



| EASTING | NORTHING | RECOMMENDATION | LOCATION | QTY | PHOTO REF | PRIORITY | COSTS |
|---------|----------|----------------|----------|-----|-----------|----------|-------|
|---------|----------|----------------|----------|-----|-----------|----------|-------|

Use Type: Town Centre

Auditor: J Lowe

Date of Audit: 25/03/2008

Capita Ref: 017

Name: Shillelagh

Address: Co. Wicklow

Section 1: Town GENERAL ACCESS AND CIRCULATION

| REF: | QUESTION: | Y/N: |
|------|---|------|
| 1.1 | Are general circulatory routes clearly marked out? | Yes |
| 1.2 | Are circulation routes suitably surfaced, and slip resistant? | Yes |
| 1.3 | Are routes kept free of snow, ice and fallen leaves? | Yes |
| 1.4 | Are there sufficient forms of accessible transport which provide access to the main roads throughout the town centre? | No |

There was no evident bus routes along the main route. A general discussion should be given consideration to see if public transport access should be improved. This should also include proper bus stop construction and shelter.

Along the main road 4

Section 2: Town PEDESTRIAN CROSSING POINTS

| REF: | QUESTION: | Y/N: | COSTS |
|--------|--|------|--------|
| 2.1 | Are there suitable crossing points present at regular intervals to allow circulation throughout the residential area? | No | €5,000 |
| 299030 | 168162 No crossing point exists from one side of the main street to the other. After a feasibility study with road engineers, consideration should be given to either a controlled or uncontrolled crossing dependant on need, traffic flows and pedestrian volumes. A budgetry figure has been included. | | |
| | This is a T junction that has dropped kerbs either side of minor road however as this is an uncontrolled junction, consideration should be given to placement of tactile paving in accordance with sections 5.1.2 and 5.1.3 of the NDA "Building for Everyone". Secondly the dropped kerbed is angled such that the user will be be directed out towards the main road. In this instance, flooding is also evident at one of the dropped kerbs and a redesign and proper gradients should be considered. | | |
| | Along Main Street | 1 | 1 |
| | Entrance to residential area mid way along Station Road | 1 | 2 |
| | | 3 | €2,500 |

| EASTING | NORTHING | RECOMMENDATION | LOCATION | QTY | PHOTO REF | PRIORITY | COSTS |
|---------|----------|---|---|-----|-----------|----------|-----------------|
| | | REF: 2.2 | QUESTION: Are all crossovers flush with the carriageway? | | | | Y/N: Yes |
| | | REF: 2.3 | QUESTION: Is the surface slip resistant? | | | | Y/N: Yes |
| | | REF: 2.4 | QUESTION: Is blistered tactile paving present at all crossovers where the kerb upstand has been removed? | | | | Y/N: No |
| 299030 | 168161 | This is a T junction that has dropped kerbs either side of minor road however as this is an uncontrolled junction, consideration should be given to placement of tactile paving in accordance with sections 5.1.2 and 5.1.3 of the NDA "Building for Everyone". Secondly the dropped kerbed is angled such that the user will be directed out towards the main road. In this instance, flooding is also evident at one of the dropped kerbs and a redesign and proper gradients should be considered. | Station Road leading into a residential area | 2 | 2 | 3 | |
| | | REF: 2.5 | QUESTION: Is all blistered paving located in a suitable manner that will not lead to confusion for someone with a visual impairment? | | | | Y/N: N/A |
| | | REF: 2.6 | QUESTION: Is all street furniture suitably located to ensure that it will not cause a hazard to pedestrians? | | | | Y/N: Yes |
| | | REF: 2.7 | QUESTION: Is there a strong colour contrast at the kerb edge to assist partially sighted users? | | | | Y/N: No |
| | | Refer to 2.4 | | | | | |

Section 7: Town HORIZONTAL CIRCULATION

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------|---|--|--|--|-----------------|
| | | REF: 7.1 | QUESTION: Have guidance path surfaces been used sparingly to guide people around obstacles? | | | | Y/N: Yes |
| | | REF: 7.2 | QUESTION: Do the bars run in the direction of pedestrian travel? | | | | Y/N: Yes |
| | | REF: 7.3 | QUESTION: Have information surfaces been used to draw attention to amenities such as phone kiosk, post boxes, or information points? | | | | Y/N: Yes |
| | | REF: 7.4 | QUESTION: Are information surfaces level with the surrounding footway? | | | | Y/N: Yes |
| | | REF: 7.5 | QUESTION: Does the surface extend the full width of the amenity or 800mm, whichever is greater? | | | | Y/N: Yes |
| | | REF: 7.6 | QUESTION: Does a space of 400mm exist between the amenity and surface? | | | | Y/N: Yes |
| | | REF: 7.7 | QUESTION: Are pedestrian routes free of hazards? | | | | Y/N: Yes |

| EASTING | NORTHING | RECOMMENDATION | LOCATION | QTY | PHOTO REF | PRIORITY | COSTS |
|---|----------|---|-------------|-----|-----------|----------|-----------------|
| | | REF: 7.8 QUESTION: Does the lighting installation take into account the needs of people with visual impairments? | | | | | Y/N: Yes |
| | | REF: 7.9 QUESTION: Are junctions between different surfaces smooth to ensure that they do not present a tripping hazard or cause visual confusion? | | | | | Y/N: Yes |
| | | REF: 7.10 QUESTION: Are pedestrian routes a minimum of 1800mm wide? | | | | | Y/N: Yes |
| | | REF: 7.11 QUESTION: Is suitable seating provided at regular intervals? | | | | | Y/N: No |
| | | Along the main streets, there is generally a lack of suitable seating areas. A review of providing seats at regular intervals along main thoroughfares should take place. Following guidelines from section 5.3.7 of NDA "Building for Everyone". | Main Street | 2 | 4,6 | 3 | |
| | | REF: 7.12 QUESTION: Is general circulation available to all areas by way of accessible routes? | | | | | Y/N: No |
| 298733 | 168024 | An area of pathway approximately 50m is absent across the entrance to a garage at the top end of the main street which is the only route up towards the church from the direction of the town centre. | Main Street | 50m | 6 | 3 | |
| | | REF: 7.13 QUESTION: Is town centre signage suitably positioned, sized with necessary colour and tonal contrast between letters and background? Is there alternative pictorial signage where possible? | | | | | Y/N: Yes |
| Section 8: Town VERTICAL CIRCULATION | | | | | | | |
| | | REF: 8.1 QUESTION: Is the location of any steps clearly indicated by use signage/colour contract/texture/lighting? | | | | | Y/N: N/A |
| | | REF: 8.2 QUESTION: Do any steps have a handrail to both side(s) and does it extend 300mm beyond the top and bottom of any flight? | | | | | Y/N: N/A |
| | | REF: 8.3 QUESTION: Is any level change clearly lit? | | | | | Y/N: N/A |
| | | REF: 8.4 QUESTION: Are treads and risers uniform? | | | | | Y/N: N/A |
| | | REF: 8.5 QUESTION: Are nosings identifiable? | | | | | Y/N: N/A |

| EASTING | NORTHING | RECOMMENDATION | LOCATION | QTY | PHOTO REF | PRIORITY | COSTS | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--|---|-----|-----------|----------|-----------------|--|
| | | REF: 8.6 | QUESTION: Is the location of any ramp clearly indicated by use signage/colour contract/texture/lighting? | | | | Y/N: No | |
| 299147 | 168026 | An excellent separation of pedestrian and traffic flows has been introduced with the placement of a footbridge and whilst access is good, the entrance on and off the bridge as well as the safety barriers have poor visual contrast with the surroundings. A band of contrast as detailed in section 5.3.3. NDA "Building for Everyone" should be considered, this band could also be of dual purpose being of high light reflection for periods of low light level. | Bridge and surrounding railings on Main Street. | 6 | 1,3 | 2 | €1,200 | |
| | | REF: 8.7 | QUESTION: Are steps available as an alternative to any ramp or ramped surface? | | | | Y/N: Yes | |
| | | REF: 8.8 | QUESTION: Have all ramps got a suitable gradient in respect to their length? | | | | Y/N: Yes | |
| | | REF: 8.9 | QUESTION: Do any ramps have a handrail to both side(s) and does it extend 300mm beyond the top and bottom of any flight? | | | | Y/N: Yes | |
| Section 9: Town INFORMATION | | | | | | | | |
| | | REF: 9.1 | QUESTION: Is there a tactile plan of the town centre? | | | | Y/N: No | |
| | | Due to the town being small in size, A tactile plan is unnecessary in this instance. Therefore no further recommendations. | | | | | | |
| | | REF: 9.2 | QUESTION: If orientation information is available to the public, is it available in alternative formats? | | | | Y/N: N/A | |
| | | REF: 9.3 | QUESTION: Are all relevant locations clearly signed? | | | | Y/N: No | |
| | | There is no signage to identify entrances, recommended routes, amenities etc. Due to the town being small in size, signage is deemed unnecessary in this instance. Therefore no further recommendations. | | | | | | |
| | | REF: 9.4 | QUESTION: Does the signage system incorporate colour/tone/ contrast and upper and lower case lettering? | | | | Y/N: N/A | |
| Section 10: Town Car Parking | | | | | | | | |
| | | REF: 10.1 | QUESTION: If required, are there any accessible parking spaces provided? | | | | Y/N: Yes | |

| EASTING | NORTHING | RECOMMENDATION | LOCATION | QTY | PHOTO REF | PRIORITY | COSTS |
|---------|----------|---|-------------|-----|-----------|----------|-----------------|
| | | REF: 10.2 QUESTION: Are on street accessible bays provided in a safe location? | | | | | Y/N: N/A |
| | | REF: 10.3 QUESTION: Does the accessible bay have a drop kerb to the rear to allow disabled motorists access to the walkway? | | | | | Y/N: Yes |
| | | REF: 10.4 QUESTION: Is the accessible car parking surface even and free from loose stones? | | | | | Y/N: Yes |
| | | REF: 10.5 QUESTION: Are accessible bays adequately lit? | | | | | Y/N: Yes |
| | | REF: 10.6 QUESTION: Are accessible bays adequately signed? | | | | | Y/N: No |
| 298899 | 168032 | No high level signage for either of the two disabled bays is in situ. Both of the bays are well displayed in blue road markings making high level signage of a lower priority however it should not be discarded as it is an important feature for persons driving past to quickly ascertain that an accessible bay exists. | Main Street | 2 | 4,5 | 5 | €480 |
| | | REF: 10.7 QUESTION: Is there a sufficient number of accessible parking bays to meet requirements (1 space per 25 standard spaces, 3 spaces per 25-50 spaces, 5 spaces per 50-100 standard spaces) | | | | | Y/N: Yes |