**A338 COLLINGBOURNES KINGSTON AND COLLINGBOURNES DUCIS**

**RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS**

Questions identified by Danny Kruger MP at the meeting at Collingbourne Kingston on 29th July 2022:

**Why were speed cameras removed in Wiltshire, and would it be possible to reintroduce them, and/or install average speed cameras along this section of the A338?**

The Swindon and Wiltshire Camera Safety Camera Partnership disbanded in August 2010. This was because of reductions in funding grants from the Department of Transport (DfT). As a result, fixed speed cameras were no longer used in Wiltshire, but the police could still enforce speed limits using mobile equipment.

Subsequent attempts to establish a replacement service have been unsuccessful. The funding for any scheme would probably have to be provided locally. It should be noted that the money collected from prosecutions mainly goes to government, so there is a likely to be a need for substantial local funding to be able to operate the service.

Consideration of speed cameras is likely to be a matter for the Wiltshire and Swindon Road Safety Partnership. However, the introduction of fixed speed cameras will depend on the availability of funding.

The use of average speed cameras could be an option, but the partnership would need to consider the funding implications and the priorities for enforcement. It is likely that an average speed camera system would be more expensive as multiple cameras would be required.

**Is it possible to charge HGVs a toll for using the A338?**

No. The government made a statement in 2013 (See link below, Page 11) that ‘it would not implement tolls on the ‘existing’ road network. The understanding is that any order would have to be approved by the Secretary of State (SoS). The power for the SoS to implement this is limited and focuses on the trunk road network. The legal, technical and implementational difficulties of a toll road (or tolls for specific vehicles) should not be underestimated.

<https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/SN00442/SN00442.pdf>

If there are any changes in the legislation that would allow tolls that could be considered at that time.

**Can the double white lines along the route be reinstated to prevent overtaking?**

No – Double White Line are removed where speed limits have been reduced to 40mph or below. Double White Line systems are based on the speed of vehicles and the forward visibility. Generally, with lower vehicle speeds there is adequate forward visibility to enable drivers to make appropriate decisions on whether an overtaking manoeuvre would be safe.

It should be noted that the presence of a solid line prevents roadside parking or loading, which in some cases could be an inconvenience to residents and businesses.

**Could a continuous speed limit of 30mph throughout the villages replace the mixture of 30mph and 40 mph speed limits currently in place?**

The section of road between the villages would not be suitable for a 30mph speed limit.

The Department for Transport Circular 01/13 Setting Local Speed Limits sets out guidance as a basis for assessments of local speed limits.

The criterion for a 30mph limit is detailed in the Department for Transport Traffic Advisory Leaflet 01/04; Village Speed Limits, and is based on the amount of frontage development, with a requirement for 20 or more houses over a minimum length of 600 metres.

This length may be reduced to 400 metres when the level of development density over this shorter length exceeds the 20 or more houses criterion and in exceptional circumstances a reduction to 300 metres is permissible. If there are just fewer than 20 houses, then the Highway Authority can make extra allowance for key buildings, such as a church, shop, or school.

The measurement of frontage development is based only on those houses that front onto the main road. It does not include groups of houses that access the main road from a side road. Frontage development density has to achieve an average of three houses per 100 metres throughout the length but particularly at the entrances to the limit. This ensures appropriate reinforcement of a village environment to the motorist.

The rural section between the villages on the A338 does not have a sufficient density of houses to justify a 30mph speed limit according to these standards.

Setting a speed limit too low can result in drivers being tempted to make unsafe overtaking manoeuvres.

A benefit of a change of speed limit on a route is that it can be used to reinforce the change of environment to drivers and make them more aware that they are entering a built-up area and need to take more care as there will be more pedestrians and other road users.

**What traffic calming measures can be installed?**

As it an A class road for through traffic as the primary function, there are limitations on the type of traffic calming that would be suitable. Speed humps and vertical deflection would not be appropriate and could lead to considerable disturbance for residents.

Chicanes and road narrowing with give-way markings would be feasible, but there can be issues with additional noise from vehicles braking or accelerating. Careful consideration would need to be given to the locations of such features to avoid creating additional hazards or adversely affecting residents and local accesses.

The narrowing or chicanes could be provided at intervals through the village, or just be located at or close to the entrances to the villages. Consideration would need to be given to the lighting and signing to ensure that they are visible to drivers at night or in poor visibility, and that they are located where drivers can see on coming traffic.

**Could the speed limits be moved to outside the villages?**

In some cases speed limit ends can be moved, and this is currently being arranged at the northern entrance to the village.

**Is it possible to install pavement barriers along the road, particularly at the choke points?**

Pedestrian safety barriers could be provided where there is sufficient width. However, in most locations within the villages the footways do not have adequate width to provide barriers as well as allow movement of wheelchairs, prams or children’s buggies.

If there are specific locations where pedestrian barriers would be feasible and beneficial these could be suggested to the Local Highways and Footway Improvement Group (LHFIG) via the Parish Council.

**Is there a voluntary Code of Conduct for HGV drivers?**

There is an Industry Code of Practice (ICOP) produced by Transport for London and the Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in the UK (CILT (UK)), which is the leading membership organisation for professionals involved in logistics and supply chains. It recognises that managing drivers effectively is the right thing to do. It notes that it is important to approach driver selection and management in an informed way to ensure employees and the public alike are not at risk.

Many of the larger transport companies contributed to the code, and many organisations also have their own codes or standards.

The Road Haulage Association and other trade organisations also issue guidance. However, these are voluntary, and the main controls on the drivers are through the relevant legislation.

The Council have implemented some voluntary agreements with hgv operators elsewhere (B4040 and B4069) with limited success. An attempt was made to apply a code of conduct to Barn Street / Herd Street, Marlborough in 2012, but it proved difficult to get sufficient operators to sign up at that time. It should be noted that it often involves considerable resources to establish specific agreements.

The Local Forum set up in connection with the Solstice Park distribution centre should provide a means of communication with some of the key hgv operators in the area.

**Is possible to threaten HGV firms who routinely break the speed limit with losing their licence?**

It appears that the driver has the responsibility regarding speed limits.

Those organisations operating hgv vehicles need an operators’ license. The Driver and Vehicle Standards Agency carries out regular [roadside vehicle checks](https://www.gov.uk/roadside-vehicle-checks-for-commercial-drivers/checks-on-your-vehicle) and checks on operating centres. They then submit information to the independent traffic commissioners.

A vehicle may be [prohibited](https://www.gov.uk/roadside-vehicle-checks-for-commercial-drivers/roadside-prohibitions) or [immobilised](https://www.gov.uk/roadside-vehicle-checks-for-commercial-drivers/what-happens-if-your-vehicle-is-immobilised) if a DVSA roadside check finds that:

* It is overloaded
* It is unroadworthy
* It breaks the [rules on the transport of dangerous goods](http://www.dft.gov.uk/vca/dangerousgoods/dangerous-goods-offi.asp)
* A driver has broken [drivers’ hours regulations](https://www.gov.uk/drivers-hours)

The operator’s licence could be taken away, suspended or restricted by the traffic commissioner if they:

* Break any of the terms or conditions of the licence
* Do not meet health and safety conditions
* Are convicted of certain offences
* Are made bankrupt or (if the licence holder is a company) that company goes into liquidation, administration or receivership
* Use a place not listed on the licence as an operating centre
* Are given a prohibition notice by DVSA following an inspection

The traffic commissioner may decide to call a [public inquiry](https://www.gov.uk/traffic-commissioner) to consider if any action against a licence if necessary.

**Can a weight limit can be implemented on Burbage Bridge to prevent larger vehicles from using this route?**

Not at present. The road alignment is poor at Burbage Wharf, but the bridges have adequate strength.

Sometimes it is possible to introduce environmental weight limits. However, as the A338 is designated as part of the Primary Route Network it is not possible to place such restrictions on this type of road. Under EU Directive 89/460/EC, the Primary Route Network must provide unrestricted access to 40 tonne vehicles. All bridges and other structures on the Primary Route Network currently meet this standard.

Making a case to change the status of the A338, and apply weight limits, may be difficult because of the lack of suitable alternative routes, especially given the limitations of the A345, and the longer diversions via other routes such as A350 or A34.

**Is the signage clear enough and in the right places?**

A review of signing and road markings could be undertaken if prioritised through the Local Highways and Footway Improvement Group (LHFIG) via the Parish Council.

**Is it possible to have certain routes removed from hgv sat nav databases?**

No. There is no current legislation on Satellite Navigation use in the UK. These devices are considered as a ‘driver aid’ and the professionalism of the driver should be the overriding factor in competency. It would not be possible to have specific routes removed from data bases.

**Other questions or matters raised at the meeting**

**Would a 20mph speed limit be possible on part of the route?**

It would probably not be appropriate to introduce a 20mph on this type of road without suitable traffic calming features.

In order to ensure general compliance, the current guidance from the DfT (01/13) suggests 20mph speed limits should only be considered for use on roads where mean speeds are already 24mph or less and where the layout and character of the road gives a clear indication to drivers that a lower speed is appropriate.

Whilst there is no requirement for physical traffic calming, lighter touch engineering measures may be specified in isolated areas where average speeds consistently remain above 24mph. However, the likelihood of significant speed alterations remains poor, in such circumstances. Almost all the research into 20 mph limits indicates they generally lead to relatively small reductions in ‘mean’ speed (1-2mph), and as such they are most appropriate for roads where the average traffic speeds are already low.

In order to implement a 20mph speed limit on the A338 it is likely that physical changes such as chicanes or road narrowing would be required.

**Could 30mph repeater signs be used?**

No. Current guidance is that 30mph repeater signs should not be used where there is a system of street lighting on a road. There is a risk of unsuitable signing invalidating the speed limit and preventing enforcement.

Consideration could be given as to whether there is a need for all the existing lighting if there are significant benefits in having 30mph repeater signs on this road.

**Could 30mph roundel road markings be used?**

The speed limit is displayed on signs at the beginning of a section of road. Carriageway roundels are road markings that can be used to reinforce the start of the speed limit.

Carriageway roundels can be used as repeater markings, but not in a street lit area.

**Are SIDs in the best locations?**

The locations of Speed Indicator Devices (SIDs) can be reviewed by the LHFIG to determine if there are better locations.

**What are the arrangements for the Forum in connection with Solstice Park hgvs?**

The planning agreements for the Solstice Park development make provision for a Local Forum to be set up.

Council officers recently met with representatives of T.J. Morris and the Solstice Park Development Manager to discuss the proposed Forum. The purpose of the forum is to take such measures as are reasonably necessary to ensure that people local to the Site through the Local Forum are given an opportunity for any concerns arising as a direct or indirect result of the movement of Lorries to and from the Site to be discussed with the Occupiers at the Local Forum.

The first meeting will be on 16th December 2022 and suggested representation is:

Chairman of Amesbury Area Board

Chairman of Tidworth Area Board

Chairman of Amesbury Town Council

Chairman of Collingbourne Ducis Parish Council

Chairman of Collingbourne Kingston Parish Council

Collingbourne Road Safety Working Group

Wiltshire Council Officers

The Police

Solstice Park Development Manager

Representatives of T.J. Morris Regional Distribution Centre.

**What measures could be taken where the road is narrow and hgvs have trouble passing, and go close to pedestrians?**

Where the road is narrow it may be possible to widen the footway by narrowing the road to form chicanes with traffic in one direction giving way to oncoming traffic. Care needs to be taken about private accesses and junctions, and to ensure there is adequate visibility of approaching traffic.

**Is the 7.5t weight limit from Collingbourne Ducis to Ludgershall enforceable?**

The weight limit was introduced to remove hgvs from the Butts in Ludgershall when a new link road between the A338 and A3026 at Tidworth was constructed. The weight limit is enforceable, but because it has an except for access exemption, any prosecution would probably have to demonstrate that any vehicle was not there for legitimate access reasons.

**Could traffic be delayed sufficiently to encourage hgvs to use another route?**

It is unlikely that traffic management measures on their own would encourage many to use alternative suitable routes.

It may be possible to increase journey times by 12 to 14 minutes with traffic calming and traffic signals at Collingbournes Ducis. However, journey times between Salisbury and Swindon on the A350 for example would still take 8 minutes longer and require vehicles to travel an additional 20 miles which may not be attractive to vehicle operators.

In the longer term, wider traffic management in the area and improvements on other routes could be supported by traffic calming measures on the existing route to re-route some traffic.

**Could hgvs be banned from the A338 through the Collingbournes?**

Sometimes it is possible to introduce environmental weight limits. However, as the A338 is designated as part of the Primary Route Network it is not possible to place such restrictions on this type of road. Under EU Directive 89/460/EC, the Primary Route Network must provide unrestricted access to 40 tonne vehicles.

Making a case to change the status of the A338, and apply weight limits, would require the identification of suitable alternative routes and potential measures to encourage their use. This may prove to be a challenge given the longer diversions required to use other routes such as the A350 or A34.

In order to determine whether it would be possible to restrict hgvs on the A338 it would be necessary to understand what routes they would use instead, and what the potential implications of additional traffic on those routes would be and how they could be managed.

Traffic counts undertaken in 2006 indicated that there was a high proportion of hgv movements on the route with a local origin or destination, and that the proportion of through trips on the A338 was comparatively low at 38%. This indicated that the potential for most hgvs to easily use alternative routes was probably low.

The destinations of traffic may have changed with the opening of distribution centres in the area and other changes to traffic flows over time following the pandemic and economic changes. Extensive traffic counts would be required to obtain up to date information to identify what routes diverted traffic could use across the wider road network.

Work on preparing a new Local Transport Plan (LTP4) is expected to start next year and this will include a review of the county’s freight strategy. The LTP is an integral part of a broader spatial planning system and is the tool that brings together evidence and aspirations to create a vision for transport in the county.

Businesses and the wider supply chain rely on the transport system for the supply of materials, the distribution and export of goods, and the provision of services. However, freight transport can also have significant impacts, including pollution, road safety and damage to road surfaces. The LTP may need to consider how to balance the economic and environmental impacts of freight in different places.

In order to inform the development of the LTP and related freight strategy, traffic counts will be undertaken, including obtaining detailed information on hgv movements where these are considered to be particular issues or concern. This will enable options for hgv routing to be modelled and considered as the freight strategy is developed.

The results of National Highway’s M4 to Dorset Coast Connectivity study should be available next year. This study is considering the suitability of north-south routes in the region including the A338 and A350. The outcome of that study may also have implications for future freight routes in the area.

Consultations on the Local Transport Plan will be undertaken to identify local needs, knowledge, and concerns. The engagement will be undertaken throughout the development and implementation of the LTP and is expected to start next year.