

TAPAG INFORMATION PACK

19th July 2020

Contents:

TAPAG response to some residents' objections submitted in February 2020:

- **Concerns, 1 to 18**
- **Suggestions, 1 to 9**
- **Information requested from the Parish Council/TAPAG, 1 to 14**

Appendix 1 – Presentation made by TAPAG at the Parish Council meeting in July 2020

Appendix 2 – Specification for Traffic Consultants, 15th June 2018

Concerns

1. Residents who don't have the privilege of owning their own driveway won't be able to park within a reasonable walking distance of their homes – significantly further than they do now.

2. The increased traffic flow will disproportionately benefit commuters through the village, not residents.

3. The increased traffic flow will inevitably increase traffic speeds – increased danger to residents – particularly when crossing the road,

What is regarded as reasonable 25m, 50m, 100m?

Should this be improved flow? If this is the case the issue of less congestion and reduced emissions has been raised many times by residents. Additionally, some residents especially travelling from N can take 20 minutes to enter the village from Whitchurch Hill. Lack of passing places for N bound traffic and three parking spaces at the bottom of the High St. impact on the commuting time of 100's of other residents in the village every day, adding up to several hours of delayed journeys per year for some.

Traffic surveys carried out by SIDS show that by official measuring criteria there is not a speeding problem in the village. The SIDS survey is a 24 hour survey for 7 days or 14 days. It is possible that the rapid acceleration we see at stages in the High St will be reduced if there are smaller blocks of orderly parked cars. In rush hour it is unlikely that the speed of cars will increase enough to affect the SIDS data.

The biggest danger to residents at present is cars making "a dash" for a tight gap someway up the High Street.

<p>4. The most dangerous area in the village, the narrows outside the Ferryboat where there is no curb has not been addressed, and is highlighted as High Priority in the Village Plan,</p> <p>5. We live in a quaint old Village and love it. We accept the congestion for short periods at rush hours to discourage more cars to come through the village.</p> <p>6. Double Yellow Lines along the full length of the High Street seems extreme and will visually not be appealing,</p> <p>7. If the traffic flow through the village is increased this will result in sat-navs directing more cars through the Village – negating the benefits, increasing danger to pedestrians and still incurring the significant dis-benefits to Villagers (cost and loss of parking and visual impact),</p>	<p>Pavements are not part of TAPAG’s remit. TAPAG understands the PC is committed to taking actions to address this, which is happening independent of the TAPAG work.</p> <p>It is not the case that everyone accepts more congestion and given there are a limited number of bridges over the Thames, with increased housing and reduced parking it is unlikely that the situation will ease even if congestion is a deterrent. The recognition that we live in a “quaint old village” is welcomed. The Independent Group engaged by the PC to carry out a Conservation Area Survey has stated “cars parked on pavements have a detrimental effect on the look of the village given its importance as a conservation area”.</p> <p><i>*It should be noted that the Government is to run a consultation about a national ban on pavement parking following the Transport Committee’s 2019 influential inquiry and report. There is a ban on pavement parking in London. There is a drive to extend it across the country giving priority to pedestrians which is one of the stated goals of the objectors</i></p> <p>Not all residents share the view that yellow lines would be a problem visually. There are thinner versions of the lines commonly used for heritage areas which we can apply for. It is difficult to see an alternative solution. The White lines which are courtesy and not legally enforceable are even ignored by residents. The OCC Highways officer professed a view to TAPAG’s questioning that the only parking deterrent was double yellow lines.</p> <p>What evidence is there for this statement?</p> <p>The visual impact of badly parked cars even on pavements is already unappealing and especially at the top narrows where parked cars increase the danger to pedestrians who, on occasions cannot get a buggy or mobility scooter through and must walk into the road. This is less likely to be a resident but once visitors see cars on the pavement especially below the top narrows they too park but have more concern with protecting their car than the safety of pedestrians and the further south cars are</p>
---	---

<p>8. Pushes parking from the High Street into other roads – particularly Eastfield Lane.</p> <p>9.. Increased parking in Eastfield Lane is likely to result in parking near the Eastfield Lane narrows, effectively elongating it – making it a new bottle neck,</p> <p>10. Increased parking in Eastfield Lane will reduce sightlines for pedestrians and drivers – significantly increasing danger as it’s a high pedestrian traffic area for school children (the school are trying to encourage walking to school),</p> <p>11. Increased parking on Manor Road,</p> <p>12. Increased parking on Hardwick Road,</p>	<p>parked the closer they are to the bend drawing them further onto the pavement. This is more noticeable at weekends. There are 24 parking places planned for the High St. There were rarely 24 cars parked before lockdown.</p> <p>This statement is hypothetical and could be negated by further double yellow lines. TAPAG has considered extending the proposal to add yellow lines (or single as appropriate) to Eastfield Lane and the lower High Street by the bridge and possibly parts of Manor road. See appendix 1</p> <p>As above</p> <p>As above NB it has been noticed/remarked that many of the speeding drivers in Eastfield Lane are parents going to or from the school, perhaps after being held up in the congested High St. The headmistress has highlighted this at times. There have also been email exchanges with the school and a school governor about the inability of coaches to get down Eastfield Lane due to the increased coach size but also in part due to parked cars in the High St. The recent issue with school coaches accessing Hardwick road to pick up at Muddy Lane was due entirely to parked cars at the High St end.</p> <p>Double yellow lines could negate this apart from four or five spaces at the top end. See Appendix 1</p> <p>It is unlikely this would be an issue at the High Street end of Hardwick road as it is already full. Parking on Hardwick Road layby is already full below Hillside for residents with a second car or whose garage is too small. Parking on the east side is generally limited to time of the school run. Swanston Field does not seem to be a problem, although some residents there have also expressed concerns of cars parked close to the corner in Swanston Field restricting view up and down Hardwick Road. If we are referencing overflow from the High St this could occur when the 24 parking spaces are used up. Although “Residents Only” parking in the high street is more likely to be the catalyst for cars parking elsewhere.</p>
---	--

13. The cost to the Parish of £21,620.00

The budget for the proposed works in the High Street called for £8,120 including an estimate of £2k for lining and OCC will go no further than an indicative cost. Therefore, perhaps this will stretch to £9k but more consultation and justifications will increase this figure. Given this is the highest priority issue raised by residents in the Village Plan and with this level of spending stretched over 3 years it seems appropriate and has been approved by the parish Council. There is no plan to raise the precept to support this.

If the proposal in **Appendix 1** is endorsed drawings are likely to cost around £925 and one might add another £1000 for lining.

Further estimated costs have been allocated over three years for:

- A mandatory speed limit of 20mph £6,000
- Residents Parking signs and enforcement £5,000
- Improve verges £2,500

14. There is no chicane in the plan, so one direction the drivers will get a free run through the length of the village,

We're not sure what this means. Currently there is no chicane even one created by cars as at times there is no gap from the bottom narrows to Walliscote Farm Drive. The idea of having regulated banks of cars creates a chicane.

15. The three spaces by the bottom narrows are proposed to be removed which currently slows the traffic and also serves as parking for local residents,

This is commonly acknowledged by residents as the major risk area with cars and especially vans even mounting the road on the corner of Eastfield lane. Residents have complained about this repeatedly. It is also the major location of the traffic blockages in the High Street

<p>16. That TAPAG have misinterpreted the fundamental basis for the proposed traffic plan - the village survey results (with regards to the parking question). Residents when they responded that they were concerned about parking, they meant they want more/better parking, not less!</p> <p>17. The proposed “Residents Only” Parking is not currently available and there is no guarantee it will be implemented in the next few years – if ever,</p> <p>18. What is the Council’s Plan B if it doesn’t work? Spend more money? Leave it?</p>	<p>We disagree, many of those approving the proposals (90% of signatures) were concerned about unacceptable two-way stationary traffic delays. The Parish Council and TAPAG have evidence of the full range of traffic concerns from annual surveys’ and Open Days documenting residents’ concerns dating from 2015, up to and including the 2018 Village Plan Survey. Congestion has been a growing priority.</p> <p>More organised parking (ref. “better”) should mean that at least as many cars as present can park along the High Street. The Lockdown has shown that some mornings/evenings there are between 4 and 6 residents’ cars S of Manor road. It is hard to see where additional parking can be conjured up. There may be possibilities to park at the Village Green or in the Village Hall Car Park.</p> <p>As defined in the village plan, this is only intended to be the first phase. Follow-on phases with residents parking and potential traffic calming measures to achieve 20 mph speed limit are part of the longer term vision but clearly how they would be designed and implemented would be influenced by how well the first phase works.</p> <p>This is not within TAPAG’s brief.</p>
--	---

Suggestions

1. Don't change the existing layout apart from putting priority signs at the top and bottom narrows directing traffic out of the Village in both directions,

a. Existing Residents are not penalised by having their parking taken away,

b. Allows parking for visitors to local businesses and residents,

c. Cost effective,

2. Don't change the existing layout apart from change the white line to Double Yellow Lines and add a 4 x car passing bay opposite Duchess Close,

3. If implemented, the plan needs to be a Village Traffic and Parking Plan – not a High Street Plan,

4. If implemented, the plan needs to look to the future needs of the village ie electric car charging points, projected parking needs, projected traffic flows,

This has been considered and assessed as impracticable as southbound traffic would tend to follow on, creating a stationary stream thereby preventing northbound traffic moving through the narrows. Northbound traffic would not be able to see oncoming traffic because of the bend in the road by Highwayman's Cottage.

It is simply not true that parking spaces are being taken away. There is proposal for 24 cars. Based on recent surveys This is currently enough. The objective is to get order into the parking.

This is not guaranteed now

The logic is difficult to follow here. This presumes the 3 car spaces at North of the bottom narrows are not seen as an issue. The suggestion seems to agree we need regulated pull ins to allow flow but doesn't regulate the parking and clearly doesn't address the congestion problem of the pinch point at the bottom narrows. What it does do is "save" the three contentious parking places.

This is a reasonable point and is under consideration as part of this first phase and the PC already has a second phase under consideration. **See Appendix 1**

This is not part of TAPAG's current remit. Although it is unlikely to be High Street Charging. Charging points could be located at the Village Hall car park which could accommodate 3 or 4 charging points for residents

<p>5. "Residents Only" Parking (but only if guaranteed in writing, enforceable and cost effective),</p> <p>6. Try the above proposed layouts with cones before committing to painting any Double Yellow Lines,</p> <p>7. Put up some Residents Parking signs to see if this helps deter commuters,</p> <p>8. Divert the money from the Double Yellow Line in to putting in a Pedestrian Crossing,</p> <p>9. Consider a 20mph speed limit (if possible).</p>	<p>There is no question that the aim is to implement "Resident's Only" Parking and the PC is committed to seeing this through. It is a key part of the strategy. Unfortunately, there is no commitment from SODC on when this can be achieved so no commitment can be given to having it in the initial plan.</p> <p>There will be a H&S issues and organisation will be at a cost. We do not believe we'd get the go ahead from Highways to do this due to the H&S issues we may even have to have a public consultation. We are not sure this would sit well with the residents and would embarrass the PC. The PC could be accused of alienating the many for the sake of the few</p> <p>A sensible proposition and needs to be investigated from the legal perspective with the appropriate authority. TAPAG will also speak to the police as there are other Highway code contraventions taking place on a daily basis; these from both non-residents and residents.</p> <p>There is no suggestion of where this should be sited so cannot be commented on seriously. However, one assumes opposite Prospect House. This would involve zig zag lines 20m either side of the crossing wherever it is situated at least this suggestion would resolve the issue of 3 cars parking at the narrows. Cost circa £30k or more. The Woodcote crossing cost was eye watering. A minimal raised crossing such as that in front of the toll bridge has been discussed in the past. This would be less expensive and could be funded by OCC. It is possible as a Phase 2 in conjunction with a 20mph speed limit after the access is cleared from parked cars.</p> <p>The 20mph is part of the strategy for Phase 2 as defined in the Village Plan.</p> <p><i>*Recent correspondence in Henley Standard suggests it has made no difference there to date.</i></p>
---	---

Information Requested from the Council/TAPAG

1. What is the quantifiable problem that is trying to be fixed by the plan? Can we see the project brief?
2. What is the Specification that was sent to Mode (Transport Planners who have drawn up the proposal)?
3. What is the current flow of traffic through the village (top to bottom narrows) and how will this be improved by the proposed plan?
4. What is the current average time through the village (top to bottom narrows) and by how much will this be reduced by the proposed plan?
5. Has any modelling been completed – if so can we see it?
6. What is the current average pollution level? – where/when has this been monitored? – How much will this be improved upon after the proposed plan? How do we compare to urban pollution levels?

We are not sure TAPAG are obliged to answer these questions, the PC gave the brief; however:

Village Plan consultation cited congestion and poor parking as major issues for WoT. The results of surveys from 2015, including the Village Plan survey which included:

- Inconsiderate driving- 77% response, and Inconsiderate parking – 82% response, as the two biggest issues in the village.
- Addressing Traffic issue at 76% was by far the top priority of residents.

See Appendix 2

Before Lockdown the traffic flow was about 36,000 cars per week over 24 hours with a working week flow of between 5,400 and 5,800. Tolls are collected from circa 32,000.

This is subjective and depends on the time of day. On a bad peak time this could be greater than 20 minutes. On a good night or after the rush at 20mph 70 seconds – take your pick.

This is an ambiguous question. What modelling is required.

Can the objectors point TAPAG to any surveys showing that pollution from idling cars does not have a negative respiratory effect or contribute to other health problems?

TAPAG has not measured pollution levels. It is assumed that reducing idling traffic in WoT will reduce carbon particulates. This assumption is based on scientific information and surveys of other areas where monitoring has been carried out. The cost of a pollution survey by someone such as Ricardo will cost £17-20k. There is UK data and USA/CDN data. The below link has a good general summary.

<https://www.rac.co.uk/drive/advice/emissions/idling/>

<p>7. What is the number of Residents Parking Spaces required along the High Street? What provision has been made for visitors, trades people and customers to local businesses? How has the Council ensured that all houses without driveways have been captured in this figure?</p> <p>8. How many commuter cars are there on average in the Village each day?</p> <p>9. How many spaces are currently available on the High Street? (bearing in mind the entire length is available for parking currently)?</p>	<p>Furthermore, since lockdown studies at University of York have proved congestion increases air pollution because vehicles are forced to repeatedly accelerate and brake as well as spending time stationary. It seems we don't need savage reductions in road traffic to achieve improved air quality if polluting traffic can be reduced by 10-20% and congestion is eliminated it may well have a disproportionate effect on air quality. If Whitchurch can reduce congestion the air quality should improve.</p> <p>Is this a reference to parking standards as per the planning system? Each local planning authority would have defined parking standards as part of their local policies. For Whitchurch-on-Thames, SODC would refer to OCC's residential parking standards which set out the number of parking spaces per dwelling. These are a planning policy requirement for new developments (notwithstanding all other planning considerations) and a development must demonstrate its compliance with these standards. However, this is only in reference to a planning application and not a general norm, nor would it apply to the proposed traffic scheme for High Street.</p> <p><i>*The survey carried out in February 2018 catered for 9 residents S of Manor Road and 5 at the top narrows. Survey Results were: Max number of cars both residents and non-residents in top narrows 4 and max S of manor road 17.</i></p> <p><i>NB The top narrows have worsened since then with up to 6 cars and at weekends there can be up to 13 cars parked but many of these are day leisure visitors. The area S of Manor road and N of Walliscote Farm Drive has improved during Lockdown but parked cars are now building up during the working week.</i></p> <p>There are approximately 36,000 cars travelling through the village each week. The weekday figures vary between 5400 and 5800 cars per day.</p> <p><i>*2018 data supplied by the Bridge Company</i></p> <p>If the High St is one continuous line of parked cars there will be gridlock. This cannot be calculated accurately as people parking do not do so in an orderly manner. The marked bays in the proposal will allow more effective parking due to current inefficient and inconsiderate parking.</p>
--	---

<p>10. What due diligence has been performed by the Council? Can we see the report please?</p>	<p>The due diligence is years of feedback from residents on the Village plan survey and 3 annual village Open Day sessions. OCC highways are aware of and regard WoT as a blackspot for traffic congestion on their Highway network. This recommendation is the result of a traffic consultant survey and assessment and follows the OCC highways consultation process.</p>
<p>11. How has the Council ensured that residents without the privilege of private parking are not detrimentally affected?</p>	<p>There was nothing in the brief to cover this. There is no legal obligation but possibly one of courtesy. There will be 24 parking spaces. It is unreasonable to claim that residents' wishes to park on the High Street have been ignored.</p>
<p>12. How is the Council ensuring that the 'problem' won't get moved elsewhere?</p>	<p>This is not possible as one cannot legislate for motorists to regard their car and its parking needs as taking precedence over pedestrians, aesthetics and other motorists or residents desires. See Appendix 1 which is trying to accommodate part of that question.</p>
<p>13. How have the Council determined where the Double Yellow Lines should go? ie up the entire middle length of the High Street where it is widest?</p>	<p>The plan was devised by a Consultant and checked with OCC to improve traffic flow but also provide parking provision and regulate two way flow by using parked cars as barriers. The reference to Due diligence earlier could also be applied after the event as part of the discussion with OCC was to ensure the plan had a good chance of being accepted as if it did not comply with OCC guidance on sightlines etc it would not be accepted and the PC would have wasted scarce funds on going to a public consultation.</p>
<p>14. What is the Council's Plan B if it doesn't work? Spend more money? Leave it?</p>	<p>This is not for TAPAG to answer.</p>

Appendix 1

Presentation by TAPAG at the Parish Council meeting in July 2020

TAPAG Update and Next Steps

Following on from the informal public consultation earlier this year our traffic consultant, MODE, was asked what the implications would be if we wished to add some additional parking restrictions prior to submission of the traffic management plan to OCC for formal public consultation. Areas under consideration were yellow lines in Manor Road from west of Old Gardens to the Village Hall bend. The objective being to restrict parking with the aim of allowing Thames Water vehicles and refuse vehicles enough room to pass without having to drive on the pavements which are showing signs of damage. This would also give added protection to the verges and consequently the trees and reduce the issues Manor Road residents are having in entering and exiting the estate. The situation here has deteriorated in the last six months. Secondly, as suggested by some residents, extension of the lining from the Ferryboat to the Toll Bridge would seem sensible. Although it does not seem likely that cars will park there one cannot rule out the possibility. These additions will involve some drawing work and will delay implementation but will save the cost of another application. Another suggestion was to consider double yellow lines in part of Eastfield Lane, however, as the current kerbing is inadequate we understand OCC will not be able to comply should we even make a request. The drawing and consultation work have been estimated and needs confirming depending on the level of the extension proposed. A budget addendum for approval will be supplied when required.

We need to continue the push for “Residents Only” parking as it has become apparent during lockdown that our plan of 24 parking places in the High Street is more than adequate for the number of residents parking there. The timeline on this is ambiguous due to the complexities involved in transferring parking enforcement from the Police to SODC. Our recent and present understanding is that SODC will not pursue Civil Parking Enforcement until they are assured OCC, as the Highway Authority, have checked all road markings and signage are correct. The exact position and how we should lobby OCC and SODC is under investigation.

From TAPAG’s perspective the Parish Council now needs to decide if we add the above minor amendments to the original plan prior to submitting to OCC for public consultation. The formal Public Consultation will give those opposed to the plan an official platform to raise their objections which obviously will be upheld if the scheme is deemed unworkable or inappropriate.

From the Parish Council Minutes it can be seen at the November 2019 meeting:

Resolution: The PC voted unanimously to support TAPAG progressing with traffic flow improvement initiative.

Resolution: The PC approved the funding request which is in line with the previously approved long-term budget agreed for the Village Plan. This is for an additional £1000 for Mode Consulting (£3000 in total) and £5120 to pay OCC in the next fiscal year for consultation and implementing the yellow lines).

An informal public consultation, which is not a legal requirement, has been held and the overwhelming majority of residents felt the proposed scheme was a sensible solution to the traffic flow issues we currently experience. The exit poll showed a majority of +85% in favour, mirroring the Village Plan outcomes which the Parish Council is tasked, having developed, to deliver. Subsequent to the informal public consultation the Parish Council has also had a walkthrough of the plan with a chance to interrogate TAPAG members on its validity. One might ask what the point of these exercises, expense and publicity were if we are seen to ignore the one topic that stands out as critical to the majority of those living here.

There is a small minority of people opposing this plan and seem to believe it has evolved by subterfuge and suddenly been sprung upon the Village. Records as far back as 2003 cite traffic as an issue in our village. TAPAG believes it has acted in good faith and at least one Parish Councillor has been present at every TAPAG meeting. As an advisory group we have carried out the task we were set. It has been developed by unbiased professionals and assessed by the senior traffic officer in OCC as is the norm in these situations as no consultant will put their client to unnecessary cost by recommending a course of action that will not pass scrutiny. It also must be recognised lots of additional time consuming work has been carried out in the background by members past and present collecting and checking data and verifying findings to get to this conclusion.

In TAPAG's opinion there are no other viable options for the High Street that will get past OCC except a reduction in parked cars especially North of Manor Road. We think that failure to see this through will give the impression the Parish Council is talking the talk but not walking the walk. It will render the costs expended so far on the consultations and even the Village Plan document released in a blaze of publicity last year as wasted.

The alternative is of course to leave things as they are and let events take their natural course. With this second option one must therefore conclude that TAPAG's role would be redundant and that we should disband.

TAPAG

30th June 2020

Appendix 2

Outline Plan by TAPAG for discussion and submission to Traffic consultants, 15th June 2018

Introduction

Whitchurch on Thames has a severe congestion problem in the High Street principally during the morning and evening rush hours. The problem is exacerbated by the Toll Bridge, the railway bridge in Pangbourne and ill-disciplined parking, in the main, by non-residents causing backups. As part of the village plan a transport group, TAPAG, was formed. A recent review of the 2009 Village Plan revealed that little progress had been made with any of the objectives about traffic and parking issues which had worsened considerably since the Toll bridge had reopened bringing all the issues into sharper focus. It must be acknowledged that Whitchurch Toll Bridge was closed for a year of this period. However, since the plan was conceived the challenges facing the village and therefore TAPAG have increased significantly. TAPAG has recently been repopulated and reenergised.

Even though traffic through Whitchurch has declined by 5% overall since 2006 (data supplied by The Bridge Company) congestion is much worse especially at peak times. The decline in volume has levelled off and is gradually increasing. Since the Toll Bridge was reopened in September 2014 increased parking by non-residents to either walk into Pangbourne or the Station has become a norm. Undoubtedly the High Street parking problem has, in part, been caused by the replacement of residents without parking facilities and either no car or one car by younger people with one car or in many cases two cars. Reduced parking options in Pangbourne is contributing to the problem. There is a good chance that this will worsen during the working week as more space is predicted to be taken up by expansion of apartment building at the expense of parking spaces. The effect is already being seen at weekends where the free parking in Howarth Court has been terminated for Saturday shoppers. Furthermore, Coombe Park has been acquired by an IT company with plans to seek a change of use from residential to commercial use which could add significant traffic flows in Manor Road in the future with the associated problem of getting into the High Street. Woodcote has plans to build 50-70 new houses and this is likely to add to both traffic and parking issues.

Congestion around the bottom narrows and Eastfield Lane is particularly bad due to the parked cars and narrowness of the road. As Eastfield Lane is the main access to the village school this congestion also involves children on foot, cycles, scooters and in prams as well as pedestrians especially in the morning rush hour. There does not appear to be an easy solution here although more visibility for both drivers and pedestrians would help safety concerns. This is despite discretionary white lines which are mainly ignored by resident and non-resident parkers alike. There is also a bottle-neck at the top of the High Street just before the top narrows. It is understood that the police have agreed to turn a blind eye to parking on the pavement on the west side of the High Street just before the narrows, however, what was originally conceived as parking for four cars has now turned into parking for anything up to 9 cars causing major issues at this T junction in the busy periods.

An outline plan has been developed by TAPAG but no one in the group is an expert and what TAPAG may feel is needed is not necessarily what will be acceptable to the various authorities we will have to negotiate with and convince. If funding allows it seems sensible to engage a specialist to critique, advise and shape the proposal.

The outline of the plan is to improve traffic flow which will remove frustrations for drivers, increase safety for pedestrians and reduce air pollution. One of the biggest conundrums is to avoid pushing the parking problem in the High Street to other parts of the village.

Current Thoughts

Preference	Pros	Cons
Create two designated blocks for cars to park on the west side of the High Street creating space for several northbound cars to pause allowing southbound flow. The rest of the west side of the High Street to have double yellow lines, this will save additional signage. The first block to be north of Eastfield Lane which should remove one of the bottlenecks by replacing discretionary white lines with double yellow lines. See diagram attached	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restrict speed outside of peak times • Aid flow at peak times • Increase the possibility of disciplined parking • Improved flow should reduce frustrations and air pollution • Improve the chances of keeping the High Street clear on programmed street cleaning days 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost of yellow lines • Policing
A mandatory speed limit of 20mph to continue from the Toll Bridge to the narrows above Hardwick Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase safety • Improve flow 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional signage • Policing
Residents only parking for one or two set times a day in the designated parking blocks. These restrictions need be no longer than one hour.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discourage long term parking which can be all day and all week in some instances. • Improve flow at peak times as there will be fewer cars parked even in the designated blocks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional Signage • Residents permits and their management • Visitors' permits and their management • Enforcement/ Policing • Moving the all day and all week parkers to other parts of the village • Cost
Reconstitute the verge on the east side of the High Street between Duchess Close and Racquets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain the structure of the verge • Prevent further erosion and potholes • Improve flow by reducing "new" road width • Improve aesthetics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost of reconstitution and insertion of physical barrier; high kerb or posts
Create a bay for 3-4 cars on east side of High Street north of Racquets and again with	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase parking opportunities • Help reduce speed with a physical barrier 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional Signage • Residents permits and their management

residents only parking as above.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visitors' permits and their management • Enforcement/ Policing • Moving the all day and all week parkers to other parts of the village • Cost
Replace Single white lines on east side of High street with single yellow lines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid the possibility of parking on that side of the High street 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional Signage • Enforcement/ Policing • Cost
The verge in Manor road has been encroached upon for some time both by residents with no off-street parking and all day or all week parkers. Ideally cutting into the verge could create a designated residents' only parking area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevent further erosion and potholes • Improve aesthetics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost of construction and insertion of physical barrier; high kerb or posts • Additional signage • Policing and enforcement

Traffic Consultants

We need to seek three quotations for the consultation.

wrb150618