

1: Glen Turnbull, 8 Mackenzie Place, Cockfield

Objection

From: Glen Turnbull [<mailto:turnbullglen@hotmail.com>]
Sent: 24 November 2016 20:01
To: Suffolk Highways Enquiries
Subject: Re: 137106 Cockfield TRO

Dear Melanie,

I didn't find this change advertised on the Suffolk Highways site, however please take this email as a formal objection.

Many thanks for your assistance.

Kind regards,

Glen Turnbull

Consultation response

From: Glen Turnbull [<mailto:turnbullglen@hotmail.com>]
Sent: 08 October 2016 21:27
To: Suffolk Highways Enquiries
Subject: Feedback regarding consultation on extended 40 mph limit near Mackenzie Place, Cockfield

Dear Melanie,

Thank you for your letter dated 7th October regarding the statutory consultation for a proposed extension of the existing 40mph speed limit on the A1141 Lavenham Road, Cockfield.

From our experience with this road, considering the level of risk already, we believe extending the existing 40 mph limit by any distance (let alone 220m) is not going to reduce the risk; given that it's also dependent on a housing development, which we presume would have an entrance near where the current 40mph limit starts, we believe it would only increase that risk due to the increase in traffic volume, making a fatality even more likely.

As you mentioned, visibility from the northwest is hindered by a curve in the road and even with the small mirror that is in place, this already presents a high level of risk, both to road users travelling on the road and residents joining it from Mackenzie Place and the neighbouring Crowbrook Place. In addition to that, there is also pedestrians to consider, as there is a narrow path particularly when walking southeast; we know that at least one man was killed through a road traffic accident while walking on that path. Families with young children are particularly at risk. Many motorists also don't heed the existing speed limit and there is nothing to deter them.

Taking into consideration also the size of Cockfield compared to it's population, i.e. the number of possible alternative locations for housing development, we believe this proposal is frankly very ill

advised, let alone unnecessary. For example, there is Perrydown Lane behind us which is currently hardly used and leads right into the centre of the village; it could therefore make a much better access/egress point, if it was even necessary to have the housing development in this vicinity at all.

If there are any further consultations, e.g. meetings, etc. we would very much appreciate the opportunity to be involved.

Best regards,

Glen and Caroline Turnbull (8 Mackenzie Place)

2: Mr Goold, 11 Crowbrook Close, Cockfield

Objection

25 November 2016. At 2.30pm this afternoon Justin Lewis had a phone call from Mr Goold of 11 Crowbrook Close (01284 828402) returning the phone message left yesterday. Mr Goold has strong views over the need for a 30 mph speed limit given the bus stops and tight accesses in the vicinity and does wish for his consultation response to be considered as an objection. Mr Goold has been unwell and unable to look at the site notice so I gave him the contact details as he will be emailing or writing a further letter concerning his objection.

Consultation response

From: Hall, Melanie

Sent: 17 October 2016 10:22

To: Lewis, Justin

Subject: Statutory Consultation - A1141 Lavenham Road, Cockfield - Ref:137106/STAT/

Dear Justin

I have had a call from Mr Goold – 01284 828402 regarding the consultation.

He has expressed that he would like to see the speed limit reduced further to 30mph. He states that there are 2 bus stops and several tight accesses to residences along this stretch of the carriageway and he has concerns regarding the safety of pedestrians and drivers slowing to turn into driveways with vehicles approaching from behind.

Best Regards

Melanie Hall

Kier – Suffolk Highways

4th November 2016 Message left on answerphone 3.30pm. Mr Goold phoned back at 11am following message left by Justin Lewis at 3.30pm on 2nd November 2016. Mr Goold feels strongly that there should be a 30mph speed limit particularly as someone was killed in an accident in the vicinity fairly recently and the narrowness of the cul-de-sacs (JL has seen

this today). He has received the update letter to residents and JL updated him that the TRO is being formally advertised on 7th Nov (although notices have been put up on site by JL today - 4 Nov). He is happy with the process so far.

3: Hamish McLoughlin (address not supplied)

Objection

From: McLoughlin, H (Hamish) [<mailto:Hamish.McLoughlin@rabobank.com>]
Sent: 28 November 2016 11:15
To: Heather Miller
Subject: A1141 Lavenham Road (40 mph Speed Limit) Order 201

Hi Heather,

Regarding the Suffolk County Council proposal to extend the existing 40 mph on Lavenham Road, Cockfield, my objection is that the proposed extension (and existing section) is 40 mph, when in fact the speed limit for both should be 30 mph. The Department for Transport guide to 'Setting Local Speed Limits' (January 2013) clearly stipulates under section 7: "It is government policy that a 30 mph speed limit should be the norm in villages". The rest of Cockfield village, on exactly the same stretch of A1141 road towards Bury St Edmunds is 30 mph, so why is the County Council proposing to extend a speed limit which is antithetical to Department for Transport guidelines ? This stretch of village road is presently so dangerous that the pub on Lavenham road has had to erect two red signs urging motorists to slow down because children play in the vicinity of the pub garden.

Let's not let it take a child fatality to belatedly change the speed limit to 30 mph, this is a perfect opportunity to extend the section, but also make the entire section conform with Department Of Transport guidelines and make the village road safer for all users...

Best Regards

Hamish

