative measures are welcomed and considered appropriately but cannot be promoted without amendments to the planning condition and with agreement of the developer. Leicestershire County Council have tested this option via site visits, produced a draft design, modelled various vehicle turning paths, and subjected the design to impartial review, including via a Road Safety Audit together with Officer experience of similar sites. The alternative scheme was also subject to a meeting between LCC officers, local*

*elected members, Parish Council members, and local residents/petitioners.*

*In this case the banning of turning movements is likely to result in a number of issues as detailed below. It must also be borne in mind that this scheme would not address the planning condition of the developers and they would be under no obligation to fund this and that the Police have objected to this.*

**General issues (applicable to whole scheme)**

- *Risk of violation and subsequent enforcement issues for the Police due to increased journey time of up to 5 minutes at peak times.*
- *Potential for loss of passing trade for local shops.*
- *Likelihood of diverted traffic using unsuitable routes such as Forest Rise (local concern over this has been expressed).*
- *Traffic turning right into the estate from the A47 may conflict with traffic exiting the estate (due to the presence of any buildout /central-island).*

**Left Turn Ban (into Maytree Drive)**

- *Likelihood of violations by left turning traffic into the estate, particularly by local residents and those wishing to access the shops.*
- *Overrunning of the built out footway (by left turning traffic into the estate in violation of the restriction) placing pedestrians at risk of being struck.*
- *Potential for U-Turns on the A47 to allow Leicester-bound traffic to enter the Maytree Drive estate via a right turn.*

**Right Turn Ban (out of Maytree Drive)**

- *Right turning traffic (in violation of the ban) out of Maytree Drive may conflict with traffic on the A47 who are not expecting such a manoeuvre.*

*Given these issues the Council would not support this scheme in its present form. If a 3rd party wished to progress and fund an alternative design that addressed these issues we would of course remain open to this.*

*Enforcement via Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) cameras was discussed with the Police. This would have to be undertaken by them, and they have confirmed that this is extremely costly and that they do not have the resources to do so.*

*It is agreed that the alternative proposal would divert traffic onto other local routes, many of which may also be considered unsuitable, in particular residents of Forest Rise. There is no scope to widen or significantly improve the Kirby Lane junction to accommodate this.*

*Whilst there is a mechanism to provide such prohibitions, the enforcement would*

*prove extremely problematic and could only be undertaken by the Police who as you will note above, do not have the resources to do so.*

*As regards the suggested 15 mph speed limit please see response below.*

**2. Issue/Objection Raised**

A mandatory 20 mph speed limit should be provided instead of traffic calming and enforced by speed cameras. Alternatively, enforce the current 30 mph speed limit with cameras.

**Officer Response**

*Any speed limit needs to be self-enforcing and based around the mean speeds of vehicles to be effective. For this reason, the majority of 20 mph zones in the County are supported by traffic calming. Mean speeds on Maytree Drive are approximately 25-26m mph, with 85% of vehicles travelling up to 30-31mph. For these reasons a 20mph speed limit on its own would be unlikely to be effective.*

*Speed limits are only enforced via speed cameras where there is clear evidence of a persistent speeding problem and a history of injury accidents, particularly those involving fatalities or serious injury. This includes the current trial of average speed cameras within the County, which need to be linked to existing speeding / accident problems.*

*In this case the use of speed cameras could not be warranted given the speed data above and the fact that there have been no personal injury accidents in the last 5 years through the Maytree Drive/Barry Drive estate. There has been a single slight personal injury accident on Warren Lane however this could not be attributed to excessive speed. We will continue to liaise with the Parish Council to undertake community speed watch in the area.*

**3. Issue/Objection Raised**

The money should be spent on relieving traffic issues in and around Enderby issues associated with general commuter traffic and Next traffic in particular.

**Officer Response**

*The scheme is being externally funded by the New Lubbesthorpe developers as part of a planning condition imposed on them by the local planning authority Blaby District Council. The Council have been commissioned to design and consult on this proposal on their behalf. As such the scheme is not publicly funded and there is no option for LCC to reallocate the funds to other priorities.*

**4. Issue/Objection Raised**

Yellow box markings should be provided instead at the junctions of A47 Hinckley Road with Beggars Lane, Warren Lane, Stafford Leys, and Kings Drive.

**Officer Response**

*The potential for a yellow box at the junction of Warren Lane was considered in November 2017. However, with the majority of issues only occurring for a short duration during the morning peak of traffic it was decided that it would not be warranted. This decision was revisited during the consultation and would also be similar for Beggars Lane and the other locations.*

*There are forthcoming improvement works to the Beggars Lane, and Kirby Lane junctions. It should also be noted that there is a signal strategy in operation that maximises the likelihood of gaps in traffic on the A47 allowing the best opportunity for traffic to exit the side roads.*

*However, it is considered beneficial to review this once the improvements above are in place.*

**5. Issue/Objection Raised**

Instead of the traffic calming, parts of Maytree Drive/Barry Drive should be made one way. This will prevent rat running.

**Officer Response**

*Experience at other sites has shown that isolated sections of one way system in relatively low traffic conditions are liable to abuse. This places other road users in danger as they are not expecting to encounter oncoming traffic and also leads to an enforcement burden for the police and are liable to object to any such proposal. As above, this scheme would also not fulfil the developers planning obligation.*

**6. Issue/Objection Raised**

The Maytree Drive / Barry Drive estate should be signed as “no through road” and enforced by cameras with fines issued during certain hours of the day when through traffic is at its greatest e.g. 0700-1000 and 1600-2000.

**Officer Response**

*No through road signing is only applicable where there is no physical through route for traffic, which is not the case here. There is no legal basis for a part-time*

*no through route or a mechanism for its enforcement.*

**7. Issue/Objection Raised**

Petition against the traffic calming was misleading. Whilst people may sign this as it benefits the residents of the estate, it would create problems with traffic diverted onto the alternative routes.

**Officer Response**

*The Council was presented with a petition of 111 signatures during the consultation period for this scheme. It is hoped that any signatories to this private petition will consider the full implications of the proposal.*

*See paragraph 5 on the suggested alternative scheme in issue #1 above.*

**8. Issue/Objection Raised**

Chicanes should be provided instead of speed humps or alternatively some form of priority working.

**Officer Response**

*These measures are generally only effective when there are balanced traffic flows in either direction resulting in the need to give way. This is not the case for these two estates, which whilst busier at peak commuter times, generally have low traffic volumes.*

**9. Issue/Objection Raised**

A bypass is needed for Kirby Muxloe instead of these proposals. This will remove traffic from local roads, particularly HGVs.

**Officer Response**

*A bypass is outside of the scope of the current planning condition and funding available.*

**10. Issue/Objection Raised**

The proposed alternative scheme to ban movements at the Maytree Drive junction with the A47 will lead to traffic for the estate (inc residents) having to suffer delays, use unsuitable/longer routes and is not supported either.

**Officer Response**

*The alternative scheme proposed in #1 above is likely to result in additional traffic*

*using the A47 and Kirby Lane as the nearest, practical alternative route. It is also considered likely that some traffic may elect to use Forest Rise. This diversion is in the order of up to 5 minutes at peak times. For this reason it is expected that the proposal would suffer from high levels of non-compliance.*

**11. Issue/Objection Raised**

A mini roundabout should be provided at the junction of Forest House Lane / Beggars Lane. This will improve traffic flow at this junction together with reducing speeds.

**Officer Response**

*Should the scheme be approved, the proposed junction table will reduce speeds and therefore assist with turning movements here. Additionally, there are planned capacity improvements to the Beggars Lane / A47 signals that should help reduce standing traffic here at peak times, improving access/egress from Forest House Lane.*

**OBJECTIONS / REASONS NOT TO DO SCHEME**

**12. Issue/Objection Raised**

Traffic calming is ineffective and will not be a deterrent to either speeding traffic or through traffic. It is uncomfortable for those with back problems/elderly/disabled. There is already too much traffic calming on the roads, often where it is not justified such as in this case. Alternatives should be provided. Local residents will have to go over a large number of speed tables many times a day, and new rat runs will form.

**Officer Response**

*Experience of using traffic calming at other sites across the County has shown that traffic calming can be an effective deterrent to through traffic, and at slowing vehicle speeds. The proposed traffic calming would be well within the national maximum standards which were developed following extensive testing of a variety of vehicle types and with regard to occupant comfort. When negotiated at an appropriate speed there should therefore be no discomfort.*

*A variety of alternative options have been discussed – see Section 1. The traffic calming would cover all key routes through each estate, helping avoid new rat runs forming, although it is accepted that additional traffic may use the A47/Kirby Lane as a result.*

**13. Issue/Objection Raised**

Will the Council compensate me for damage to my vehicle that will be caused by

the traffic calming?

**Officer Response**

*It is the responsibility of drivers to drive in accordance with the Highway Code and to approach the traffic calming features at an appropriate, safe speed.*

*The traffic calming will adhere to national standards, which will allow all vehicles that conform to UK specifications to negotiate the features safely. Mindful of potential concerns from residents, the traffic calming proposals are in fact slightly lower and with shallower ramps than typically used elsewhere.*

*If road users feel that the County Council has been negligent or failed in its statutory duties around the construction and maintenance of the highway they may submit a claim and associated evidence for consideration, there is no automatic right to compensation and each claim will be considered on its own merits in accordance with the individual circumstances and current legislation.*

**14. Issue/Objection Raised**

The cost of the scheme is unjustified and is a waste of money. The money should be spent on other things, such as maintaining the roads, fixing potholes and sunken drain covers.

**Officer Response**

*The New Lubbesthorpe developers have a planning obligation to provide traffic calming (speed tables) to prevent through traffic using the adjacent Leicester Forest East (Warren Lane) and Kirby Muxloe (Barry Drive/Maytree Drive) estates. This proposal is being fully funded by the developers. There is no scope for the County Council to reallocate these monies to other priorities.*

**15. Issue/Objection Raised**

Traffic calming leads to various issues such as:

- Noise (as vehicles speed up/slow down between features, general traffic though the day, and particular issues at night and from HGVs)
- Traffic speeds up / slows down between features
- Pollution
- Vibration issues
- Inconvenience for local residents who are most affected.
- Slows larger vehicles down too much, making congestion worse.
- Affects emergency services vehicles and response times
- Discomfort for drivers/passengers, particularly elderly, disabled and ambulance patients.

- Slopes of the tables can be slippery in inclement weather, particularly where there is already a slope of the road such as Somerfield Lane.
- Damage to vehicles inc suspension and tyres
- Hazard to cyclists and motorcyclists
- Speed tables will not slow traffic enough to improve pedestrian safety
- Reduces on street parking availability.
- Affects access to/from specific private driveways making access difficult or causing grounding.
- Speed tables will ruin the character of the estate.
- House prices affected by the above.
- Traffic calming is ignored by many road users and will not solve the traffic issues – the road will still be used as a rat run or by speeding traffic.

### **Officer Response**

*It is driver choice as to how traffic calming features are negotiated; but it is very likely that any manoeuvre will be undertaken at a low speed. Department for Transport (DfT) research has concluded that traffic calming does not cause damage to vehicles when negotiated at appropriate speeds. The traffic calming is designed to national standards, and should therefore be able to be traversed by all vehicles which conform to manufacturer's specifications and there should be no discomfort/ injury for drivers or passengers when cushions are negotiated at an appropriate speed. By encouraging motorists to travel at an appropriate, consistent speed, any increased vehicle emission rates are unlikely to result in poor local air quality, there should therefore be no negative impact of increased pollution; similarly with noise, although any increase in noise would be minor and only limited to the occasional vehicle.*

### **16. Issue/Objection Raised**

There is too much housebuilding going on in the area which is leading to traffic issues (speed/congestion) particularly affecting local residents and using unsuitable local roads such as the Maytree Drive/Barry Drive estate.

Traffic would not use these estates if the New Lubbesthorpe roads were better designed (too many speed tables) and if other infrastructure such as links over the M69 had been provided.

### **Officer Response**

*Government have placed house building allocation targets on all local planning authorities such as Blaby District Council. These are allocated to specific geographical areas via their Local Plan and subject to public consultation. The New Lubbesthorpe development was also the subject of extensive consultations. The proposed traffic calming scheme was an obligation placed on the developers via this process to address such issues. The new link road (Tay Road) has*



*speed tables to prevent its misuse whilst there is little or no development traffic using it. It is likely that in future years the continuing need for these will be reassessed. The planned link road across the M69 is still a requirement but is not triggered until at least the 2,000<sup>th</sup> house occupation which is likely to be up to 10 years away.*

**17. Issue/Objection Raised**

There is no speeding/traffic problem to address on these roads therefore the scheme is unnecessary. The traffic should be kept as free flowing.

**Officer Response**

*The scheme has been proposed as a result of a planning obligation placed on the New Lubbethorpe developers by Blaby District Council as part of their planning consent. The aim of the scheme is to help protect the communities of Leicester Forest East and Kirby Muxloe from traffic from the development, making these residential roads less attractive to through traffic. Additionally, the proposals will benefit the local communities by reducing vehicle speeds and benefitting non- motorised user such as pedestrians and cyclists.*

**18. Issue/Objection Raised**

The proposal will result in more traffic using Kirby Lane therefore is not supported.

**Officer Response**

*It is accepted that traffic discouraged from using the Maytree Drive estate is likely to use the A47/Kirby Lane as an alternative.*

**19. Issue/Objection Raised**

Traffic calming will not deter through traffic from using Beggars Lane.

**Officer Response**

*The purpose of the traffic calming features on Beggars Lane is more aimed at reducing excessive vehicle speeds, and highlighting the transition from a 40 mph limit to a 30 mph residential area.*

**20. Issue/Objection Raised**

Why is traffic calming being proposed when the Government has urged local

councils to remove traffic calming? Councils all over the Country are removing speed humps due to the pollution they cause.

**Officer Response**

*The features have been located at regular intervals throughout each estate to reduce the opportunity for vehicles to speed up/slow down between them. Experience at other sites has shown that this is effective at influencing the behaviour of the majority of drivers and consequently there is little or no increase in pollution. Arguably, if the traffic calming deters through traffic there is likely to be an overall decrease in pollution, benefiting residents.*

*Whilst there has been media debate regarding the merits of traffic calming it is still a valid speed reduction tool.*

*The recent government announcement specifically referred to the removal of features on main 'A' roads and therefore not applicable to the proposals.*

**21. Issue/Objection Raised**

Concerned about the height of the traffic calming features and the angle of the ramps.

**Officer Response**

*The height of the majority of features will be 70mm with a gradient of 1 in 13. This is lower than traditionally used at other sites and in accordance with limits set out in Government traffic calming regulations which were set after extensive vehicle testing. Any vehicle compliant with UK specifications should have no difficulty negotiating the features if driven appropriately.*

**ISSUES WITH THE TRAFFIC CALMING**

**22. Issue/Objection Raised**

A full width speed table should be provided on Beggars Lane (between Mallard Way and Forest House Lane) instead of the speed cushions proposed. These are ineffective and do not slow larger vehicles with wider wheelbases. Motorcyclists will bypass cushions. A kerb to kerb table will be more use for pedestrians, particularly disabled and mobility scooter users.

**Officer Response**

*A set of speed cushions has been proposed in this location as it is not possible*

*to install a full speed table without the removal of the existing pedestrian refuge. It was considered that this is a valuable resource for vulnerable road users and should be retained. The refuge will create a narrowing of the carriageway at this location which together with the speed cushions is expected to be effective at reducing vehicle speeds. Additionally there are speed/junction tables either side of this, meaning that speeds should remain low.*

**23. Issue/Objection Raised**

There are existing speeding problems and a further speed/junction table is required:

- At the junction of Bosworth Way/Beggars Lane
- At the junction of Warren Lane / Forest House Lane
- All along Forest House Lane
- On Somerfield Way (near Hunters Way/Heathley Close, Accacia Close junctions)

**Officer Response**

*The proposals have been developed in accordance with the requirements of the planning condition and with regard to the built environment, taking into account road use, driveways, bus stops and local amenities. They have been proposed at regular spacings to help ensure consistent speeds, whilst balancing this with the costs of this external scheme that are being borne by the developer.*

*Somerfield Way and Forest House Lane are outside of the scope of the current scheme as per the planning condition.*

**24. Issue/Objection Raised**

Vehicle activated (SLOW DOWN) signs are requested at appropriate points throughout the scheme areas or could be used instead of tables.

**Officer Response**

*Whilst Vehicle Activated Signs (VAS) have been used extensively across the County and have been proven to have a speed/accident reduction effect, this is only one of the aims of this scheme. The primary aim is to reduce the impact of traffic from New Lubbethorpe on these local communities by deterring “rat runs” through them. VAS would not assist in this and would therefore not address the developer’s planning obligation.*

**25. Issue/Objection Raised**

The location of the proposed speed/junction table is already very busy with

bus/school/commuter traffic, together with those accessing local amenities. There are also issues with buried services (e.g. speed table near 37 Warren Lane and at the junction of Forest House Lane), meaning it is likely to be dug up regularly.

**Officer Response**

*Internal consultations have been carried out with our school and public transport teams and no concerns have been raised. However, if this became an issue the location of the pickup/drop off points for home to school transport could be reviewed and amended as required.*

*It is inevitable that there will be buried utilities below the majority of the traffic calming features. Utility owners have a duty to reinstate these appropriately after any necessary works.*

**26. Issue/Objection Raised**

Requests for consideration for cyclists by providing speed tables that do not cover the entire road width, allowing cycles to bypass them.

**Officer Response**

*The majority of the speed tables are tapered edge tables, leaving a channel at the edge which allows drainage and for them to be bypassed by cyclists if required.*

*A small number of junction tables are proposed, and given the shallow ramps it is not expected that cyclists will have any difficulty negotiating them. No comments have been received from representative cycle groups that are consulted as part of this proposal and our experience elsewhere has been that these are not problematic for cyclists.*

**27. Issue/Objection Raised**

The scheme should be extended to cover other areas (such as Forest House Lane, Somerfield Way and Kirby Lane) which have existing problems with traffic volume/speed.

**Officer Response**

*The proposals have been developed in accordance with the requirements of the planning condition placed on the New Lubbethorpe developers. Unfortunately the areas suggested above are outside of the scope of this and there is no public money available to do so.*

**28. Issue/Objection Raised**

Speed cushions should be used at some/all locations instead of tables. They allow motorcycles and cycles to bypass them, cars can use them more easily, and larger vehicles such as emergency vehicles can pass over them safely and comfortably for patients. They would also be cheaper to provide and maintain.

**Officer Response**

*The proposals have been developed in accordance with the requirements of the planning condition placed on the New Lubbesthorpe developers which specified the use of speed tables.*

**29. Issue/Objection Raised**

The proposals are overkill, there are too many features. In particular the number on Barry Drive and Maytree Drive. The number of features could be reduced, focussing on key junctions/locations only.

The need for traffic calming is accepted but the number of features should be reduce by 50%.

**Officer Response**

*The proposals have been developed in accordance with the requirements of the planning condition placed on the New Lubbesthorpe developers which specified the scheme to be provided. The speed tables have been proposed at regular intervals to reduce the opportunity for drivers to speed up and subsequently slow down between features, which can contribute to increased noise and concerns around pollution.*

**30. Issue/Objection Raised**

Traffic calming in the estate roads is supported, but not on Beggars Lane. This should be upgraded as it is key for access to local business. It will also be used more due to New Lubbesthorpe, together with additional schools being built in the area.

Proposed speed tables on Beggars Lane are unnecessary.

**Officer Response**

*The features on Beggars Lane are key to ensuring that the transition between the higher 40 mph speed limit and the start of the urban 30 mph speed limit with greater movements of pedestrians, cyclists and turning traffic is emphasised and speeds are controlled.*

**31. Issue/Objection Raised**

The scheme should be restricted to junction tables only. They are better for vehicles to traverse and serve to highlight the junction.

**Officer Response**

*Junction tables are more costly to provide due to the inevitable need to carry out drainage modifications and the significantly larger size of the tables. With the extents of this scheme it would be prohibitively expensive to do so, even were it practical give the locations of private driveways, accesses etc. We have therefore restricted the use of junction tables to locations of higher pedestrian activity, or where it was impractical to provide a speed table between closely located junctions.*

**32. Issue/Objection Raised**

Forest Rise should be made “no entry” from the A47 Hinckley Road and/or traffic calmed, otherwise traffic will use this as a cut through to avoid the traffic calming.

**Officer Response**

*Given the nature of Forest Rise it is expected that the majority of traffic would elect to use the A47 and other local roads to access their destination within the Maytree Drive estate.*

*Forest Rise is not publicly maintained and therefore it would be very difficult for the County Council to implement measures here. For example, any traffic regulation order (such as legally required for a “no entry”) would require the consent of all residents.*

*It would not be legally possible for us to implement traffic calming on this road. The only scenario under which this could be undertaken is if the residents funded the necessary works to bring the road up to an adoptable standard first i.e. drainage, footways, surface and street lighting.*

**33. Issue/Objection Raised**

Traffic calming alone will not solve the problem of rat running, speeding vehicles and high traffic levels.

Other measures such as speed cameras are needed. Improvements are also needed to the Kirby Lane junction – this is a bottleneck at peak times, prompting people to use the Maytree Drive estate as a cut through to avoid it. Traffic will also use Forest Rise which is an unadopted and unsuitable road. In this case a

10mph speed limit should be imposed to it, and “access only” signs provided.

**Officer Response**

*Experience at other sites within the County has shown that area wide traffic calming such as this can be an effective deterrent to through traffic and at controlling vehicle speeds.*

*Speed cameras (including average speed cameras, mobile cameras and fixed cameras) are only used at sites with poor compliance with the posted speed limit and where there is evidence of an injury accident problem which is not the case here.*

*There are no plans/funding available at present for physical improvements to the layout of the Kirby Lane approach to this junction, which is in any case restricted by available highway space. However, signal timing/capacity improvements are likely to be made here as part of highway improvements associated with the New Lubbesthorpe development, and also as part of the proposed Tesco food store development.*

**34. Issue/Objection Raised**

If the traffic calming is successful it will divert traffic onto other unsuitable local roads, particularly the A47 and Kirby Lane which are already congested.

Traffic calming on these estates will increase congestion and delays on the A47 Hinckley Road, and problems at the Kirby Lane junction. This will need to be improved with upgraded/new signal junctions, speed cameras and yellow boxes.

**Officer Response**

*See response above regarding Kirby Lane and speed cameras. Yellow boxes have been addressed via comment #4.*

*There is no funding available as part of this proposal for other improvements to junctions, however as mentioned above, developer funded capacity improvements are due to be made to the Kirby Lane and Beggars Lane junctions.*

**35. Issue/Objection Raised**

The number of speed tables is excessive / specific speed tables are unnecessary or should be relocated to cover other areas e.g. Barry Close junction as one example.

**Officer Response**

*The traffic calming has been proposed at regular intervals to help ensure consistent speeds throughout the estates and in accordance with the developer's planning obligation.*

*A junction table was originally proposed for the Barry Close junction but at the request of Kirby Muxloe Parish Council this was amended to the current proposal which allows for a speed table either side of the junction. It was felt that this gave a more consistent spacing and the greatest opportunity to influence vehicle speeds approaching this junction and is a minor alteration to the planning condition.*

**36. Issue/Objection Raised**

We are in the process of having a vehicular access constructed for our property. Please reconsider the proposed speed table outside of our property and relocate it.

**Officer Response**

*If the proposal is supported, officers will contact the resident to discuss this matter and how best to accommodate their new access. If the speed table is likely to result in any issues it may be possible to remove the table or relocate/reduce its size.*

**37. Issue/Objection Raised**

The proposed speed table at the junction of Warren Lane and Somerfield Way is not required – it is already slow and congested here and visibility is restricted.

**Officer Response**

*The proposed junction table has been proposed at this location to achieve a regular spacing and consistent vehicle speeds. A junction table is particularly beneficial at busy locations as it slows approach speeds, assisting with turning movements and general road safety, particularly of pedestrians and cyclists.*

**38. Issue/Objection Raised**

The proposed speed table on Warren Lane between the junctions of Magnolia Close and Pleasant Close will be an issue due to on street parking related to the doctor's surgery.

**Officer Response**

*Traffic calming features in busy locations such as this can be beneficial as they*



*slow vehicle speeds, making it easier for pedestrians to cross the road and for vehicles to pull into/out of parking spaces, accesses and side roads. If the scheme were introduced and parking became an issue, the need for waiting restrictions could be reviewed.*

**39. Issue/Objection Raised**

Traffic calming on Barbara Avenue is unnecessary – it is not used as a cut through and the layout/on street parking make it unattractive for this anyway.

**Officer Response**

*It is likely that if other roads within the Maytree Drive estate were traffic calmed that Barbara Avenue would become more attractive as a route to bypass several traffic calming features and save journey times. For this reason, a consistent approach has been proposed throughout the estate.*

**WEIGHT RESTRICTION ISSUES**

**40. Issue/Objection Raised**

The proposal will not resolve the current issues of HGVs using these estate roads as a cut through in violation of the weight restriction.

A weight restriction should be provided for the Maytree Drive/Barry Drive estate as it suffers from significant levels of HGV traffic cutting through. There are also significant numbers of school buses using the estate

**Officer Response**

*The Maytree Drive/Barry Drive is already subject to a 7.5 tonne environmental weight restriction. This makes it an offence for HGVs above this weight (when either laden or unladen) to travel through this zone unless carrying out loading/unloading or other exempt activities.*

*Enforcement of the weight restriction is a matter that is dealt with by the Police. If you are aware of any specific companies or times of day that are particularly problematic this information would be extremely useful. Please contact the Police directly on [rpu.tm@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk](mailto:rpu.tm@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk).*

*Bus and Coaches that are not in service can operate along any roads considered suitable by the bus driver. This would only be restricted if there was an axle weight restriction on a highways structure. There can be no general access restriction applied as access is required for delivery vehicles and dustbin lorries of similar sizes. Should the traffic calming be introduced this may clearly influence the routes being taken by drivers. It should also be noted that*

*environmental weight restrictions do not apply to buses and coaches.*

**41. Issue/Objection Raised**

There are existing parking problems (inc HGV and commercial vehicles) at the following locations that need to be addressed:

- At the junction of Bosworth Way/Beggars Lane

**Officer Response**

*There have been no records of any reported issues at this location however the matter will then be considered separately against the criteria to promote such a scheme. If a scheme is considered necessary, it will be subject to public consultations with affected local residents, together with notices on site and in the local press.*

**CONSULTATION ISSUES**

**42. Issue/Objection Raised**

Request that the comment forms from residents are made available to view publicly.

**Officer Response**

*It is not possible under data protection legislation to release the comment forms as they contain personal information which may directly (via the contact details) or indirectly (via the comments made) identify individuals. Respondents are entitled to the anonymity of their responses.*

*All of the comments received have been analysed in detail and are collated and summarised within this appendix.*

**43. Issue/Objection Raised**

Highways have a legal obligation to consult with the Police and other emergency services. A copy of their reports is requested.

**Officer Response**

*Consultation included the Police, Fire and Ambulance services. None of these organisations has raised any objection to the proposals. There are no reports available from these organisations on this matter however if you wish to discuss their position on the scheme you may of course contact them directly for comments.*

**44. Issue/Objection Raised**

Insufficient effort has been made to adequately consult residents. We are left with a choice of what type of speed tables we want. There are better alternatives such as the option provided by the Parish Council.

**Officer Response**

*Extensive consultations have been carried out and details of this can be seen in the main report. This included the Police, Fire and Ambulance services, together with various statutory consultees, representative groups, adverts on site and in the local press, and letters to some 1,700 properties, followed by 2 public exhibitions and a subsequent meeting. This far exceeded our statutory duty and reinforces our commitment to meaningful engagement on this proposal.*

*For issues around the Parish Council's suggested alternative, please see comment #1.*

**ISSUE OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF THIS SCHEME****45. Issue/Objection Raised**

Additional white centre lining is needed on Beggars Lane. A car travelling on the wrong side of the road caused damage to our vehicle. Traffic on here will only increase.

**Officer Response**

*This issue will be passed on to our Traffic & Signals team for consideration.*

**46. Issue/Objection Raised**

Traffic management associated with the construction of the proposed development off Barry Close will lead to traffic using Cherry Tree Drive to avoid the lights, leading to congestion.

**Officer Response**

*If the proposed development is approved it is expected that any traffic management for the development will be planned carefully and take into account local traffic flows together with the needs of local residents and businesses. It is inevitable that there may be some disruption whilst works are ongoing.*

**47. Issue/Objection Raised**

A public footpath should be provided instead from New Lubbesthorpe along

Beggars Lane to the existing one near Forest House Lane.

**Officer Response**

*There is an existing public right of way linking the New Lubbesthorpe development directly to Forest House Lane. This provides a link through to local shops and amenities. There are no proposals for further footpaths on Beggars Lane.*

**48. Issue/Objection Raised**

Double yellow lines are requested outside the Doctors surgery on Warren Lane to the junction of Pleasant Close, only allowing vehicles to park on the Western side.

Parking near the surgery (on a bend) is dangerous and should be removed.

**Officer Response**

*This issue will be passed on to our Traffic & Signals team for consideration.*

**49. Issue/Objection Raised**

The plans for New Lubbesthorpe showed that access onto Beggars Lane would be via the new roundabout. However there is an access near the bend which is being used and is dangerous.

**Officer Response**

*A section of the Lubbesthorpe Bridle Road was temporarily available for limited vehicular access whilst works were being undertaken. These have since been completed, and the bridle road has been closed to vehicular traffic via bollards, the only exception being access to 2 existing properties just off Beggars Lane which is unaffected.*

*Just beyond the bridle road there was a temporary access to the development site for construction traffic, known as a haul road. This has since been closed as the construction progressed to new areas and the land for the haul road is now being built upon.*

*There are no further plans for temporary accesses at this time in this vicinity, it is intended that this will be via the new roundabout and main road (Tay Road) in future. However, it should be noted that the New Lubbesthorpe developers will submit a planning application for a new farmer's access, but this is much further along Beggars Lane and away from the bend described.*

**50. Issue/Objection Raised**

There is no overall assessment of the problems of traffic associated with this development and its impact on the locality.

**Officer Response**

*The New Lubbethorpe development was the subject of extensive traffic modelling and impact assessment during the planning process. The details of this are available via the Blaby District Council planning website. This is one of the mechanisms through which this planning obligation to deliver traffic calming for the communities of Leicester Forest East and Kirby Muxloe was secured.*

**51. Issue/Objection Raised**

The scheme does not address safety issues at Barry Close junction with Barry Drive associated with a proposed housing development.

The Maytree Drive / Barry Drive estate is unsuitable for further development. There are already blind corners/dangerous bends and the infrastructure cannot cope. Design standards such as 6C Design Guide require the road to be widened due to their severity.

The junction of Barry Close suffers from poor visibility.

**Officer Response**

*The junction of Barry Close with Barry Drive has been assessed and meets current highway standards for visibility based on the recorded speeds. The traffic calming proposals provide for speed tables either side of this junction, which will further improve the situation.*

*Leicestershire County Council no longer use the 6C design guide and local guidance known as the Leicestershire Design Guide is now being used. Design guidance such as this is only applicable for newly constructed roads and does not apply retrospectively to the existing highway network.*

**52. Issue/Objection Raised**

The junction of Barry Drive/Forest Rise/Kirby Lane/Station Road is unsafe, narrow and vehicles travel on the wrong side of the road. Cars/vans parked on the junction also make this worse.

**Officer Response**

*There are no recorded personal injury accidents at this location therefore it would*

*not be a priority for improvements ahead of other sites given our limited resources.*

**53. Issue/Objection Raised**

Improvements are needed to the Kirby Lane and Braunstone Lane junctions with the A47 to improve general traffic flow in the area and reduce pollution.

**Officer Response**

*There are proposals to improve the Kirby Lane junction as part of the New Lubbethorpe developers highway improvements. Further details of this are available via Blaby District Council. As of yet, no plans for these improvements have been submitted to the Council but is expected that improvements here will seek to maximise the junction capacity and reduce delays. It is also likely that there will be further modifications to this junction should the proposed Tesco store (at the former garage) be approved.*

*The Council do not have any proposals to implement improvements at the Braunstone Lane junction.*

***A further response on this matter is awaited from Blaby District Council's Planning Officers***

**54. Issue/Objection Raised**

The new road at New Lubbethorpe over the M69 has too many speed tables and they are very sharp. We do not want similar here. This road has become unusable as a commuter route. Speed cushions or chicanes should have been provided here instead.

**Officer Response**

*Whilst available for all road users, the new road has not been provided as a commuter route but is intended to serve (and funded by) the New Lubbethorpe development. The speed tables have been provided to control speeds on this route and improve road safety for all road users. The tables are compliant with current legislation.*

**55. Issue/Objection Raised**

Left turn filter lanes are needed at the junctions of Beggars Lane and Warren Lane with the A47 Hinckley Road.

**Officer Response**

*There is already a separately signalled left turn lane at the junction of Warren Lane with the A47 allowing traffic to turn into Warren Lane from the A47.*

*There are junction improvements proposed at the junction of Beggars Lane, funded by the New Lubbesthorpe development. These include additional lanes, footway improvements, a pedestrian crossing across Beggars Lane and general capacity improvements.*

**56. Issue/Objection Raised**

Traffic signals on the A47 Hinckley Road at the junctions of Warren Lane and Beggars Lane need to be improved. They seem to operate on a timer and not in relation to the flow of traffic out of these roads i.e. stopping traffic on the A47 when nothing is coming out of the side roads.

**Officer Response**

*There are already proposals to improve capacity at the Beggars Lane junction (see above).*

*At peak times the signals on the A47 are designed to operate on short cycles, allowing traffic from the side roads to enter the A47. This also helps to break up the stream of traffic, allowing the side road traffic to join the A47 without blocking the junctions.*

*There can also be delay introduced when pedestrians press the button to cross the road, at which times vehicular traffic is stopped by red lights. On occasion, pedestrians may press the button and subsequently cross during a gap, making it appear that traffic has been stopped without a reason.*

**57. Issue/Objection Raised**

Traffic on the A47 turning right into Sainsbury's on the A47 Hinckley Road (just after Kirby Lane) cause delays, meaning that Leicester bound traffic can't get through the Kirby Lane junction during the green light.

**Officer Response**

There are many competing demands for limited highway space in this vicinity. This includes access to/from the shops which are valuable community amenities, together with pedestrians crossing at the signalised crossing point, and also through traffic on the A47. It is inevitable in situations such as this that there may occasionally be delays to traffic at busy times. However, overall it is considered that there is an appropriate balance, reflecting the needs of all road users and the wider community.

**58. Issue/Objection Raised**

Car transporters for the garage at the Braunstone Lane crossroads are causing significant delays at peak times.

**Officer Response**

*It is appreciated that such delays can be frustrating however it is also essential that local businesses are served by deliveries. Inevitably this means commercial vehicles and HGVs loading/unloading and in some cases this cannot be carried out off the highway. Any disruption is usually short duration and not a regular occurrence.*

**59. Issue/Objection Raised**

Improvements are need to the Kirby Lane junction. This will help with traffic flow, consequently making cutting through the Maytree Drive estate less attractive. Right turning traffic on Kirby Lane blocks other traffic, and this congestion leads people to turn off before the junction and rat run through Maytree Drive.

**Officer Response**

*See issue 53 above regarding the Kirby Lane junction.*

*As regards right turning traffic on Kirby Lane, unfortunately there is no scope to make meaningful improvements here due to the restricted highway space and the presence of a footway.*

**60. Issue/Objection Raised**

A tram system is needed for Leicester running from the Desford crossroads on the A47 to the city centre and beyond to Uppingham. It should also link Fosse Parke, Oadby and Birstall with the City centre and railway station. This would solve many of the problems of commuter traffic.

**Officer Response**

*This is outside the scope of the current scheme and there are currently no proposals for transport infrastructure of this nature.*

**61. Issue/Objection Raised**

The left turn lane into Warren Lane from the A47 has “give way” lines at the end of it, meaning that you have to stop for any right turning traffic. This is contrary to



the normal rules of the road, and dangerous when the lines fade. Please remove this and revert it to a normal operation where left turners have right of way.

**Officer Response**

*A left turn layout of this nature is not unusual, and irrespective of the presence of give way lines, all road users are required to be mindful of other vehicles and road users at junctions.*

This page is intentionally left blank