

		<p>Woodplumpton, there aren't other routes for the HGVs. The suggested measures would just mess everything up.</p> <p>Other Concerns Parking around the school needs sorting out, like maybe adding double red lines in certain spots to stop cars completely clogging up the northern side during drop-off and pick-up times. People should be encouraged to use the village hall car park more, and honestly, bringing back a lollipop person might make things a lot easier.</p>
4		<p>Summary Speeding in Catforth? Yeah, it's an issue, but the plan they're coming up with just isn't it. It tries to cover way too much area, drops speed limits too much, and throws in stuff like chicanes and speed bumps. That's not gonna work here with all the farm vehicles, horse trailers, and HGVs driving through. Plus, those speed bumps and chicanes would cause loads of noise for people who live nearby, could damage vehicles, and would suck for animals being transported.</p> <p>Speed Limits Here's what makes sense: • Catforth Road: Make it 40mph from the new Saddle roundabout to the Benson Lane junction (instead of 60mph), then 30mph from Benson Lane to the Green Lane junction (which is basically what it already is). • School Lane: Drop it to 20mph up to the bridge over the brook, then bump it to 40mph until it hits Moorside Lane.</p> <p>Traffic Calming Measures What we actually need? Better speed limit signs like road markings, rumble strips, lit-up signs, and those speed indicator things. Chicanes and speed bumps? Nah, they'd just mess everything up. Catforth's full of farm traffic and horse trailers, and unlike Woodplumpton, there's no other way for HGVs to go. Those ideas just don't fit here.</p> <p>Other Concerns The parking around the school is a nightmare. Maybe add double red lines in some places to stop cars from blocking the northern side during drop-off and pick-up. Get people to use the village hall car park more, and honestly, bringing back a lollipop person would help tons.</p>
5		<p>Summary While I agree that speeding is an issue in Catforth, the proposed plan isn't suitable for the village. It covers too large an area, lowers speed limits excessively, and introduces chicanes and speed bumps, which don't work with the amount of agricultural, equestrian, and HGV traffic passing through. These measures would create significant noise for nearby homes (and could cause damage) and would also negatively impact livestock being transported.</p> <p>Speed Limits • Catforth Road: The speed limit should be 40mph from the new Saddle roundabout to the Benson Lane junction (mostly reduced from 60mph) and 30mph from Benson Lane to the Green Lane junction (which is largely unchanged). • School Lane: It should be 20mph up to the bridge over the brook, then 40mph to the Moorside Lane junction.</p> <p>Traffic Calming Measures Catforth needs better speed limit signage, such as road markings, rumble strips, illuminated signs, and speed indicators. Chicanes and speed bumps are unsuitable for the village due to the heavy agricultural and equestrian traffic. Unlike Woodplumpton, there are no</p>

		<p>alternative routes for HGVs, so the proposed measures would create unnecessary disruption.</p> <p>Other Concerns The parking situation near the school needs attention. Adding double red lines in certain areas could prevent congestion along the northern side during drop-off and pick-up times. Encouraging use of the village hall car park, along with a lollipop person, could help improve safety and reduce parking issues.</p>
6		No concerns needs something and speed bumps etc would be the way to go
7		Speed Bumps Needed
8		Speed bumps etc needed to slow traffic
9		<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>Please do not introduce speed bumps to the village of Catforth.</p>
10		I support the traffic calming measures
11		<p>Speed bumps slightly reduce speeding issues, but massively increase noise pollution. The only proper solution to slowing EVERY car down is to install none noise polluting Average Speed Cameras. Speed bumps don't just cause heavy noise pollution but also place unnecessary strain on vehicles mechanical components related to suspension, alloys, tyres etc and causes premature wear and failures. Speed Bumps are a massive NO from me and my wife. If you're serious about traffic calming. INSTALL AVERAGE SPEED CAMERAS!!!</p>
12		<p>My husband and I absolutely object to the currently proposed plans. They are a relatively ineffective plan, as speed bumps, unless quite harsh, do not reduce speeding, they simply create excessive noise pollution, destroy tyres and suspension on vehicles and absolutely are not welcome.</p> <p>None of Catforth Road should be an insanely high 60mph speed limit, that in itself creates the wrong impression for those using the road to speed. All of Catforth road should be a 30mph, and where the parish hall is and the school, should be reduced to a 20mph zone. With reactive speeding lights and signage to encourage drivers to slow down.</p> <p>[REDACTED] Wales, and they have adopted Average Speed camera systems. This solution HAS slowed ALL traffic in the area without creating ANY negative side affects for the communities these cameras protect.</p> <p>To consider anything other than Average Speed Cameras in an age of technology we live, is nothing less than short sighted management and some would say, including me, quite draconian too.</p>

		<p>Speeding is an issues UK wide, it's nothing new, and evidance presented by neutral parties who present the affects vs benefits analysis shows that traffic calming measures such as proposed for Catforth Villiage, are unsafe and create more harm to the local community and environment, due to increased pollution levels too, that they are simply ineffective as a long term standard of traffic management.</p> <p>IF YOU ARE SERIOUS about resolving the speeding traffic issue in our local community. Use the insanely high council tax funds you collect from us all, we pay nearly Â£4000 per annum, and use the money you currently fail to provide street lighting with, and instead use it to install Average Speed cameras. Reduce all ares of Catforth to a 30mph area, around schools reduce it again to 20mph and then you will of implemented a long term solution that will support the community needs with none of the environmental associated issues and negatively on this small community lives.</p>
13		I fully support the proposed traffic calming measures
14		<p>As concerned Catforth residents we are strongly opposed to the current proposals for speed humps and chicanes along Catforth Rd. However, we are aware that there is a definite issue with speeding throughout the village which needs addressing. We need a speed limit of 40mph up to the hall and then 30mph through the village to Green Lane , with 40 mph beyond. We need more signage and speed indicator signs. Chicanes and speed humps are not suitable for Catforth due to the high volume of agricultural and equestrian vehicles . The Woodplumpton scheme will not be the solution for Catforth.</p>
15		<p>As concerned Catforth residents we are strongly opposed to the current proposals for speed humps and chicanes along Catforth Rd. However, we are aware that there is a definite issue with speeding throughout the village which needs addressing. We need a speed limit of 40mph up to the hall and then 30mph through the village to Green Lane , with 40 mph beyond. We need more signage and speed indicator signs. Chicanes and speed humps are not suitable for Catforth due to the high volume of agricultural and equestrian vehicles . The Woodplumpton scheme will not be the solution for Catforth.</p>
16		<p>I HAVE ONE SIMPLE COMMENT TO MAKE. I DO NOT WANT ANY FORM OF TRAFFIC CALMING WITHIN THE CATFORTH AREA WHATSOEVER.</p> <p>Second Comment added Below</p> <p>I previously sent a comment stating that I "did not want any form of traffic calming whatsoever". I would like to clarify that simple statement. What I am against is the chicanes and road humps although I do appreciate that traffic is travelling far too fast through the village and the number of lorries using the routes as a through road is totally unacceptable.</p> <p>My suggestion would be to keep any controls as simple as is reasonably practicable as follows :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) One single speed limit of 20mph monitored by 2 sets of "average speed" cameras. 1 set would cover the whole of School Lane and the 2nd set would cover the whole of Catforth Road from the motorway to Preston Road / Lewth Lane /Catforth Road junction. 2) Make the whole area "Access Only" for lorries and vehicles above a certain axle weight (size to be agreed).

		3) I consider the parking proposals put forward to be an excellent step forward.
17		The speed of this road is far too high. There are businesses and homes along this road and to enter the road can be extremely difficult and dangerous. Since the new road layout with the roundabout the speed limit of this road seems to have been increased. The only thing that makes the road safer is when it's winter time with the early nights it means you can see cars headlights. You have a significant amount of blind bends and hidden entrances. Lack of footpaths. From Priory Hospital to Bartle Hall there are no footpaths this makes it very dangerous to walk along this road, also the multiple amount of potholes that walkers and cars need to avoid.
18		I think this is an absolute must due to the speed people pass through the village, the lack of footpaths and also past Priory Hospital where there can be vulnerable patients. None of this is taken into consideration
19		My overall thought is that the traffic calming idea is good for the safety of the people of the village and pedestrians in general, my only comment would be, could there be chicanes rather than speed bumps. It's just a thought, speed bumps are actually more noisy for residents due to vehicles slowing down and speeding up before and after each one, and they actually do damage to vehicles.
20		I fully support the Catforth Traffic Calming plan in its current form & hope it is implemented as soon as possible.
21		I completely happy with the current / latest Traffic Calming Plan.
22		I fully support the proposed traffic calming measures, this was agreed previously and should not be stopped by last minute social media campaigning by a small number of vocal individuals. Many residents believed it was already in progress and, as a result, may not respond to this survey.
23	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	Traffic calming is a good idea but the speed humps in Woodplumpton are agony for arthritis sufferers.
24		[REDACTED] I fully support and agree with the proposed traffic calming measures. Research has confirmed that reduced speed limits backed by physical measures have substantially greater speed and casualty reduction benefits than those without. The research project was carried out by the Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety (PACTS), with together an international team of road safety experts, and was made possible by funding from The Road Safety Trust. The project set out to explore the evidence from six countries in mainland Europe as well as in the UK where more and more towns and

		<p>cities are introducing 20mph limits. The report also finds that compliance with 20mph limits where no physical measures are in place is poor.</p> <p>There are further benefits to applying the proposed measures such as diverting through traffic away from neighbourhood streets, promoting walking and cycling along safer routes, reducing traffic noise and improving air quality.</p>
25		<p> find the speed at which many vehicles travel through the village frightening at times. Physical measures such as speed humps and chicanes are the only effective way to slow vehicles down as a speed limit sign or warning indicator are both easy to ignore. If you are looking for an alternative then I believe cameras / an average speed zone of 20mph would be the only other effective deterrent although not as effective as physical road features.</p>
26		<p>I am supportive of a scheme that will reduce the speed of traffic. I'm just not sure what the best scheme would be. Do we have any evidence that the scheme in Woodplumpton has resulted in the desired affect? I certainly would not want any scheme on School Lane that would cause any additional congestion during school drop off and pick up times.</p>
27		<p>I do not feel that the current proposed plan will work for Catforth. The village is quite unique in relation to the fact that there is a large volume of traffic that flows through it. There are agricultural vehicles (with noisy trailers), pedestrians, cyclists, horses, buses and heavy goods vehicles on quite a narrow windy road. As it stands, the house vibrates significantly when a heavy vehicle goes past as a result of the combined weight of the vehicle, speed and poor road surface. In addition, there is a severe problem with speeding. When pulling out onto Catforth Road, it can be impossible to know if a car is doing the speed limit of 30 mph, or 70 mph. The junction with School Lane is particularly bad. I have witnessed many accidents that have included all of the above; not all of which will have been "reported" incidents.</p> <p>However, it is clear that something needs to be done. Speed bumps will never win: either too severe or not enough, depending on the context and point of view. Additionally, if they are placed near a property this will be dreadful with braking, more vibration, pollution and noise.</p> <p>In my opinion, the only option is speed bumps as you enter the village (away from properties), clear road markings, signage and average speed cameras. If traffic could be encouraged to take alternative routes (not through the village) this would be better.</p> <p>As a matter of urgency, hedgerows should be cut as this state is causing pedestrians onto the road to avoid injury) and should be considered in light of the speeding problem. Flooding also needs to be taken into account as if you simply resurface on top of what is currently in place this would possibly have an impact on properties and the status quo.</p> <p>Thank you for considering something that will work.</p>
28		<p>Speeding in Catforth and its surrounding areas is a big problem. With such a relatively small distance from any major route, it would make sense to have a universal 30MPH speed limit in place, as drivers would incur very little time saving benefit by travelling at 40MPH or 60MPH as is permitted on some sections of the road. Also a 20MPH limit should be mandatory on the first section of School Lane where it passes the school.</p> <p>The use of the proposed speed bumps as a means of 'traffic calming' is unhelpful, as drivers will often ignore them which then causes</p>

		<p>damage to the road surface in the 'landing zone'. Extra noise and intermittent speeding up and slowing down are both undesirable side effects of speed bumps and, from an environmental concern, cause air pollution due to brake dust and tyre rubber particulates. Also, drivers can't be prosecuted for ignoring speed bumps whereas they can if they ignore a speed restriction.</p> <p>Of additional concern is an RAC report in 2018 which showed that local councils were paying Â£38,000 in compensation to drivers due to speed bump damage. In today's financial climate, that that doesn't make any sense for councils already struggling to balance the books.</p> <p>With those points in mind I wholeheartedly reject the proposed traffic calming scheme.</p>
29		<p>While speeding is a problem in Catforth, the proposed traffic scheme is unsuitable as it covers too large an area, reduces speed limits excessively, and includes chicanes and speed bumps that are incompatible with the village's heavy agricultural, equestrian, and HGV traffic. These measures could cause significant noise, damage, and harm to livestock in transit, negatively impacting the village.</p> <p>Proposed Speed Limits: • Catforth Road: 40mph from the Saddle roundabout to Benson Lane, then 30mph from Benson Lane to Green Lane. • School Lane: 20mph to the brook bridge, then 40mph to Moorside Lane.</p> <p>Traffic Calming Suggestions: Improved speed limit signage, road markings, rumble strips, illuminated signs, and speed indicator devices are better alternatives. Chicanes and speed bumps are unsuitable due to the lack of alternative routes for HGVs and high agricultural traffic.</p> <p>Other Issues: • Parking near the school should be addressed, possibly with double red lines. • Encouraging use of the village hall car park and reinstating a lollipop person could help manage school drop-off and collection times.</p>
30	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	<p>I acknowledge that speeding in Catforth can be a problem, but the proposed scheme is, in my opinion unsuitable. It covers an excessive distance, proposes too low a speed and includes speed humps and chicanes which both cause noise nuisance and are inappropriate for the large vehicles that have to use the road.</p> <p>What I feel is needed is</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a reduction in the speed limit around the village centre / school area, at school times. - no speed humps - average speed cameras at either end of Catforth road <p>Please learn from the mistakes made in Woodplumpton:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - householders living by the speed bumps having constant noise disturbance from vehicles slowing down for the bumps - damage being caused to our cars by repeated driving over the bumps - vehicles driving in excess of the speed limit between the speed bumps then slowing down for the bumps - increased danger to cyclists (vulnerable road users) having to contend with a flow of traffic that is not travelling at a constant speed. A

		whole new set of hazards has been introduced for cyclists.
31	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	<p>As someone who walks Rosemary Lane and School Lane, the speed of vehicles and lack of pavement on these winding roads is a huge concern. Therefore, it is confusing why a reduced speed limit from 60mph to 30mph has never been implemented for the whole traffic calming area before now. This would be virtually free and cause no disruption. It seems the parish council must spend Â£400,000 to achieve this basic, free, common-sense necessity.</p> <p>The road surface of Catforth Road and Rosemary Lane is appalling, and has been for a long time, particularly between the village hall and Preston Road and outside Bartle Hall. It is difficult to control a vehicle above 30mph due to all the bouncing about. There is no need for road humps with the road in this state as it's already got them. The road markings between the village hall and Preston Road have not only faded but are non-existent. Why have these basic road safety issues not been addressed by LCC years ago with public money? Why do we have to spend CIL money on what we should be entitled to for free?</p> <p>My grounds for objecting are the extortionate cost of "lumps of tarmac" and the uglification of the parish. The Parish Council will have spent the best part of a million pounds when all this is finished. And we still don't have a community centre, a shop or any normal facilities that many other villages enjoy. I have no objection to the reduction in speed limit or to waiting restrictions. I have always maintained that a reduced speed limit and average speed cameras would be a better option for road safety in the parish and more effective.</p>
32		<p>Proposed scheme is NOT acceptable for our village. The plan covers too much of an area and the idea of speed bumps and chicanes will just cause havoc to our rural lives.</p> <p>The amount of agricultural vehicles with attachments, HGV's, horse boxes, walkers and cyclists that use the road CANNOT cope with the bumps and chicanes. Emergency services also dread such road designs.</p> <p>Residents living next to the planned bumps will experience extreme noise nuisance-ask the residents in Woodplumpton!!</p> <p>Speed limits-should be 30mph from Green Lane to Benson Lane, 40 mph from Benson Lane to the new junction after Bartle Hall. School Lane 20 mph from the school to the brook and then 30 mph to Moorside.</p> <p>The roads should have markings/shaded areas to show speed and warnings for school , bus stops etc.</p> <p>SPID's should be installed along the area, and Traffic police speed camera vans visit regularly.</p> <p>CIL money could be spent on improving the parking near the bus stop across from the village hall, the village hall car park and the LCC road site on School Lane so that they can be used for safer school parking. A footpath from the LCC site would make it safer for parents and children walking to school. Reinstate a "Lollipop" person.</p> <p>Money can be spent more wisely than on bumps and chicanes!!!</p>

33	TO BE DISREGARDED	<p>I personally believe it's the community's interest to just firm it turn the whole road into a dual carriageway and make it a 70mph , therefore tractors are visible and less people will complain because they will have to move lol</p> <p>Ps please grit more often as I keep crashing because I keep stinging it and I'm too fast</p>
34		<p>I am writing to formally voice my objections to the proposed traffic calming measures in Catforth.</p> <p>While I appreciate the Parish Council's efforts to address road safety concerns, I believe the proposed measures are not suitable for our village and will have significant negative impacts on residents, local agriculture, and the wider community.</p> <p>My concerns are outlined below, supported by evidence from the UK Department for Transport (DfT) and other relevant sources.</p> <p>Impact on Agricultural Traffic</p> <p>Catforth Road and School Lane and surrounding roads are frequently used by farm tractors towing trailers and other large agricultural machinery. The proposed traffic calming measures, such as speed bumps, chicanes, or narrowing, will create significant difficulties for these vehicles:</p> <p>Speed bumps are particularly problematic for tractors towing heavy loads, as they can cause damage to equipment, spillage of cargo, and even pose a safety risk to the driver and other road users. The DfT's *Traffic Advisory Leaflet 1/07* explicitly warns that vertical deflections (e.g., speed bumps) can cause issues for large vehicles, including agricultural machinery, and recommends avoiding their use on roads with significant heavy vehicle traffic.</p> <p>Chicanes or road narrowing will make it difficult for large agricultural vehicles to navigate the road safely, especially when meeting other traffic. This could lead to congestion, delays, and increased risk of accidents. The DfT's *Manual for Streets* (2007) highlights that chicanes can create hazards for larger vehicles and recommends careful consideration of their impact on rural roads.</p> <p>The measures may force agricultural traffic to take longer, less suitable routes, increasing fuel costs and creating unnecessary inefficiencies for local farmers.</p> <p>2. Impact on Horse Riders</p> <p>Catforth is home to many horse riders who regularly use the roads in Catforth to access local bridleways and riding routes. The proposed measures could create hazards for both horses and riders:</p> <p>Speed bumps can startle horses, leading to unpredictable behaviour and increasing the risk of accidents.</p> <p>The British Horse Society (BHS) has repeatedly raised concerns about the use of speed bumps on roads shared with horses, stating that they can cause significant distress to animals and riders alike</p> <p>Chicanes or road narrowing may force riders into closer proximity with vehicles, reducing the space available for safe passing and increasing the likelihood of collisions. The DfT's *Cycle Infrastructure Design* (LTN 1/20) acknowledges that shared road spaces must</p>

		<p>provide adequate room for all users, including horses, and that poorly designed traffic calming can compromise safety.</p> <p>Horse riders, particularly those with young or inexperienced horses, may feel compelled to avoid the road altogether, limiting their access to essential routes.</p> <p>3. Impact on Pedestrians The proposed measures could also negatively affect pedestrians, particularly those with limited mobility, children, and the elderly: Speed bumps and other vertical deflections can cause vehicles to accelerate and decelerate abruptly, increasing noise and air pollution for those walking nearby. The DfT's <i>Traffic Calming on Major Roads: A Code of Practice</i> (1994) notes that speed bumps can exacerbate noise and vibration issues, particularly in rural areas where quiet is valued. Chicanes or road narrowing may encourage drivers to focus on navigating the obstacles rather than watching for pedestrians, potentially increasing the risk of accidents. Research by the Transport Research Laboratory (TRL) has shown that poorly designed traffic calming can distract drivers and reduce their awareness of vulnerable road users. Pedestrians crossing the road may find it more difficult to judge the speed and distance of approaching vehicles, particularly if drivers are distracted by the traffic calming measures.</p> <p>4. Increased Fuel Consumption and Pollution The proposed traffic calming measures, particularly speed bumps and chicanes, will require vehicles to slow down and accelerate frequently. This stop-start driving pattern is known to increase fuel consumption and emissions, contributing to air pollution and higher costs for road users. Research by the Transport Research Laboratory (TRL Report PPR243, 2006) found that speed bumps can increase fuel consumption by up to 50% on urban roads, with similar effects likely on rural roads. Additionally, the European Environment Agency (EEA) has highlighted that frequent acceleration and deceleration significantly increase nitrogen oxide (NOx) and particulate matter (PM) emissions, which are harmful to human health and the environment. In a rural community like ours, where many residents rely on private vehicles for essential travel, these measures could disproportionately increase fuel costs and worsen air quality, particularly for those living close to the road.</p> <p>5. Lack of Evidence for Need I have not seen sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the current traffic conditions on Catforth Road and School Lane justify the introduction of traffic calming measures. The data provided does not appear to show a high incidence of accidents or near misses that would warrant such interventions. The DfT's <i>Guidance on Traffic Calming</i> (2013) emphasises that traffic calming should only be implemented where there is clear evidence of a safety issue, and alternative solutions have been considered.</p> <p>6. Lack of Resident Support It is clear from conversations within the community that the majority of residents oppose the proposed measures. The Parish Council should prioritise the views of those who live in and are directly affected by these changes. The DfT's <i>Guidance on Public</i></p>
--	--	--

	<p>Consultation* (2014) stresses the importance of community engagement and ensuring that local residents' views are central to decision making processes.</p> <p>7. Alternative Solutions I believe there are more effective and less intrusive ways to address traffic concerns, such as:</p> <p>Improved signage to remind drivers of the speed limit.</p> <p>Community lead speed watch initiatives.</p> <p>Enhanced enforcement of existing speed limits by local police.</p> <p>Vegetation management to improve visibility at key points.</p> <p>These alternatives would address safety concerns without the negative impacts associated with physical traffic calming measures. The Department's *Speed Management Guidance* (2018) highlights the effectiveness of education and enforcement as alternatives to physical measures, particularly in rural areas.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>I strongly urge the Parish Council to reconsider the proposed traffic calming measures and explore alternative solutions that are more appropriate for our village. The impact on agricultural traffic, horse riders, and pedestrians must be carefully considered, as these groups are integral to the character and functioning of our rural community.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my concerns. I look forward to your response and hope that the Parish Council will take residents' views into account before proceeding with any plans.</p>
35	<p>As a resident living on Roots Lane I am really concerned to the costs being spent on a scheme that does not fit the community needs, we are a rural village not a sprawling suburb!</p> <p>The amount of humps and chicanes will dramatically affect the village users of agriculture and business/family users and shall be an environmental and noise nuisance for years to come if allowed.</p> <p>Why cant the village hall carpark not be included to expand the carpark spaces with gravel type surfacing at relative low cost on the wasted grass areas, giving several more spaces for parents to use and make parking near the school a no go area in school hours. The scheme on School lane is generally accepted but I feel could be shortened to save cost, why does it need to stretch all the way to the junction Lewth Lane, it should stop at drawing 31 at most, possible renew junction white lines only.</p>

		<p>The extent to Bartle Hall is also too long and the scheme should start at the Priory/Crown Lane towards the village, again saving some cost on wasted signs and reducing speed limits unnecessarily .</p> <p>More use of Red anti skid paint and more flashing speed signs rather than humps and bumps.</p> <p>If the junction at School lane and Catforth Road is upgraded as the priority , is there an option to install a zebra/pelican crossing from village hall, layby upgrade and a new path, to one slow cars due to the crossing lights and also safe passage for the kids at school start/finish. Surely this is the important part of the village.</p> <p>Spend money of new lines, but surely LCC should be covering some of this cost in there budget as general repairs and renewals, not for the CIL money to fund!! There is notes for sorting low points and ponding, why are the village having to pay for this?</p> <p>I use the lanes several times a day and at weekends, and don't see a real issue with lots of excessive speed, Yes make points to highlight and warn, but lets use OUR money for improvements to the Village also, we may never get this chance again for these sums involved. LCC will certainly spend OUR money with no questions asked if allowed.</p> <p>40mph is acceptable on most lanes, 30mph past the Village hall is acceptable and 20mph past the school in school hours only, 30mph after would be acceptable.</p> <p>It is hard to cover all points and drawings in this reduced text box, But I feel really strongly the the current proposed scheme is simply not right and needs reducing and simplifying, Look after the village centre as a priority. use fixed/average cameras as a back up if cost allow, there will be a sum coming from future CIL to ensure a good period of maintenance is reserved for camera cost.</p> <p>Please don't railroad over our opinions just because the scheme is drawn, now is the time to amend and simplify.</p>
36		<p>Speed bumps would have a detrimental effect on the village. They will cause an increase in noise and pollution due to braking. Traffic travels in a lower gear using significantly more fuel per mile. Heavy vehicles, trucks, and SUVs are not always slowed down by speed bumps. They cause increased wear and tear of brake pads. The main speeding offenders are those that use Catforth as a cut through, not local residents. They would likely not take anymore care and slow down. I feel the best solution would be to implement average speed cameras.</p>
37	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY	<p>As a parish, we have a golden opportunity to improve things and I agree reducing speeding is an area worthy of investment. I would however like to reduce speeds and increase road user safety throughout the whole parish, not use the whole remaining budget so intensely on just 2 stretches of road.</p> <p>We have other very pressing issues as a parish such as flooding that are becoming increasingly an issue so a more cost effective</p>

<p>AFFECTED AREA</p>	<p>approach to the Catforth speed calming proposal seems prudent. I therefore believe the current proposal could be improved for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Simpler and more cost effective methods to reduce speed through the village have not been tried first. Newsham Hall Lane has added 30 mph signs and as a regular user of that road, they have made a significant difference already to reducing speed. Catforth has very few 30mph signs so I would suggest this is the first option to try as some motorists may not even be aware of the current speed limit. 2. Catforth is a rural village with many HGVs and farm vehicles. Speed bumps and forcing traffic onto the wrong side of the road would be especially difficult for these vehicles and would cause noise and disruption for locals. This was highlighted vehemently by local farmers at the Parish meeting in December. 3. Making one road difficult to navigate sends traffic on alternative routes, thereby only moving the problem within the parish. Lewth Lane would no doubt receive more traffic as a result of making Catforth difficult to navigate. Lewth Lane is very windy and has already seen a significant increase in traffic due to the increased house volume in Inskip and more rural businesses developing. As a rural lane that has frequent cyclists, pedestrians and horses sharing the space, I have noticed more problems as the traffic volume has increased on Lewth Lane. I have noted down the dates of a few recent accidents that I have personally seen as evidence. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6th March 2023 - van in ditch near Rolling Pin Farm 24th April 2023 - lorry snapped electric pole in two outside The Hermitage 12th September 2023 - car crash between Rolling Pin Farm and Varleys 28th February 2024 - accident at the bend between The Hermitage and Catforth 1st May 2024 - car driven into electricity pole near Varleys 14th December 2024 - car needed extracting from ditch near Rolling Pin Farm 19th January 2025 - car driven into hedge on bend opposite Fernleigh <p>I hope this demonstrates that speed and careless driving is an issue for the whole parish - not just specific stretches.</p> 4. Residents should not be penalised with disruptive traffic calming road furniture that will make the village more difficult to navigate and not even address the pot holes that are already dangerous for cyclists in particular. The traffic calming measures in Woodplumpton have received animated feedback which I do not believe are being listened to objectively before going ahead in Catforth (increased noise, road rattle and vibrations were mentioned during the December meeting). <p>Suggestions:</p> <p>Conduct the road safety improvements in two phases to ensure the most efficient use of budget.</p>
-----------------------------	--

		<p>For example: Phase 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> â€¢ More frequent reduced speed limit signs used to educate drivers throughout the parish â€¢ Locals volunteer with the police to do speed checks â€¢ Smiley face solar signs trialled as utilised successfully near Woodplumpton and Newsham Hall Lane â€¢ Intermittent traffic lights as used in Scotland which turn red/ record speeds for speeding drivers â€¢ Investment into the junction from school lane to catforth road as this is difficult to navigate and a danger for school children. Zebra crossing? Pedestrian lights? <p>If data shows lower cost measures successfully reduce speed, any surplus budget could go to other areas such as flooding. There are areas on Lewth Lane and at the Catforth Rd junction towards Inskip that are literally not passable at certain times of the year. Car drivers have needed rescuing by emergency services last year so funding the local farmers to clear the ditches, brooks etc, like the council used to in this area, would be an excellent use of budget helping the local farming community too.</p>
38		<p>It is all very well putting in these humps, but before this I think the money would be better spent on resurfacing the roads, these are atrocious. Also a scheme whereby when traffic lights fail these could be attended to immediately. The dangerous roundabout near the Saddle have been out of action for at least 5 days. It would also be a lot safer without all the lorries carrying soil down Blackleach.</p>
39		<p>I am happy with these measures and hopefully they will help with the speed of the traffic. I hope that the road will be totally resurfaced from School Lane, past Bay Horse lane right to the T junction towards Inskip. It is in a shocking state. I am disappointed that the parking area for the school is not included. Is it the councils intention to ban Heavy Goods wagons from this road? The Canal Bridge on Rosemary Lane is starting to suffer and it looks like vibration from Heavy Goods vehicles is starting to dislodge the stone walls particularly on the left hand side as you travel towards Catforth. (we have reported this the Canal Trust). I am sure that this bridge was never intended to take such a volume of heavy transport vehicles.</p>
40		<p>Why is there no resurfacing of Rosemary lane and Lea lane outside Bartle Hall to tie in to the new by-pass road improvement. This is currently one of the worst roads in Lancashire. Spending vast sums on traffic calming while road surfaces on Catforth lanes is hazardous to cyclists and motorist and are more needed than this scheme</p>
41		<p>We both agree with the proposed traffic calming measures. It will make a big difference to the safety of Catforth residents and school children.</p>
42		<p>We both agree with the proposed traffic calming measures. It will make a big difference to the safety of Catforth residents and school children.</p>
43		<p>No comment on the traffic calming plans themselves but with children attending Catforth Primary we strongly support proposals to improve the layby on School Lane and make a safe walking route from it. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Currently we do use the layby but then have to walk in the road / cross with restricted view. A better layby may encourage parents not to park all the way up to the bend to the east of the school.</p>
44		<p>While we all agree traffic needs slowing through the village, we don't think speed bumps are the answer. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] we see many near misses as large lorries etc meet buses or agricultural traffic. The road is used by cyclist cars, lorries, horses,</p>

		tractors with trailers and the noise level of going over bumps will be unbearable, not to mention damage to my property. Since the new motorway junction on the M55 more heavy goods wagons etc use this route. Parking near the school needs to be sorted and traffic slowed. Would rumble strips, more signage, and road markings, with speed indicators not be a better idea. (rumble strips in red). From Blackleach Lane to Jane Lane.
45	William Clarke william.clarke@gn.com	While we all agree traffic needs slowing through the village, we don't think speed bumps are the answer. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] we see many near misses as large lorries etc meet buses or agricultural traffic. The road is used by cyclist cars, lorries, horses, tractors with trailers and the noise level of going over bumps will be unbearable, not to mention damage to my property. Since the new motorway junction on the M55 more heavy goods wagons etc use this route. Parking near the school needs to be sorted and traffic slowed. Would rumble strips, more signage, and road markings, with speed indicators not be a better idea. (rumble strips in red). From Blackleach Lane to Jane Lane.
46		Catforth Road, is a dangerous thorough fare, with traffic ignoring the 30mph limit. Vehicles of all types, exceed the limit and make it seriously unsafe for pedestrians, cyclists, horses, dog walkers and other law abiding vehicles and drivers. Traffic speeds past pedestrians at breakneck speeds, vehicles make unsafe overtakes in inappropriate areas, just because you are doing 30mph. Turning out of any of the side lanes is fraught with danger when vehicles are speeding through the Village. For all users of Catforth Road the traffic calming is long overdue, we are still a relatively small village, surely people who live here want the best for the majority, to make Catforth Road safe, for its residents
47		Please remove the give ways and bollards and only change the speed limit from 30 to 20 miles per hour on Catforth road 400 yards either side of the School lane junction and on School lane from that junction to be a 20 limit to the bridge over the brook then a 30 limit with signs warning of the bad bend. A large part of Catforth road and some of School Lane need resurfacing and the existing footpaths too!
48		This absolutely should not be allowed to happen. The exact same plan was put in to place in woodplumpton and has caused nothing but anguish and peril for the residents. The speed bumps are far too steep (well over the 75mm proposed) causing damage to cars that are lowered, adding to general wear and tear of vehicles, causing loud noise and vibration on larger vehicles which in turn disturbs residents. The issue of speeding is a concern but this could easily be solved by creating a 30 zone with 3 average cameras at the start of the speed restrictions (end of school lane, start & end of catforth road) and surely much cheaper. I agree the catforth school area needs a re-work and proposed parking area and pavement are a good idea in that area, possible 20 zone lights & pedestrian crossing etc. During peak school hours.

	<p>Please do the right thing and don't rip our roads up for something that will cause the residents of catforth headaches and issues for years ahead. There MUCH are better ways of dealing with speed concerns.</p>
49	<p>I would welcome traffic calming in Catforth - and specifically a 30mph [REDACTED] on Swillbrook Bridge. There are some drivers who seem to find it a challenge to see how fast they can approach the bridge (from both sides) and walking [REDACTED] is quite frightening at times. Although they are unable to see around the bends, some drivers will happily take to the wrong side of the road to pass you! At least once a year a car will end up in the field just on the bend by the junction with Blackleach lane - all it takes is for this to coincide with a walker(s) and there will be fatalities. There are numerous 'bumps' on the bridge, most minor but there have been some more impressive ones - the last more major one was last October when 2 cars got themselves wedged on the bridge, no injuries this time but the road was blocked for over 2 hours, causing chaos. (police were notified several times but did not attend) It appeared (though I did not witness it) that speed was at the heart of the incident. I personally don't feel speed cameras will do much to slow cars down whereas a physical 'speed bump' will force people to slow down and even if drivers do slow down and speed up (as has been suggested) there are few cars capable of achieving the speeds that I have personally witnessed people doing through the village. Since the building of the new road and the traffic calming in Woodplumpton, the traffic on Catforth Rd has increased immensely - particularly very large trucks - and now when the motorway is closed between J33 and J32 traffic is being directed (by GPS) through Catforth. I feel very strongly that we need effective traffic calming!</p>
50	<p>I have seen the proposed plans for Catforth and feel 16 speed bumps and 2 chicanes is complete over kill. I don't feel there is any issue with speeding on Catforth road and there is no history of accidents.</p> <p>The proposal plans for a speed bump outside my house, [REDACTED] With the local farm traffic and other road users this would create noise pollution with slowing down/speeding up and tractors and trailers bouncing over the bump. I feel this would cause a detriment to our lives and as such would look to legally challenge the site of this speed hump should the current plan go ahead. There are plenty of non residential sections of road to site a speed bump, not that they are needed in any way.</p> <p>I suggest you go back to the drawing board and question whether any of these proposals are needed at all as many residents do not want them.</p>
51	<p>Re: Traffic Calming Measures to Catforth Road</p> <p>Application Reference Number: LSG4/894.19385/AFR</p> <p>I am writing to you with my objections to the Notice of Proposal for Road Humps and Chicanes on Catforth Road [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>

		<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>Furthermore, I would like to offer my objections to the scheme in full along Catforth Road, I feel a better solution would be to put full time average speed, speed camera at each end of the village to deter people from breaking the speed limit.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
52		<p>Re: Traffic Calming Measures to Catforth Road</p> <p>Application Reference Number: LSG4/894.19385/AFR</p> <p>I am writing to you with my objections to the Notice of Proposal for Road Humps and Chicanes on Catforth Road. [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>Furthermore, I would like to offer my objections to the scheme in full along Catforth Road, I feel a better solution would be to put full time average speed, speed camera at each end of the village to deter people from breaking the speed limit.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>

53		<p>Having seen the proposed plans, we have a number of significant concerns :</p> <p>Speed humps described as speed cushions cause significant noise pollution and vibration to residents.</p> <p>Chicane's do slow traffic down but many people do not give way thus causing road rage.</p> <p>Our preferred solution to traffic calming is that the parish council properly explore a range of camera solutions perhaps static cameras in both directions in the centre of the village near the village hall,</p> <p>Together with further pair of average speed cameras (30mph) from green lane to benson lane.</p> <p>We have no objection to a range of traffic calming measures in front of the school, however genuinely feel the proposed scheme for the remainder of School Lane and the entire length of Catforth Road is unnecessary.</p> <p>We understand the traffic calming measures taken in Woodplumpton have had a negative effect on local businesses, public transport and school transport services. We urge the parish council to reconsider before inflicting the same fate on Catforth residents, farmers, businesses etc.</p> <p>We remain of the opinion that non of the proposed works solve the problems of the dreadful condition, of the road surfaces in Catforth, this combined with the inadequate drainage of the roads at the northern end of village continue to be overlooked by the parish council and LCC.</p>
54		<p>Having seen the proposed plans, we have a number of significant concerns :</p> <p>Speed humps described as speed cushions cause significant noise pollution and vibration to residents.</p> <p>Chicane's do slow traffic down but many people do not give way thus causing road rage.</p> <p>Our preferred solution to traffic calming is that the parish council properly explore a range of camera solutions perhaps static cameras in both directions in the centre of the village near the village hall,</p> <p>Together with further pair of average speed cameras (30mph) from green lane to benson lane.</p> <p>We have no objection to a range of traffic calming measures in front of the school, however genuinely feel the proposed scheme for the remainder of School Lane and the entire length of Catforth Road is unnecessary.</p> <p>We understand the traffic calming measures taken in Woodplumpton have had a negative effect on local businesses, public transport and school transport services. We urge the parish council to reconsider before inflicting the same fate on Catforth residents, farmers, businesses etc.</p> <p>We remain of the opinion that non of the proposed works solve the problems of the dreadful condition, of the road surfaces in Catforth, this combined with the inadequate drainage of the roads at the northern end of village continue to be overlooked by the parish council and LCC.</p>
55		<p>I do not believe the speed limits need to be reduced to 20mph for the stretches on the plans. I believe the limits of 20mph are appropriate for areas around the hall and the school but other areas should remain at their current speed limits. The area from the motorway bridge to Rosemary lane past Priory hospital needs reduced speed limits to 20mph and would benefit from hidden entrance signs and mirrors positioned outside the hospital entrance. This would make this area safer for patients, staff and visitors to the hospital. All too often</p>

		people are travelling at 60mph in that area and I have witnessed several near misses between vehicles leaving the hospital and other traffic on the road.
56	.	<p>████████████████████ The speed limit at the exit of Blackleach Lane onto Catforth Road is the National Speed Limit which I think is 60 mile an hour. I walk my dog nearly every day on Catforth Road and I am shocked how fast people drive over the canal bridge up to the 30 mph speed signs; I've had numerous near misses with vehicles careering around the bends and plenty just ignore the speed reduction signs. I have also noticed a significant increase in traffic due to the new roads at The Saddle, especially HGVs. As there are no pavements from the motorway bridge up to the village hall, it is very dangerous and a lot of vehicles just squeeze past me when I am walking or running; I've nearly been in the hedge a couple of times. When my sons went to Broughton High School, they used to walk to the bus stop at the village hall and twice had cars hitting their school bags. I think it's essential that the speed is reduced through Catforth, especially where there are no pavements. I think the installation of speed humps are very much needed.</p>
57	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	<p>I think reducing speeding is an area worthy of investment. Not with speed bumps though. They are expensive, damage cars, prevent emergency services, cause more pollution and noise and haven't worked in wood plumpton.</p> <p>I would however like to reduce speeds and increase road user safety throughout the whole parish, not just one specific road in catforth. The budget is for all the parish, use it in all the parish.</p> <p>I believe the current proposal could be improved for the following reasons.</p> <p>Simpler and more cost effective methods to reduce speed through the village have not been tried first. Signs are cheap and work. Newsham hall road leaves you in no doubt as to the speed limit. Lots of signs and smiley faces for compliance, plus it's worked! I use that road every day and can truthfully says the speed has altered. People obey it.</p> <p>Catforth is a rural village but has manyHGVs and farm vehicles. Speed bumps and forcing traffic onto the wrong side of the road (like woodplumpton) would be especially difficult for these vehicles and would cause noise and disruption for locals. It will be dangerous as people trying to (wrongly)quickly nip past on the wrong side of the road will cause accidents. I have seen many of these incident in woodplumpton, where someone speeds up to get ahead of oncoming traffic on the wrong side of the road. Locals didn't want this as was mentioned in your December meeting.</p> <p>Making one road difficult to navigate sends traffic on alternative routes, thereby only moving the problem within the parish. Lewth Lane would no doubt receive more traffic as a result of making Catforth difficult to navigate. Lewth Lane is very windy and has already seen a significant increase in traffic due to the increased house volume in Inskip and more rural businesses developing.</p> <p>As a rural lane it has an odd combination of cyclist, horses and heavy goods vehicles on a 60mph road! Even pedestrians walking on the actual road due to the absence of a path. I have noticed more problems as the traffic volume has increased on Lewth lane. It is damaged at the sides all throughout. Big ditches that cars fall regularly into and require emergency help, tyre shredding pot holes especially after JN civics cause such damage, it's 60 mph, which is truly ridiculous for such a windy, thin and heavy hgv traffic road, it should be 30 or 40 on Lewth lane. It feels like a forgotten part of the parish. speed and careless driving is an issue for the whole parish.</p> <p>Residents should not be penalised with disruptive traffic calming road furniture that will make the village more difficult to navigate and not even address the pot holes that are already dangerous for cyclists in particular. The road surface on catforth road is a total disgrace</p>

		<p>and just a matter of time before a cyclist is badly injured on your watch. I believe as part of your huge expense on bumps, that doesn't include resurfacing. I think you might be missing a significant point there. I have had two visits to the tyre shop for repairs in the last year alone.</p> <p>The traffic calming measures in Woodplumpton have universally panned by everyone that uses it and to disagree shows a lack of listening to your constituents before going ahead in Catforth (increased noise, road rage and vibrations were mentioned during the December meeting).</p> <p>Suggestions:</p> <p>Conduct the road safety improvements in two phases to ensure the most efficient use of budget.</p> <p>For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> â€¢ More frequent reduced speed limit signs used to educate drivers throughout the parish. There are loads on newsham hall lane, hardly any at all on catforth road. â€¢ Locals volunteer with the police to do speed checks. These result in letter to offenders, that might make the think twice. â€¢ Smiley face solar signs trialled as utilised successfully near Woodplumpton and Newsham Hall Lane â€¢ Intermittent traffic lights as used in Scotland which turn red/ record speeds for speeding drivers â€¢ Investment in flooding prevention needs to be considered too. There are areas on Lewth Lane and at the Catforth Rd junction towards Inskip that are literally not passable at certain times of the year. [REDACTED] This is due to no investment in dredging, loads of house building in inskip so the water must go elsewhere. Car drivers have needed rescuing by emergency services last year so funding the local farmers to clear the ditches, brooks etc, like the council used to in this area, would be an excellent use of budget helping the local farming community too. <p>One last point. Do we have any police attendance in the parish at all? People wouldn't speed as much if there was. Plus some of the rural burglaries that are increasing my be prevented.</p>
58		<p>The 30mph speed limit has not worked in the village. Vehicles regularly travel through way in excess of the limit. This presents a danger to pedestrians, other road users including horse riders. Something needs to be done.</p>
59		<p>I am writing to register my objection to the proposed traffic calming measures on Catforth Road, Catforth, Preston. As I understand, it is proposed that the speed limit is to be reduced to 20 mph and there are to be 12 speed humps and 2 chicanes along Catforth Rd, the main road through our village. I do agree that traffic drives too fast through the village but I do not believe this is the best solution to the problem. This is for several reasons;</p> <p>The noise as vehicles pass over the humps, particularly large agricultural vehicles (of which there are many) many with trailers, trucks and vans - these vehicles are heavy and can travel over the humps at greater speed making it unbearable for people living next to a 'hump'</p> <p>These humps cause significant damage to regular vehicles, damaging springs, shock absorbers and mountings. It isn't possible to safely go over these humps at the proposed 20 mph, you need to travel at 10 - 15 mph which is much too slow for a main thoroughfare.</p> <p>The traffic will sit at the chicanes and cause unnecessary congestion along the main road. This causes people to 'rush' at the chicanes to try and get through before they have to give way making them actually more dangerous at times, as proven by the chicanes at Woodplumton and Broughton.</p>

		<p>This scheme will impact the value of property in Catforth – it will become unpleasant, noisy, congested, irritating and costly to vehicles to live in our village and therefore make our village a less desirable place to live as it has done in Woodplumpton. We have several friends who no longer want to live in Woodplumpton and are actively trying to move out of the village because of the terrible situation caused by the traffic calming there.</p> <p>As residents of Catforth we have chosen to live here because it is pleasant and away from the congestion and urbanisation in the towns this scheme will make Catforth feel much more urban and generally unpleasant to drive in and out of. The scheme penalises the residents who live here not the occasional 'drive throughs' that are the problem.</p> <p>I can understand the calming measures around School Lane near the primary school to protect children coming to and from school but the measures proposed along Catforth road are excessive and unnecessary. 12 Speed humps and a reduction to 20mph is very excessive!</p> <p>In my opinion a better option would be speed cameras at either end of the village, we have however been told by the parish council that this is not an option. If speed cameras are not an option then I believe that the best solution would be to have very clear 'gateway' signage at the junction of Catforth Rd and Lewth Lane and after the canal bridge at Swillbrook, at the Crown Lane/Rosemary Lane junction – red painted road markings and roadside signs to alert drivers they are entering the village and the limit is now 30mph - currently the limit there is still 60mph and the change down to 30 is not clear and too far into the village. The canal bridge at Swillbrook should certainly be a lower speed limit than the current 60mph, unfamiliar motorists approach it too fast. A weight limit on this bridge could also go some way to reducing the heavy traffic through the village resulting from the new motorway junction. Increased Signage, both roadside and painted road surface markings at regular intervals through the village, with driver feedback, radar speed signs to remind drivers of their speed. It would be also be sensible to maybe have a 20mph limit around the junction with School Lane, possibly flexible/variable around school times.</p> <p>I believe that a 20mph limit for the length of Catforth rd is too slow on a main thoroughfare through the village, 30mph is much more reasonable and realistic and I believe stands more chance of being observed.</p> <p>I do believe there are many residents of Catforth who feel the same - we welcome a speed change and better signage but not the excessive humps, chicanes and 20mph that is being proposed. We really feel that the money would be much better spent on resurfacing the full length of Catforth Road as the surface is in a shocking state and doing something to resolve the VERY frequent flooding and serious disruption that this causes - residents of the dead end lanes being trapped in their houses unable to get out of the lane and vehicles being destroyed trying to get through flood water. This has happened to me several times in just the last 2 years! The flooding on Catforth Rd at the junction with Green Lane up to the Lewth Lane junction is of particular concern to me.</p>
60		<p>We fully support the latest version of the Catforth traffic calming scheme as shown on the WPC website.</p> <p>We [REDACTED] have been raising our concerns about traffic volumes and speed on the road since 2017, through attendance at Parish Council meetings and communication with the Parish Clerk, Parish Councillors, County Councillors and Lancashire County Council Highways Department.</p>

		<p>it, do this naturally for traffic entering the village.</p> <p>Proposed school lane changes are appropriate.</p> <p>20 mph limit through village is appropriate. Not sure so many speed cushions are required on the stretch through the village though.</p> <p>In my view, main excess speed is entry/exit to village on the straight sections (north and south). Once vehicles are in the village the ability to speed is limited due to bends, parked cars etc. so getting vehicles slowed when they enter should be priority. Therefore, implement these first.</p> <p>If, after implementing entry/exit controls, speed is still an issue then consider the additional measures (cushions etc).</p>
65	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	<p>The main thing is to lower the speed limit outside Priory Hospital. This should be 20mph. I strongly disagree with road humps which damage cars and impede access for the emergency services.</p>
66		<p>We agree with the calming suggestions, speeding and inconsiderate driving urgently needs addressing ,</p>
67		<p>I object strongly to most of the Catforth traffic calming scheme.</p> <p>Catforth is a rural village and tractors and trailers will be very noisy going over the proposed speed bumps. The vibrations will be extensive.</p> <p>I do not want to bump in and out of my village.</p> <p>The 20 mph zone on catforth road and school lane will hopefully reduce the average speed through the village.</p> <p>The only part of the scheme that is necessary is the safer parking for school parents and safer driving for the rest of us when the school run is on.</p>
68		<p>I am against these measures. The roads are in such poor condition they already calm the traffic. Farmers and tractors have great difficulty navigating traffic calming and this might have the reverse of the intended benefit by bottlenecking cars tractors and cyclists.</p> <p>Catforth is a rural area with agriculture prevalent. It's hugely expensive and we don't need it.</p>
69		<p>we wish you had included the old part of Rosemary Lane in your proposals as since the advent of Bartle Grange it has become something of a race track with their traffic. I believe representations have been made to the Parish Council, the road surface is now in a dangerous condition.</p>
70		<p>I don't agree with the implementation of any changes to the extent of the current 30mph limit, introducing any 20mph speed limit or construction of 'traffic calming' humps along Catforth Road because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The existing 30mph limit and its extent already embraces the concentration of Catforth buildings around the village hall vicinity & Square

		<p>Lane junction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The school is already included within the existing 30mph perimeter with additional signage & warning lights imposing 20mph limits during school drop off/pick up hours. - I can find no history of road traffic accidents through Catforth to justify the changes, other than one 'slight' in 2022. - The case for 20mph speed limits resulting in a reduction in pollution is yet to be made. (See London LTN controversy). - On the evidence of the Woodplumpton traffic calming attempts, the scheme will be an inefficient and incompetent waste of money at a time when Council Tax continues to rise significantly. The works through Woodplumpton have taken multiple, costly attempts (chicanes, remove/adjust chicanes, remove chicanes/build humps, repair/adjust ramps to humps), the design is still flawed (incorrect radius at Woodplumpton Road/Newsham Hall Lane junction yet to be addressed, and the 30mph limit imposed along Newsham Hall Lane is continuing to consume resources monitoring it's ineffectiveness. - Catforth Road and its pavements are in a poor state of repair. I suggest a better use of any council funds for roadworks in Catforth would be better spent on resurfacing the road through the village, repairing the pavements to make them smooth, safe walkways., cutting back of hedges to allow free access to the pavements, and prohibition of cars parking on the pavements. (The only section of Catforth Road pavement that has recently been resurfaced (at the Lewth Lane junction) is unusable because of the cars habitually parked upon it)!
71		Our recommendation is to go ahead ASAP with the recommended measures. We have been waiting far too many years now for this work. The traffic calming is urgently needed to reduce the speed of drivers and mitigate the potential for accidents.
72		Our recommendation is to go ahead ASAP with the recommended measures. We have been waiting far too many years now for this work. The traffic calming is urgently needed to reduce the speed of drivers and mitigate the potential for accidents.
73		<p>We do not want speed humps or chicanes running through Catforth. Those at Woodplumpton and Cottam are horrendous. [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] Average speed cameras would alleviate the problem! The amount of large agricultural vehicles, tractors and trailers using Catforth Road would undoubtedly cause increased noise and vibration to the detriment of residents and homes. People who are driving vehicles that do not belong to them, often drive ridiculously fast over the humps anyway, which we have witnessed in Cottam and Woodplumpton. A Road with a reasonable surface to drive with speed cameras would be a joy compared to this proposed plan.</p>
74		<p>We do not want speed humps or chicanes running through Catforth. Those at Woodplumpton and Cottam are horrendous. [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] Average speed cameras would alleviate the problem! The amount of large agricultural vehicles, tractors and trailers using Catforth Road would undoubtedly cause increased noise and vibration to the detriment of residents and homes. People who are driving vehicles that do not belong to them, often drive ridiculously fast over the humps anyway, which we have witnessed in Cottam and Woodplumpton. A Road with a reasonable surface to drive with speed cameras would be a joy compared to this proposed plan.</p>

75		<p>I am fully opposed to the current plans for traffic calming in Catforth.</p> <p>There is no history of accidents in Catforth and in my opinion very few issues with speeding. The village has been fine for decades with a 40mph speed limit, more recently reduced to 30.</p> <p>The traffic calming measure installed in Woodplumpton are shockingly poor and spoil the village, I do not want this in Catforth.</p> <p>The proposed measures will cause noise and air pollution along with wear and tear on residents cars. In all likelihood they will also increase accident rates.</p>
76	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	<p>Catforth really doesn't need traffic calming, it needs the road resurfacing and some flood prevention scheme in place. I just don't see speed as a major issue through Catforth, you'll always get the occasional idiot, speed bumps or not.</p>
77		<p>I have many concerns with the traffic calming measures planned for Catforth.</p> <p>Catforth Road is a major thoroughfare for traffic coming into Preston from Wyre, including Inskip, Elswick, and Great Eccleston. This has only been accentuated with the speed bumps now in place in Woodplumpton. It is ludicrous that this key road should become a 20mph road with speed bumps, when all indicators point to it as a standard 30mph road.</p> <p>Furthermore, speed bumps would cause unnecessary damage to the tyres and suspension of cars driving through Catforth. They pose a danger to tractors passing through the village, as well as a cause of substantial noise pollution.</p> <p>The evidence provided of people speeding through the village has been rosey at best; it is mostly hearsay and there has been no statistical backing for the supposed problem trying to be fixed.</p> <p>I strongly believe the scheme would be regressive to the interests of both the residents of Catforth and the wider local community.</p>
78		<p>I fully support the Catforth traffic calming scheme. I reviewed the designs during the consultation process previously and had no comments so did not submit a response of my support. I am only writing now as I have observed Facebook comments urging Catforth residents to have their say and implying that there is not support for such a scheme. Drivers through Catforth have already demonstrated they will not slow down without intervention and therefore I support any intervention to slow drivers as safety is a high priority. The design of the scheme is irrelevant to me and I trust the professionals within Highways department to develop a scheme which is effective and value for money. It is frustrating that this scheme is being delayed and I do hope a resolution is found as soon as possible before an accident occurs. Please don't assume that those who 'shout the loudest' on social media represent the views of residents. I hope you will consider that whilst consultations are useful, people who object are far more likely to respond than those in favour and therefore it is hard to get a true representation of public opinion.</p>

79		<p>As a local resident, I appreciate the efforts to improve road safety, but there are a few areas that need attention.</p> <p>Firstly, the road from Edith Rigby Way to Catforth village is quite uneven, with noticeable bumps and potholes, especially towards Inskip and Woodplumpton. Some resurfacing would make it safer for all road users. Also, visibility at night is a concern due to blind spots and the lack of streetlights.</p> <p>The bridge is another issue. While headlights and signals help at night, some drivers still don't slow down, despite the 30mph limit. With schoolchildren walking to bus stops, dog walkers, horse riders, and joggers around, I'd suggest lowering the speed limit to 20mph in the village and school areas for better safety.</p> <p>Top 3 Ways to Improve Traffic Calming:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Road Repairs – Resurface and fix the uneven road from Edith Rigby Way into Catforth, especially towards Inskip and Woodplumpton. 2. Lower Speed Limits – Reduce the limit to 20mph in school and village areas to protect pedestrians and other road users. 3. Better Safety at the Bridge – Add more signage, warning signals, or rumble strips to make drivers slow down, especially in poor visibility. <p>Small changes like these can make a big difference in keeping our village roads safer for everyone.</p>
80	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	<p>Concerns over excessive noise/vibration/damage to neighbouring houses. Damage to owners cars having to travel through these every day. I agree to speed measures but not in the proposed format. Average Speed cameras would be more suitable.</p>
81		<p>I am not in favour of the proposed Catforth traffic calming scheme.</p> <p>I do not feel that speed bumps and chicanes would be effective and cause inconvenience to residents more than any benefits. There would likely be more noise and possible damage to vehicles.</p> <p>A 20 mph zone in the centre of the village (School Lane and Catforth Road from Benson lane to Green Lane) would hopefully be effective.</p> <p>I fully support the proposal for School parking and providing safe footpaths as the situation at present is dangerous for both school children and other drivers, with parking too close to the junction with Catforth Road and on the bend at Clarkson Green.</p>
82		<p style="text-align: center;">Catforth Traffic calming Survey January 2025</p>

		<p>[REDACTED] Catforth Rd is not a busy road. It has a footpath throughout the length of the village.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We do <u>not</u> wish to see any 20 mph limit (except by the school in school hours) 2. We do <u>not</u> wish to see any traffic calming (except at the entrance and exit to the village) 3. We do <u>not</u> wish to see any extension to the current 30 mph zones 4. We <u>do</u> welcome the plans around Catforth school ie. Partial double yellow lines and improved parking.
83		<p style="text-align: center;">Catforth Traffic calming Survey January 2025</p> <p>[REDACTED] Catforth Rd is not a busy road. It has a footpath throughout the length of the village.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We do <u>not</u> wish to see any 20 mph limit (except by the school in school hours) 2. We do <u>not</u> wish to see any traffic calming (except at the entrance and exit to the village) 3. We do <u>not</u> wish to see any extension to the current 30 mph zones 4. We <u>do</u> welcome the plans around Catforth school ie. Partial double yellow lines and improved parking.
84		<p>Traffic calming in Catforth</p> <p>I have already emailed my thoughts both to LCC and the Parish council on the dangerous speeding that I have witnessed in the village, especially as peak time in the morning and evenings, so I am not going to re-iterate this.</p> <p>We need to slow down motorists through our village and without anything physical, nothing else will work. No extra signage, no SPIDS, no occasionally speed van turning up, lowering the limit will work they will all be ignored. This will also cost money to implement and when the money spent on these things, there will not be any/enough money for other changes to be made.</p> <p>I am totally dismayed at the comments I have heard regarding the scheme, about reducing the speed, putting up signage. There are two very large signs at each end of the village to say that itâ€™s a 30 MPH zone - these are obviously ignored, how much more signage would there need to be to make a difference? Reducing the speed limit will not work and has not worked on Newsham Hall lane, (as per the WPC agenda items), which beg the question - why would this work in Catforth?</p> <p>The village needs physical barriers to stop the speeding and itâ€™s the only way.</p> <p>I am in favour speed humps/chicanes in strategic places [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>For me the major concern is my children get on/off the high school bus and have to cross a road that is full of speeding motorists. There</p>

		<p>should be a safe crossing such as a pelican or zebra. This would be more prevalent as parents of the children from the primary school on school lane would have to park on the village hall with the new scheme.</p> <p>There is another danger spot as you come to the end of school lane to adjoin Catforth Road, you can't see right and again you have to pull out onto Catforth road to see (I have had drivers swerve at the last minute as they were going to fast) this junction should be changed. Change the road layout at the T junction at the top of School Lane which joins Catforth road by implementing give way lines on Catforth Road at the junction heading towards Preston; therefore you will not have the right of way on Catforth road, thereby reducing the speed in this area. Give-way lines on Catforth Road at the school lane junction, would allow drivers to pull out of school lane safely and stop erratic manovers and slow down motorists. This could also be a point of crossing by using pelican lights.</p> <p>My children would like to cycle to friends houses and the local cafe but itâ€™s too dangerous on Catforth road. Perhaps a cycle lane should be incorporated.</p> <p>I think overall safety of all the residents should trump any other concerns. I really can't see how tractors, horse trailers have a problem with speed humps, if they are raised platforms and not those thin strips which can cause drivers to swerve or have a severe impact on the vehicle and passengers. To me they are no worse than the many thousands of pot holes they have to drive over every day.</p> <p>As part of the scheme to have double yellow lines on school lane preventing parents parking, where is the additional parking going to go? The village hall car park is not big enough for all the cars, the teachers at the school use the lay-by opposite the village hall, reducing spaces and to be hones it is not suitable for parking as it get narrow at the ends and longer cars cannot use these spaces as they stick out into the road. This should be made a clear parking area with tarmac, lines and widened. The same goes for the one at the bottom of School lane, I have seen campervans, Lorries and cars with trailers parked in the middle lengthways across the lay-by preventing many cars parking. This is also used as a turning area for the parents at school times. I feel the parking would spill over onto Catforth Road if these areas are not suitable and cause more problems for pedestrians trying to cross a busy road.</p> <p>As a resident, I have seen my fellow residents speeding through the village, so I ask the question â€œ why are these people so against the scheme and really how much noisier is it going to be, when I have seen 40 ft trucks speeding through the village to get to DPS, donâ€™t they make a noise going over the pot holes.</p> <p>To summarise - change the number of speed humps to strategic danger points and add in more chicanes to slow down the traffic, along with a zebra/pelican crossing, change of road layout as per my suggestion and address the parking issues. This is my feedback on the whole scheme.</p>
85	DOES NOT	<p>As a keen cyclist who frequently rides through Catforth- as part of our groups regular rides including the weekly chain gang- I was shocked to hear of the seemingly extreme measures being taken in Catforth. Such a large number of speed bumps, chicanes etcâ€¦ will make it</p>

	LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	<p>both dangerous for cyclists who are passing through. I speak on behalf of many cyclists when I say that we have all avoided Woodplumpton for a number of years due to the extensive, yet seemingly ineffective, traffic calming measures as it is unsafe for cyclists; the chicanes in particular are dangerous as the supposed cycle lanes/pass through at the side is always filled with debris yet cars get unsafely close- and become extremely annoyed- at cyclists navigating the chicanes in the same way vehicles do. The works will disrupt many of our rides but will particularly affect our weekend chain gang ride. In summer, we can have 30-40 cyclists meeting to split into smaller groups to ride a short circuit around Catforth and surrounding areas; we would not safely, or even enjoyably, be able to navigate the extensive measures proposed in Catforth. Not only would this have a negative impact on the health, wellbeing and safety of local cyclists but not being able to cycle through Catforth will significantly reduce the amount of business small, local businesses (such as Roots cafe) will receive. I respect speeding is a problem in many areas and equally respect the parish advocating for action; however, I feel the proposed measures are too extensive and will have a negative impact on many who use the roads- including cyclists. I urge the council to reconsider the current plans.</p>
86	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	<p>It would cause chaos as drivers tend to accelerate between humps to make up time and get to the narrow section without having to give way, thus making it very dangerous.</p>
87	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	<p>[REDACTED] Yes, we do need measures to slow traffic on both Catforth Road and School Lane, but practical and environmental impacts from the noise and congestion of the often large agricultural traffic/school buses and all other vehicles being forced over speed bumps and through chicanes seems to be counterproductive. School Lane has always been a nightmare within term time, with too little parking on offer due to the expansion of the school. Parents often park irresponsibly and illegally to drop off their children and the road being gets blocked by buses from Broughton High School. However, in recent years, the village hall car park has offered an alternative location for parents. We need a designated crossing on Catforth Road with lights/lollipop lady to get children safely to school and encourage parents to park more responsibly, knowing they have a safe crossing space for their families, which at the moment they do not - it's like dicing with death, especially if you have a pram to manage too! This crossing in conjunction with lowered speed limit along Catforth Road would go a long way to reducing speeds on this stretch of road without blighting the very nature of our rural and agricultural village.</p>
88	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY	<p>I am not in support of this idea. I do not think it would be beneficial to Catforth or surrounding areas. I think the money could be better spent elsewhere.</p>

	AFFECTED AREA	
89	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	<p>I very much support the intention to reduce speeding in the area, however I feel that the proposals made are not appropriate. The number of speed bumps suggested is excessive, vastly outnumbering most other schemes. They will prove a significant hazard when the road floods (as it regularly does), as well as being a nuisance on a daily basis and causing expensive wear and tear to vehicles. The measures suggested will also only serve to divert traffic onto other local roads, many of them even less suitable for it.</p> <p>While the best option would be average speed cameras, these do have an associated cost. However, ordinary speed cameras would be less expensive and would reduce speeding without becoming either a hazard or a nuisance for those locals who drive safely - which surely must be the aim.</p> <p>In addition to my previous comment.</p> <p>The suggestion to narrow school lane to a single lane using a "coloured table" and apply double yellow lines defies all logic.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Any issues in school lane are limited to half a hour morning and evening, and are caused by a lack of parking. Reducing it further will only add to the problem. 2) If parked cars are considered a hazard that makes double yellow lines necessary, then narrowing the road will have the same effect. 3) Forcing 100 children, plus parents and siblings, to cross multiple roads does not increase safety. Does the council plan to hire school crossing supervisors and fund this for the foreseeable future? Three supervisors would be needed to make these proposals safe, one outside the village hall and two on school lane. 4) The Village hall car park does not have enough spaces to accommodate the school, even assuming the car park is not already in use for an event at the hall. <p>In short, while this measure would benefit me personally (my children have blue badges and yellow lines would effectively guarantee parking for us outside school) it is utterly nonsensical and serves no purpose.</p>
90	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	<p>The current proposed scheme does not realistically alter the average speed of drivers through the proposed routes, all it really does is create an inconvenience to local residents who need to pass through. The already installed scheme in Woodplumpton only allows drivers down at the speed bumps or chicanes, people regularly speed up in between and therefore create more pollution and go over the 30 limit. It also creates unnecessary thudding and vibrations to local residents and unnecessary increased wear on cars. The proposed scheme for Catforth will just be an inconvenience. A much better provision would be the introduction of average speed cameras which would have the desired effect on keeping cars below the speed limit for the duration of their journey through the proposed area and not be an</p>

		inconvenience to local residents etc.
91	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	The roads in the immediate area including Lewth lane are overloaded with increased heavy goods vehicles travelling to local businesses. The speed limits of 60 through the windy lanes of Lewth have resulted in numerous crashes into ditches and hedgerows. Corners are also mounted constantly causing damage to carriageway and verges. These issues lead to debris blocking drainage which in turn causes flooding. Repairs are not done in a timely fashion. Long term the roads cannot cope with the HGVs either through the village or around Lewth Lane. Maybe an HGV route down the wider , straighter route through salwick should be considered, rejoining at the Derby Arms. Trafficking calming will push more traffic onto Lewth Lane which is not fit to take this additional capacity.
92		I don't believe putting speed bumps along a road which is essentially a traditional farming village with agricultural machinery using the road multiple times per day, is a wise move! It is clear potholes that have existed along these stretches of road for some time don't get maintained or repaired adequately by the council so why would newly installed speed bumps suddenly be repaired every time they are compacted by a tractor or heavy goods vehicle. The combination of compaction at the sides of the speed bumps coupled with deep potholes is going to cause serious damage to cars with minimal clearance even at a reduced speed of 20 or 30 mph. I am fully on board with traffic calming measures in the correct locations and agree that removing national speed limits on a somewhat dangerous road with blind bends is absolutely necessary but for the above reasons I believe speed bumps are not the answer in this location [REDACTED]
93	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	Lets be honest the main issue with Catforth is the current state of the road which in itself is unsafe due to the unevenness making vehicles harder to handle. Also massive pot holes which cause drivers to swerve or potentially cause damage to vehicle which again lets face it LCC will try not to compensate. We should be pushing LCC to meet there legal obligation of providing a road of good a state which seems they have neglected for the last near 10 years. There is nothing wrong with the speed limits at present as ultimaty Catforth road and Rosemary lane is a through route towards the newly constructed Preston distributor. Guidance states before changing a speed limit traffic authorities need to satisfy that expected benefits exceeds costs. Which i can only assume can be achived if the roads are majorly developed hence turning Catforth into a suburb of Preston which i hope is not what residents or the parish council wish to achieve. Also i note that School Lane is earmarked for speed reduction which again i believe the above apply and neither would benefit Catforth or Inskip and there are large bends before hitting the village which are a natural speed deceser. I also believe driver awareness should be the main focus on roads which if a low speed limit is enforced takes the drivers eye away from the road and onto the speedometer. We have already been hit with the poor state of (traffic calming) in woodplumton and reduction of speed on Newsham hall lane which quite obviously is to slow for the road. Regarding the speed reduction and traffic calming scheme for Catforth itself what is wrong with 30mph? I cant recall the last serious injury. If the school have an issue then should something small like better parking or lollypop lady be introduced or even a variable speed limit outside the school at open/close times.

		Overall the whole scheme seems way to excessive which i am strongly against and it is ultimately urbanising beautiful Catforth and surrounding roads with the horendous (Traffic calming bollards etc) which i hope is not the parish council councils objective.
94	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	My suggestion would be, instead of speed humps and giveaway signs just install average speed cameras with the speed limit clearly displayed. I would think that would be cheaper and less invasive for the residence. It also wouldn't hinder emergency vehicles. It seems to work very well on Blackpool Road near Kirkham;
95	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	I agree with reducing the speed limit through the village. 30mph from catforth Road to the canal bridge with 20mph around school. Extend the footpath opposite the village hall, by the bus stop to allow people to cross safely from the village hall carpark and walk on the paveme t rather than the verge or the road. A zebra crossing here would be helpful also. I would be against chicanes or speed bumps due to the potential damage to vehicles, damage to surrounding buildings due to vibrations and access for larger vehicles especially with trailers. There is also additional risk of damage due to these not being seen at the bottom of the village on the numerous occasions that the village is flooded ! There needs to be careful consideration of the impact of these changes on the safety of the roads. The junction changes at Woodplumpton are frankly dangerous and have attracted multiple complaints and concerns.
96	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	As a regular commuter to Catforth I feel that speed bumps as a traffic calming measure would prove both ineffective and potentially dangerous. I think the proposed scheme has been overthought and needs to be revised. Speed limits of 30mph though the village would be appropriate, 20mph near the School during term times, road resurfacing and repairs alongside anti skid surfaces in some areas, maybe rumble stripes accross the roads warning of speed limit changes. Just a thought.
97	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	Very few people I have seen speeding in catforth to warrant speed humps or traffic calming. I suggest repairs to pot holes and rough tarmac needing repair. Through catforth there are many bends which also slow traffic. This road could do with drains and ditches maintained to prevent flooding which happens when there is a heavy rainfall.The Road looks like a river. One house has built a wall around their garden to try and stop their gardens being flooded. There are new drains near the car garage that don't work properly. It seems the council look at speed humps and not what is needed. <div style="background-color: black; width: 400px; height: 15px; margin: 5px 0;"></div> Money should be spent on the things needed.

98		<p>Comments, Concerns & Suggestions:</p> <p>While speeding is a problem in the centre of Catforth village itself, the proposed traffic scheme is unsuitable as it covers too large an area, reduces speed limits excessively, and includes chicanes and speed bumps that are incompatible with the village's heavy agricultural, equestrian, and HGV traffic. These measures could cause significant noise, damage, and harm to livestock in transit, negatively impacting the village.</p> <p>Proposed Speed Limits: Catforth Road: 40mph from the Saddle roundabout to Benson Lane, then 30mph from Benson Lane to Green Lane. School Lane: 20mph to the brook bridge, then 40mph to Moorside Lane.</p> <p>Suggestions: Improved speed limit signage, road markings, rumble strips, tarmac changes, illuminated signs, and speed indicator devices are better alternatives. Chicanes and speed bumps are unsuitable due to the lack of alternative routes for HGVs and high agricultural traffic. In addition, the excessive number currently proposed may introduce driver frustration and actually increase the danger in the area by causing intermittent and rapid acceleration and braking, or swerving in between the physical obstructions. The main focus of attention should be around the Catforth Road and School Lane junction where the greatest risk pedestrians and others vehicles exists.</p> <p>Other: Parking near the school should be addressed, possibly with double red lines. Encouraging use of the village hall car park and reinstating a lollipop person could help manage school drop-off and collection times. Has the idea of a three way traffic light controlled junction been considered for this location? Physically bringing vehicles to a standstill and only one direction being allowed to move at any point.</p>
99	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	<p>Please think again about speed bumps, as a regular driver through Catforth I personally think other measures would be more effective, lowered speed limits, monitoring, 30mph in areas, warning lights near the school, limiting it to 20 mph when the children are coming and going, speed strips across the roads before speed limits changes, speed bumps just cause damage , potential injury, hamper emergency services</p>
100	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE	<p>By traffic calming I assume you mean speed bumps my concerns with speed bumps is the roads through Catforth are horrendous with potholes already and can damage tyres etc so will the roads be getting made before proposed traffic calming</p>

	DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	
101		<p>As much as I am directly affected by the speed of the traffic [REDACTED] do not support the current scheme. I am very aware of just how much agricultural traffic and heavy goods vehicles pass my property daily. I have no issue with the vehicles that use this road [REDACTED] Much of the noise could be reduced by resurfacing as this has been neglected and left in disrepair for many, many years! Speed bumps will only add to the wear and tear already experienced by many. [REDACTED] To have extra noise inflicted on people's homes due to speed bumps would be horrific. The illuminated speed signs seem to have an impact on traffic slowing. More of these would be beneficial. [REDACTED] Also painted road markings are easier to see as the streetlights are not overly bright and overall signage not great. Speed cameras I feel would be more beneficial.</p> <p>Another issue on Catforth road is cars parking on the already narrow footpath opposite the running pump as you pass Number 2 Joiners Cottage and adjoining house, Spring Cottage. Both properties park on the road. Pedestrians all must walk in the road to pass and it is also a slight bend with reduced view. This requires some restrictions of parking here as this is not acceptable for anyone to deal with. It is very unsettling to see how many people with children /dog's/ horses I have either come across walking in the road to get by them. I've also been faced with vehicles on my side who refuse to stop and have little consideration for ahead on collision. At different times of the day and night horns can be heard for those frustrated to have had a bad experience on this part of Catforth Road.</p> <p>I also feel that signage could be clearer. There are multiple changes to speed but not sufficient signage /road markings to further enforce this.</p> <p>School lane is a particularly bad road. The signage is diabolical. Once past The Primary School and BT exchange there are no warnings of bends, the speed would be better suited to continue as 30mph- Max of 40mph. Also, a big concern for this stretch of road is that it is never gritted! This makes no sense. Not only does that affect school foot traffic but the older generation walking to get the bus. School Lane does not need speed bumps, I feel it would be a waste of money. At the end of school lane trying to pull out on to Catforth Road, visibility is limited due to the hedge on the corner. Firstly, this should be a stop sign not give way. For myself to turn right out of school lane I need to slowly edge out when nothing is coming from the left in case there is something coming from the right. It's not safe, visibility is reduced, and something needs to be enforced with the maintenance of that hedge.</p> <p>As a local business owner our trucks would be affected by the changes to the road. We have recently had the new junction to access Edith Rigby Way and the M55. By putting your proposal of the current scheme in place then means we would be forced to go back to using Broughton which already becomes a bottle neck, has more time in a stationary position due to congestion, increases our fuel costs, wages, fleet expenses and does not go anywhere towards the impact on the climate.</p>
102		<p>Concerns are the numerous speed humps down catforth road. Don't believe extending the reduced speed limits will be of any benefit. Traffic has increased significantly so be Edith rugby way opened</p>
103	DOES NOT	<p>[REDACTED] we do not support the proposed traffic calming suggestions. [REDACTED]</p> <p>Since the opening of Edith Rigby Way and the new junction to the M55 this has made a positive difference to our business. Previously</p>

	<p>LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA</p>	<p>when the only option was the bottle neck of traffic via Broughton we can now utilise the new roads and reduce our overall business costs. Should the proposal go ahead this will further delay deliveries, increase fleet costs (diesel & maintenance) and overall impact not only our business but access for customers and our suppliers. Business is hard enough without making our roads more difficult to use [REDACTED]</p> <p>School lane issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It will not benefit from speed bumps. This road consists of a number of major bends. This road is never gritted and sometimes be completely white, the bumps would not be visible creating another hazzard. 2. Inadequate signage for sharp bends on School Lane. The state of the hedge reflects how many have left the road. 3. Speed needs reducing to at least 40mph 4. Junction of School Lane and Catforth Road should be a stop sign not give way. Visibility restricted due to hedge of property on the corner at this junction. <p>Catforth road:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Desperately needs resurfacing. This road has been neglected for many years. It would appear much of the funding has gone to Woodplumpton Village as that section of road has been done more than once due to errors on the previous attempt. Another reason to not rush this scheme through to avoid wasting money. 2. This is another example of restricting business for many as the junction at White cross is no longer accessible in the same way. Some suppliers can no longer turn into the village if approaching from Broughton. Struggle to exit if they have been diverted through Woodplumpton. The state the grass is currently in is far from fair to those we know residing at White Cross. Businesses are literally being cut off with these unnecessary changes. More consideration is needed for HGV's. 3. Extra signage is required 4. Speed cameras would be beneficial. <p>[REDACTED]</p>
104	<p>DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA</p>	<p>[REDACTED] we do not support the proposed traffic calming suggestions [REDACTED]</p> <p>Since the opening of Edith Rigby Way and the new junction to the M55 this has made a positive difference to our business. Previously when the only option was the bottle neck of traffic via Broughton we can now utilise the new roads and reduce our overall business costs. Should the proposal go ahead this will further delay deliveries, increase fleet costs (diesel & maintenance) and overall impact not only our business but access for customers and our suppliers. Business is hard enough without making our roads more difficult to use. [REDACTED]</p> <p>School lane issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It will not benefit from speed bumps. This road consists of a number of major bends. This road is never gritted and sometimes be

		<p>completely white, the bumps would not be visible creating another hazard.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Inadequate signage for sharp bends on School Lane. The state of the hedge reflects how many have left the road. 3. Speed needs reducing to at least 40mph 4. Junction of School Lane and Catforth Road should be a stop sign not give way. Visibility restricted due to hedge of property on the corner at this junction. <p>Catforth road:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Desperately needs resurfacing. This road has been neglected for many years. It would appear much of the funding has gone to Woodplumpton Village as that section of road has been done more than once due to errors on the previous attempt. Another reason to not rush this scheme through to avoid wasting money. 2. This is another example of restricting business for many as the junction at White cross is no longer accessible in the same way. Some suppliers can no longer turn into the village if approaching from Broughton. Struggle to exit if they have been diverted through Woodplumpton. The state the grass is currently in is far from fair to those we know residing at White Cross. Businesses are literally being cut off with these unnecessary changes. More consideration is needed for HGV's. 3. Extra signage is required 4. Speed cameras would be beneficial. <div style="background-color: black; height: 40px; width: 100%;"></div>
105	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	<p>The scheme needs to consider all road users and the impact on the surrounding villages.</p> <p>If traffic is forced to go slow through Catforth this could cause motorists to take alternative routes which would impact Inskip-with-Sowerby. We already struggle with speeding through the village but we do not have the benefit of CIL monies so we cannot self fund traffic calming.</p> <p>The roads in the whole area (Catforth, Woodplumpton, Inskip-with-Sowerby and Lewth etc) are used by vulnerable road users (on foot, cycles, horses and mobility scooters)and this should be encouraged.</p> <p>It is unfortunate that drivers do not respect vulnerable road users and require traffic calming measures.</p> <p>Any measures that are sensible and do not adversely affect surrounding roads would be welcome.</p>
106	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	<p>After working and living in Catforth for all my life i have a few concerns in regards to the plans. I move heavy machinery through the village and it will have adverse effects to my vehicles and will likely damage them having to travel over speed bumps. The plan numbered 7 i believe will cause accidents. it is positioned on a stretch of road that ponce was a 60mph and after a blind bend. Motorists will speed up between the traffic calming measures and then be met after a blind bend by stationary traffic. Causing accidents. I feel that after these measures are put in place it will have a damaging effect to the community. the road conditions already are not acceptable. Yet rather than repair the road money is going to be wasted on traffic calming measures. the traffic calming measured suggested are all placed in an area that is not high accident rate or high problem rate. more accidents have happened on the stretch of road after crown lane and up over the motorway towards Preston travelling south. this is simply being dropped to a 30mph stretch which simply will be ignored. I feel that it is</p>

		with good intentions these plans have been drawn up but i feel they do not meet rural village needs. I feel average speed cameras would solve the speeding. Although these are expensive to set up they will produce revenue which will pay for its self generally within a couple of years . Speed bumps are damaging to vehicles. Heavy farm machinery is a part of rural life and these will become hazards to the roads. Its is well known that horses, which are plentiful in the village, do not understand or see speed bumps and will become a huge hazard for the many equine people that live in the village. These measures that are suggested will make the village a less idyllic and friendly place to live. These measures are not a suitable fit for a rural village and are not advised by the highways agency for rural villages. I would of hoped that after the mistakes that have been made in Woodplumton the Parrish council would look at repairing and putting these right before destroying another village.
107	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	I use this road on a regular basis both as a cyclist & car/van driver etc. It feel the chicanes aren't necessary and will create road rage incidents & increase pollution as vehicles will have to constantly stop or race through a man made pinch point squeezing cyclists and horses using the road. The flat top speed bumps aren't great when your using the road regularly, SPECS Average speed cameras should be installed to control the speed of traffic negating the need for all the road alterations. The money would be better spent on resurfacing the whole village.
108	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	I have bicycled with friends in this area for 20 years while I appreciate efforts to make road safer my experience of the chicanes is that it ends with drivers playing chicken with cyclists. They never give way and this will lead to potential head on collision.The cyclist expert the car to stop it doesn't and cyclist can't stop in time. Please reconsider these. At least with no blockage both users can be on own side of road. Are you having a speed camera or speed limit waste of time. Care design the drains on speed ramps as again cyclist can fall into the gaps causing them to hit curbs. I hope you find this constructive
109	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	The vast majority of calming scheme is completely unnecessary. The whole village needs resurfacing and the speeding problem could easily be eliminated like it has in many other villages such as Grimsargh by installing speed cameras or Average Speed Cameras. The chicanes and traffic calming measures in Woodplumpton have created an incredible amount of road rage, in particular with the pinch points for cyclists & horses as cars race through & pass close to vulnerable road users. They proposed measures also increase pollution with standing traffic queuing at peak periods, not to mention increased noise for residents as cars pass over the ramps.
110	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	As a local resident I regularly cycle and drive through Catforth and surrounding local roads and lanes that have traffic calming measures. None of the existing traffic calming schemes work effectively. Cars don't really slow down over the humps and in the case of chicanes and the narrowing priority version, cars often speed through these in daring managers that leave cyclists and other vulnerable road users in danger. On my bike vehicles have passed me within the these areas because they are to impatient to wait. Catforth is a haven for cyclists who use the roads through the village on a daily basis. The road surface through the village is appalling and is both a danger and hazard to cars cyclists horses and pedestrians. Every Saturday morning there is a dedicate d group of cyclists circa of 30 individuals who train in 2/3 organised groups. There have been accidents in the past due to the poor surface. The only effective way to reduce speed and accidents is

		to resurface the road and install SPECS average speed cameras. Traffic calming measures isn't the answer.
111		<p>The issue that Catforth faces is one of how to make our village a safe place for everyone and I believe that speed is only one factor which must be addressed to meet this goal. The plans focus on speed reduction and do not address other issues of safety.</p> <p>Speed humps will cause damage to vehicles, noise to nearby houses, issues for farmers and frustration to drivers. Frustration will lead to dangerous driving as vehicles get stuck behind cycles for long stretches etc.</p> <p>Signage, rumble strips/ red markings to note change in speed restrictions should be used in the first instance to reduce speed of traffic rather than speed humps. A cheaper alternative which may be enough.</p> <p>Reduce the speed through the village passing the school to 20 at arrival and departure times for the pupils. This happens in Broughton already, and is common and effective elsewhere. It is not necessary for most of the week.</p> <p>No consideration has been given to safe crossing points " outside the village hall, or the school e.g. zebra crossing, pedestrian crossing, small island (although this may not be practical for agricultural vehicle access) lollipop crossing. Children should be able to walk safely from the key parking locations to the school.</p> <p>Use appropriate speed limits to the road conditions. This does not mean restricting to a 20 limit everywhere as drivers become frustrated and can act dangerously. Why is it proposed to reduce the section from Bartle Hall to Catforth to 30 when 40 or 50 would be perfectly adequate? This is a country road, a major link road and not a built-up area.</p> <p>Clear markings for bus stops and laybys where possible to create safe spaces, especially for children using them. If the bus can not pull in this creates a danger to traffic trying to pass.</p> <p>Adequate signage should be added to warn of other road users e.g. horses, cyclists. As well as to direct traffic around the area to the local motorway junction. Poor lighting is a factor to cause increased risks in the area as traffic can not see other road users.</p> <p>Pavements should be a safe width for a pushchair and child next to it or a wheelchair, we need more of them to join areas of the village together. They should be in good conditions so that runners use them instead of running down the road. Linking the village to its Common Land at Carrs Green now an area of conservation (one of our few public facilities).</p> <p>Safe road surfaces, most are poor with for example road width, edging, pot holes which cause cyclists for to swerve out into the centre of the road or vehicles have no safe passing places.</p> <p>Visibility to safely pull onto the main roads, use of mirrors to enhance view around bends.</p> <p>The junction of Catforth Road and Lewth Lane should be a STOP rather than a give way. Visibility is poor at the junction due to a hedge and many people do not slow (including large groups of cyclists) when pulling onto a 60 limit road never mind stop. This junction is the site of a school bus stop and used by many HGVs ! An accident waiting to happen.</p> <p>From the points listed above there are many other aspects that need to be addressed to make the area safe rather than adding speed cushions. A 20 limit will have limited impact as it will encourage frustrated drivers to drive dangerously and be counterproductive.</p>
112	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY	<p>I'm concerned about the disruption the speed bumps will have on the agricultural sector as some times tractors are running late at night and bouncing over the bumps with empty trailers will make a huge noise in the evening. Also since the new link road went in there is a lot more HGVs going up and down Catforth rd and I feel that putting speed bumps in this will cause a lot of damage to properties as a lot</p>

	AFFECTED AREA	shake already when vehicles go past.
113	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	I am majorly against the proposed traffic calming in and around Catforth. It feels as though villages are being cut off by reducing speed limits as it will deter people from them due to increased time spent traveling to them from surrounding towns and cities. 20mph through the village with or without physical measure is completely unneeded and a blot on a beautiful village and complete waste of money.
114	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>I would like a reduction of speed along the main Catforth Road by use of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Average speed camera SPIDS Speed circles on the road Rubble strips More speed control signage Police speed watch Red no waiting on the corners of school lane to stop bad parking, blocking viability. <p>We are aware of many of our friends with horses we visit, [REDACTED] who are worried about navigating the speed bumps. Also farmers will be hugely impacted by the bumps which have been proposed. We also believe the scheme is far too big!</p>
115		<p>The proposed scheme is not suitable.</p> <p>From Bartle Hall to Crown Lane the speed limit should 40mph.</p> <p>From Crown Lane the whole length of Catforth Road should be 30mph.</p> <p>School Lane should be 20mph to the bridge over the brook and then 40mph to the junction with Moorside Lane.</p> <p>The village needs significantly improved speed limit signage. The speed limit needs to be painted on the road. Rumble strips, illuminated signs and speed indicator devices also need to be added.</p> <p>Speed bumps and chicanes are not suitable for busses, agricultural and equestrian traffic.</p>

		<p>Other concerns Traffic around the school needs to be addressed. School numbers have increased over the last years which has added extra cars and people crossing the road. A lollipop person needs to be reinstated A stop sign needs to be added - too many cars are not giving way to traffic on Catforth Road. School Lane needs to be gritted in icy conditions.</p>
116	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	<p>I don't think the speed bumps are a good idea, they always scrape my car and have damaged it making my car unsafe to drive (I needed a costly repair) !!! I always drive safely and at the correct speed, I am no idiot!! I do agree that drivers need to slow down, and obey the traffic laws! But please No Speed Bumps / Ramps etc, they only cause problems and potential accidents .</p>
117		<p>I'm NOT in favour of the speed humps that are proposed but acknowledge that speeding is a major concern through our village ..more and better signage using the latest technology would be preferred . Average speed cameras would be the best option but doubt we would fit the criteria requirements.</p>
118		<p>I am very concerned about the need for traffic calming in Bartle and Catforth. HGVs have pounded the road surfaces + edges between the link road + Treales - [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Traffic cameras are the only solution. Speed bumps are damaging, unsuitable for cyclists, horses, ambulances etc. Two would suffice + would assist in crime prevention + tracing those who speed, rather than every careful road user being forced to bounce over speed bumps.</p>
119		<p>[REDACTED] I would like to object to the proposed traffic calming scheme for Catforth Road. The scheme in Woodplumpton has brought many problems, noise, speeding over the traffic humps, vibration to property, disruption to traffic flow and chaos at peak times when the road is parked full of cars for school pickup and dropoff. I do not want this for Catforth. This is an agricultural area with high numbers of farm vehicles using the roads, traffic humps are totally unsuitable for this type of traffic. Slowing down and speeding up to negotiate these humps will increase noise, vibration and disrupt traffic flow. This is not acceptable to those living on Catforth Road. A large number of cyclists and horse riders use the Catforth area but will be put in danger if the scheme proceeds. Cyclists avoid Woodplumpton and it is a fact that horses do not negotiate speed humps safely, they trip onto them and slip off them. Transporting live</p>

		<p>animals in trailers over them to the motorway junction or Myerscough Equestrian facilities is another hazard.</p> <p>To my knowledge in the last 7 years during planning, there has not been any RTA's or pedestrian incidents on the part of Catforth Road the traffic calming is proposed for.</p> <p>I do not think we need these measures. A reduction of the speed limit and speed cameras (mobile or static), along with adequate signage, is surely the way forward. By dropping the 30mph limit to 20mph near the school and the 60mph limit to 30 or 40mph the traffic will be allowed to flow normally causing little disruption to drivers and residents.</p>
120		<p>I am totally opposed to the proposed traffic calming scheme for Catforth Road. [REDACTED] I am only aware of a minimal number of RTA's and none along Catforth Road where the traffic humps are proposed.</p> <p>Catforth is a quiet village, the volume of traffic being recently increased by the opening of the M55 junction and link road. During the planning stage taking 7 years, was the increase in traffic taken into account? I think not. Traffic humps cause disruption to traffic flow, excessive noise, vibration and pollution. The increase in traffic volume is not a problem, most drivers respect the village and keep to the speed limits.</p> <p>What will cause a problem is the volume of traffic when faced with multiple traffic humps. Vehicles passing the houses on Catforth Road are gone by in a couple of seconds, this process will be altered to unacceptable noise levels over a much longer period of time, slowing down, speeding away and rattling and banging over speed humps. At busy times the noise would be constant.</p> <p>This is an agricultural area, with large numbers of farm vehicles towing trailers using Catforth Road. Farm vehicles are large and not built for quietly negotiating speed bumps. Highways do not recommend this type of traffic calming in agricultural areas.</p> <p>Catforth is a safe haven for cyclists and horse riders alike, they avoid Woodplumpton due to the speed humps which are dangerous to negotiate by both. There are many stables in the area and both farmers and horse owners need to move livestock along Catforth Road, be it for business or pleasure, speed bumps are very hazardous when transporting animals.</p> <p>I do think the speed limit needs to be lowered from 60mph to 30 or 40mph and perhaps 30mph to 20mph near the school. We do not want or need traffic humps and I am sure a reduction in the speed limit, rumble strips and increased signage would be the way forward. Traffic cameras and flashing speed signs are known to be a suitable solution in village environments. A 'Please Drive Carefully Through Our Village' sign at both ends of Catforth Road would also denote entry to the village.</p> <p>Our village needs to be protected and it's identity maintained for future generations....</p>
121		<p>At 6am in the morning, Catforth Rd becomes increasingly busy. There are HGVs, tractors, vans, buses " a variety of vehicles. Since the opening of the new motorway junction, Catforth has seen increased traffic. Installation of speed bumps will increase the noise and further disruption caused to residents from the increased traffic.</p> <p>The road needs repairing, with more obvious speed reminders.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>

	<p>The pavements are unsafe and the road measures are going to make it far worse for pedestrians. It will also make it unsafe to overtake cyclists safely, who also regularly use the road.</p> <p>Furthermore, speed bumps can pose a hazard for cyclists and motorcyclists, as they are more difficult to navigate safely compared to cars.</p> <p>I would like to know if the Parish council are accepting liability of issues caused to the houses as well as potential accidents to cyclists which will occur due to speed bumps.</p> <p>In regards to other local villages, such as Woodplumpton, speed bumps are ineffective at reducing speeding, particularly when the design does not suit the traffic patterns of the area or if drivers are simply not inclined to slow down. Vehicles will speed up and then wait to proceed. This stopping and starting will create greater risks to pedestrians and other road users.</p> <p>Other issues will also include greater pollution and fumes, the speed bumps not being of rural nature, delays to emergency services and congestion.</p>
122	<p>The government website states that speed bumps are ineffective if they are not placed close together. The drawings presented by the Parish Council, along with vague and contentious comments about moving them, have led to significant inaccuracies. The plans shown at the Village Hall did not clearly indicate the distance between the speed bumps, and according to government research, speed bumps placed more than 50 meters apart are ineffective.</p> <p>Additionally, the government guidelines specify that speed bumps should not be installed in agricultural areas or on bus routes, also they negatively impact emergency services' response times.</p> <p>While improvements are being made to School Lane, such as the addition of extra parking spaces (as we've been told), there is no consideration for disabled parents or guardians who need to bring their children to school. Furthermore, this area is also becoming a prime location for illegal dumping and overnight parking. The layby is currently being used as an unofficial campsite. By extending this parking area, the Parish Council is essentially inviting further anti-social behavior, particularly outside of school hours and during school breaks.</p> <p>[REDACTED] if this proposal moves forward, I would like to know whether I will be entitled to a reduction in council tax to compensate for the inconvenience. Will residents' rates be decreased due to the disruption caused by these changes?</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>

	<p>Furthermore, the pavements and curbs are in poor condition, posing a significant trip hazard. They are unsuitable, too narrow, and need to be repaired to ensure pedestrian safety. As someone with a disability, the uneven surfaces create great risks when walking. Because of this, I am unable to safely walk in my area [REDACTED]. Regarding School Lane, safer pavements would benefit children and parents far more than a car park would. Additionally, a car park that encourages children to cross at a corner will require funding for a Crossing Patrol to ensure safety.</p> <p>Another concern is the increased pollution and fumes from cars accelerating away from the speed bumps. According to government research, speed bumps need to be placed less than 25 meters apart to be effective. This creates further issues regarding air quality and environmental impact.</p> <p>Two speed cameras in the village would make an impact. When the mobile speed unit is present, our village is a safer place to be. Inskip, Goosnargh, Elswick, Broughton, St. Michael's, Bilsborrow, Churchtown etc. do not have speed bumps. They have effective measures in place. Our Parish Council must take their examples of traffic calming into consideration, before any more local funds and uproar ensues.</p>
123	<p>Whilst speeding through Catforth is an issue with me, as I walk my dog on the narrow pavement or even Catforth road itself, speed bumps or 20 mph is not the answer. A camera is one option the other A hump across the width of the road should be put in at the start and end of this restricted area and where possible especially School Lane near the school to lay -by a wider footpath be made and single traffic with preference arrows Then smiley illuminated faces on posts on the side of the road as on Newsham Lane</p>
124	<p>Dear Parish Council,</p> <p>I am writing to formally object to the proposed traffic calming scheme for Catforth, specifically regarding the inclusion of speed bumps and chicanes. I have significant concerns about the effectiveness of these measures and the potential negative impact they could have on residents, businesses, and the overall character of the village.</p> <p>1. Effectiveness of Speed Bumps</p> <p>While I understand the intention behind introducing traffic calming measures, I believe there is insufficient evidence to support the effectiveness of speed bumps in reducing speed, especially in the context of our village. In Woodplumpton, residents have reported significant issues following the installation of similar measures. Many have experienced constant disruption, including vibrations that shake homes, damage to buildings (including cracks in the walls of local businesses), and increased noise pollution.</p> <p>A key concern raised at a recent meeting [REDACTED] [REDACTED] has observed no improvements in road safety since the installation of speed bumps. In fact [REDACTED] suggested that they may have made the situation more dangerous, particularly for pedestrians. This direct feedback, along with my own observations, forms part of my</p>

objection.

Moreover, your own figures on the reduction of average speed in Woodplumpton fail to account for the substantial decrease in traffic volume (around 1,000 fewer vehicles, approximately 50%). This significant reduction skews the data, making it difficult to assess the true impact of the speed bumps on speed reduction. Therefore, I believe the evidence provided does not adequately justify the implementation of such measures in Catforth.

2. Negative Impact on Residents and the Environment

There are a number of specific concerns about the broader impact of the proposed traffic calming measures, which I feel have not been fully considered:

â€¢ Noise, Vibration, and Air Pollution:

The introduction of speed bumps in our rural village would significantly increase both noise and vibration, due to the frequent movement of heavy farm machinery and trucks. The constant rattling of trailers and vehicles passing over speed bumps would exacerbate these disruptions, making life less comfortable for residents and potentially damaging property. Many of the homes in the village are centuries old and built on traditional foundations, which are not designed to withstand the impact of heavy traffic. In addition to the vibrations, vehicles slowing down and then accelerating over each bump would generate continuous noise, including engine revving, braking, and rattling. This would disturb residents' peace, especially those with health concerns, young children, or elderly relatives. The proposed 20mph speed limit would only increase this disruption, as frequent acceleration and deceleration lead to more engine strain and greater emissions. This stop-start driving could contribute to a rise in air pollution. The added noise and air pollution would, therefore, significantly alter the rural character of Catforth, making it a less desirable place to live.

â€¢ Impact on Vulnerable Individuals: A personal concern I have is the potential risk posed to [REDACTED] as they would create an uncomfortable and potentially dangerous journey whenever there is a need to travel through the village.

â€¢ Vehicle Damage: From my own perspective, I am worried that [REDACTED] especially those with low ground clearanceâ€”will sustain damage from the speed bumps, which could cause significant wear and tear on suspension components and undercarriages. The cost of repairs for vehicles damaged by speed bumps would be substantial, and I would be forced to seek alternative routes to access the village [REDACTED]

â€¢ Infrastructure Damage: Apart from personal vehicle damage, speed bumps can also contribute to wear and tear on local roads and infrastructure. The repeated jolting of vehicles over the bumps could accelerate the degradation of the road surface, leading to increased maintenance costs. This is already a problem for our village and will only get worse.

	<p>⌘ Equestrian and Agricultural Traffic: Catforth is home to several equestrian properties, and speed bumps would introduce unnecessary risks for horses and riders. The additional stress placed on both vehicles and horses, especially during transportation, would make it harder for owners to safely navigate the village with horses in transit.</p> <p>⌘ Pedestrian Safety: Ironically, speed bumps may not improve pedestrian safety as intended. In some cases, drivers may slow down momentarily when approaching speed bumps, but then speed up again once they have passed them. This can result in erratic driving and a false sense of security for pedestrians, who may feel the road is safer but still face unpredictable driving behavior. Pedestrian safety could be better addressed with pedestrian crossings, improved footpaths or better traffic enforcement.</p> <p>⌘ Emergency Service Delays: Speed bumps can delay emergency services, such as ambulances, fire & Rescue, and police vehicles. These vehicles need to respond quickly to emergencies, and slowing down to navigate speed bumps could increase response times, potentially putting lives at risk. In a rural setting like ours, where emergency response times may already be longer, this is a serious concern, especially for our elderly and vulnerable residents.</p> <p>3. Community Concerns and Consultation Issues</p> <p>The communication around this scheme has been inadequate, and many residents feel excluded from the decision-making process. The atmosphere at recent meetings, particularly the conduct of some councillors, has made it difficult for people to voice their concerns without fear of being belittled or dismissed. This has understandably discouraged many from engaging in constructive dialogue about the proposed changes.</p> <p>The presence of speed bumps could discourage visitors to local businesses, especially those who travel through the village for leisure or work. Businesses that rely on passing trade, such as Roots caf�� and the other small businesses on that site, may see a decline in customers who are deterred by the discomfort of navigating over speed bumps, a huge portion of their trade is from cyclists who turn up in the hundreds, a portion of these would be deterred if they have to navigate multiple speedbumps to access the village.</p> <p>Furthermore, I believe the proposed traffic calming measures are a "one-size-fits-all" solution that fails to account for the unique characteristics of our village, which includes agricultural and equestrian traffic. Speed bumps and chicanes are blanket solutions that are not tailored to meet the specific needs of our community.</p> <p>4. Alternative Solutions</p> <p>Rather than implementing speed bumps, I urge the council to consider other, more suitable measures that could effectively address speeding and road safety without the negative side effects. For example:</p> <p>⌘ Improved Signage and Road Markings: Clearer signage, including additional speed limit signs, "slow down" markings, and a</p>
--	---

		<p>pedestrian crossing, could be implemented to improve visibility and awareness without the disruption caused by speed bumps.</p> <p>â€¢ Flood Management and Drainage: Our village is prone to flooding, which disrupts local life and causes significant damage. The money allocated for this traffic calming scheme would be better spent on flood defence measures, such as improving drainage and creating soakaways to prevent road closures and improve safety during adverse weather conditions.</p> <p>â€¢ Speed Cameras: Increasing enforcement through mobile speed cameras or average speed cameras could more effectively manage traffic speeds without the need for physical barriers like speed bumps. These cameras have become more affordable and effective in recent years and could provide a long-term solution. If we drop to a 20mph zone we will lose the use of the mobile speed enforcement van.</p> <p>5. Conclusion In conclusion, I strongly believe that the proposed traffic calming scheme, particularly the installation of speed bumps, is not the right solution for Catforth. The negative impacts on residents, businesses, and the environment far outweigh any potential benefits, and the evidence supporting the proposal is insufficient. I urge the council to reconsider this blanket approach and explore more targeted, sustainable solutions that address the communityâ€™s specific needs.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration of my concerns. I strongly urge the council to reconsider the proposed traffic calming measures in Catforth. We are committed to finding a solution that ensures the safety and well-being of our community while preserving the quality of life that makes our village special. I trust the council will consider these points thoughtfully and work with residents to find a more tailored approach</p>
125		<p>The scheme proposed seemed excessively sized for Catforth and just seemed to be a 'cut and paste' of what was done in Woodplumpton. The 2 villages, although geographically close, are miles apart in terms of housing density, pedestrian footfall and also the types of vehicle seen. There's significantly more HGV traffic comes through Catforth which will cause significant noise when travelling over speed bumps. (At least until that traffic decides it's not worth it and all motorway bound traffic heads down Lewth Lane and through Broughton instead of using the millions of pounds of new infrastructure down near the Saddle)</p> <p>I acknowledge there is concern about cars travelling at speed near the end of School Lane but that for me would be the end of the debate. Put something on Catforth Road either side of School Lane (speed bumps, or preferably pedestrian crossings), change the speed limit to 30mph all the way from Swillbrook to Lewth Lane and leave the rest alone and I feel you may see some support for the scheme.</p>
126	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY	<p>if the road outside the school goes down to single file this will be very problematic. Parents use that road aswell as the village hall to park, There is already not enough parking space but we make it work, having less will be detrimental to the time taken to pick up and drop of the children as not enough parking will be available and the road will come to a near stand still at crucial times of day.</p>

	AFFECTED AREA	
127	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	<p>Making School Lane double yellow lines will cause absolute chaos at the village hall car park and in the lay-bys at school drop off and pick up times. There is not enough space for people to park in the car park or either of the two lay-bys. The lay-by on School Lane is dangerous as there are no pavements for children to walk on.</p>
128	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	<p>This idea is ill thought out. Where are parents supposed to drop off and collect their children every day? There is no foot path from the layby up to the school so you are actively making the journey dangerous. There is not sufficient parking either end of the school or in the wider catforth area to accommodate parents EVERY DAY. Please reconsider this proposal because itâ€™s a terrible idea and cripples the school long term.</p> <p>Who does the current parking situation even affect? There are few local residents so it would be a large investment of funds that would have minimal public impact. Council funds should be better allocated than on this mess of a proposal</p> <p>People drive too quickly past the school and a more intelligent use of funds would be to install speed bumps outside the school.</p>
129		<p>No problem with the measures proposed for School Lane, I think this would be very beneficial. However for any further restrictions along Catforth Road, I do not believe this required and if anything will cause more of a risk due to cars accelerating and decelerating between any proposed measures.</p>
130	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	<p>Two issues if there is a change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The danger will even increase, having more children walking grouped and disorderly in the narrow pavement that surrounds School Lane. - The situation would look calm right in front of Catforth School, but more chaotic in the "not fully prepared" outside parking/reversing areas further from the school. <p>The further the small children walk from school the more possibilities of fatal traffic accidents.</p>
131		<p>Are you able to advise exactly how many residents have requested these traffic calming measures? As a village resident myself I am not aware E of anyone supporting this. Why is funding being used for this project when it could be better spent fixing the road that runs through Catforth Village?</p>
132	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	<p>This is a terrible idea which would introduce danger to children who attend Catforth school [REDACTED]</p> <p>Catforth Road leading to School Lane has a lot of very fast traffic most days, particularly around school run times, therefore forcing children to cross this road introduces significantly more risk of an accident than the new proposal would alleviate.</p>

		The money would be better spent improving the road through Catforth Village, filling potholes and introducing safer ways to cross etc.
133		Please do not put double yellow lines outside Catforth School, there are not enough spaces in the village hall and unsafe to cross roads to walk to school. If a footpath was made all along [REDACTED] I would seriously consider walking all the way, but right now it's very unsafe with children.
134		WE FULLY SUPPORT THE PROPOSED TRAFFIC CALMING. Its finally happening! Traffic calming that will benefit all the residents of Catforth and will make the roads safer. Also to note that the current parking situation at Catforth Primary School is an accident waiting to happen. The school I do not think is in support of this traffic calming - which I personally think is unacceptable for a school to not to be in support of making the road outside of the school safer for the children.
135		WE FULLY SUPPORT THE PROPOSED TRAFFIC CALMING. Its finally happening! Traffic calming that will benefit all the residents of Catforth and will make the roads safer. Also to note that the current parking situation at Catforth Primary School is an accident waiting to happen. The school I do not think is in support of this traffic calming - which I personally think is unacceptable for a school to not to be in support of making the road outside of the school safer for the children.
136	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	<p>This is concerning [REDACTED]</p> <p>There hasn't been any accidents down school lane and everyone is very considerate in the mornings towards other drivers parents and children. The current measures in place such as the flashing lights and no parking outside the school is plenty. I go for a walk around the area most morning [REDACTED] and drivers are considerate and I've not had a problem with their speed. Their may be an occasional one but that happens.</p> <p>These measures are a waste of tax payers money - fixing a problem which doesn't exist. The problems that exist are the bad road surfaces around the area - large potholes at the moment.</p> <p>Also the laybys that we'd need to park in are in bad condition and with car turning around there with bad visibility would worry me that their would be an accident.</p> <p>The road would get conjested with parents and children walking - there are many parents with small children which these measures would cause great inconvenience too.</p> <p>Please don't waste the money on this scheme.</p> <p>Catforth Primary school is a lovely school and please don't make parents not want to send their child there due to the inconvenience of parking and access etc.</p>
137	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY	<p>I object and do not support this. If you are to stop parents from parking outside of school when picking up and dropping off children to school then I suggest you provide a lollipop lady/man at the end of school lane or even better A ZEBRA CROSSING on Catforth road to make a safe crossing for primary and nursery aged children to safely cross the busy road and get to school safely.</p> <p>Sadly, cars drive far too fast on Catforth Road, and even yesterday there was a car crash and police presence on that road after a car</p>

		lane that cannot cope with additional traffic particularly not when that traffic is using excessive speed and causing a danger to pedestrians, pets and livestock. The only part of the scheme that i do not wholly object to are the chicanes however again due to the poor standard of driving which will not be monitored I feel these may cause accidents as people ignore the rights of way. We have seen only recently an incident involving the two cars becoming 'wedged' on a local bridge due to unwillingness to yield.
142	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	I believe the proposed plans for school lane pose a significant risk to the children and families that attend catforth primary school, making every family need to pass over a busy road regardless of where they park. I believe this increases the risk of a road traffic accident which could cause significant risk to the lives of children and their families. Especially as these "calming measures" are likely to cause increased road rage of drivers at what is already a tedious time of day on the roads
143	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	I do not agree with placing double yellow lines on school lane next to catforth primary school. This will make it more unsafe leaving children to walk and have to cross roads! [REDACTED] this would make this extremely difficult for parents and children!
144		I believe the issue is more about the volume of traffic than the speed of the traffic through Catforth. The volume has increased significantly since the new Edith Rigby Way road has been built. The first principle of all risk management is to eliminate the risk therefore would suggest the development should focus on this by creating a diversion road off Edith Rigby Way to eliminate the majority of traffic from Catforth. In regards to any calming methods in Catforth the principle of separating people from traffic should be applied via better crossings and pathways particularly to and from bus stop and school. Would rather chicanes than speed bumps for traffic noise
145		Woodplumpton and Catforth Parish Council Consultation on Proposed Traffic Calming Measures I am writing to raise my concerns and voice my objection to the above At a recent Parish Council meeting I invited the members of the parish council to agree with me that Catforth Road was a rural road. There was no disagreement to or objection raised to this statement. Catforth is a rural and farming area and Catforth Road is therefore a rural road Agricultural Traffic Catforth Road and surrounding roads including School Lane are frequently used by farm tractors towing trailers and other large agricultural machinery. The proposed traffic calming measures, such as speed bumps, chicanes, or narrowing, will create significant difficulties for these vehicles: Speed bumps are particularly problematic for tractors towing heavy loads, as they can cause damage to equipment, spillage of cargo, and even pose a safety risk to the driver

	<p>and other road users. The DfT's *Traffic Advisory Leaflet 1/07* explicitly warns that vertical deflections (e.g., speed bumps) can cause issues for large vehicles, including agricultural machinery, and recommends avoiding their use on roads with significant heavy vehicle traffic.</p> <p>Chicanes or road narrowing will make it difficult for large agricultural vehicles to navigate the road safely, especially when meeting other traffic. This could lead to congestion, delays, and increased risk of accidents. The DfT's *Manual for Streets* (2007) highlights that chicanes can create hazards for larger vehicles and recommends careful consideration of their impact on rural roads.</p> <p>The measures may force agricultural traffic to take longer, less suitable routes, increasing fuel costs and creating unnecessary inefficiencies for local farmers.</p> <p>Horse Riders</p> <p>There are many horse kept in the environs of Catforth and many horse riders who regularly use the roads in Catforth to access local bridleways and other areas. The proposed measures could create hazards for both horses and riders:</p> <p>Speed bumps can startle horses, leading to unpredictable behaviour and increasing the risk of accidents.</p> <p>The British Horse Society (BHS) has repeatedly raised concerns about the use of speed bumps on roads shared with horses, stating that they can cause significant distress to animals and riders alike</p> <p>Chicanes or road narrowing may force riders into closer proximity with vehicles, reducing the space available for safe passing and increasing the likelihood of collisions. Riders' and horses' lives may be put at risk by inconsiderate drivers who may feel that they can barge their way through chicanes and or drive aggressively over raised platforms causing distress to the horses and causing an unintended collision after a horse has been startled causing it to bolt</p> <p>The DfT's *Cycle Infrastructure Design* (LTN 1/20) acknowledges that shared road spaces must provide adequate room for all users, including horses, and that poorly designed traffic calming can compromise safety.</p> <p>Horse riders, particularly those with young or inexperienced horses, may feel compelled to avoid the road altogether, limiting their access to essential routes.</p> <p>Increased Fuel Consumption and Pollution</p> <p>The proposed traffic calming measures, particularly speed bumps and chicanes, will require vehicles to slow down and accelerate frequently. This stop-start driving pattern is known to increase fuel consumption and emissions, contributing to air pollution and higher costs for road users. Research by the Transport Research Laboratory (TRL Report PPR243, 2006)T found that speed bumps can increase fuel consumption by up to 50% on urban roads, with similar effects likely on rural roads. Additionally, the European</p>
--	---

		<p>Environment Agency (EEA) has highlighted that frequent acceleration and deceleration significantly increase nitrogen oxide (NOx) and particulate matter (PM) emissions, which are harmful to human health and the environment.</p> <p>In a rural community like ours, where many residents rely on private vehicles for essential travel, these measures could disproportionately increase fuel costs and worsen air quality, particularly for those living close to the road.</p> <p>Lack of Evidence for Need</p> <p>I have not seen sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the current traffic conditions on Catforth Road and School Lane justify the introduction of traffic calming measures. The data provided does not appear to show a high incidence of accidents or nearmisses that would warrant such interventions. The DfT's *Guidance on Traffic Calming* (2013) emphasises that traffic calming should only be implemented where there is clear evidence of a safety issue, and alternative solutions have been considered.</p> <p>Lack of Resident Support</p> <p>It is clear from conversations within the community that the majority of residents oppose the proposed measures. AT Parish Council meeting I have attend the majority have express a lack or no support for this proposal The Parish Council should prioritise the views of those who live in and are directly affected by these changes. The DfT's *Guidance on Public Consultation* (2014) stresses the importance of community engagement and ensuring that local residents' views are central to decision making processes.</p> <p>Pedestrians</p> <p>It has been shown that where a driver has sensory overload i.e too many signs, chicanes and raised platforms or cushions that drivers are overwhelmed and may miss important things. As drivers navigate the signs etc their minds suffer from sensory overload and this will put pedestrians at risk as the driver will become 'blind' to them.</p> <p>Further for obstacles simply encourage some drivers to race from one obstacle to the next.</p> <p>There are alternative solutions to the proposed traffic calming:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Signs informing the driver of their speed Improved signage Rumble strips Enforcement of the speed limit <p>I would ask the Parish Council to reconsider the proposed traffic calming measures and explore alternative solutions that are more appropriate for our village. The impact on agricultural traffic, horse riders, and pedestrians must be carefully considered, as these groups are integral to the character and functioning of our rural community</p>
146	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY	<p>I am writing to express my concerns and opposition to the proposed traffic calming scheme in Catforth. While I understand and appreciate the intention behind such measures, to enhance safety for pedestrians and residents, I believe that this scheme may not be the most effective solution and could potentially cause more harm than good.</p>

		<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>I don't want the thump thump of speed humps, the extra vibration and noise of cars going over, slowing down for and accelerating away from the ill conceived "Traffic Calming Measures"</p> <p>Additional Post</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>In the 7 years of planning it fairly obvious that the communication with the villagers most affected has been poor at best</p>
149		We fully support the proposed traffic calming scheme, especially a speed limit of 30mph continually from Bartle Hall to Catforth. The route has high volumes of fast traffic, making it very dangerous for walkers, cyclists, horse riders many of whom are young people, residents in or out of properties and the employees of a local medical facility.
150		We fully support the proposed traffic calming scheme, especially a speed limit of 30mph continually from Bartle Hall to Catforth. The route has high volumes of fast traffic, making it very dangerous for walkers, cyclists, horse riders many of whom are young people, residents in or out of properties and the employees of a local medical facility.
151		I am in favour of the traffic calming scheme [REDACTED] to realise the speed of cars and wagons, there are some very large wagons go down there. It is not before time, something needs to be done. Some people will object, [REDACTED]
152		<p>We fully support and welcome the necessary proposed traffic calming measures through Catforth Village & beyond. [REDACTED] we also support the proposed 30mph speed limit.</p> <p>This route is now a feeder road for the motorway and we have noticed a significant increase in fast traffic. This route has now become exceptionally dangerous to pedestrians, particularly those individuals who work at the Priory Hospital, & regularly walk this section (no 55 to 59 on the scheme map). The horse riding fraternity also regularly utilise this route as well as cyclists and walkers, and with the current excessive speed of traffic, often in excess of 60mph makes them highly vulnerable.</p> <p>It has also become very dangerous [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] Pulling out or entering our property, especially with a trailer on our vehicle is now very high risk. We have experienced several near misses with cars travelling around the bends at speed. There has already been a fatality outside the Priory entrance and this does not want repeating. It feels that this section of road, particularly from the M55 motorway bridge to Bartle Hall has become a race track in both directions.</p> <p>All we can ask is that LCC at the very least reduce the speed limit to 30mph. It would be advantageous to have additional traffic calming measures on the stretch (55 to 59) such as speed humps, which are not on the current scheme. Unfortunately with the speed humps ending at Crown Lane (No 52) we envisage traffic increasing their speeds further to make up perceived lost time. Therefore we would welcome similar measures for section 55-59.</p>

		Lower speeds not only would improve safety but also help the environment and noise pollution for the benefit of all residents in the village and surrounding area.
153		<p>We fully support and welcome the necessary proposed traffic calming measures through Catforth Village & beyond. [REDACTED] we also support the proposed 30mph speed limit.</p> <p>This route is now a feeder road for the motorway and we have noticed a significant increase in fast traffic. This route has now become exceptionally dangerous to pedestrians, particularly those individuals who work at the Priory Hospital, & regularly walk this section (no 55 to 59 on the scheme map). The horse riding fraternity also regularly utilise this route as well as cyclists and walkers, and with the current excessive speed of traffic, often in excess of 60mph makes them highly vulnerable.</p> <p>It has also become very [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] Pulling out or entering our property, especially with a trailer on our vehicle is now very high risk. We have experienced several near misses with cars travelling around the bends at speed. There has already been a fatality outside the Priory entrance and this does not want repeating. It feels that this section of road, particularly from the M55 motorway bridge to Bartle Hall has become a race track in both directions.</p> <p>All we can ask is that LCC at the very least reduce the speed limit to 30mph. It would be advantageous to have additional traffic calming measures on the stretch (55 to 59) such as speed humps, which are not on the current scheme. Unfortunately with the speed humps ending at Crown Lane (No 52) we envisage traffic increasing their speeds further to make up perceived lost time. Therefore we would welcome similar measures for section 55-59.</p> <p>Lower speeds not only would improve safety but also help the environment and noise pollution for the benefit of all residents in the village and surrounding area.</p>
154		Surely a smiley face reminder should be sufficient!
155		Something drastic needs to be done about the traffic through Catforth. The Woodplumpton system has much improved the road through Woodplumpton & I am sure it will help at Catforth. The problem starts at Rosemary Lane just after Bartle Hall and gets worse past the priory and up the hill to the bridge, it very rarely slows down to go over the canal bridge. Cars coming from Catforth have even been known to force oncoming cars to reverse backwards and nearly into the dyke, which is very steep, it is a frightening experience. Even sounding ones horn on either side does not seem to register with most drivers.
156		Something drastic needs to be done about the traffic through Catforth. The Woodplumpton system has much improved the road through Woodplumpton & I am sure it will help at Catforth. The problem starts at Rosemary Lane just after Bartle Hall and gets worse past the priory and up the hill to the bridge, it very rarely slows down to go over the canal bridge. Cars coming from Catforth have even been known to force oncoming cars to reverse backwards and nearly into the dyke, which is very steep, it is a frightening experience. Even sounding ones horn on either side does not seem to register with most drivers.
157		<p>Putting double yellow lines down school lane is a terrible idea and will cause lots of problems for parents dropping children off at Catforth school.</p> <p>The village hall carpark is not big enough to take the additional cars. The other layby opposite is very small also and the layby at the far end of school road would involve walking down a blind bend with no pavements.</p>

158		<p>Making School lane double yellow and narrowed near the school, will make the children have to cross either 1 or 2 additional roads, by narrowing the road you will encourage cars to speed up to make "the gap" ie clear the narrowing prior to other cars coming. I am concerned that you are putting children more at risk by this measure. [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] this will actually be counter productive and actually make school lane a more dangerous place than it is. This road should be made one way. Or indeed blocked off so it is for residents only.</p>
159		<p>Following receiving the proposals relating to the traffic calming scheme I note the following concerns;</p> <p>The scheme will not reduce traffic to the road. There will be the same amount of traffic passing through due to the school and normal traffic flow.</p> <p>The traffic on school lane will be replaced by traffic on Catforth road given the community centre entrance can only allow for entry OR exit at any one time. The village hall parking is not sufficient alone for all parents. Suggested parking at the lay by on school lane would require pupils and parents to navigate a blind bend. There is not sufficient paving to walk safely from this location to catforth primary school.</p>
160	<p>DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA</p>	<p>Catforth needs to slow down. However, the actions implemented by Parish Council need reviewing as they are out of touch with locals, schools, community groups as well as government guidelines. Speed humps along Catforth Rd " Are spaced too far apart to have an impact. (Gov.com) Parking at the primary school will pose a greater risk to children " they are parking further away from the school, without adequate road safety measures provided by LCC. Beavers, Cubs and Scouts also use these facilities. Therefore, Street Lamps are needed, as well as greater consideration of the proposed plans " otherwise the parish council continue to put greater numbers of lives at risk. The Layby on School Lane is now an unofficial campsite. 250/364 days, cars are parked there at the end of the day and in the morning. Has this been monitored by the Parish Council. How are Parish councillors going to move people on " where will they go? To Carr"s Green? Or will gates be implemented? Opening this up as an official school parking area needs to be monitored more closely. If parking is being provided for parents " will disabled parking be available at Catforth Primary School? [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] There is no disabled parking currently at the school.</p> <p>[REDACTED] Has this been considered by Lancashire County Council? Please let me know their response.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] It seems like the Parish Council and Lancashire are not working alongside each other for the benefit of our future generation [REDACTED]</p>

The Layby on School Lane is now an unofficial campsite. 250/364 days, cars are parked there at the end of the day and in the morning. Has this been monitored by the Parish Council. How are Parish councillors going to move people on " where will they go? To Carr's Green? Or will gates be implemented? Opening this up as an official school parking area needs to be monitored more closely. If parking is being provided for parents " will disabled parking be available at Catforth Primary School? [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] There is no disabled parking currently at the school.

[REDACTED] A suggestion from Lea Endowed would be to turn the school into a bus terminal. Has this been considered by Lancashire County Council? Please let me know their response.

[REDACTED]

I would also like to raise my concerns regarding air b&b planning within the Parish. How is this being authorised and monitored? With accepting consent of planning the parish council have allowed paedophiles to book in, park up and have access to parish children.

I would also like to clarify in terms to the irregularities with regard to planning - will infill now be between speedhumps? Previously planning disregarded road boundaries but surely further planning, with the implementation of speed humps from our Parish council, this will need to be re-evaluated?

[REDACTED]

		<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>I am all for going slower but the Parish Council are proceeding without full knowledge of the area makes individuals victims.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
162	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	<p>Catforth needs to slow down. However, the actions implemented by Parish Council need reviewing as they are out of touch with locals, schools, community groups as well as government guidelines. Speed humps along Catforth Rd “ Are spaced too far apart to have an impact. (Gov.com) Parking at the primary school will pose a greater risk to children “ they are parking further away from the school, without adequate road safety measures provided by LCC. Beavers, Cubs and Scouts also use these facilities. Therefore, Street Lamps are needed, as well as greater consideration of the proposed plans “ otherwise the parish council continue to put greater numbers of lives at risk. The Layby on School Lane is now an unofficial campsite. 250/364 days, cars are parked there at the end of the day and in the morning. Has this been monitored by the Parish Council. How are Parish councillors going to move people on “ where will they go? To Carr’s Green? Or will gates be implemented? Opening this up as an official school parking area needs to be monitored more closely. If parking is being provided for parents “ will disabled parking be available at Catforth Primary School? [REDACTED] [REDACTED] There is no disabled parking currently at the school. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] A suggestion from Lea Endowed would be to turn the school into a bus terminal. Has this been considered by Lancashire County Council? Please let me know their response. [REDACTED]</p> <p>I would also like to raise my concerns regarding air b&b planning within the Parish. How is this being authorised and monitored? With accepting consent of planning the parish council have allowed paedophiles to book in, park up and have access to parish children.</p>

	<p>I would also like to clarify in terms to the irregularities with regard to planning - will infill now be between speedhumps? Previously planning disregarded road boundaries but surely further planning, with the implementation of speed humps from our Parish council, this will need to be re-evaluated?</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>I am all for going slower but the Parish Council are proceeding without full knowledge of the area makes individuals victims.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
163	<p>Comments, Concerns & Suggestions:</p> <p>I am concerned about the proposal to put double yellow lines down School Lane, narrow the road to a single lane outside the school and install a raised table. Whilst I agree that it does get busy on School Lane at school times, this is for a very short period of time only at either end of the school day for no more than 30 minutes at a time and only during term time which is 38 weeks of the year. Therefore, this does not constitute a serious enough problem to prohibit parking outside school and cause a massive inconvenience and added danger to our children and families. With only a handful of houses on School Lane close to the school, it is not causing a huge inconvenience to Catforth residents who moved into their homes knowing there was a school close by and therefore also knowing that there would be busy times of day during term time and so presumably they are OK with that. Cars are not usually parked on the road for the duration of the school day because we have a car park so it really is only an issue twice a day for 30 minutes.</p> <p>The proposal that children and families park some distance from school and walk is ridiculous and unrealistic for a number of reasons.</p> <p>1. They will have to cross at least one road, which will add some risk and danger to them coming to and from school. Imagine how the Parish Council will feel if this leads to an accident where a child is injured or worse because of this measure. With the best will in the world, some children do run off and parents cannot always catch up with them to keep them safe. Stopping parents from parking outside school and making them walk some distance and cross roads is adding an unnecessary risk for our children, which a representative from</p>

		<p>LCCs Road Safety team pointed out.</p> <p>2. It was also pointed out that at school times, the parked cars do in fact provide protection for pedestrians using the footpath by forming a barrier. There are some big tractors and trucks that use that road and if they were to accidentally mount the pavement the results could be catastrophic.</p> <p>3. Some parents have a number of children, including babies and toddlers. A parent bringing up to four children to school is going to really struggle to park some distance from school and bring four little ones safely across one or two roads. It will be an absolute nightmare for them, causing a lot of additional stress, which the Parish Council have failed to appreciate.</p> <p>4. Blue Badge holders need to park as close to school as possible. People have a Blue Badge for a variety of reasons, including issues with mobility or additional needs. They cannot enter the school car park at drop off and pick up times as this will present a serious danger to pedestrians walking into school at this time.</p> <p>Suggestions have been made that we have a School Crossing Person to help children cross the road safely. We would need two people, one at each of the proposed parking sites. [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>One Parish Council member is keen to point out that he has regularly seen parents letting children out of the car on the road side rather than the kerb, which is dangerous and he feels that by putting double yellow lines down School Lane, parents will no longer be able to do this. [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>The issue of congestion outside school at drop off and pick up times has also been raised as the parking of cars effectively reduces the road to a single lane at these times. This is only for 30 minutes at either end of the school day for 38 weeks of the year so hardly makes it a major issue and I am sure that residents avoid School Lane at these times if they don't want to deal with the issue.</p> <p>To conclude, I am not sure what the Parish Council is hoping to achieve by installing these measures to School Lane outside school. Parking is not a serious issue in my opinion because cars are not parked there all day every day. The inconvenience that this would cause to our families is huge and the added danger involved in having to cross roads and walk down a narrow footpath for some distance should be a very real consideration for the Parish Council. I have a very real fear that it could lead to a serious accident.</p>
164	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	<p>I travel once a week through catforth and there are hardly any speed signs to notify drivers of the speed limit. I believe an average speed should be put into place of 30 mph, 20 mph around the school. Speed bumps would not be good at all for all the local farmers who use that road daily</p>
165		<p>The suggested/ planned traffic calming measures have not taken in to account the views or opinions of the actual village residents it concerns!</p> <p>The proposed double yellow lines and a single lane, on school Lane will effectively prevent [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>

	<p>Further more the speed hump traffic calming [REDACTED] as they negotiate them, at all hours of the day and night, since the new bypass/ junction 2 for the m55, traffic through the village has increased, particularly the volume of HGV vehicles using the village as a cut through. These vehicles will make a considerable noise negotiating the humps and in the night time hours it will excessively noisy and disturb the peace of a rural village even more. Thus impacting on the physical and emotional wellbeing of those, in the village with properties adjacent or near the humps, trying to get an undisturbed night's rest. Of which is not just particularly important to those who already have good health but people like my elderly mum and dad, and those with disabilities who are maybe already suffering a lesser quality of sleep, [REDACTED]</p> <p>Add in the extra wear and tear on villagers cars and vehicles as they traverse getting into and put of the village... a point that has been cited by the neighbouring Woodplumpton over issues they have had, since a very similar plan was implemented there.</p> <p>I feel that the parish Council are failing to address the concerns the village, its occupants, and also many who have businesses bssed with in the village, have brought before you.</p> <p>And I ask you to reconsider your planned actions and truly act upon the best interests of those that do reside or work within or from the village.</p>
166	<p>I am writing to you in regards to the ongoing traffic calming scheme on the Catforth road, [REDACTED] this resulted in a major incident involving the fire service and the environment agency. I would like to draw attention to the current traffic calming scheme in the village of Woodplumpton close by which came about as a result of the tragic death of an 8 year old boy who was hit by a speeding car whilst walking with his parents Janet and Jeff Whalley. The car in question was travelling at well over the speed limit for the built up area which had been plagued with speeding traffic over a long period of time prior to the accident. Please don't let the residents of Catforth miss the opportunity to make Catforth a safer place for us and any visitors to the area and push forward to implement the traffic calming scheme ASAP before another tragic life is lost.</p>
167	<p>I respect the work that Woodplumpton Parish Council has done over the last 7 years to get the traffic calming schem to this stage. But I have lived in Catforth Road for over 4.5 years and have seen first hand the problems with both speeding and the amount of traffic. I am not in favour of the speed bumps because it will mean extra noise with the heavy farm traffic and HGVs that we get most days. Also the traffic comes through the village at high speed will just slow down for the humps (a little) then speed up between then causing even more danger and noise.</p> <p>The only way to slow the vast amount of traffic down is average speed cameras. These will easily pay for themselves within a short period of time with the fine revenue. It will only need 4 or maybe 6 speed cameras (at the start middle and end of the current 30MPH zone, the road should easily be allowed speed cameras on the amount and size of the traffic.</p>

168	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	<p>I am not a resident Catforth resident [REDACTED] do not object to the principle of the proposed plans, in fact I welcome the suggestion of speed calming measures. However my concern in particular is what is planned down School Lane. The narrowing of the roads to single file I feel is excessive and unnecessary. Additionally I feel the double yellow lines are only required round the bend to the east of the school and at the T-junction to the west of the school.</p> <p>The existing parking at the village hall and the lay bys is not sufficient at peak school times given it's already full when parents are already parked along School Lane so this is a key area for those who drop off outside of peak school times, which I feel is an oversight here. Single lane traffic will inevitably delay their exit from the area, increasing congestion. This can be solved by simply removing the single lane proposal from the plan and keeping the double yellow lines to the areas previously mentioned.</p> <p>I am pleased to see a proposal to widen the footpath and increase the number of crossings. However I would propose that one is placed at the end of School Lane rather than round the corner, or closer to the Village Hall car park where inevitably larger number of cars will be parking.</p> <p>I encourage you to consider the impact of over-controlling this area and not ignore human behaviour. Forcing parents to park further away will undoubtedly lead to a larger number of parents ignoring the measure as they are delayed getting to drop off, which in turn will cause further delays for other parents. Improved speed control is necessary, but too much will, without a doubt cause other issues.</p>
169		<p>[REDACTED] although speeding along the main stretch from Bay horse Lane to Blackleach lane is the biggest concern for me and the safety of my family, I do not think that adding in such a large number of obstacles in a farmed village is going to be beneficial to residents.</p> <p>Those in Woodplumpton are awful.</p> <p>Chicanes are not appropriate at the end of catforth road where the flooding occurs. There does not need to be anything added to prevent the water flowing away or for vehicles to find themselves stuck on as they aren't visible.</p> <p>If you think that they will be seen then please wade through the water at its peak and you will be able to see that it will be a hazardous addition.</p> <p>The main areas of speeding are as I stated above and also between the canal bridge and the far side of the motorway bridge.</p> <p>I fail to see how adding large speed humps to the area will be of benefit. Please reconsider for more appropriate measures such as speed cameras, lowering the speed limit with rumble strips. Adding a pedestrian crossing with traffic lights by the village hall.</p> <p>[REDACTED] driving through chicanes with a HGV and trailer is not appropriate along with farmers who have significant sized tractors and tankers all trying to earn a living and feed the nation.</p> <p>[REDACTED] Adding double yellow lines along School Lane is a very bad idea. Parking can be a touch of an inconvenience but many parents have two or three children and walking those children along such narrow uneven pavements is dangerous especially trying to cross a road with school bags, lunches. School lane is treacherous in winter as it is not gritted. Asking school children to walk further when frozen with pavements that are hard to stay upright on is dangerous.</p>

		<p>There is no benefit in forcing parents to park in laybys that aren't large enough and try and fit into a village hall car park that's not big enough. You run the risk of a child being knocked down.</p> <p>There is also no lolly pop people present either so this idea should be re thought.</p> <p>It all should.</p>
170		In support of the traffic calming measures
171	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	<p>[REDACTED] regularly drive to them and through the village. I am not supportive of the plan to introduce 'speed cushions' or chicanes into the village. I feel this would add unnecessary noise due to vehicles slowing down to cross speed cushions, wear and tear on vehicles, increase pollution and add inconvenience to regular journeys. I feel council money would be much better spent on repairing the terrible state of the road, which I believe would be more likely to cause an accident.</p>
172	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>I fail to see the benefits of adding double yellow lines preventing safer dropping off for parents and children. I have two children and I hate having to park on the village hall or lay by because it means crossing roads with multiple items and trying to keep my most important items (my two children) safe.</p> <p>School lane is not gritted and there are no salt bin provisions for anyone to grit pavements, the pavements are terrible when lcey and frosty and we are slipping and sliding. They aren't wide enough to walk safely on and are uneven. You are significantly raising the risk of children falling and breaking limbs along with their parents/carers , many of which are grandparents dropping off or disabled.</p> <p>There is no mention of lolly pop people at either end in your plans and this or a pelican crossing would need to be installed. I personally think Pelican crossings are better.</p> <p>The layby especially on school lane is not a safe place to be parking, it also floods between there and the dip just before the bend up towards the school.</p> <p>There are only two 15/20 min periods of the day that parking on school lane can be a little congested however its so much safer for children to get into cars from the pavement side than crossing one, potentially two roads.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>those in Woodplumpton are horrendous. I avoid the village as much as possible, these will just add significant wear and tear to my vehicle.</p> <p>I am already capable of travelling below the current set speed limits and to the conditions and would welcome lower speed limits [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>Catforth road already has a set of rumble strips created by whichever firm was allowed to spray ripples of tarmac when they were actually supposed to repair the pot holes. The road is in a terrible state between Green lane and Jane lane. I don't mind them so much as it does slow traffic down! So there is proof that rumble lines are a good speed reducer right there !</p> <p>The flooding between woods lane and green lane on Catforth road is awful and is getting worse. Adding in anything to lurk under the water is dangerous.</p>

		<p>I have ridden horses through the village since I was 4 years old. Traffic has definitely worsened, drivers seem to have less common sense or respect for other users and volumes have increased due to the unnecessary development of rural villages.</p> <p>My personal opinion is that if the zone between Bartle Hall and Bay horse lane was addressed with speed cameras, rumble strips, maybe a speed cushion up the motorway bridge and down it, lowering speed limits (throughout the whole of Catforth as you have on Newsham hall lane) and adding in a Pelican crossing outside the village hall with additional rumble strips then you would see a decrease in speeding vehicles.</p> <p>Please reconsider. I am all for a safer village and whole heartedly agree something needs to be done but I don't feel the current set of plans are a good fit for Catforth Village life.</p>
173		<p>We very strongly oppose the traffic calming scheme that is proposed for Catforth Village.</p> <p>[REDACTED] Due to the lack of suspension on these vehicles this could cause serious back problems for the operator. This constant jolting could also cause damage to the machines and distress the animal livestock being transported. [REDACTED] in Woodplumpton in my experience of 4 years the speed bumps have not made traffic slow down. Also ther countless episodes of road rage with one incident involving people getting out of vehicles and threatening the other person with a machete. We suggest either a pelican crossing or a lollipop person at the school.</p> <p>We feel that the only way to truly slow vehicles down is by fixed penalty and points on licence.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
174		<p>We very strongly oppose the traffic calming scheme that is proposed for Catforth Village.</p> <p>[REDACTED] Due to the lack of suspension on these vehicles this could cause serious back problems for the operator. This constant jolting could also cause damage to the machines and distress the animal livestock being transported. [REDACTED] in Woodplumpton in my experience of 4 years the speed bumps have not made traffic slow down. Also ther countless episodes of road rage with one incident involving people getting out of vehicles and threatening the other person with a machete. We suggest either a pelican crossing or a lollipop person at the school.</p> <p>We feel that the only way to truly slow vehicles down is by fixed penalty and points on licence.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
175		<p>I do believe there is a problem with cars speeding through Catforth. However, after travelling over the speed humps in Woodplumpton I do not think they are good for residents or cars. The average speed cameras are a better solution. The distance of the speed humps when travelling through Catforth will be excessive and detrimental to residents.</p>
176	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY	<p>[REDACTED] the speed humps will cause excessive wear & tear on vehicles along with more noise created from going over them. I do not think the restrictions are necessary, however a total resurfacing of Catforth road is</p>

	AFFECTED AREA	required.
177	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	Traffic calming is very well intended, but designing pinch points and points for traffic to take turns to pass a man made obstacle is dangerous, not environmentally friendly with the stationary traffic. Pinch points for cyclist, horse riders. Having a consistent wide road is far safer for cyclist and horse riders. Having a smooth potholeless road is far safer for all road users. Having a raised road section, the ones that are 3 to 5 metres in length on the approach to a village, with speed notification illuminated signs are far better than chicanes. Traffic islands are not needed in Catforth. The road is a B road, I never see many or any people waiting to cross over. These make vehicles race to beat cyclist or horse riders to get passed before the pinch points.
178	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	Squeeze points and raised bumps are dangerous for cyclists. Squeeze points because traffic often races a slower vehicle into the squeeze point with disregard to safety. Speed bumps... well try going over one at 12/15/17mph on a bike..... not nice and potentially damaging. A raised cushion with space for 2 wheels is a better option.
179	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	Speed humps/chicanes etc are not effective incontrolling speed and can be dangerous for bike users. They can also cause traffic congestion at busy and therefore traffic pollution. Totally opposed to this scheme. My suggestion would be average speed cameras installed at either endvof village, fine the culprits and provide plenty of visibility as to how many drivers have been fined.
180	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	Total waste of money having speed bumps , they damaged cars, [REDACTED] this will ruin my car, the road surface alone in the condition it has caused issued, average speed cameras from Bartle right through catforth and inskip will solve the issue, revenue will be made from speeding motorists, its been done in lancaster through to fylde, don't understand why going backwards with speed bumps was ever a suggestion, also definitely not good for the local farm vehicles either
181	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	[REDACTED] using this road and although traffic slowing down would be welcomed some of the proposals such as the chicanes can be dangerous to cyclists and put is in a vulnerable position. Would prefer SPECS average speed cameras.
182	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE	This dangerous for the children attending catforth school no parking near school and having to cross what will be extremely busy road. There isnt enough parking at the village hall for all parents to park on there so many will then have to park on the road potentially taking the main road through Catfirth down to one lane. Far too dangerous for an entire school of children to be walking on the road on school lane

	DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	to the lay by or crossing the main road all at the sametime. Lorries, trucks and van fly down the road and down care now this plan has not taken children into consideration. It may of worked in woolplumpton as they dont have to cross the main busy road and also have a crossing/lollypop lady this plan will not work on school lane.
183	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	This is sangerous and doesnt rake into concsideration the number if children having to cross a very busy main road. Dangerous not practical need to go back to the drawing board will not work on school lane.
184	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	I do not feel speed humps are the answer, they cause numerous problems, with ambulance's., tractors and larger vehicles that regularly use that road.
185	DOES NOT LIVE IN THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED AREA	After the disaster of the Woodplumpton scheme, I have no confidence in the plans for Catforth and do not wish for them to suffer the same fate as Woodplumpton.
186		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am in favour and support the scheme. 2. I do not agree with the reduction in speed limit to 30mph between the Saddle services and Catforth. If the speed of traffic needs to be reduced this should be set to 40 mph and as existing to 30 mph just before Benson Lane. 3. The 20 mph limit should be restricted to the area around the school i.e. between the Village Hall and Square Lane on Catforth Road and from the bridge on School Lane.
187		<div style="background-color: black; height: 40px; width: 100%;"></div> <p>I have seen many near misses and dangerous speeds during school pick up and drop off times. The speeds of cars through Catforth road would kill a child instantly, they wouldn't even see it. There is a playground on the other side of Catforth road with no way for the children to cross safely. The footpaths are narrow and children will unknowingly step into the road when passing other children.</p> <p>It is amazing no child has been killed while I have lived here so I welcome any traffic calming measures and the plans look like they will</p>

	<p>improve the current dangerous situation near the school lane / Catforth road junction.</p> <p>I would like to say that opposition to the scheme i've seen promoted on social media should not be considered over and above the lives of children. Speed humps are NOT noisy, do NOT add wear to vehicles, and do NOT upset horse boxes or farm vehicles IF THEY ARE DRIVEN OVER SLOWLY.</p> <p>I hope the council do not bow to the social media groups and dilute or cancel the plans. Safety should be the priority.</p> <p>I would add that I would like to see a 'SPID' sign either end of the stretch of road that passes the playground, school lane turning, and the blind corner at the square lane junction.</p> <p>I would also like to see a zebra crossing connecting the school side and playground side of Catforth road as the parking in the playground area is where most parents will park and also the playground side is the only side with a footpath if the children are walking home.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to contribute my opinion.</p>
188	<p>The scheme for traffic calming isn't fit for purpose. The scheme will cause great nuisance for the local residents of Catforth without improving any levels as highways safety. Heavy goods vehicles and other vehicles will bag over the humps, and the stopping and starting to administer the chicanes will cause excessive vibration, noise and local pollution. Damage to local properties.</p> <p>The speed limit of Rosemary Lane is current national speed limit. This is totally fine if drivers are driving to the road conditions. There is no need to reduce this.</p> <p>The proposed yellow lines outside the school are dangerous and impractical. Have the individuals proposing the scheme actually witnessed a number of drop offs and collections, over a suitable period of time?</p> <p>The village hall car park is not properly stoned or set up for this and parking on there means crossing a very busy road [REDACTED]. The access getting out of the car park is dangerous as visibility lines are very poor.</p> <p>The lay by on Catforth Road means reversing onto a busy road [REDACTED].</p> <p>The lay by on School Lane is far away and has no pavement and is not properly surfaced - we have walked from there before and it is more than a little bit dangerous.</p>

		<p>Visual displays showing actual speed limits need to be permanently displayed at either ends of the village and School Lane and most importantly the full length of Catforth Road needs resurfacing. This makes current conditions far more dangerous. You have to position a vehicle either side of the ruts and pot holes to ensure you don't cause damage to your vehicle, whilst having to avoid oncoming traffic, which is also trying to avoid the same. It's beyond dangerous and I have personally witnessed a number of very near misses. Pavements also need making good to ensure they are safe and fit for purpose. A number are overgrown, too narrow and poorly surfaced.</p> <p>Please re think these proposals, and implement a more pragmatic and common sense approached scheme, to ensure Catforth highways are made safer. The village needs you to develop a better scheme.</p>
189		<p>We are in agreement that measures to make the village a safer place are welcome, especially to negate reckless driving. However we have concerns that the proposals will be detrimental not only to the owners/drivers of large agricultural and haulage vehicles but also the poor residents on Catforth Road who will have to live with the resulting noise and vibrations caused by them negotiating the proposed speed inhibitors.</p>
190		<p>We are in agreement that measures to make the village a safer place are welcome, especially to negate reckless driving. However we have concerns that the proposals will be detrimental not only to the owners/drivers of large agricultural and haulage vehicles but also the poor residents on Catforth Road who will have to live with the resulting noise and vibrations caused by them negotiating the proposed speed inhibitors.</p>
191		<p>Traffic calming humps, chicanes a narrowing is a <u>disgrace</u> for Catforth and surrounding area. Catforth is a <u>RURAL</u> area not an inner town/city road where the majority of traffic is only cars. Catforth has: emergency services, buses, HGVs, cattle wagons, horse boxes, tractors with implements, cyclists, motorbikes, walkers, joggers & horse riders and the road calming proposed is outrageous.</p> <p><u>Solution</u> – SPIDs on the entry to Catforth, - School Lane, junctions of Benson Lane and Green Lane. Also road speed marking circles throughout as a reminder & extras police speed vans.</p> <p>The CIL money being spent on the proposed scheme should be spent elsewhere to support the wishes of the local people, for example employ a lollypop person for the safety of our youngsters, resurface areas near the village hall for safe parking, keep hedgerows cut alongside pavements etc. The WPC are <u>NOT</u> listening to their community and I have no confidence in them on any matters that they deal with – Traffic Calming, Planning decisions and their accounting.</p>
192		<p>I am definitely NOT in favour of the proposed traffic calming measure and no consideration has been given to those who work in the area. Very few signs are in place indicating the speed limits. The state of the road is shocking and double yellow lines are needed at square lane, the Running Pump and Bunker Hill.</p> <p>I am told the council say that emergency services all approve the scheme. What a load of nonsense – an emergency is an occurrence or situation requiring immediate action. So don't try telling me they approve of such obstructions. I have spoken to at least 3 ambulance crews recently and not one approved of speed bumps.</p> <p>An obscure detector van regularly in the early days not a high vis one with no one to catch the flashing motorists is that it appears the limit is a success and god for the statistics.</p>

		Copycat of Woodplumpton. I know not everyone there will tell you it is a success – a copy of that – no thanks. Not helpful for road clearances, eg snow in winter [REDACTED]
193		<p>I am definitely NOT in favour of the proposed traffic calming measure and no consideration has been given to those who work in the area. Very few signs are in place indicating the speed limits. The state of the road is shocking and double yellow lines are needed at square lane, the Running Pump and Bunker Hill.</p> <p>I am told the council say that emergency services all approve the scheme. What a load of nonsense – an emergency is an occurrence or situation requiring immediate action. So don't thy telling me they approve of such obstructions. I have spoken to at least 3 ambulance crews recently and not one approved of speed bumps.</p> <p>An obscure detector van regularly in the early days not a high vis one with no one to catch the flashing motorists is that it appears the limit is a success and god for the statistics.</p> <p>Copycat of Woodplumpton. I know not everyone there will tell you it is a success – a copy of that – no thanks. Not helpful for road clearances, eg snow in winter [REDACTED]</p>
194		<p>Please do not destroy CATFORTH village as you have Woodplumpton.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No to Speed bumps raised beds • No to Chicanes • No to Road Carriage way narrowing <p>This is s arural agricultural area and speed ramps are not welfare friendly causing much distress to driver and animals, ambulance driver/patients.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rumble strips could replace these to alert car drivers as many do not slow down for ramps in Woodplumpton now. • Chicanes – not required – dangerous and cause more congestion + pollution. • No carriageway narrowing, road obstructed + narrow to start with. <p>Catforth Road is a major through road and always has been. This is even more the case due to the new motorway junction + all extra housing being passed in and beyond Catforth ie Inskip and Bartle.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More signage and road marking /rumble strips will help reduce speed. But resurfacing the road needs to be done before work begins. • No Speed Bumps raised beds • No Chicanes • No carriage way narrowing <p>I hope WPC will take notice of the villages opinions</p>