

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

4<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2004

---

**MELKSHAM WITHOUT: BOWERHILL -  
OBJECTIONS TO WAITING RESTRICTIONS**

**Purpose of Report**

1. To consider objections to proposed waiting restrictions and to recommend the implementation of the proposals with minor amendments.

**Background**

2. Following a request from the Parish Council for traffic measures on both Bowerhill residential and industrial estates, the Regulatory Committee, in March 2002 as part of the Annual Traffic Report, resolved to carry out a study. The outcome of this study was reported to the Regulatory Committee in March 2003, at which it was resolved not to introduce a one-way Order but to introduce waiting restrictions on the bend at the northern end of the Industrial Estate.
3. Vehicles are frequently parked on the outside of the bend in the vicinity of the vehicle repair businesses, causing difficulty for opposing vehicles, particularly heavy goods vehicles. A number of these vehicles appear not to be moved for days at a time.
4. A scheme was prepared which considered the area comprehensively to ensure that displaced vehicles did not transfer to other locations such as junctions and bends, which would have been just as unsatisfactory as the current situation.
5. The proposals shown on the plan at **Appendix 1** were advertised. As a result of the advertisement twenty letters of objection have been received. The objectors and their reasons for objecting are summarised in **Appendix 2**. Full copies of the letters are available in the **Members' Room** and from the Environmental Services Department prior to the meeting.
6. Comments in relation to the various points raised are summarised in **Appendix 3**.

**Main Considerations for the Council**

7. As can be seen from **Appendices 2 and 3**, fifteen of the objections relate mainly to the proposed introduction of two hours limited waiting on the east side, south of the children's nursery. This was proposed to prevent all-day parking and thus provide a turnover of spaces for visitors to the nursery and other businesses. However, following discussions with the owner of the nursery, he has agreed that his concerns, and those of his staff, will be overcome if the time limit is not implemented. The proposed limited waiting element can be deleted without compromising the overall purpose of the parking controls but this will mean that short stay parkers will vie for space with those parking for longer periods of time.

8. The remaining five letters relate generally to the extent of the proposals and the loss of parking for businesses on the estate. The Chamber of Commerce agrees that the majority of restrictions are appropriate to prevent vehicles obstructing visibility or accessibility, and the Parish Council supports the need for restrictions on the outside of the bend, but both are concerned about the overall extent.
9. There are suggestions that the restrictions should only apply to one side of the road. This would be likely to result in vehicles parking on the unrestricted side opposite and thus relocate the problem. Whilst some of the parking is taken up by employees of businesses in the area, a number of vehicles are parked long-term in connection with the businesses. There are lengths of kerb on the straight which are to remain unrestricted and available for employees.
10. A number of the objectors have commented that the one-way system previously suggested by the Parish Council be installed instead of the proposed waiting restrictions. The comments in **Appendix 3** indicate why the one-way option is not an appropriate solution.

#### **Environmental Impact of the Proposal**

11. The introduction of lines in the area will have an impact but this has to be compared with the benefits of relocating the current parking away from the bend.

#### **Risk Assessment**

12. There is no increased risk to the County Council by the introduction of waiting restrictions as proposed.

#### **Financial Implications**

13. There is an allocation in the current approved Traffic Management budget to cover these proposals, as approved by the Committee in March 2003.

#### **Options Considered**

14. The options considered are:-
  - to implement the proposals as advertised
  - to implement the proposals with the deletion of the two-hour limited waiting
  - to not implement the restrictions

The one-way proposal was assessed previously, in the study, and not considered practical. It is not considered a viable option.

#### **Reasons for Recommendation**

15. It is considered necessary to remove the current parking from the bend, but the introduction of the two-hour limit is not critical to the operation of the scheme and, in view of the objections, it would be appropriate to delete this element.

## **Recommendation**

16. That:-

- (i) The proposals be implemented as advertised with the exception of the limited waiting which will be deleted from the proposals.
- (ii) The objectors be informed accordingly.

**GEORGE BATTEN**

Director of Environmental Services

Report Author

**PETER HARRIS**

Casualty Reduction Manager

---

**The following unpublished documents have been relied on in the preparation of this Report:**

Letters of objection

