

**PROHIBITION OF DRIVING & WAITING RESTRICTIONS – NO WAITING AT ANY TIME****HIGH STREET (LOCALLY KNOWN AS MILL LANE), FIGHELDEAN****ADDENDUM TO REPORT WITH FURTHER REPRESENTATION**

<b><u>Ref</u></b>	<b><u>Comments</u></b>	<b><u>Response</u></b>
Wiltshire Councillor	Full support for the scheme	Support is noted.
Resident's of Figheldean – 60 in total	60 residents have registered their full support for the scheme	Support is noted
Resident of Figheldean	<p>Objection to parts of the TRO. I feel that the proposals will simply push the problems to other parts of the village. The disruption and disturbance that people experience would continue to have an impact to a degree on residents of Mill Lane as well as additional disruption to residents further into the village itself.</p> <p>We do support the introduction of yellow lines, sensible and enforceable parking restrictions, new clear signage, traffic calming measures and any other reasonable efforts to make the area safe and peaceful, but if it is too extreme and there is no arrangement to properly enforce them by the local authority, they will be pointless and not help the residents of Mill Lane or neighbouring properties who will in turn be impacted by their introduction.</p>	<p>As previously commented in Appendix 2 of the report, it is accepted there will be a certain amount of displaced parking further into the village of Figheldean.</p> <p>This scheme has been identified as a local priority by the Amesbury Community Area Transport Group and during the consultation period a substantial level of local support was received.</p>
Resident of Figheldean	<p>Objection to the proposals. Concerns over emergency vehicle access and restricting access to the enjoyment of everyone using the mill pond. Requests residents parking, regular police enforcement, more bins and signing to request the area is respected.</p>	<p>The emergency services are consulted during the formal consultation period as part of the legal TRO process. No commented were received.</p> <p>As previously commented in Appendix 2 of the report, the provision of residents parking</p>

		<p>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> <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> <p>Police enforcement in the area will have to be raised directly with the local policing team.</p> <p>The allocation and maintenance of litter bins is dealt with by the Streetscene department and can be contacted at – <a href="mailto:StreetScene@wiltshire.gov.uk">StreetScene@wiltshire.gov.uk</a></p> <p>Unfortunately signs of this nature are not permitted on the public highway. Signing provided on the public highway is required to adhere to the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016.</p>
Resident of Figcheldean	I support the measures as detailed in the proposal for points A and C, however I do not agree with the proposal for double yellow lines as unless this is checked by traffic control officers it would quickly be less of a deterrent. Is there any way this could be marked as residents only parking and parking permits be issued to appropriate households for their cars and guests. I have lived somewhere previously when double	As previously commented in Appendix 2 of the report, 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

	<p>yellow lines were introduced to stop anti-social parking and all it did was move it further down the road and cause locals and guests to be fined for parking near their homes or when visiting which wasn't the intended outcome.</p>	<p>of permits is not financially viable at this location.</p> <p>As previously commented in Appendix 2 of the report, it is accepted there will be a certain amount of displaced parking further into the village of Figcheldean.</p> <p>This scheme has been identified as a local priority by the Amesbury Community Area Transport Group and during the consultation period a substantial level of local support was received.</p>
Residents of Figcheldean.	<p>This issue has only recently come to our attention (mainly due to poor communication and holidays) and we would like to make objections to this proposal for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. We believe that this would not alleviate the problem but in fact make it worse elsewhere. It only means an extra 50yd or so walk to the Mill Pond which will not deter anybody.</p> <p>Putting parking restrictions and a low barrier gate in Mill Lane will only cause problems in Church Lane and the High Street with visitors now parking there. These roads are fairly congested with cars etc. anyway and further parking will cause mayhem and health and safety issues along this main village thoroughfare. Mill Lane is off a fairly sharp bend with a blind access road almost opposite. Parking on both sides of the road will also only allow a tight single vehicle passage in places.</p> <p>At the weekend, when this problem is at its worst, local tradesmen in Church Lane park their high sided trade vehicles along the roadway all day compounding the traffic and access issues. The Church itself has no</p>	<p>As previously commented in Appendix 2 of the report, it is accepted there will be a certain amount of displaced parking further into the village of Figcheldean.</p> <p>This scheme has been identified as a local priority by the Amesbury Community Area Transport Group and during the consultation period a substantial level of local support was received.</p>

	<p>dedicated parking so visitors (weddings, funerals, services etc) park down Church Lane also.</p> <p>2. Putting double yellow lines alongside Figheldean House would not necessarily stop people parking there. This would require constant policing and I cannot envisage traffic wardens coming all the way to Figheldean to monitor a very small stretch of road especially on a Saturday and Sunday when it is most visited. Not cost effective to manage. If and any initial policing of this area would soon die off and word of this would soon spread around.</p> <p>You will also find that people will park opposite these double yellow lines in front of residents' houses causing further friction.</p> <p>3. Mill Pond in Figheldean is well advertised in the media as a wild swimming venue and picnic area. A simple "google" of "wild swimming Figheldean" will get a plethora of results. References can be found on the BBC, Newspapers(eg Daily Telegraph) WildSwim and Wildswimming etc etc websites. Whilst these links remain people will still travel to this venue. Again this will not help the parking issues on Church Lane/High Street.</p> <p>4. Many of the reasons for the proposal have been overstated. E.g. "Speeding cars through Ablington and Figheldean". This can be a problem but in my experience is more due to traffic problems/roadworks on the A345 and the school run!. Also an outsider to Figheldean would not use or be aware of the Ablington back road link into Figheldean.</p> <p>5. Not cost effective. Implementing this proposal does not cure anything</p>	<p>If implemented the effectiveness of the scheme will be monitored and some targeted enforcement can be requested to deter contravention of the restrictions.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>but simply expands the problem further into Figcheldean. Policing of the yellow lines (would be only ones in Figcheldean) would be prohibitive due to the costs of doing so.</p> <p>People are being encouraged to comment individually to this proposal so please count this as two objections.</p>	
--	---	--