

**Email Exchange between the SRA and Taylor Wimpey / DPDS ref the Spine Road through Ridgeway Farm**

**SRA Email 7 March 2013**

Dear Rob and Les

The Shaw Residents Association is deeply concerned about the design of the Ridgeway Farm spine road and we call again for it to be re-routed around the north and east of the development.

Furthermore, we now understand the road will be just 6.5m wide – this is narrower than Swinley drive which measures 6.75m and has just one private drive onto the road (shared by six houses) and no on road parking.

The Ridgeway Farm spine road, being 0.25m narrower, will have 11 side roads, four pedestrian crossings (one a toucan), one shared space, an estimated 60 private drive ways and, as a result of the 60 or so house frontages onto the road, will suffer from considerable levels of on road parking.

If we assume an average car is 1.9m wide (allowing for door mirrors) and, allowing for just a 0.6m gap between passing cars, the space required for two vehicles to pass is 4.4m, leaving just 2.1m spare. If a car is parked on the road it will take up about 2m (allows for a small gap between car and curb), leaving a 0.1m gap should two vehicles wish to pass the parked car at the same time. Ten centimetres cannot be a safe passing distance and we believe the vast majority of motorists will choose to wait for the approaching vehicle to pass before navigating around the parked one. Of course, the road will be used by HGV's and buses as well and, if we estimate a bus to be about 2.4m wide, to pass a parked car with another car coming the other way, the road would need to be about 7.7m wide.

This analysis assumes on road parking will only be allowed to take place on one side of the road – if it is allowed on both sides, it is reasonable to assume that the road will become not just a bottleneck to be avoided, but completely unfit for purpose.

With an estimated 60 private driveways feeding onto this road, there will be a considerable number of vehicles reversing off their drives, across the footpaths and cycle ways and between parked vehicles, onto the spine road – leading to even more congestion along the road and resulting in greater frustration for home owners as they try to get out of their own drive (perhaps encouraging them to park on the road as a result).

We are of the opinion that over time, and similar to other estates across Swindon, motorists will choose to park their vehicles on the footpaths, cycle ways and verges rather than on the main road. Aside from the detrimental impact this has on the look and feel of the area, it presents further dangers to pedestrians who may, particularly those with child buggies, be forced onto the main road in order to navigate past parked vehicles. We do note that about 1/3 of the curb side (mostly near the village centre) is designated as 'Swale' – we assume this is a soft verge drainage area and so off road parking would not be possible to take place in such areas.

Given the concerns existing residents have today with the 500 or so vehicles heading south on the existing B road at peak time and a similar number heading north from Stone lane, both Swindon and Wiltshire residents and councillors are looking at road changes to minimise the impact of the increased traffic on Swinley Drive, Washpool and Stone Lane. The design of your spine road will create serious congestion at peak times forcing existing drivers to look for alternative routes. Given the proposals on the table for changes to existing roads, these alternative routes will likely not be available, resulting in life for residents in your development becoming intolerable as they try to get out of their drives, pull away from the curb or exit from one of the 11 side roads. We suspect if this scenario is apparent to purchasers from the outset, you may have a hard time selling your properties.

It is clear this road has not been designed with the concept of through traffic in mind and we implore you to please take another look at the design and make appropriate changes to mitigate these very real concerns. In the mean time, the SRA will be making these concerns available to the public and media.

Best Regards  
Kevin Fisher – SRA Chair

**DPDS reply 2 April 2013**

Dear Kevin

Thank you for your latest e-mail.

We have now had an opportunity to consider the points raised in your previous e-mail with our transportation team. The key points in response to those that you raised in your first e-mail are set out below:-

1. Streets are currently designed to be as narrow as practicable, however clearly it is essential that the width of any street is sufficient to serve their purpose and be safe. One of the mechanisms used for checking street widths is by applying tracking manoeuvres which simulate the likely traffic movements in each direction and the street width is determined accordingly.
2. It is acknowledged that the Spine Road on Ridgeway Farm, in addition to serving houses within the development, will also act as a through route for HGV's and as such tracking demonstrates that 2 HGV's can pass safely on a nominally 6.5m wide road, although localised widening to 7m will be required in bends. This additional width provides 900mm practical un-used carriageway width which make provision for 500mm between vehicles and circa 200mm on each side of the road which is sufficient to accommodate the circumstances envisaged. This widening will generally be required over approximately 50% of its length within the development.
3. Although increasing the overall width of the entire road would allow more space for HGV's to pass, this increased width will also increase the potential for other drivers to speed in excess of the 30mph intended, even with the planned traffic calming measures, and potentially encourage on-street parking either wholly on the street or partly on the pavement.
4. Safety for all road users is paramount in any design process and as such Road Safety Audits will be undertaken by independent Road Safety Consultants at each stage in the design process, with an obligation for any issues raised to be addressed by the Designers and the Adopting Highway Authority prior to gaining Technical Approval to the design and ultimate Adoption.
5. Wiltshire County have requested the need for double yellow lines at certain locations to limit errant parking in sensitive locations and these will be defined through the Design process.

Given the above regulatory controls which TWO are obliged to follow, our transportation team consider that adequate measures are in place for safe vehicular movement through the development along the full length of the spine/distributor road.

I hope this additional information will help allay concerns about congestion on the spine road and this, in turn, leading to additional traffic being deflected onto Swinley Drive.

Kind Regards

Les

**L M Durrant Dip TP MRTPI FRICS MInstD**  
**Chairman and Managing Director**  
**DPDS Consulting Group**

**SRA reply 2 April 2013**

Dear Les

I am not sure I follow your email; I can read it in two ways:

1. You do plan on widening the road along about 50% of its length or,
2. Other than painting some yellow lines on the road (which does not stop people parking on verges by the way), you do not plan to change the design of the spine road at all and are in disagreement with the entirety of my email.

Can you be clear which of these is the situation please.

Best Regards

Kevin

**DPDS reply 3 April 2013**

Dear Kevin

Many thanks for your further e-mail on the spine road issue. In answer to the points that you raised I have spoken further with our traffic engineers who have advised that, effectively, because approximately 50% of the road is along curved sections the design extends to localised widening, hence a "nominal 6.5m" road actually becomes 7.0m wide where the section of road is significantly curved. So, yes, approximately 50% of the road will be at the wider dimension.

In response to your second point, we do not disagree with the whole of the contents of your e-mail and do acknowledge that errant parking is a common problem on residential streets. However, on the Ridgeway Farm development we have provided adequate off-street parking designed to cater for the house sizes to be provided. Notwithstanding this, we also acknowledge that errant parking can be a problem on residential estates and therefore as well as utilising double yellow lines in specific locations, we will be encouraging Wiltshire Council to agreeing to us utilising vertical faced increased height kerbs which our engineers have discovered to be a very effective deterrent to most drivers who may be inclined to park half on footways.

I hope that this helps to clarify the position but if you need anything further please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind Regards

Les

**L M Durrant Dip TP MRTPI FRICS MInstD**  
**Chairman and Managing Director**  
**DPDS Consulting Group**

**SRA reply 4 April 2013**

Dear Les

Many thanks for your constructive reply.

1. I would guess the road needs to be wider on bends simply to accommodate HGV's and buses in particular that will take more width as they negotiate a bend (simply because they cannot bend around them). My guess is that, given this point, the additional 0.5m will not really have any benefit on the ability of vehicles to pass each other if there is a parked car on the road.
2. When you say "adequate off street parking" – can you put that into numbers for me please? I would guess it varies based on the number of bedrooms in the house? Can you tell me the number of car parking spaces per 1 bed, 2 bed, 3 bed, 4 bed, x bed house that will be available please and be clear as to whether the number includes space on the private driveway?
3. The raised curbs sound like a good idea – I hope Wiltshire council agrees to it – of course people that drive cars with alloy wheels will hate such a concept. I can see how this will deter all but off road type

vehicles from parking half on the road and half on the verge / path, but I do not see how it will stop vehicles from parking entirely on the verge / path, here is why: Each house fronting the spine road will have a private drive running across the footpath and grass verge to the spine road. As it enters the main road it will of course have dropped curbs. So, a driver can easily enter his drive and then turn off onto the verge or footpath to park. A solution would be to make all verges raised on all four sides, but then how would council workers get grass cutting machines onto them?

4. On the subject of house frontages, I estimated about 60 homes fronting the spine road. Can you tell me what the actual number is please?

Again thank you for the dialogue. I note I have still not received a response to my other email about results of the public consultation and best guess date for the spine road to be open to through traffic.

Best Regards

Kevin

**DPDS reply 5 April 2013**

Dear Kevin

I have contacted our transport consultants and layout designers and their further comments are set out below. The numbers correspond with those in your e-mail:-

1. This is correct - the road has been made wider as a result of the track simulations produced demonstrating that making provision for 2 HGV's to pass safely necessitates widening by 0.5m on the bends and this will not aid on-street parking in any way.
2. The parking spaces are provided to suit the number of bedrooms which is contained in a standard parking provision schedule agreed with the LPA and Wiltshire Council.
3. You are correct in that dropped kerbs do provide opportunities for vehicles to mount the kerb, particularly off-road vehicles, however in our experience it does deter some drivers particularly with the higher kerbs. Consequently this particular issue may be addressed by double yellow lines or, in certain circumstances, some type of bollard positioned on the back of the kerb can be used to address this in very sensitive locations.
4. There are 54 dwellings fronting the spine road, including those houses which are corner units where the front door is on a side road.

I trust the additional information is helpful to you.

Kind Regards

Les

**L M Durrant Dip TP MRTPI FRICS MInstD**  
**Chairman and Managing Director**  
**DPDS Consulting Group**

**SRA reply 28 April 2013**

Dear Les

Many thanks for your response for which I do have follow up questions and requests. But first I would like to summarise some factual points, please let me know if you disagree with any of them:

1. There are no points along the spine road where it has been designed to enable vehicles to park on it and not hinder two-way traffic flows
2. Whilst some deterrents can be put in place to discourage verge or pavement parking; there are no methods available that can be implemented along the entire length of the spine road to ensure it cannot happen
3. There will be a considerable number of dwellings fronting the spine road. I estimate 60, the right number is 54 all of which will have a drive-way that enters the spine road, thereby causing some disruption to through traffic
4. Yellow lines will be required along certain 'sensitive' parts of the spine road
5. Since the spine road has been designed to take through traffic, including HGV's, through a residential area it has been purposely designed to ensure legally parked vehicles anywhere on its length will have the potential to stop traffic flow in one direction – thereby reducing speeds of vehicles

Here are my follow up questions:

1. Please tell me where the 'sensitive' areas are for yellow lines and what proportion of the length of the spine road they will cover
2. Will yellow lines be used to ensure vehicles can only be parked on one side of the road, or will parking be allowed on both sides?
3. The key question you are evading from my last email is the number of parking spaces per dwelling. Please send me the approved parking scheme documents you submitted to the LPA and WCC or let me know where I can fund them
4. I would guess the development will start from the Sparcells roundabout and work in a north westerly direction with the spine road being built as the development progresses (correct me if I am wrong). I have not yet had an answer to my question about the estimated date for the spine road to be open to through traffic. However, given that as initial houses that front onto the spine road are sold, there will be no through traffic for the new residents to become frustrated by; what legal or moral obligations do Taylor Wimpey sales have in explaining to these new residents the anticipated impact from opening the spine road to through traffic? I am thinking in terms of vehicles numbers during peak periods and the parking restrictions (yellow lines) that will be put in place?
5. Can you tell me your assessment, in percentage terms, of the peak hour traffic (8am – 9am) coming from homes in the development that exit from each of the three access points – e.g. head north, exit at the Sparcells roundabout and exit onto Swinley drive – we will disagree on the volume of cars the development will produce which is why I am asking for percentages

Best Regards  
Kevin

#### DPDS reply 30 April 2013

Dear Kevin

Thank you for your recent e-mails in connection with the above. We have been putting together a comprehensive response from our professional team and Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire (TWO) in respect of the additional points that you raised but we have received similar correspondence from other interested parties on highway matters and, unfortunately, in an attempt to get a co-ordinated response, this has delayed our reply.

I am now in a position to respond to the points that you raised but could I preface any further reply by asking yourself and the members of your Association to please remember that TWO will be implementing the scheme for which outline planning permission has been granted, based on the master plan, the Design and Access Statement and the Environmental Statement and as framed by the conditions attached to the grant of planning permission. Because of the strict rules surrounding environmental impact assessment there are limits as to the extent to which TWO are able to change things at this stage.

I have set out below our response in red to your individual questions:-

1. There are no points along the spine road where it has been designed to enable vehicles to park on it and not hinder two-way traffic flows

This is correct there is no provision for on-street parking along the Primary Street indeed measures will be put in place to actively deter parking; high kerbs, yellow lines and bollards if necessary.

2. Whilst some deterrents can be put in place to discourage verge or pavement parking; there are no methods available that can be implemented along the entire length of the spine road to ensure it cannot happen

Should erroneous parking become a persistent problem, strategically placed bollards is a measure that can be implemented in specific areas.

3. There will be a considerable number of dwellings fronting the spine road. I estimate 60, the right number is 54 all of which will have a drive-way that enters the spine road, thereby causing some disruption to through traffic

It is acknowledged that there will be vehicle movements associated with houses fronting directly onto any street; it is common practice on streets of this type and supported in the Manual for Streets guidance document.

4. Yellow lines will be required along certain 'sensitive' parts of the spine road

Yellow lines will be considered and agreed with Wiltshire County together with any other parking deterrent measures.

5. Since the spine road has been designed to take through traffic, including HGV's, through a residential area it has been purposely designed to ensure legally parked vehicles anywhere on its length will have the potential to stop traffic flow in one direction – thereby reducing speeds of vehicles

It is intended to avoid any parking on the Primary Street however should there be a situation where there has been a specific requirement for a legally parked vehicle then this parked vehicle would effectively restrict vehicle speeds on that side of the road.

Follow up questions:

1. Please tell me where the 'sensitive' areas are for yellow lines and what proportion of the length of the spine road they will cover

Sensitive locations are particularly on either side of junctions.

In situations where driveways are present, it is rare for people to park across their driveway. However in order to overcome this possibility, the yellow line is proposed to be continuous along the street; this is a matter however that will need to be agreed with Wiltshire Council as it will necessitate a Traffic Order. At the present time the yellow lining is intended to be on the left channel of the spine road. However should Wiltshire Council deem both sides appropriate, we would also consider that.

2. Will yellow lines be used to ensure vehicles can only be parked on one side of the road, or will parking be allowed on both sides?

The yellow line is proposed to be continuous and could be on either side of the street; this is a matter however that will need to be agreed with Wiltshire Council as it will necessitate a Traffic Order. The yellow line is currently proposed on one side only (see above). We were happy that the swale on the opposite side would prevent parking here too, so as to avoid parking on the spine road at all.

3. The key question you are evading from my last email is the number of parking spaces per dwelling. Please send me the approved parking scheme documents you submitted to the LPA and WCC or let me know where I can fund them

**This is defined by the size of the dwelling and is readily available, as shown on the Draft Planning Layout. Parking requirements are in line with WC planning/highway policy.**

- 4 I would guess the development will start from the Sparcells roundabout and work in a north westerly direction with the spine road being built as the development progresses (correct me if I am wrong). I have not yet had an answer to my question about the estimated date for the spine road to be open to through traffic. However, given that as initial houses that front onto the spine road are sold, there will be no through traffic for the new residents to become frustrated by; what legal or moral obligations do Taylor Wimpey sales have in explaining to these new residents the anticipated impact from opening the spine road to through traffic? I am thinking in terms of vehicles numbers during peak periods and the parking restrictions (yellow lines) that will be put in place?

**There is no obligation to redirect Purton Road through the development before the development is complete, however, there may be operational benefits to do this sooner and TWO and WSP will consider these as part of the on-going phasing work. This will be agreed in broad terms as part of the discharge of conditions that is currently in process. TWO will be providing information to prospective purchasers in line with the requirements of the Consumer Code.**

- 5 Can you tell me your assessment, in percentage terms, of the peak hour traffic (8am – 9am) coming from homes in the development that exit from each of the three access points – e.g. head north, exit at the Sparcells roundabout and exit onto Swinley drive – we will disagree on the volume of cars the development will produce which is why I am asking for percentages.

**With regard to the development traffic distribution, this was reviewed at length at the appeal Public Inquiry. Although your Association produced some different figures in respect of trip generation the WSP figures were accepted by the Inspector.**

**The traffic distribution for the 0800-0900 period has been extracted from the agreed SATURN model. We have provided the passenger car units (pcus) which are the units used to model vehicles. The distribution is summarised below:**

**Head North - 13 (6%)  
Swinley Drive - 15 (7%)  
Sparcells Rbt – 155 (67%)  
Washpool/Stone Lane – 47 (20%)**

I trust that this additional material is helpful to you. We have also received a request from residents in Ash Close/Purton Road/Common Platt to consider closing the western section of Purton Road as originally intended and have had to look at this correspondence in the same way that we have reviewed your last e-mail. This request, as you will be aware, is not one that TWO can influence to any great extent as the decision is on public highway land and is one for Wiltshire Council in their capacity as Local Highway Authority.

In short, TWO will be implementing the scheme for which they have received a grant of planning permission whilst at the same time trying to liaise with the local residents and your Association to try and take on board all reasonable requests. However, I fear that the recent correspondence from yourselves and others perhaps serves to underline the fact that there simply is no common view prevailing amongst the local residents so that whatever route we take we will not be able to keep everybody happy.

Finally, we are in the process of finalising the analysis of the consultation event responses and I will be letting you have a copy of that under separate cover. As you will see in due course, there are not any issues being raised that we have not shared with yourself and your Association and we will ensure that those points that were raised will be addressed as far as possible.

Kind Regards  
Les

**L M Durrant Dip TP MRTPI FRICS MInstD  
Chairman and Managing Director  
DPDS Consulting Group**