

**Andy Coles**

---

**From:** Andy Coles  
**Sent:** 26 August 2014 09:20  
**To:** Thomas Hayward  
**Subject:** FW: Proposed Traffic Regulation Orders at Harts Lane Hallatrow (PEV10272/TH and PEV10273/TH)  
**Attachments:** image001.jpg

Here you go.

---

**From:** Matthew Smith  
**Sent:** 26 August 2014 08:19  
**To:** Andy Coles  
**Subject:** Fwd: Proposed Traffic Regulation Orders at Harts Lane Hallatrow (PEV10272/TH and PEV10273/TH)

Hi Andy

Is this a TRO which you are dealing with?

Matthew

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Myles Kidd <[myles.kidd@cambrooktp.co.uk](mailto:myles.kidd@cambrooktp.co.uk)>  
**Date:** 25 August 2014 14:23:15 BST  
**To:** <[transportation@bathnes.gov.uk](mailto:transportation@bathnes.gov.uk)>  
**Cc:** <[matthew\\_smith@bathnes.gov.uk](mailto:matthew_smith@bathnes.gov.uk)>  
**Subject:** Proposed Traffic Regulation Orders at Harts Lane Hallatrow (PEV10272/TH and PEV10273/TH)



Monday 25<sup>th</sup> August 2014

Dear Sir/Madam

I write to object to the proposed traffic regulation orders for Harts Lane as I do not believe they justify the public money invested. I am surprised that more deserving schemes have not been prioritised as these devalue other schemes and to my mind question the purpose of publicly financed highway schemes / "improvements".

I have not taken the not insignificant time needed to visit the Hollies to look at the Councils reasons for this scheme, and am disappointed that they can't be viewed on-line, or attached to the notice on Harts Lane – this discourages informed comment and adds to additional mileage for those who this scheme is advertised for.

I hope the justification for the schemes are scientifically based (speed surveys, traffic counts, collision information, likely diversions and impacts) and if so I would like to see that information.

For those, such as myself, who regularly drive, walk and cycle along Harts Lane, it is hard to imagine that the average or even 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed on Harts Lane is

more than 30mph without the imposed TRO – there is a small stretch where you could possibly (and safely) drive at 40mph, but the majority of the lane is narrow and windy, with blind corners. For the few drivers that travel irresponsibly, I very much doubt that 30mph signs will be seen as a deterrent.

I also suggest that Harts Lane does not have an HGV through traffic problem so do not see the point of the HGV ban: the lane is constrained by a 12ft 9inch high former railway bridge and has a highway narrowing by way of an offset hump back bridge crossing the Cam Brook immediately north of the railway bridge. I imagine that the industrial areas to the north of the bridge are aware of this and note that the more recent re-use of one of the sites (Oakus) has a working traffic management plan to send larger vehicles northwards towards Clutton.

Lastly I note that Marsh Lane, is also proposed to be 30mph – is this speed limit going to be imposed for all country lanes in the B&NES area and what is the cost and benefits of doing so? I suggest these changes are reconsidered as I want my contribution towards public funds to be spent more appropriately, and if more appropriate schemes cannot be found, want the money not to be spent – austerity measures do not seem to have affected capital programmes as I imagined they would?

Best Regards

Myles

**Myles Kidd** B.Eng. (Hons) MCIHT MCILT MTPS

Independent Transportation Planning Consultant

Nº4 Cambrook House, Eastcourt Road, Temple Cloud, Somerset BS39 5BU

Telephone: +44(0)1761 453940 / +44(0)790 534 2492

email: [myles.kidd@cambrooktp.co.uk](mailto:myles.kidd@cambrooktp.co.uk)

Disclaimer

This message (including any attachments) is confidential and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you should not disclose, copy or use any part of it. If you have received this email in error, please delete the email and any attachments and we would be grateful if you would notify [myles.kidd@cambrooktp.co.uk](mailto:myles.kidd@cambrooktp.co.uk). We have taken all reasonable care to avoid the transmission of electronic viruses and do not accept liability for damage caused by such. It is your responsibility as recipient to ensure that the opening or other use of this message and any attachments will not adversely affect your systems.