

Objections and Comments
<b>Tadcaster Road Copmanthorpe</b>
<b>OBJECTIONS</b>
<p>Ashley Helme Associates on behalf of Gladman Development Ltd - letter of objection.</p> <p>This states 'The implementation of a permanent speed limit change beyond the 'experimental' period would be premature. It does not take account of the likely change in use of the adjacent land and the likelihood of introducing a residential access at this location.'</p>
<p><i>Officer comment: The outline planning application is still to be determined and there is therefore no guarantee that the development will take place; and if approved the development will be at some time in the future. The proposed access can be safely accommodated within a 40mph limit. The nature of the road will be largely unchanged by the proposal with no properties directly fronting Tadcaster Road and the footway on the one side remaining the same. The speed limit can be reviewed in the future if there are other changes not currently envisaged.</i></p>
<p>One resident of Copmanthorpe submitted an objection: 'I wish to strongly object to the relocation of the 30mph speed limit and would like to see the signs put back in their original position.' The reasons are summarised as follows:</p> <p>The 'signs are in a poor position'.</p> <p>The original location at the 'bricked ramp' 'acted as a reminder to drivers to reduce their speed as they approach the village'.</p> <p>The footpath changes side 'a higher speed when crossing at this point with the bend in the road by the pond does not help sighting before crossing'.</p> <p>'It is my opinion that continuing the 40mph into the village does not improve public/road safety, but could have the opposite effect'.</p>
<p><i>Officer comment:</i></p> <p><i>The original position of the speed limit change was not effective in reducing speeds locally at the crossing point or in the built up area – both have seen a reduction in speed of traffic.</i></p>
<b>COMMENTS</b>
<b>Residents of Tadcaster Road within new speed limit area</b>
<p>One resident in this area has commented: There is a small residential development being built to the rear of the property, the new access is within the new 30 limit and the access to the original property is</p>

currently within the 40 limit. The householder/developer stated on 6 February 'if, you move the area of the speed limit to no11 that will simply encourage speeding up to no11 and by nature beyond and therefore cause more potential danger at the bus stop crossing point'. 'Further there is development underway at no11 where five residences will be built over the next 18 months and construction traffic will be using the existing and the new access road continually over the development period.'

He further commented on 27 February that 'the cycle path stops at the village entrance and now you are encouraging vehicles to speed up in the built up area where cycles and children are ever present. It is bad enough already with people actually overtaking when we turn in to drives and the proposals are inviting accidents and worse'.

On 26 April he stated 'traffic now travels from the bypass at 45/50 mph on average and assumes these speeds past the houses on Tadcaster Road. Traffic accelerates from the block of flats down the hill and hits the 40mph signal at 50mph. Children live on this road and surprisingly residents also have to leave their drives onto Tadcaster Road, as do residents further in to the village'.

*Officer comment: There have been no other comments or questions from residents on this section of Tadcaster Road and the speeds suggested have not been observed. The speed of traffic at the cycle/pedestrian crossing point has reduced despite the increased speed limit here.*

#### **Other comments from residents of Copmanthorpe**

Two residents questioned the reasoning for the experimental change and received explanations.

A resident commented that 'I think this would be a poor decision'. 'I cycle in to York to work every day. There are quite a few young children that I see cycling this route on their way to school in Copmanthorpe, and others that cycle to York College from this village. This is going to make the route much less safe.' '....please assure me that you will at the same time change the cycle path signage so that the footpath becomes a shared cycle path all the way to the location of the new 40mph/30mph change.'

*Officer comment: This cycle route is popular and it may be worth giving consideration to changing the status of the footway. This has been raised with the officer with responsibility for cycling provision. The crossing point however has seen a reduction in traffic speed.*

A resident commented that the modifications seemed sensible but questioned the visibility of the signs.

<p><i>Officer comment: Some work to the surrounding vegetation is required if the order is made permanent.</i></p>
<p>A resident wrote to ‘raise safety concerns’, ‘the original location for the 40mph/30mph sign was more logical’. He also questioned the visibility of the signs.</p>
<p><i>Officer comment: Some work to the surrounding vegetation is required if the order is made permanent.</i></p>
<p>A couple wrote to question the experiment, ‘the road is specifically designed to mark the entrance to Copmanthorpe’ ‘it is a clearly defined indication of the change in traffic circumstances and therefore an appropriate place for a speed limit change. Potentially, your experiment creates greater danger for crossing pedestrians and cyclists. And, for cyclists, greater hazards beyond the designated cycle track on a relatively narrow road without a separate track into the village.’ ‘We hope that the experimental change will be discontinued’.</p>
<p><i>Officer comment: Speed of traffic has reduced at the crossing point and also in the built up area towards the village, however speed has increased in between these sections which may be less comfortable for cyclists who are overtaken here.</i></p>
<p>A resident wrote to ‘voice my concerns at the changed position of the 30 limit signs’. ‘I cycle to work daily on this stretch of road and whilst previously I was passed by cars exceeding the 30 limit occasionally, the general speed of cars passing me is even greater, with more people exceeding the 40 limit, and it feels clearly more dangerous’. ‘I hope that the 30 limit signs can be moved back to their original location as soon as possible and the 30 limit enforced’.</p>
<p><i>Officer comment: Speed of traffic has reduced at the crossing point and also in the built up area towards the village, however speed has increased in between these sections which may be less comfortable for cyclists who are overtaken here. Enforcement is unlikely if the original location is resumed due to the identified need for engineering measures to improve compliance.</i></p>
<p>Cllr Kramm submitted comments ‘I would strongly advise to reverse these changes and reduce the speed limit before the crossing point. This particular bit of Tadcaster Road is very uncomfortable to cycle in both directions.’ ‘Additionally, due to noise from the A64 it is impossible for cyclists to hear cars approaching from the back and the fast overtaking even scarier’.</p>
<p><i>Officer comment: Speed of traffic has reduced at the crossing point and</i></p>

*also in the built up area towards the village, however speed has increased in between these sections which may be less comfortable for cyclists who are overtaken here.*

No objections or comments were received for the other locations at Dunnington and Hopgrove.