

Comments Received and Officer Comments:

Ref.	Comment	Officer Comment
1	<p>Our family have lived in Mill Lane for many years and have witnessed over time the deterioration of the picturesque place that is the mill pond. It has become an area for antisocial behaviour with vehicles speeding up and down the lane. There are regular instances of obstruction to the lane and properties due to parked vehicles.</p> <p>Many times we have stood in the lane and respectfully requested that drivers slow down only to receive an abusive reaction. Therefore, we strongly support the proposals and urge implementation as the earliest opportunity.</p>	Support for these proposals is noted.
2	<p>I live in Mill Lane and write to support the prohibition of driving order and installation of the gate to prevent traffic reaching the end of Mill Lane. We have suffered from antisocial behaviour, vandalism, littering, intimidation of residents, speeding and dangerous driving. The installation of a gate will likely mean more traffic waiting and turning closer to our property, including delivery vans reversing into our wall, but I still support it in order to solve the greater problems endured further along the lane.</p> <p>I have difficulty in supporting the prohibition of waiting order, the installation of a gate will move the parking problem closer to our property where parking is already quite limited, we have no garage, driveway or front garden so have no option but to park on street.</p> <p>The proposal put forward by the Parish Council included residents parking bays outside the front of the houses. I understand that the proposal for residents parking bays has been withdrawn which will make the parking problem far worse. I cannot therefore support the proposed prohibition of waiting order without the additional provision of residents parking bays.</p>	<p>Support for this proposal is noted.</p> <p>Objection to this proposal is noted.</p> <p>The provision of residents parking is only considered in shopper/commuter locations where parking problems are experienced. Displacement of parking and the cost of enforcement for a small number of spaces in a rural environment against the cost of permits is not financially viable at this location.</p>
3	<p>This is not necessary as an average driver can both stop and turn here with no problems to themselves or others at all. The road has always been suitable for vehicles and safe. Congestion has never been an issue that cannot be easily navigated.</p>	<p>Objection to these proposals is noted.</p> <p>These proposals are being promoted as a result of concerns raised by the local community who have witnessed</p>

		many incidents of congestion on Mill Lane as well as deterioration of the verge due to regular turning manoeuvres.
4	<p>I live in London and find that access to the waterways has helped my mental and physical health enormously. I object to both the orders. I am sure you are aware the road has been passable for vehicles and regularly used despite parts having deteriorated from a lack of maintenance.</p> <p>I have found it wide enough for myself and others to park sensibly. Perhaps it would be advisable to avoid bad parking by putting yellow lines along the road which would no doubt act as a deterrent, or even a timed restriction.</p> <p>I have enjoyed the spot along with so many others over many years and this road is precisely what enables that, thankfully I can change there out of sight avoiding a more public setting. This road also prevents parking problems elsewhere in the village.</p>	<p>Objection to these proposals is noted.</p> <p>The existing road surface condition is not suitable to successfully lay road markings along the full extent of the lane. Equally the implementation of waiting restrictions along the entire length would not allow vehicles to legally park out of sight to avoid changing in a more public setting.</p> <p>It is accepted there will be a certain amount of displaced parking further into the village of Figheldean.</p>
5	<p>I am writing to strongly object to both orders. I have been swimming in this location with family and friends for many years and would be incredibly upset if access was removed from one of the historic hidden jewels of Wiltshire. The road was made for vehicles and it seems that the residents simply want this small part of Wiltshire paradise for themselves. I agree that the road is rough but so are many country roads and lanes.</p> <p>It is wide enough for people to park and pass each other safely. If a few cars park badly then they should be penalised, but it shouldn't keep everyone else from using it. You could try limiting the parking times but please don't take the access away altogether.</p>	<p>Objection to these proposals is noted.</p> <p>Refer to ref. 3 and 4 above.</p> <p>It must be noted that the proposals are to restrict access to part of High Street (Mill Lane) for vehicles only. Pedestrian access to the footbridge and mill pond will remain.</p>
6	<p>I object to both proposed orders for the following reasons:</p> <p>The road is of a type and character constructed, maintained and used by motor vehicles for many years. Its surface sustains daily motorised use both by residents to access property and for general parking. The usable highway width is comparatively generous when compared to surrounding minor roads and appears to have been engineered to</p>	<p>Objection to these proposals is noted.</p>

	<p>accommodate parking and turning.</p> <p>The surface near the river does not appear to have been maintained recently, safety would be improved if the road were subject to maintenance. The TRO process should not be abused to evade a statutory duty. An order to prevent parking one side of the highway or prescribe a maximum waiting time would achieve the stated reasons for making order two without penalising people who wish to drive/park on the road.</p> <p>The road is a through route which is currently obstructed at its ford. The proposed order would make a cul-de-sac of the road and risk being used to evade the statutory duties detailed in section 130 of the Highways Act 1980.</p> <p>Mill Lane offers safe, convenient and discreet parking to people wishing to swim in the river Avon, which is an historic and popular swimming location. The proposed orders would aggrieve swimmers making use of the road's heritage.</p> <p>The orders would likely compel swimmers to park in the village's High street, risking congestion. There would also be a significant risk to the public being exposed to the sight of swimmers dressing/undressing at their vehicles.</p> <p>The orders would prohibit the use of motorcycles, despite such use being both sustainable on the highway surface and of minimal effect to traffic congestion given the smaller size and weight compared to four wheeled motor vehicles.</p>	<p>Follow the link below to view the Council's Policy and Strategy for highway infrastructure maintenance and renewal:</p> <p>http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/highways-roads-care-cycle-lanes</p> <p>Please see Appendix 4 for site photographs beyond the mill pond leading to A345. It is considered this road has not been used as a through route for a number of years, based on the water level of the mill pond as well as the condition of the surface. The footbridge is designated as a right of way Footpath for pedestrian use only.</p> <p>It is accepted there will be a certain amount of displaced parking further into the village of Figheldean.</p> <p>These proposals are being promoted as a result of concerns raised by the local community who have witnessed many incidents of congestion on Mill Lane as well as speeding motorcycles.</p>
7	<p>As a resident of Mill Lane, I write to support the order to curtail traffic using this road. For years during summer months we have had to put up with congestion, excessive noise and anti-social behaviour from those visiting the mill pond. Traffic has also sped up and down this lane, therefore this order is very necessary.</p> <p>In relation to the prohibition of waiting order, I cannot understand the logic in refusing our request for residents' parking spaces along the westerly side of the lane, especially opposite the proposed length of double yellow lines. Why is the inclusion of a residents parking</p>	<p>Support for these proposals is noted.</p> <p>Refer to ref. 2 above.</p>

	<p>restriction not possible given that there are other places in the county where dedicated allocations are allowed?</p> <p>That said, I support the proposed orders.</p>	
8	<p>As an elderly resident of Figheldean I have lived here for over 50 years and have seen first hand on numerous occasions the reckless ways cars are driven along Mill Lane (High Street). I have suffered verbal abuse when asking drivers to slow down, the majority are driving too fast for the small narrow lane. No thought is given to residents when parked cars are obstructing access to gateways or any pedestrians walking along the lane. The use of double yellow lines and a gateway will have a positive affect on the residents of Figheldean and hopefully stop a serious accident likely to happen if these measures are not put in place soon.</p>	Support for these proposals is noted.
9	<p>We have lived in Mill Lane for over 25 years and we would like to strongly support the proposals. Over the years the number of cars using the lane to use the mill pond or as a meeting point has become intolerable with the speed at which vehicles are driven putting both pedestrians and pets at risk.</p> <p>The end of the lane has become an area for anti-social behaviour with cars parked revving engines, blasting horns, playing loud music, wheel spinning, littering as well as cars turning around in private driveways. Cars queue to get down the lane preventing access to residents' properties.</p> <p>The implementation of these proposals will make a huge difference to not only the residents of High Street (Mill Lane) but other residents of Figheldean.</p>	Support for these proposals is noted.
10	<p>I am writing to express my support for these proposals.</p>	Support for these proposals is noted.
11	<p>I would like to formally write to support the proposed TRO's.</p>	Support for these proposals is noted.
12	<p>I wish to object to these proposals; the dead end should remain open to traffic. Historically it's a very significant piece of road, being once a through route from the village via the ford to the main road.</p> <p>Your statement of reasons is very weak and if followed through would suggest that all dead</p>	<p>Objection to these proposals is noted.</p> <p>See Appendix 4 and ref 6 above.</p> <p>The statement of reasons used, both from the Road Traffic Regulation Act</p>

	<p>ends should be closed. I live on a dead end, as such traffic movements are few and slow, making it a very safe road.</p> <p>The road is entirely suitable for traffic and turning at the end in its current state. Please can it be clarified how regularly congestion is happening?</p>	<p>1984 and the supplementary information accompanying it, does not in any way make reference to the closure of a dead end. It simply demonstrates the reason for the proposal is to retain the existing character of the road.</p> <p>These proposals are being promoted as a result of concerns raised by the local community who have witnessed many incidents of congestion on Mill Lane as well as deterioration of the verge due to regular turning manoeuvres.</p>
--	---	---