

Support

Ref	Comment	No.	Officer Response
S1.	<p>I agree with the proposal to install traffic lights at the bottom of Station Hill.</p> <p>Please can you consider a yellow box across the proposed junction as I use this road every day and blocking back is already an issue on New Road which could be exacerbated with 2 sets of traffic lights in quick succession.</p> <p>Are you planning to co-ordinate the sequence of the existing traffic lights on New Road (under the railway) with the proposed traffic lights at the bottom of station Hill and the proposed Toucan outside St Paul's House?</p> <p>The recently provided disabled bay at the top of Station Hill outside Tyre City is always empty and could be put back as a regular on-street parking. I expect a disabled space at the top of the steepest road in Chippenham is not popular with disabled users.</p> <p>All other proposals sound sensible and are supported.</p>	1	<p>The comments in support for the proposal are noted.</p> <p>The proposed traffic signals will be linked with those already in place around the Western Arch's and will be programmed to ensure that queuing traffic does not cause any obstruction.</p> <p>The use of a yellow box marking is not being considered as part of the proposals; however, this remains an option once the traffic signals are operational and motorist driving behaviour has been established.</p> <p>The comments regarding the provision of the existing Disabled Bay in Station Hill are noted, but there are no plans to reallocate this space to other road users at present.</p>

Objection

Ref	Comment	No.	Officer Response
1.	<p>I understand there is consultation for a traffic light system at the bottom of Station Hill in Chippenham. As a resident of Monkton Park I strongly object to this installation. The roundabout currently in use serves its purpose, and it is not this which causes any delays it is the traffic lights that stop the flow of traffic under the railway arch which then stops people turning up and down Station Hill as they are queuing back from the railway arch lights.</p> <p>A set of traffic lights instead of a roundabout does not solve this problem it compounds it. It will stop flow completely removing the option of filtering which you can currently do at the mini roundabout and so keep some traffic moving.</p> <p>I agree with the proposal to remove parking around this area as this is a safety issue.</p> <p>You have already removed the option of vehicles exiting Monkton Park via Monkton Hill so you will increase the traffic and wait going down Station Hill and wanting to turn left at the end of it. This is unacceptable and unnecessary.</p> <p>Please listen to the local residents.</p>		<p>Evidence obtained through analysis of the developed Chippenham Transport Strategy shows that planned development growth in this area will have a detrimental impact on the operation of the junction in its current format and that the introduction of Traffic Signals is the most appropriate solution to ensure the junction operates efficiently in the longer term.</p> <p>The introduction of the traffic signals offers up the opportunity to implement measures which improve the provision for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>The comments in support of the amendments to the parking in the vicinity are noted.</p>
	<p>The scheme has so many flaws it's hard to know where to begin.</p> <p>Station hill & New road traffic lights. These will not only exacerbate traffic further, but increase pollution and, once again, force pedestrians to stand and wait in the fumes (as the little George traffic lights have). I walk the route multiple times a week, often daily, at various times. Only for a very short period is traffic a problem here, but these lights will extend that period and force cars to wait unnecessarily at all times. All while using unnecessary amounts of energy. Where are the control boxes for these traffic lights going to be situated? Will you block the pavements and the natural passage of</p>		<p>Evidence obtained through analysis of the developed Chippenham Transport Strategy shows that planned development growth in this area will have a detrimental impact on the operation of the junction in its current format and that the introduction of Traffic Signals is the most appropriate solution to ensure the junction operates efficiently in the longer term.</p> <p>The introduction of the traffic signals offers up the opportunity to implement measures which improve the provision for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the introduction of the proposal will result in additional street furniture, the</p>

<p>people as you have at the Little George? Do you even consider the street scene in your plans?</p> <p>There are double yellow lines already present along New road and station hill, but the poor maintenance of these and complete lack of enforcement, even at peak times, are what cause the problem with traffic and make it unsafe for pedestrians to cross. Rather than spend what I am sure will be an obscene amount of money on traffic lights again, why not enforce what already exists? This will make it safer for pedestrians to see and be seen by drivers turning left up station hill, where the view is often blocked by delivery vehicles for the takeaways.</p> <p>Why are you putting in loading bays when you have repeatedly informed me that vehicles are well within their rights to park on double yellow lines, up on $\frac{2}{3}$ of the pavement, sometimes for hours on end (as outside dominos and Papa John's)?</p> <p>Please do not change anymore zebra crossings for further traffic lights. Zebra crossings make it easier for pedestrians to cross and every set of lights you have put in to replace them elsewhere has resulted in inordinate amounts of time waiting in the traffic fumes for pedestrians (little George again).</p> <p>Please move the taxi rank and waiting area somewhere more suitable, maybe on monkton hill? The wide footpath in the taxi rank narrows outside the fruit and veg store, as their stalls extend $\frac{2}{3}$ of the pavement width. With the taxi rank here, people can only pass in single file, or with current covid restrictions, wait to pass. The pavement by the taxi waiting area already narrows outside the solicitors, with the taxis parked here and wing mirrors extending on pavement and taxi drivers out of their cars chatting, there just isn't enough room.</p> <p>This once again smacks of a poorly thought out plan that will cause further damage to Chippenham and cost a fortune, for what I can see as no</p>	<p>location of which has been considered to minimise impact on pedestrian thoroughfare and the overall streetscene.</p> <p>The proposal includes for the comprehensive resurfacing of the carriageway throughout the extents of the proposal. This will ensure that all the restrictions are suitable for enforcement, and that road users are aware of them.</p> <p>No Waiting At Any Time (Double Yellow Lines) permits the ability for motorists to load and unload from the highway. It is recognised that this activity will adversely affect the ability of the proposed traffic signals to operate efficiently and consequently the proposal seeks to supplement this with for the introduction of a loading restriction to prevent such an activity. A specific loading bay has been proposed to assist delivery vehicles for those businesses in the locality, located outside of The British Heart Foundation.</p> <p>The proposals have been developed to assist the movement of non-motorised road users, and it is acknowledged that the introduction of traffic signal controls, may at times seem less demand responsive than other forms of crossing facilities such as zebra crossings. To mitigate this, the modern technology employed within traffic signal detection is able to respond to demand in an intelligent manner, such as extending time for pedestrians, cancelling unnecessary demands etc.... By replacing the existing Zebra Crossing outside of Ivy House, this permits greater levels of control between all systems as the facilities can be linked to ensure optimum efficiency for both users of crossings and vehicular traffic.</p>
---	---

	<p>benefit.</p> <p>With the number of traffic lights that have been installed and proposed around Chippenham, it feels like there must be someone in the council who has an interest in the construction company or traffic light manufacturers - like mafia Italy!</p> <p>Please actually consider pedestrians in your schemes. You have declared a climate emergency, but all you do is concrete over areas, build car parks, and try to smooth the passage for cars. You should be encouraging walking and cycling, not making it more difficult, as this will once again do so.</p> <p>Finally, please listen to residents on this. You have left a disgraceful legacy with the multi storey car park that no-one wanted. Don't force more inappropriate and poorly thought out plans on us.</p>		
--	--	--	--

General Comments

Ref	General Comments	No.	Officer Response
G1.	<p>Thank you for consulting Chippenham Town Council on proposed Traffic Regulation Order Ref LJB/TRO/CHIP5 (below). This was discussed at a meeting of the Town Council's Planning, Environment & Transport Committee held on 19 November 2020 and it was resolved that the following comments regarding this proposed TRO be submitted:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="268 696 767 1144">• <i>The proposed Toucan crossing on New Road, to replace the existing Zebra crossing (adjacent to St. Paul's House) should not be installed as this will cause extended wait times for pedestrians/cyclists and hinder free-flowing traffic. It is requested that a parallel cycle crossing is installed on the outside of the existing Zebra crossing to keep cyclists separated from pedestrians.</i> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="268 1218 767 1682">• Changing from a zebra crossing to a toucan crossing will increase wait times for people using this crossing. This is an area where pedestrians and cyclists must already cross multiple light-controlled crossings, many with very long wait times. Adding to this already long wait time is undesirable, and makes the area less attractive to pedestrians and cyclists. This is a view backed by the Chippenham Town Council Planning, Environment and Transport (PET) committee. <li data-bbox="268 1720 767 1951">• Given there is a zebra crossing at this location currently, it will previously have been deemed that this type of crossing in this location was appropriate. We would therefore ask "what has changed, to now require a traffic-light-controlled crossing?" <li data-bbox="268 1989 767 2116">• If the reasons why a zebra was previously deemed appropriate are in fact still valid, there is no reason why the zebra crossing cannot be upgraded 	2	<p>The proposals have been developed to assist the movement of non-motorised road users, and it is acknowledged that the introduction of traffic signal controls, may at times seem less demand responsive than other forms of crossing facilities such as Zebra or Parallel crossings.</p> <p>To mitigate this, the modern technology employed within traffic signal detection is able to respond to demand in an intelligent manner, such as extending time for pedestrians, cancelling unnecessary demands etc.</p> <p>Replacing the existing Zebra Crossing outside of Ivy House, this permits greater levels of control between all systems as the facilities can be linked to ensure optimum efficiency for both users of crossings and vehicular traffic.</p>

	<p>to a parallel (i.e. a segregated cycle crossing directly alongside). This would be a cheaper solution, and aid pedestrian and cycle flows, thereby encouraging active travel.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There will be natural breaks in the traffic at this location, due to the traffic lights at the New Road/Marshfield Road junction, and the lights to the east of the railway arches. 		
G2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The traffic signals proposed for the junction of New Road and Station Hill should be co-ordinated with the traffic signals at the railway arches to prevent congestion.</i> 	1	The proposal includes for the linking of proposed signalisation of Station Hill and the existing controls at the Railway Arch and its junction with New Road / Marshfield Road and the various crossing facilities.
G3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The number of disabled parking spaces in the Town centre be checked to ensure the number complies with the statutory ratio of disabled spaces to public spaces.</i> 	1	The proposals have increased the number of formal Disabled spaces by one within the extent of the proposal. The proposal also seeks to ensure that the Disabled Bays are marked in accordance with the current guidance relating to their size.
G4	<p><i>To amend Parking, Waiting and Loading restrictions on Monkton Hill, St Marys Place, New Road, Station Hill and The Bridge</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All existing and new 'no waiting' restrictions need to be enforced, to keep these sections of road unobstructed by parked vehicles. This enforcement does not currently happen. To assist with this enforcement, the proposed cycle lanes in these areas should be mandatory cycle lanes and use physical segregation, to prevent vehicles entering them or parking in the 'No waiting' areas. Use of segregation also aligns with Government Cycle Infrastructure Design document LTN 1/20, where principle 3 states: "Cyclists must be physically separated and protected from high volume motor traffic, both at junctions and on the stretches of road between them. [...] On roads with high volumes of motor traffic or high speeds, cycle routes indicated only with road markings or cycle symbols 	1	<p>It is acknowledged that the enforcement of all restrictions, be they associated with this proposal or other restrictions on highway network, necessitate effective enforcement to ensure adherence.</p> <p>This project commenced prior to the publication of the LTN1/20 and the changes in design advice.</p> <p>Ensuring that cycle facilities remain unobstructed of vehicles (parked or loading / unloaded) was recognised and as such the proposals include for the addition of the Loading Restriction, allied to the proposed No Waiting At Any Time. In light of the comments received, the consultants undertaking the design are reviewing the proposal to identify whether alterations to mandatory cycle lanes are feasible.</p> <p>The information provided within LTN1/20 has further expanded guidance contained in previous publications relating to cycle infrastructure. Wiltshire Council has yet</p>

	<p>should not be used as people will perceive them to be unacceptable for safe cycling.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please see separate Cycle Network Development Group response regarding the design of the cycle facilities in this area. 		<p>to agree to adopt the principles within LTN1/20. Schemes already in the design phase at the time of publication do not require redesigning in light of revised guidance and consequently not all elements contained within LTN1/20 can be adapted into this proposal.</p> <p>A response to the separately submitted comment on the design elements will be provided.</p>
G5	<p><i>To remove the existing Pelican Crossing in A420 Marshfield Road and install a TOUCAN” Crossing (an un-segregated crossing for pedestrians and cyclists) in A420 Marshfield Road - at a point 46 metres south east of its junction with Dallas Road:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Converting this crossing to a toucan makes it legal for cyclists to use it. • The light timings should be set to minimise waiting times for cyclists and pedestrians crossing this road. Current wait times for pedestrians at this crossing are reasonable, particularly when vehicular traffic has been on green for an extended period – in these situations, pressing the pedestrian button instantly changes the vehicle lights to red, resulting in very short pedestrian wait times. 	1	<p>The timings associated with the proposed Toucan Crossing will be optimised to suit the demands of users.</p>
G6	<p><i>Traffic Signals for New Road and Station Hill. The Traffic signals are being introduced to provide improved junction capacity, reduce congestion and provide improved facilities for cycle and pedestrian users. Amendments to the parking provision and waiting restrictions are required to ensure the approaches and cycle lanes remain unobstructed by vehicles:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All existing and new ‘no waiting’ restrictions need to be enforced, to keep the roads on the approaches to the junctions unobstructed by parked vehicles. This enforcement does not currently happen. • To assist with this enforcement, the cycle lanes on the approaches to the junctions should be mandatory cycle lanes and use physical segregation, to prevent vehicles 		<p>See response to reference G4</p>

	<p>entering them or parking in the 'No waiting' areas. Use of segregation also aligns with Government Cycle Infrastructure Design document LTN 1/20, where principle 3 states:</p> <p>"Cyclists must be physically separated and protected from high volume motor traffic, both at junctions and on the stretches of road between them. [...]</p> <p>On roads with high volumes of motor traffic or high speeds, cycle routes indicated only with road markings or cycle symbols should not be used as people will perceive them to be unacceptable for safe cycling."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please see separate Cycle Network Development Group response regarding the design of the cycle facilities in this area. 		
G7	<p><i>To introduce 'No Waiting at any time' on various lengths of roads: Monkton Hill, Station Hill, St Mary's Place, New Road, Foghamshire and the Bridge (see link).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>To assist with this enforcement, the cycle lanes in these areas should be mandatory cycle lanes and use physical segregation, to prevent vehicles entering them or parking in the 'No waiting' areas. Use of segregation also aligns with Government Cycle Infrastructure Design document LTN 1/20, where principle 3 states: "Cyclists must be physically separated and protected from high volume motor traffic, both at junctions and on the stretches of road between them. [...]</i> On roads with high volumes of motor traffic or high speeds, cycle routes indicated only with road markings or cycle symbols should not be used as people will perceive them to be unacceptable for safe cycling." • <i>Please see separate Cycle Network Development Group response regarding the design of the cycle facilities in this area.</i> 		See response to reference G4
G8	<p><i>To introduce No Waiting at any time at locations on Monkton Hill, Station Hill, New Road and the Bridge (see link).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All existing and new 'no waiting' restrictions need to be enforced, to keep these sections of road 		See response to G4.

	<p>unobstructed by parked vehicles. This enforcement does not currently happen.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• To assist with this enforcement, the cycle lanes in these areas should be mandatory cycle lanes and use physical segregation, to prevent vehicles entering them or parking in the 'No waiting' areas. Use of segregation also aligns with Government Cycle Infrastructure Design document LTN 1/20, where principle 3 states: "Cyclists must be physically separated and protected from high volume motor traffic, both at junctions and on the stretches of road between them. [...] On roads with high volumes of motor traffic or high speeds, cycle routes indicated only with road markings or cycle symbols should not be used as people will perceive them to be unacceptable for safe cycling."• Please see separate Cycle Network Development Group response regarding the design of the cycle facilities in this area.		
--	---	--	--