

Meeting: CHIPPENHAM AREA BOARD
Place: The Neeld Hall, Chippenham, Wiltshire SN15 3ER
Date: Monday 5 March 2012
Time: 7.00 pm

ADDITIONAL / LATE PAPERS

Relating to item 9 on the agenda for the above meeting

Report to	Chippenham Area Board
Date of Meeting	5th March 2012
Title of Report	Annual Waiting Restriction Review 2011/12 Prioritisation of schemes

Purpose of Report

To approve Chippenham Community Area Transport Group's (CATG) recommendation for the prioritisation of the following schemes in the Annual Waiting Restriction Review:

1. Sheldon Road opposite junction for Stonelea Close (Community Issue 1621)
2. Middlefield Road, opposite the entrance to Hathaway Medical Centre (Community Issue 1976)

1. Background

- 1.1. During the course of each year, Wiltshire Council receives numerous petitions and requests for waiting restrictions. There is always a demand for new and changes to existing waiting and parking restrictions from individuals and communities, some are minor and some major.
- 1.2. All waiting and parking restrictions are controlled by a legal Order known as a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO). Enforcement is then carried out as a contravention of the legal Order. The TRO process can take many months to complete and the costs of developing proposals and consultation, together with the advertising and legal fees, can be substantial.
- 1.3. For this reason, schemes requiring a TRO are not normally carried out on an ad hoc basis. Experience has also shown that the introduction of ad hoc restrictions can result in shifting the problem elsewhere. Accordingly, a comprehensive review of the parking in a Town or Parish as a whole is the most effective and efficient way of dealing with parking issues.
- 1.4. It should be noted that works resulting from new developments and associated S106 agreements are progressed independently and requests relating to restrictions outside of schools are dealt with in the first instance through the School Travel Plan advisors.
- 1.5. In September 2011, Wiltshire Council proposed that it would be more appropriate, and indeed in line with Wiltshire Council's Corporate Goals, that the requests go directly to the Towns and Parish Councils. Town and Parish Councils have a more detailed knowledge of their local area, the extent of the issue, and the conflicting demands on the road space and would also be aware of specific issues which often only come to the authority's attention during the formal consultation period. *See Appendix 1 Waiting and Parking Restriction Review.*
- 1.6. A simple guidance sheet was produced to aid the Towns and Parishes in the initial analysis of the requests and to explain the prioritisation process. All existing requests on the current waiting list were sent to the Town and Parish Councils for their consideration.
- 1.7. Chippenham Town Council did not feel able to take on this work; the assessment process was therefore passed to the Chippenham Community Area Transport Group (CATG) to make recommendations to Chippenham Area Board.
- 1.8. A list of all requests received for waiting and parking restrictions in the Chippenham Community Area is attached *See Appendix 2*

Background documents used in the preparation of this Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Waiting and Parking Restriction reviews HT- 030 -11 and its appendices 1 – 4
--	--

2. Main Considerations

- 2.1. The cost of processing individual requests is substantial (£3,000 for a simple change and up to £50,000 for a major review), therefore, to make the best use of taxpayers' money the approach to setting priorities has to be properly structured.
- 2.2. The top ranking requests from all areas will be assessed against the matrix attached at Appendix 1 and the scores reported to the Cabinet Member on an annual basis, for agreement on which schemes to progress.
- 2.3. It is anticipated that if an area within a Town or Parish is selected for progression, all requests for that Town / Parish will be considered as part of that review to ensure a holistic approach to the scheme design.
- 2.4. Chippenham Area Board will be advised of the schemes agreed for progression in the area. All schemes which are not selected for progression will be included in the following year's report.
- 2.5. The Chippenham CATG recommend that the following requests are prioritised:

Community Issue 1621	Sheldon Road opposite junction for Stonelea Close
Community Issue 1976	Middlefield Road, opposite the entrance to Hathaway Medical Centre

3. Environmental & Community Implications

There are no immediate environmental implications from the recommendations made in this report.

4. Financial Implications

There are no immediate financial implications from the recommendations made in this report.

5. Legal Implications

There are no specific Legal implications related to this report.

6. HR Implications

There are no specific HR implications related to this report.

7. Equality and Inclusion Implications

There are no specific equality and inclusion implications related to this report.

8. CATG recommendations

To approve Chippenham Community Area Transport Group's (CATG) recommendation for the prioritisation of schemes at 2.3.

Appendices:	Appendix 1 - Waiting and Parking Restriction Review Appendix 2 – List of requests for Waiting and Parking restrictions in the Chippenham Community Area 2011/12
No unpublished documents have been relied upon in the preparation of this report.	
Report Author	Victoria Welsh, Community Area Manager Tel: 01249 706 446 E-mail: victoria.welsh@wiltshire.gov.uk

CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT – CLLR R TONGE

DEPARTMENT OF NEIGHBOURHOOD AND PLANNING

OFFICER CONTACT: Joanne Heal (713276) email: joanne.heal@wiltshire.gov.uk

REFERENCE: HT- 030-11

WAITING AND PARKING RESTRICTION REVIEWS

Purpose of Report

1. There is always a demand for new and changes to existing waiting and parking restrictions from individuals and communities, some are minor and some major, each is a cause of concern to the originator. The cost of processing individual requests is substantial (£3,000 for a simple change and up to £50,000 for a major review), therefore, to make the best use of taxpayers' money the approach to setting priorities has to be properly structured. The purpose of this report is to set out a policy for assessing and prioritising requests for changes to parking and waiting restrictions throughout Wiltshire (excluding Residents' Parking Schemes).

General

2. Waiting restrictions are often required to control or regulate inappropriate parking which may cause safety problems or obstruct the free flow of traffic. Where safety is concerned it may be appropriate to restrict parking at all times with the use of double yellow lines; however, in certain circumstances parking at particular times may be the best solution and it may be more appropriate to use a single yellow line restriction with controls, for example between 8.00 am and 6.00 pm. The intended use of the area of highway must also be taken into consideration using the hierarchy of road user needs when determining the appropriate restrictions, for example the area may also be used as a bus stop or loading area.

Kerb Space Hierarchy – detailed in the Local Transport Plan (LTP) 2011 - 2026

1. Bus Stop
 2. Taxis
 3. Blue Badge parking
 4. Car Clubs
 5. Deliveries
 6. Short stay parking
 7. Residents' parking
 8. Long stay parking
3. In some areas it may be appropriate to permit or formalise parking with some form of control – either by type of user (blue badge, taxi, doctors bay, etc.) or by time limit to ensure an appropriate turnover of the space, for example time limited to one hour in town centre locations.

4. All waiting and parking restrictions are controlled by a legal Order known as a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO). Enforcement is then carried out as a contravention of the legal Order. The TRO process can take many months to complete and the costs of developing proposals and consultation, together with the advertising and legal fees, can be substantial. For this reason, schemes requiring a TRO are not normally carried out on an ad hoc basis. Experience has also shown that the introduction of ad hoc restrictions can result in shifting the problem elsewhere. Accordingly, a comprehensive review of the parking in a Town or Parish as a whole is the most effective and efficient way of dealing with parking issues.
5. It should be noted that works resulting from new developments and associated S106 agreements are progressed independently of this review process and requests relating to restrictions outside of schools are dealt with in the first instance through the School Travel Plan advisors.

Background

6. Following the introduction of Decriminalised Parking Enforcement (now known as Civil Parking Enforcement) in the districts of North Wiltshire and Kennet during 2006, parking patterns were monitored to capture any displacement occurring as a result of the increased enforcement activity. Comprehensive reviews of the existing restrictions were then carried out, and the legal Orders changed to map based Orders to improve the accessibility of information.
7. Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) was introduced in West Wiltshire during 2008 and reviews of the existing waiting restrictions were commenced but subsequently placed on hold pending the implementation of the Parking Strategy in April 2011. These reviews are now currently underway with an anticipated implementation early 2012.
8. CPE was introduced in Salisbury during 2002; however, a comprehensive review of the restrictions was not carried out. Over the past year the existing restrictions have been surveyed and draft maps have been produced to prepare for the transition to map based TROs. There is a large amount of work to be done in this area in ensuring that restrictions on the ground match those currently contained in the text based TROs before the legal Order process may be commenced. This work is a priority for the Authority. Maintenance work on signs and markings is currently ongoing and is due to be completed towards the end of the summer, following which the conversion to map based Orders will be implemented.

The Traffic Management Act 2004

9. The Traffic Management Act 2004 places new obligations on the Local Traffic Authority (LTA) regarding the way it assesses, implements and reviews TROs. There is clearly a duty to identify congestion points and take action accordingly. The Act cites implementation and enforcement of TROs as one of the prime factors affecting congestion. The Council must demonstrate that its TROs:
 - Are appropriate, adequate and relevant;
 - Are consistent along its own routes and along strategic routes which cross its boundaries into other LTA areas;
 - Are accurate, understandable and legally robust;
 - Follow appropriate implementation and management processes and systems;
 - Are properly maintained;
 - Are adequately enforced.

10. The Act emphasises the LTA's responsibility in ensuring that traffic (including pedestrians) flows with the minimum of delay across its network. The Authority has to demonstrate that the systems and procedures are in place to manage the network efficiently. This includes the need to review a road hierarchy that shows a structured approach to the allocation and management of road space. It is clear that the Council must move away from its current practise of assessing TROs in isolation and should adopt a more systematic approach.
11. Adopting the requirements of the Act will help achieve the Council's own core objectives and LTP aims. Refining the existing system will enable the TRO process to become part of an integrated transport planning strategy that will be better placed to solve traffic problems, take advantage of opportunities and enable resources to be used efficiently.

Demand

12. There are currently 18 Towns and 38 Parishes with existing waiting restriction TROs, with a further 197 Parishes which may request restrictions.
13. On average, the authority receives over 100 written requests each year for either new waiting / parking restrictions or changes to existing controls.
14. Resources are currently committed to the existing reviews in Melksham, Trowbridge, Westbury and Warminster and the conversion of the ex Salisbury area to map based TROs.
15. The implementation of the Parking Strategy involved changes to parking charges in some communities; in some cases there may be displacement from off-street car parks to unregulated highway, this is being monitored and assessed as a priority. It is normal practise to monitor changes in parking patterns for a period of six months as during this time the displaced parking locations often change. Therefore, following existing commitments, these Towns and Parishes need to be a priority for waiting restriction reviews.

Programme of works

16. Due to the extensive legal process involved in introducing TROs, even the simplest scheme can take around six months from initial consultation to implementation. On a larger scale review, this can extend to over a year, due in part to the level of consultation involved in developing an acceptable scheme. It is therefore proposed that any programme only identifies the date on which we are able to start progression of scheme design and it should be noted that implementation could roll over to the following financial year.
17. The progression of reviews needs to involve an assessment matrix to ensure that priority is given to appropriate schemes. This report outlines the proposed process for responding to and assessing the requests for waiting restriction reviews and to agree how schemes will be prioritised for implementation.

Existing commitments

Area	Start Investigations	Implementation
Chippenham – minor work - existing commitment	November 2010	July 2011
Devizes – minor work - existing commitment	November 2010	August/September 2011
Lacock – existing commitment	December 2010	Late 2011
Market Lavington – existing commitment	December 2010	2011
Tisbury (Station Parking)	Summer 2011	2012
Great Bedwyn (Station Parking)	Summer 2011	2012
Marlborough – Vicarage Close	January 2011	Late 2011
Wootton Bassett – Maple Drive area	January 2011	Ongoing
Trowbridge	Summer 2011	2012
Westbury	Summer 2011	2012
Warminster	Summer 2011	2012
Melksham	Summer 2011	2012
Salisbury - Survey, Map, assess existing restrictions prepare and progress Map Based TRO and continued maintenance programme	November 2010	2011

Future Works – Proposed Approach

18. A large proportion of officer time is involved with dealing with requests for amendment to existing or new restrictions. This includes written correspondence, lengthy telephone calls, familiarisation with site and local area (identifying plans, TROs and aerial maps and site investigations, etc.). In order to ensure that officer time is focused on designing and delivering schemes it is proposed that it would be more appropriate, and indeed in line with Wiltshire Council's Corporate Goals, that the requests go directly to the Towns and Parish Councils. They have a more detailed knowledge of the local area, the extent of the issue, and the conflicting demands on the road space and would also be aware of specific issues which often only come to the authority's attention during the formal consultation period. A simple guidance sheet has been produced to aid the Towns and Parishes in the initial analysis of the requests and to explain the prioritisation process (see **Appendix 1**). All existing requests on the current waiting list will be sent to the Town and Parish Councils for their consideration.
19. Should the Town and Parish Councils feel they are unable to take on this work, the assessment process will be passed to the Area Boards.

Process

- All requests for waiting and parking restrictions to be directed to the Town and Parish Councils.
- Town /Parish Council to send out standard request form to applicant (see **Appendix 2**).
- Town/Parish to complete assessment form (see **Appendix 3**) giving validation to resident's requests and rank requests in order of their priority, then send into Network Management team on an annual basis.
- Due to Wiltshire Council's statutory responsibility for highway safety, any requests which refer to obstruction of access for emergency service vehicles should be copied to the Network Management Team for assessment and action if necessary. These would also be reported directly to the Community Area Transport Group which currently considers other Traffic Management related requests.
- The top ranking requests from all areas will then be assessed against the matrix attached at **Appendix 4** and the scores reported to the Cabinet Member on an

annual basis, for agreement on which schemes to progress. It is anticipated that if an area within a Town or Parish is selected for progression, all requests for that Town / Parish will be considered as part of that review to ensure a holistic approach to the scheme design.

- The Area Boards will be advised of the schemes agreed for progression in their areas. All schemes which are not selected for progression will be included in the following year's report.

Capacity

20. It is anticipated that the team could commence between 6 - 8 area reviews in one financial year, with potential implementation the following year.
21. Priority needs to be given to Towns or Parishes affected by possible displacement as a result of the implementation of the Parking Strategy. Namely:

Bands 1-3 (inclusive)
Salisbury
Chippenham
Trowbridge
Amesbury
Bradford on Avon
Calne
Corsham
Devizes
Malmesbury
Melksham
Warminster
Westbury
Wootton Bassett

However following this work it will be necessary to assess other requests against the scoring matrix to ensure that appropriate schemes are prioritised for implementation.

Assessment Matrix

22. The proposed assessment matrix is attached at **Appendix 4**. Schemes would be assessed and prioritised for progression based on the following suggested criteria with the highest scoring schemes progressed first to ensure that resources are directed towards the most appropriate schemes. The criteria include:
 - Time since last parking review and number of other requests for restrictions in the local vicinity.
 - Road safety concerns based on accident records and issues such as parking contrary to the Highway Code.
 - Highway use, based on the kerb space hierarchy defined in the LTP Parking Strategy.
 - Environmental impact, such as air quality or noise improvement site, protection of Highway (verges, etc.).
 - Accessibility issues, problems with access due to parked vehicles for Emergency Services, Waste and Recycling, etc. Number of schools, retirement homes or

hospitals in vicinity. Issues with non residents parking, parking displacement, etc.

- Capacity and congestion, parking impacting on highway capacity, affecting public transport routes and proximity to alternative parking.
- Support for request, support from Member of Parliament and Wiltshire Councillors, Town/Parish Councils and Area Board. Emergency Services, Public Transport companies, Residents Associations and Petitions from Residents.
- Costing of the scheme (development and implementation) and deliverability of scheme (complexity of design and implementation).

Main Considerations for the Council

23. Due to the large demand for changes to waiting and parking restrictions and the limited staffing resources available, consideration needs to be given to an appropriate methodology for assessing and prioritising requests to ensure that staffing and financial resources are appropriately allocated.

Environmental Impact of the Proposal

24. The proposals aim to prioritise requests against a number of criteria shown in the matrix attached at **Appendix 4**, including accessibility, congestion and pollution.
25. The introduction of new parking controls will involve the laying of lines and installation of signs where necessary. This will have an impact on the visual aspect of the highway but has to be balanced against the need to ensure appropriate traffic management controls are in place.

Equalities Impact of the Proposal

26. This proposal ensures that all requests are assessed against a set criterion and the needs of Disabled drivers are taken into account under the kerb space hierarchy laid down in the LTP3. Requests for parking facilities for Blue Badge holders are also clearly identified in the assessment matrix under demand for highway use.

Risk Assessment

27.

Risks of not carrying out proposals	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued inconsistency in prioritisation of parking controls across the county. • Schemes being introduced on ad hoc basis dependant on demand as opposed to need. • Staffing and financial resources being fully occupied on demand led schemes with the potential for more appropriate traffic management schemes not to be progressed. 	
Risks of proposals	Mitigation of risks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town /Parish councils not comfortable with prioritising requests received 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information and support will be given to Towns and Parishes to enable them to

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for matrix assessment not to support progression of a scheme with a unique demand. 	<p>rank requests or pass process to Area Boards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some flexibility has been built into the matrix to enable other factors to be taken into consideration.
--	--

Financial Implications

28. The number of schemes to be progressed on an annual basis will be dependent on the size of the individual schemes. Assessing all requests against known criteria will improve transparency of decision making and ensure that the authority's financial resources are suitable allocated.

Legal Implications

29. All changes to existing parking and waiting restrictions require amendments to the Traffic Regulation Order. The process is governed by the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and associated Procedural Regulations. Failure to adhere to the statutory processes could result in the restrictions being successfully challenged in the High Court.

Options Considered

30. An alternative option that has been considered would be to engage all Community Area Transport Groups in the request assessment process. As Town and Parish Councils are Statutory Consultees, dealing with them directly will reduce duplication of effort and ensure that engagement is at the appropriate level.

Reasons for Proposal

31. That In order to appropriately manage the demand for changes to parking controls it is necessary to engage the Town and Parish Councils in the prioritisation of local demand for new controls in their area, so that limited resources of the Council are directed to deal with the demands which are supported by Town and Parish Councils and identified locally as a priority.

Proposal

32. That the proposals are adopted as outlined in this report.

The following unpublished documents have been relied on in the preparation of this Report:

None

**Guidance Notices for Town and Parish Councils on assessment of Waiting
Restriction requests**

All requests for new or revisions to existing parking restrictions should be received on the standard questionnaire (WR1). If an application has been received by letter or email, the application form should be sent out to be completed by the requester in order to gain as much information as possible about the issue-

Completed request forms, when received, should be assigned a unique application reference, in the following format: Town or Parish/location/requestors name. e.g.: Melk/Union St/Smith

If the requestor has indicated on the form that they have digital photographs relating to the request that they wish to include in the application, an email containing the unique application reference should be sent, to the address in Section 1 of the form, indicating that any photographs should be attached to reply email(s) using the unique application reference.

The application form should be scanned and saved in folder unique to the request. Any subsequent correspondence relating to this request, e.g. photographs, letters of support for request from other residents, waste and recycling services, etc, should be scanned and saved to the folder.

Any applications that are received that relate directly to road safety issues (vehicles blocking access for emergency vehicles, etc.) should be copied directly to the Network Management Team by the Town/Parish Council for their assessment. All other applications received should be assessed using the Assessment of Waiting Restriction Request form (WR2). The form should be completed using the information contained in the original request as well using any local knowledge of the issue. Requests will then need to be prioritised in order of preferred priority for progression/ importance. Where there are a number of requests relating to the same issue/location, these should be treated as a single request.

At the end of January each year, Town/Parish Councils will be requested to submit all the information on requests received to the Network Management Team together with an initial assessment form and details of their priority requests.

These requests will then be scored using an agreed rating matrix and a percentage score calculated. The requests across the county with the highest percentage scores will then be collated into an annual report and submitted to the Cabinet Member for a decision as to which schemes will be taken forward to the following years works programme.

The number of schemes that can be implemented each year will vary, depending on the complexity of the schemes.

Due to the number of requests for waiting restrictions received each year, there is no guarantee that a request ranked highly by any Town/Parish will necessarily rank highly in the matrix score. The more accurate the information and support for a request contained in both the initial application and the Town/Parish assessment will help in the final assessment process.

Name:	Address:	Postcode:
Signature:		

Section 7

Applicants Signature:

Date:

Do you wish to email any digital photographs that you have relating to the matter? **YES / NO**. If yes, an email will be sent to the address in Section 1, please reply to this email attaching any photographs. Max size of attachments 6mg, please send multiple replies if a large number of attachments.

Office use only

Application ref:

Email required

Road safety implications

Town/Parish: _____

Priority	
----------	--

Application ref
(from request sheet)

		Yes	No	Not Known
1	Does request relate to obstruction of private access?			
2	Is a mandatory marking the most appropriate solution? (is it in a location where enforcement would take place)			
3	If a mandatory marking is not appropriate, would an access protection marking be suitable? If YES forward request to Area office.			
4	Does the request raise road safety concerns? If YES forward directly to the Traffic & Network Management Team.			
5	Does request relate to parking contrary to highway code, e.g. parking too close to junctions?			
6	Does request relate to non residents parking in residential area?			
7	Is the problem related to vehicles being parked in a location to avoid paying local parking charges?			
8	Does the request relate to issues with access for Emergency Services?			
9	Does the request relate to issues with access for Waste & Recycling?			
10	Does the request relate to issues with access for public transport?			
11	Have other requests relating to the same location been received?			

12 Are there any concerns for a particular group in the area, e.g. is there a high volume of schools, sheltered accommodation, are there regular visits from health workers, etc?

13 Is the Town/Parish Council aware of any other parking issues in the immediate vicinity?

14 Is there additional support for the request, if so who from? (Local Member, Emergency Services, resident's petition, etc.)

15 Any other comments regarding request.

TRO assessment by;		Date	
Request Source;		Date	
Town/Parish;		Parkmap grid ref	
Site Location;			
Road Classification	A	B	other
Traffic Sensitive (Y/N)			
Time since last review (years)	0		
Locations banding according to LTP	0	Number of other requests in same Town/Parish	0

Safety

Details (collision rates are 3 yr period)

		Assessment Score
Recorded personal injury collision rate (High, Med or Low)	low	
Issue regarding parking contrary to highway code (Yes or No)	no	0
Issue regarding forward visibility (Yes or No)	no	0

Highway Use

Details	Demand	Suitable alternative nearby	
Demand for road use	Bus Stop (Yes, No or N/A)	n/a	0
	Taxis (Yes, No or N/A)	n/a	0
	Disabled Parking (Yes, No or N/A)	n/a	0
	Car Clubs (Yes, No or N/A)	n/a	0
	Deliveries / Loading (Yes, No or N/A)	n/a	0
	Short Stay Parking (Yes, No or N/A)	n/a	0
	Residents' Parking (Yes, No or N/A)	n/a	0
	Long Stay Parking (Yes, No or N/A)	n/a	0

Environmental Impact

Details

Air Quality or Noise improvement site	n/a		#N/A
Protection of Highway (damage to highway inc verge , etc)	n/a		#N/A
Remove visual intrusion	n/a		#N/A

Accessibility

Details

Access difficulties for Emergency Services (Yes or No)	no		0
Access difficulties for Waste & Recycling (Yes or No)	no		0
Access difficulties for Public or Hospital transport (Yes or No)	no		0
Access difficulties for visiting health workers. (Yes or No)	no		0
Part of safer route to school (Yes or No)	no		0
Accord with objectives of school travel plan	no		0
Number of Schools within area (1 KM) (number)	0		0
Hospital within area (1 KM) (number)	0		0
Retirement homes or community centres within area (1KM) (number)	0		0
Town centre & neighbourhood shops	none		0
Parking by non-residents affecting capacity	none		0
Current restrictions deemed no longer required	none		0
Encourages turnover of shopper parking	none		0
Resolves displaced parking due to car parking strategy	none		0

Capacity/Congestion

Details

Negative impact on peak hour traffic flow of A roads (Yes or No)	no		0
Negative impact on peak hour traffic flow of B roads (Yes or No)	no		0
Negative impact on Peak hour /Peak traffic flows of other roads (Yes or No)	no		0
Negative impact at any time on any classified road (Yes or No)	no		0
Is it a traffic sensitive street (Yes or No)	no		0
Is it a bus route? If so is service frequent, hourly or better, (Yes, No or No bus)	no bus		0
Negative impact at any time on other through routes (Yes or No)	no		0
Alternative parking available locally (Yes or No)	no		0

Support of request

Details (negative if objection)

Member of Parliament (Yes or No)	no		0
Councillor (local member) Number	0		0
Councillor (other member) Number	0		0
Town or Parish Council (Yes or No)	no		0

Area Board (Yes or No)	no		0
Wilts Police (Yes or No)	no		0
Other Emergency Services (Number)	0		0
Waste and recycling	no		0
Bus Operator (Number)	0		0
HGV Operator (Number)	0		0
Chamber of Commerce	no		0
Other Organisation (Resident's assn etc..) (Number)	0		0
Level of public support for request (Number)	0		0

Costing & Deliverability

Details

Deliverability of request (simple 10 to complex 0)	0		0
Cost of development & implementation (low 10 to high 0)	0		0
Sub-Total			0

Percentage score	#N/A
------------------	-------------

Requests for Waiting & Parking Restrictions Chippenham Community Area 2011/12

Street / Location Town/Parish	Community Issue Ref No	Scheme Description	Actions & Notes
Sheldon Road opposite Stonelea Close, Chippenham	1621	Double yellow lines requested Parked vehicles in Sheldon Road opposite Stonelea Close causing an obstruction and problems with access/egress to Stonelea Close and Andrews Close.	Prioritised by Chippenham CATG
Middlefield Road opposite Hathaway Medical Centre, Chippenham	1976	Double yellow lines requested Parked vehicles in Middlefield Road opposite Hathaway Medical Centre causing an obstruction and problems with access/egress to large numbers of patients using the centre.	Prioritised by Chippenham CATG
Sadlers Mead	2157	Request for double yellow lines to be extended throughout Sadlers Mead	<p>Chippenham Town Council has provided the following comment in response to this request: <i>“The Town Council recommends a one-hour waiting limit between 8am and 6pm, Mondays to Fridays, on the school side of Sadlers Mead to discourage all-day parking and also to help parents drop off and collect their children and recommends the installation of double yellow lines on the other side of the road.”</i></p> <p>The CATG noted that requests relating to waiting restrictions outside schools are dealt with in the first instance by the School Travel Plans Advisors</p> <p>Has the introduction of double yellow lines throughout Sadlers Mead already been considered and declined?</p> <p>A site visit is being arranged for Highways officers and the Division Councillor to clarify.</p>

Requests for Waiting & Parking Restrictions Chippenham Community Area 2011/12

Street / Location Town/Parish	Community Issue Ref No	Scheme Description	Actions & Notes
Roman Way, Pewsham Chippenham	1705	Double yellow lines requested Residents driving into and out of Lodge Road are faced with parked cars on the bend in Roman Way, mostly in the evening, which narrows the road available for cars to pass.	Highways Officers advise that extensive parking restrictions are inappropriate in a residential area.
Parsonage Way	2208	Double yellow lines requested, on the bend of the road between the Wavin HGV entrance and the lay-by. Alternatively, part double yellow lines with gaps enabling cars to pull over and let wagons pass would be an improvement.	This request was submitted the day after the Chippenham CATG meeting. The CATG was not therefore able to consider it for prioritisation.
Barn Owl Road	N/A	Double yellow lines requested	Insufficient information available. Division Councillor to investigate whether this request is still current.
Partridge Close	N/A	Double yellow lines requested	Insufficient information available. Division Councillor to investigate whether this request is still current.
Woodpecker Mews	N/A	Double yellow lines requested	Insufficient information available. Division Councillor to investigate whether this request is still current.
Redwing	N/A	Double yellow lines requested	Insufficient information available. Division Councillor to investigate whether this request is still current.
Pewsham Nr Magistrates Court	N/A	Double yellow lines requested	Insufficient information available. Division Councillor to investigate whether this request is still current.

Requests for Waiting & Parking Restrictions Chippenham Community Area 2011/12

Street / Location Town/Parish	Community Issue Ref No	Scheme Description	Actions & Notes
Station Hill	N/A	Double yellow lines requested to reduce congestion on Station Hill	Insufficient information available. Division Councillor to investigate and establish specific details.

