

**PROPOSED PARKING AND WAITING RESTRICTIONS - MELKSHAM****OBJECTIONS/SUPPORT****Cannon Square / Church Walk** (13 letters and 1 Petition)

1. A resident of Church Walk	A
2. Mr M Cross officially	B
3. A resident of Church Walk	C
4. Mrs N Green	B and D
5. A resident of Church Walk	E
6. Dr J Harries	F
7. Miss S Dyson	G
8. A resident of Church Walk	H
9. Mr A Biles-Wood - <b>Petition from 14 households</b>	I
10. A resident of Church Walk	J
11. Mr & Mrs C D Stevens	K and C
12. Mr I Nockolds	L and C
13. Mr K Clover	M

**Church Lane** (1 letter of support)

14. Mr H Gray	N
---------------	---

**Conigre Close** (4 letters)

15. Mrs T Strange (Governor on behalf of Aloeric Primary School)	O
16. Mr P J Knight	P
17. Mr T Box	Q
18. Mr J Price	R

**Orchard Gardens** (1 letter)

19. A resident of King Street	S
-------------------------------	---

**Ruskin Avenue** (11 letters)

20. Ms M Sidwick – Employee at The Manor School	T and U
21. Mrs S Alexander – Employee at The Manor School	T and U
22. Mrs M Elliott - Employee at The Manor School	T and U
23. A Governor at The Manor School	T and U
24. Mr K Clover – Chair of Governors at The Manor School	U
25. Ms P Smith – Employee at The Manor School	T and U
26. Ms L Geddes - Employee at The Manor School	T and U
27. Ms H Hart - Employee at The Manor School	T and U
28. A Governor at The Manor School	T and U
29. S Goulding – Employee at The Manor School	T and U
30. An employee at The Manor School	T and U

**Thackeray Crescent** (7 letters and 1 Petition)

31. Employees of Kavanaghs Letting Agents	V
32. Miss C Maslen	W
33. A resident of Thackeray Crescent	X
34. Ms N Marsh	Y
35. Mr M Griffith	Z
36. Miss J Watkins	AA
37. Mr K Bishop & Ms M Budgen	AB
38. <b>Petition 12 signatures</b>	AB

**Union Street** (3 letters)

39. M & G Pearce	AC
40. A resident of Union Street	AD
41. Mr D Edney	AE

**West End** (7 letters)

42. A resident of West End	AF
43. Mrs B Banks	AG
44. Mr G Petie	AF and AG
45. A resident of West End	AH
46. A resident of West End	AG
47. Residents of West End	AF, AG and AH
48. Mrs D McCaughan	AG and AH
49. Mrs E Kayne	AH and AI
50. Mr C Pickford	AG and AH

**REASONS FOR OBJECTIONS**

**Cannon Square / Church Walk** (13 letters 1 Petition)

- A. Considers the proposals reflect a lack of interest in the needs of the residents.
- B. Believes the proposals do not meet the needs of residents or their visitors and therefore does not effectively manage the competing demands for on-street parking or Council owned public car parks.
- C. Is concerned that the proposed restrictions will force the resident to park away from their home and being a single woman does not think it is acceptable to walk a distance home from a public car park.
- D. Considers the proposals fail to address the needs of the residents and is contrary to the aims of the Wiltshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2026.
- E. Cannot see any real need for the proposed restrictions as parking on Church Walk has not caused any issues for access for residents, it is a no through road and only residents park there. Also the properties have no parking so where would residents park?
- F. Whilst in agreement with the proposals outside the post office to provide access etc is concerned that the extension of restrictions would result in more pressure for the overnight spaces on Cannon Square causing inconvenience for residents. Also asked about a residents parking scheme.

### **Cannon Square / Church Walk cont...**

- G. The proposals will further limit the number of on-street parking spaces and do not mitigate the impact they will have on residents and their visitors. Considers that the proposals be suspended until mitigation such as a residents parking scheme is introduced.
- H. The proposals take away parking outside residential properties which will cause difficulties for families with children and elderly residents. Also concerned that they are no alternative measures proposed and questions the justification for the proposals as there has never been access problems for emergency or refuse vehicles.
- I. Petition from 14 households concerned that the proposals are contrary to the aims of the Wiltshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2026.
- J. Supports the proposals, as has experienced problems when accessing their property at times. Although requests more robust enforcement of the existing restrictions.
- K. The proposal would mean that residents of 2 and 4 Church Walk would not be able to park outside their homes which would result in parking outside other properties causing further inconvenience. The current self monitoring system by residents works.
- L. Considers that whilst it is reasonable to improve traffic flow outside the Post Office, it is not fair to reduce the number of residential parking spaces without offering an alternative.
- M. Concerned that residents in particular those that are elderly will have difficulty transferring shopping etc from their vehicles to their homes if forced to park some distance from their homes.

### **Church Lane** (1 letter of support)

- N. Supports the proposals and requests they extend further to the next junction with Crescent Road.

### **Conigre Close** (4 letters)

- O. The school supports the proposals and hopes the new restrictions will be adequately enforced. Many of the problems raised previously involve cars parking on existing restrictions on the approach to the school.
- P. Considers it is not necessary to restrict parking 24/7 and is a kneejerk reaction to two periods of the day when children are dropped off or collected from school. The proposals are unnecessarily restrictive for residents and trades people. However requests restrictions at the turning head at the end of the Close.
- Q. Considers that the proposals fall short and there should be double yellow lines right up to the school entrance and calls for better enforcement of these and existing restrictions.
- R. Agrees that while many parents park responsibly and in respect of residents, some cause obstruction problems by parking on bends and even opposite another vehicle, so is concerned that an emergency vehicle could not access the far end of the Close.

**Orchard Gardens** (1 letter)

- S. Believes that as Orchard Gardens residents have allocated parking spaces, unlike their property on King Street, they have a legitimate right to park there. The proposals will prevent this and with no viable alternative is concerned that this will affect property values.

**Ruskin Avenue** (8 letters)

- T. Governors, Teaching staff and employees of The Manor School are concerned that the proposals take away the only available parking for staff close to the school, which will place a huge logistical and financial burden on members of staff. Staff work term-time only therefore cannot benefit from the discounted season ticket in council car parks.
- U. Some letters mentioned that during the new build of the school in 2005, the school requested additional parking within the school grounds, but this was not permitted and were only given 12 spaces. They make a further request the use part of the school field for additional on-site parking as state the access road is not suitable due to maintaining emergency vehicle access.

**Thackeray Crescent** (7 letters and 1 Petition)

- V. Considers that is no other realistic or affordable form of parking for people that work in the town centre. Yet again, workers who are trying to make an honest living are being penalised for coming to work.
- W. Is concerned that there is no provision for residents to park during the day and that we propose to penalise residents that have dropped kerbs. Is also concerned that if the proposals go ahead vehicles will end up parking on the green areas in the middle of the crescent.
- X. Feels the proposals will not deter people from parking to shop in town and residents will still have difficulties in finding a space. Believes a residents parking scheme will solve the problem.
- Y. Whilst agreeing that there is a real problem with parking in the street, feels the proposals are detrimental to residents. All the proposals will achieve is a greater turnover of vehicles and still make it difficult for residents to park. Also what about people who work shifts as the restrictions times will mean they would have to keep moving their vehicles during the day. Also requests a residents parking scheme.
- Z. Concerned that the proposals create a shortage of spaces for residents and lead to "parking wars", believes the proposals will not benefit anyone.
- AA. The proposed time limit is too long this should be reduced to 2 hours, however still believes that workers will still park in the morning and afternoon and asks where residents would move to every 3 hours if not at work? Why can we not have a residents parking scheme?
- AB. Feels the proposals discriminate against the residents and are totally unacceptable as will cause problems and stress. The proposals are affectively advertising Thackeray Crescent as a car park; this is a residential area not a business area.

**Union Street** (3 letters)

- AC. Considers the proposals will detrimental to residents and those attending church services at Ebenezer Church. Residents will not be able to park close to their homes and notes that elderly people attending the church get dropped off in Union Street. So is therefore concerned that this will not be able to happen if double yellow lines are implemented. Also feels the proposed parking bay time limits are open to abuse if not enforced properly.
- AD. Requests the proposed parking bay hours be reduced to 30 minutes only as would give plenty of time for people to use local shops and facilities.
- AE. Supports the idea but considers that 1 hour parking is more than enough and would be in keeping with other bays in the town which would cause less confusion.

**West End** (7 letters)

- AF. Believes the proposals will cause congestion further down the road.
- AG. Considers there is no problem with parking for the majority of the week, there is only congestion is when the church is in use. So a 24 hour restriction is not necessary. The proposals will remove 7 spaces in an area where not may properties have the luxury of drives.
- AH. West End is a quiet residential street where residents park considerately, delivery vehicles have no access problems and there have been no accidents, therefore these proposals are unnecessary.
- AI. The proposals would restrict church goers, particularly those who are elderly or have mobility issues from parking close by.