

CHIPPENHAM: PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS**COMMENTS OF OBJECTION AND SUPPORT****Contents**

The Ashfield Road.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.	2
Audley Road.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.	4
Hill Corner Road.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.	
Parkfields/Fleet Road.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.	
Long Ridings/Malmesbury Road.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.	5
Lords Mead.....		6
Lowden Avenue		9
Patchway.....		10
Station Hill		10
The Bridge		11
The Paddocks		11
Vincent's Way (North and South)		12
Wood Lane		14

113 Letters received (62 objecting, 26 supporting and 25 commenting on)

Table below shows distribution of consultation comments

Road	Support	Objections	Comments
Ashfield Road	14	23	7
Audley Road	0	2	0
Blackwellhams	3	0	0
Hill Corner Road	0	3	1
Parkfields/Fleet Road	0	1	0
Long Ridings/Malmesbury Road	0	2	0

Road	Support	Objections	Comments
Lords Mead	6	17	3
Lowden Avenue	0	4	2
Patchway	0	1	0
Station Hill	0	0	1
The Bridge	0	0	1
The Paddocks	3	0	4
Vincent's Way North and South	0	3	2
Wood Lane	0	6	4
Total	26	62	25

Ref	Comment received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
A1	<p><u>Ashfield Road</u></p> <p>The objections received follow similar themes and have summarised as follows:</p> <p>a) By only offering Ashfield Road the proposed residents only parking this will push residents with more than one car onto the existing free parking zones in adjacent roads (Malmesbury Road/Greenway Avenue) Residents of those streets would not be able to use Ashfield Road and would be pushed to park further away from their homes.</p> <p>b) Residents of Ashfield Road have stated their objection to the proposal as this will still not guarantee them a space in their street to park and they will be paying for the yearly permits which they consider is unfair.</p> <p>c) It would only be fair if all residents with no private parking in the area were also offered the same opportunity to pay for residents parking (which is an affordable option compared with private or council car parks).</p>	<p>6</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p>	<p>The proposed scheme was developed following requests by residents and Chippenham Town Council, Wiltshire Council was approached to determine the appetite for a residents' parking scheme in Ashfield Road. This was attained through site investigations and several resident questionnaires.</p> <p>In order for a resident parking scheme to proceed we require a minimum return of 50% of questionnaires of the total number of properties, with a majority then in favour of a scheme. The results from the residents' survey indicated a return rate of 70% with 67% of those responses in support for some kind of scheme. The proposals were then formally advertised along with other proposals in the town.</p> <p>However, there was less support during this formal consultation, 14 compared with 19 previously, with 23 objections, from residents both of Ashfield Road and the surrounding streets. Concerned that as a result parking would relocate to nearby roads.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended the proposal be withdrawn and</p>

	<p><u>Ashfield Road cont...</u></p> <p>d) There are plenty of roads that need parking restrictions as they are used by commuters and town centre workers for parking daily. This has been raised numerous times with the council and been outright rejected. Why has this now been submitted just for Ashfield Road? This will simply move the problem to the other, already overcrowded roads and make it even worse. Please come up with a coherent strategy for the WHOLE of Chippenham, not just one road.</p> <p>e) The proposed scheme will no doubt alleviate the parking in this road but will further cause more problems for neighbouring streets, who also suffer from short and long term parkers. We require a proper solution to parking in all roads round this area not just moving it from A to B. Why isn't restricted parking being considered for surrounding streets?</p> <p>f) Residents of Ashfield Road comments that they do not want residents parking and have never wanted residents parking as they do not think it will make any difference to the parking situation as it doesn't guarantee a space and there are lots of residents with more than 1 car and do not think it will ease the situation.</p> <p>g) The parking issues in this area are compounded by commuters using the rail station. Residents of Ashfield Road also park in neighbouring streets as also do commuters. By restricting Ashfield Road only will push more cars onto surrounding roads. This consultation only tries to mitigate a symptom and not the cause.</p>	<p>3</p> <p>3</p> <p>2</p> <p>4</p>	<p>further residents surveys are undertaken on a wider scale.</p> <p>Previous consultations in the Marshfield Road area carried out by the then North Wiltshire District Council showed little appetite for such a scheme with residents preferring to stick with the status quo as a residents' parking scheme does not guarantee a space outside your home or even within a zone.</p> <p>Residents of Ashfield Road sought approval from Chippenham Town Council and who then requested that Wiltshire Council investigate the concerns raised. Following residents surveys conducted by Wiltshire Council, sufficient support was indicated for the scheme to reach this formal consultation stage.</p>
--	--	-------------------------------------	--

<p>A2</p>	<p><u>Audley Road</u></p> <p>a) Whilst I applaud the move to make the bend opposite Gastons Road safer, you will unintentionally worsen the already difficult exit from Seagers Court, by causing more cars to park in our visibility splay, and therefore I object to the proposal in its current form, and would like to see an amendment as suggested. I see you have taken steps to improve junction visibility further up Audley Road, and given there are 20 parking spaces at Seagers Court, generating significant traffic in and out of the car park here, I believe the same principle should be applied.</p> <p>b) A local business whilst in support for some form of restriction on the bend of Audley Road, feels the proposal will create a knock on effect that may affect their business restricting customer access to their premises and is also concerned that the speed of traffic will increase if parking is removed.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>At this stage of the legal process, we cannot increase the proposals without re-advertising the proposals, at further expense and would further delay the implementation of the restrictions for the rest of the Chippenham proposals and whilst this may seem a request for a small addition, it will require an amendment to the whole Order.</p> <p>White advisory markings can be installed to protect drives from obstruction.</p> <p>The proposal seeks to maintain clear forward visibility round the bend. Whilst road side parking can contribute to reduced traffic speeds, parking on the bends restricts forward visibility which can increase the likelihood of conflict between approaching vehicles. The speed limit remains at 30 mph and will continue to be monitored and enforced by the Police.</p>
<p>A3</p>	<p><u>Hill Corner Road</u></p> <p>a) A resident of the road believes that the parking on the corner is an asset rather than a problem. They feel the parking slow the traffic and also deter the lorries and other business vehicles that use Hill Corner Road as a “rat run”.</p> <p>They ask if there are plans to provide parking areas or will the roadside parking just shift to another part of the road and if other traffic calming features are planned to be introduced.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The proposal was developed to mitigate parking on the bend, which is contrary to the Highway Code and not as a result of the new housing estate. The proposal seeks to improve this.</p> <p>We are aware that there have been requests for a weight limit previously; however, the team dealing with those requests felt there were insufficient numbers to justify it. This will be reviewed upon completion of the new housing development.</p>

	<p><u>Hill Corner Road cont...</u></p> <p>b) Another resident is concerned that all the proposal will do is shift parking to other parts of the road.</p> <p>They are also frustrated that permission was given for the housing development with access onto Hill Corner Road. They believe the proposal to restrict parking on the bend penalise the residents of Hill Corner road who have parked there since the road was made, the additional traffic that will be seen is the cause of the planning consent.</p> <p>c) To impose a restriction would increase the risk of accidents as a significant minority of vehicles travel at excessive speed on the straight section of road leading up to the bend, with the probability some may not then negotiate the corner safely.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Wiltshire Council has no duty to provide parking for individuals; its statutory duty is to maintain the right of passage along the highway. It is the responsibility of the owner/keeper of the vehicle to find somewhere safe to park the vehicle and it is something for which the Council cannot take responsibility.</p> <p>Whilst road side parking can contribute to reduced traffic speeds, parking on the bends restricts forward visibility which can increase the likelihood of conflict between approaching vehicles. The speed limit remains at 30 mph and will continue to be monitored and enforced by the Police.</p>
<p>A4</p>	<p><u>Parkfields/Fleet Road</u></p> <p>Residents in this area would like a residents parking permit scheme introducing. Until this happens proposals are not sufficient. I note residents parking is proposed on other streets in the town centre.</p> <p>However, without a joined up town centre approach this will only push more train users on to other streets. Currently we are competing for spaces with train users, the bowls club, John Coles Park users and workers in the town centre. The problem has got notably worse over the four years they have lived here due to the construction of the splash pad (without increasing the park car park!), increased use of the station and car parking charges increasing. The only solution is a town centre wide parking permit strategy; a peace-meal approach will only worsen the situation on streets without permits.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Comments noted – see above for comments relating the proposed residents parking in Ashfield Road.</p>

<p>A5</p>	<p><u>Long Ridings/Malmesbury Road</u></p> <p>We propose a modification to the proposal to improve the safety for the school children, allow minimised disruption for access to the properties and guarantee access for emergency vehicles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply the no waiting zone to both sides of the road outside number 1 and number 3 Long Ridings and discuss with Hardenhuish School about extending the zone round the corner a few meters into their car park to stop parking on the corner. • Could the restrictions be limited to school days (Monday to Friday) or better still between 7:00 and 16:00 Monday to Friday since these are the times the children are using this access route. 	<p>2</p>	<p>The parking restrictions proposed are to improve visibility round the bend on Long Ridings and to protect its junction with Malmesbury Road.</p> <p>It is considered that from a highway safety view, this requires protection 24/7, therefore the double yellow line should remain rather than limited to day to day time restrictions.</p> <p>At this stage of the process, we cannot increase the proposals without re-advertising the proposals at further expense and would further delay the implementation of the restrictions for the rest of the Chippenham proposals, and whilst this may seem a request for a small addition, it will require an amendment to the whole Order.</p> <p>White advisory markings can be installed to protect drives from obstruction.</p>
<p>A6</p>	<p><u>Lords Mead</u></p> <p>a) Residents feel that there is a potential for those who currently park along Lords Meads, to on other surrounding roads in the vicinity of the Bumpers Farm Industrial Estate. They believe businesses on Bumpers Farm should provide adequate parking within their property, thus avoiding vehicles of their employees impinging upon the surrounding residential areas. They feel the Council should consider the wider implications of this proposed parking restriction order before it is implemented and hold a consultation meeting with residents in the wider area who are likely to be affected.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>The proposals were developed at the junctions between Barons Mead/Lords Mead and Frogwell Park, following an incident where a child was knocked off their bicycle.</p> <p>The proposals alleviate the visibility issues for those requiring egress and ingress to the above roads and clear the carriageway adjacent these junctions.</p> <p>A section of limited restricted parking has been put forward to try and allow a turnover of existing parking bays in the section of Lord's Mead adjacent St Peter's Church. The proposed daytime restrictions (Mon-Fri 8am-5pm) enable residents to park during the evenings and weekends.</p>

	<p><u>Lords Mead cont...</u></p> <p>b) Residents believe that in addition to the congestion along Lords Mead, there is significant congestion due to parking along Bumpers Way and Vincients Road, which is dangerous. The Council should consider approaching the businesses on Bumpers Farm to contribute towards a multi-storey car park to keep cars within the industrial estate.</p> <p>c) A resident requests double-yellow lines be added for 10m on all sides of the road at all the junctions on Lords Mead, Frogwell, Derriads Lane, Chamberlain Road and Bumpers Farm Industrial Estate to make it safer and easier for the larger Disabled Transport buses, Public Service buses and delivery vehicles to navigate these areas.</p> <p>d) Resident asks if there are any plans to reduce the speed limit on Lords Mead as considers that traffic already speeds and with less parked cars slowing traffic down, is concerned that traffic will increasingly speed and with Lords Mead is used a walking route to local schools.</p> <p>e) A customer of Little Stars Childminding, Barons Mead objects as they believe the proposed restrictions would mean that people currently parking on Lords Mead (whether workers or parents of school children), would park on Barons Mead. This poses a danger to all children whose parents need to drop off at 'Little Stars'.</p> <p>f) The restrictions proposed would not reduce congestion, merely mean that those who park their cars on Lords Mead now would park on the side roads. As these roads are narrower and more populated, parking here would be more dangerous for residents, road users, and pedestrians.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>3</p>	<p>As above, the proposals were developed to alleviate the visibility issues for those requiring egress and ingress to the above roads and clear the carriageway adjacent these junctions. Comments as to the source of the parking are noted; however, the primary aim is to clear the vehicles causing the obstructions.</p> <p>At this stage of the process, we cannot increase the proposals without re-advertising the proposals at further expense and would further delay the implementation of the restrictions for the rest of the Chippenham proposals, and whilst this may seem a request for a small addition, it will require an amendment to the whole Order.</p> <p>Whilst roadside parking can contribute to reduced traffic speeds, parking on junctions and bends restricts visibility which can increase the likelihood of conflict between approaching vehicles. The speed limit remains at 30 mph and will continue to be monitored and enforced by the Police.</p> <p>Wiltshire Council has no duty to provide parking for individuals; its statutory duty is to maintain the right of passage along the highway. It is the responsibility of the owner/keeper of the vehicle to find somewhere safe to park the vehicle and it is something for which the Council cannot take responsibility.</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>g) A resident whilst agreeing with the new no waiting areas proposed at the junctions, disagrees with the 8am to 5pm restrictions on Lords Mead. As allotment holders need to park close in order to carry tools etc. during the day. They consider that there are no other areas to park for the school and the church, as the car park is too small for all the parents at drop off and pick up times and the same for people attending church service and funerals.</p> <p>As a resident, I don't mind having cars parked in the street as this slows down the traffic, clear road on Lords Mead would mean a race track and people would be driving at or above 30 mph.</p> <p>h) Proposed no waiting areas will stop any cars from parking, but as residents we are aware that when there are no cars, people speed along the road too fast and dangerously - having cars on the road slows drivers down</p> <p>I suggest one side of "no waiting" be enforced but not both, to allow some cars to park these proposals do not address the underlying issue of lack of parking and access to the south end of Bumpers Farm, which is what is causing the main congestion problems in the area.</p> <p>i) Adding parking restrictions to Frogwell Road will lead to additional load on the Bumpers Farm Road. Would it not make sense to control bumpers farm access and egress first, before enforcing restrictions on current alternative parking options used by employees working here?</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p>	<p>Due to the bend and gradient of the road adjacent to the allotments, when vehicles are parked, forward visibility is reduced which during the daytime when school journeys are made is considered a risk of collision.</p> <p>Therefore, after a further site investigation after reviewing the comments made, it is considered that the proposal cannot be reduced in order to have the same affect.</p> <p>See above comment regarding the 30 mph speed limit.</p>
--	--	----------------------------	---

	<p><u>Lowden Avenue cont...</u></p> <p>c) Resident don't feel there is any need to put parking restrictions at the ends of the lanes exiting into Lowden Avenue. People are well able to enter & exit as things stand. We are concerned the lines will extend in front of our properties reducing available curb length for parking.</p> <p>d) The proposed protection of the alleyways to the rear of the properties are welcome, however the drawing shows the lines protruding beyond the width of the alleyway. Residents feel that they all cope well with just the width of the alley (which residents do not block) and do not need the lines wider than the natural width of the alley as this would remove another parking space on the Eastern side.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>2</p>	<p>In considering the comments raised concerning the proposals to protect the alleyways, it is recommended that these proposals be withdrawn.</p>
<p>A8</p>	<p><u>Patchway</u></p> <p>A resident feels that the proposals are a waste of public money as the restrictions will not be enforced after 4.30pm or at weekends and people will continue to park knowing they will not be ticketed. They feel it would be better to remove a grassed area opposite the flats so residents have somewhere to park.</p> <p>They also mention a number of vehicles that appear to have been abandoned and believe if these were removed more parking space would be available.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The proposals were developed in response to requests by residents to improve the manoeuvring space in the turning which is not possible due to parked vehicles.</p> <p>Regarding the abandoned vehicles mentioned, this has been reported to the appropriate team.</p>
<p>A9</p>	<p><u>Station Hill</u></p> <p>A disabled driver has questioned the position of the proposed disabled parking at the top of Station Hill. They ask what benefit is this compared to other available sites? Has this space been assessed to see that it can be used due to the steep slope, etc.</p>		<p>The proposal for a disabled bay in this location was in response to a request from the church and the Town Council to enable disabled visitors an opportunity to park closer to their place of worship and also to the businesses on Station Road.</p>

	<p><u>Station Hill cont...</u></p> <p>Why are the disabled spaces not reserved for all day / every day, presumably the Council don't think disabled people visit town on Sundays or in the evenings?</p>		<p>Blue Badge holders have ample opportunity to park throughout the day. Blue Badge holders can park within regular parking bays if they choose to and are not restricted to the time limits indicated. They can also park on double yellow lines if not causing an obstruction.</p>
A10	<p><u>The Bridge</u></p> <p>Why not make the whole of the river bridge area at the bottom of High Street No Parking / No Waiting?</p> <p>Some no existing waiting areas are retained for no obvious reason and could be made additional disabled spaces eg on The Bridge</p>	1	<p>There are existing restrictions in this area and the proposal for The Bridge is for no-loading with the aim of keeping this area clear and this restriction would not enable Blue Badge holders to park in this area.</p>
A11	<p><u>The Paddocks</u></p> <p>a) The 'no waiting at any time' should include BOTH sides of the road within the proposed area. This would then prevent vehicles, including lorries and emergency vehicles, from having to drive onto the pavement to avoid parked vehicles.</p> <p>b) The main issue we have on our street are workers parking Monday-Friday between 8am-6pm. Some of the residents need to park on the road from time to time and this is too restrictive for them to have free use and enjoyment of their properties. Could we propose a time limited restriction instead?</p>	2 1	<p>The restriction has been proposed due to the carriageway being blocked by parked vehicles and it is the Council's duty to maintain free, unobstructed access along the public highway. There is 'No Right to Park' on a public highway and as such the priority is to allow traffic to move unhindered along this section of road.</p> <p>From site observations during the evening it is felt that it is appropriate to implement a 24 hour restriction. By leaving the restriction on one side of the road, it will retain the opportunity for residents and their visitors to park.</p>

	<p><u>The Paddocks cont...</u></p> <p>c) This proposal is long overdue and should very much improve the parking situation. However would say is the extension of double-yellows around the corner in the vicinity of Number 21a might encourage non-resident 'parkers' to park on the corner opposite outside the entrance to No 20, Paddocks House. This would be highly undesirable and causes a siting/visibility issue for drivers coming out of Paddocks house. May I suggest that double yellows are placed on this corner also?</p>	1	<p>At this stage of the legal process, we cannot increase the proposals without re-advertising the proposals, at further expense and would further delay the implementation of the restrictions for the rest of the Chippenham proposals and whilst this may seem a request for a small addition, it will require an amendment to the whole Order.</p> <p>White advisory markings can be installed to protect drives from obstruction.</p>
A12	<p><u>Vincients Way North and South (Bumpers Farm Ind Est)</u></p> <p>a) A business in the vicinity comments that whilst they have no issue with the proposals, the council must be aware of the ongoing traffic issues with traffic movements on Bumpers Farm Industrial Estate especially at peak times which affects their business. They make a number of comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All of the double yellow lines on Bumpers Way, in particular, are faded badly. Drivers simply ignore the lines and since there is little or no enforcement, they can do so with impunity. • There is a single yellow line near the exit to the estate. In reality what this means is that HGVs park near the exit to the estate restricting the road and causing a bottle neck. • Chippenham Motor Company has given over their entire premises to car sales. Therefore all employees have to park on the road and more importantly, car transporters load and unload on the highway causing an obstruction and health and safety hazard to the transporter driver. • The Post Office sorting office has given over their entire premises to van parking. Therefore all employees park on the roadside, in particular on both sides of Bumpers Way reducing the traffic flow to single file where the 	2	<p>Comments noted. Bumpers Farm has been included in this review. We are aware of the historic issues highlighted in the response.</p> <p>Bumpers Farm is an Industrial Estate that has a demand for parking exceeding the capacity of parking available much like other industrial estates in the country. The duty of the Council is to maintain the Highway. The Highway must be free of congestion, free of obstruction and a safe. This can only be achieved if there are sufficient viable options to control parking in this instance. A balance has to be drawn between providing some on-street parking and restricting the whole area, which is not feasible.</p> <p>Regarding the concerns raised over the poor condition of the existing restrictions, this will be addressed and has been passed to our highways maintenance team. More robust enforcement by our Parking Service team will then be able to take place.</p>

	<p>junction of Bumpers Way and Bumpers Way occurs.</p> <p><u>Vincients Way North and South cont...</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The southern end of Vincients Road, where there was never an on street parking issue, has double yellow lines on both sides. These could easily be removed from one entire side with no detriment to traffic flow. b) Another business has registered their objection to this proposal to remove existing no waiting restrictions and also made some general comments regarding the traffic on the Industrial Estate; • Increased parking on this road will reduce the available roadway for all vehicles, regardless of size, and is inherently unsafe. • Businesses have large container lorries, as well as various sizes of articulated and non-articulated lorries, entering or leaving the site at all times during the working day, with some of these vehicles having to back in. The addition of parking on this stretch could prove unsafe for other road users and pedestrians. • The addition of parked vehicles would also lead to decreased visibility for vehicles exiting our site, again inherently unsafe for road users and pedestrians. • They believe a local bus company conducts brake testing on this stretch of road, often sitting in their vehicles while, they presume, noting the results. The addition of parked vehicles will make this practice unsafe for other road users and pedestrians. • There does not seem to have been any consultation with the businesses of Bumpers Farm Industrial Estate regarding this matter; surely this should be a basic step 	<p>1</p>	<p>Proposals to remove existing restrictions in Vincients Road are the subject of this proposal.</p> <p>Existing restrictions will remain in areas where large vehicles leaving business premises require a turning circle but it is proposed to remove some of the existing restrictions to enable more parking in areas where obstruction is not caused.</p> <p>With regards to consulting with businesses on the Industrial Estate, Wiltshire Council does ensure that all processes regarding Traffic Regulation Orders are carried out following the statutory regulations as set out in legislation under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.</p> <p>In terms of consulting with the public we publish a public notice within a newspaper circulating within the area (specified in the Regulations), we ensure maximum circulation of this by using the figures of highest selling publication within the area to which the Traffic Regulation Order relates.</p> <p>Whilst we do not have a statutory obligation to post notice on site, we do this as standard practice as we recognise that not everyone reads the local newspaper and it has proven to be very effective in reaching as wide an audience as possible.</p>
--	--	----------	--

	before issuing variation orders.		
A13	<p>Wood Lane</p> <p>a) Restrictions outside Charter Primary School could result in further vehicles using this section of Wood Lane as they must be moved before 8am.</p> <p>In addition, vehicles pass through this road well in excess of the speed limit and widening the thoroughfare may further encourage this, both here and past the school.</p> <p>b) The impact on resident parking as a result of this proposal will be huge, everyone will have to relocate and literally fight over any space left. I myself will have cars parked practically against my window (there is practically no pavement) because double yellow lines will be extended on the opposite side of the road (where there is a large pavement!) Surely the restrictions have been extended on the wrong side? I understand the need for improvement in Wood Lane but I feel that the proposals need to consider residents that live and park along the proposed areas to be restricted.</p> <p>c) Residents are concerned about the high percentage of kerb space which will be lost due to prohibition on a section of Wood Lane where evening parking can be difficult</p> <p>d) A resident considers that the scheme proposal is extremely detrimental and unfair to residents of Wood Lane who do not have parking facilities attached to their property.</p> <p>Whilst part of the scheme is understandable in the view of emergency service access. The no waiting time, at any time, further down will result in residents fighting for parking spaces in an already limited area.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Currently, the layby area outside of Charter Primary School is not subject to any waiting restrictions. By providing timed waiting restrictions in this area, it keeps parking to a minimum during school start and finish times, when there will be more people crossing the road in this area, thus reducing the risk of pedestrians and young children being masked by parked cars.</p> <p>It is recognised that the presence of the school may exuberate traffic in this area at peak times; therefore, the timed waiting restrictions are proposed to allow cars to use this area during off peak times.</p> <p>This proposal has been investigated as part of the Taking Action on School Journeys initiative and has been investigated with the school, gaining support from the school governors and forms part of their overall travel plan, to improve walking and cycling to school.</p> <p>Any suggestions to change the priority / layout of the pinch points outside the school need to be investigated as part of the school travel plan and if proposals are deemed suitable, the school should pursue them as further improvements through the Taking Action on School Journeys proposals.</p> <p>The proposal on the section south of the school was developed to prevent parking in the narrowest section of Wood Lane, to allow safe uncongested access along this section of highway.</p> <p>However, it is noted that there has been a mapping error on the section south of the existing restrictions. This should have been on both sides of the road at this point, and will therefore be withdrawn from the proposals at this time and will need to be re-advertised and included in a future review.</p>

	<p>No objections were received to the following proposals;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blackwellhams • Darcy Close • Derriads Green / Derriads Lane / Down View • Foundry Lane and Old Road • Fuller Close • Market Place • New Road • Parliament Street • Pavely Close • Queens Crescent / Windsor Close • Sheldon Road • Westcroft • Westmead Lane 		<p>These proposals will therefore be implemented as advertised.</p>