

APPENDIX 2**OBJECTORS AND REASONS FOR OBJECTION**

	OBJECTORS	OBJECTION
1.	Keith and Sara Clover, Cannon Square, Melksham	A
2.	Miss S.J. Braby, 77 Eastleigh Road, Devizes	A
3.	Katie Branson, Keavin, Bath Road, Devizes	A
4.	Tina Bull, 17 Lincoln Grove, Bowerhill, Melksham	A
5.	A resident of Duxford Close, Bowerhill, Melksham	A
6.	Mrs. S.A. Davis, 19 Curtis Orchard, Broughton Gifford	A
7.	Andrea Earle, Cloverleaf Nursery, 19 Lancaster Road, Bowerhill, Melksham	A
8.	Mrs. T. Frampton, 193 Avon Road, Devizes	A
9.	Miss Rebecca Gardner, 13 Hurricane Road, Bowerhill, Melksham	A
10.	Becky Jones, 7 Larch Close, Melksham	A
11.	Miss L.H. McMurray, 36 Halifax Road, Bowerhill, Melksham	A
12.	Helen Mountain, Wessex, Bath Road, Devizes	A
13.	S. Phelps, 1 Cresswell Drive, Hilperton, Trowbridge	A
14.	Debbie Purser, 18 Chestnut Mews, Melksham	A
15.	Sara Radford, 1 Larch Close, Melksham	A
16.	Melksham Chamber of Commerce	B
17.	Melksham Without Parish Council	C D E
18.	District Councillor Brian Mudge	D
19.	Keith Lye Motor Vehicle Engineers	D F
20.	Mr. Dan Williams, Den's Diner	C D G

OBJECTIONS

- A** The proposal to increase the prohibition of waiting in Lancaster Road would prevent parking close to the nursery school. Female staff at the school often start and finish work during darkness hours in the Winter months and it is argued that their personal safety would be compromised if they had to park their vehicles more than a short walking distance from the school. The objectors support parking restrictions to one side of Lancaster Road. Concern has also been raised with regard to poor street lighting in the area.
- B** Agree that the majority of the restrictions are necessary to prevent vehicles parking so as to cause restrictions on visibility or accessibility. There is, however, no need for the two-hour limit on waiting or restrictions near the roundabout. The fact that restrictions are proposed is evidence that car parking is increasingly important. There should be consultations with the businesses.
- C** A lorry park is needed, and the restrictions could force vehicles to park in residential areas.
- D** A one-way system, with traffic calming, would be preferable to waiting restrictions.
- E** No proposals are included for the southern end of the estate where new development is under construction.
- F** The prevention of parking will have a detrimental effect on businesses on the estate and could lead to redundancies.
- G** Whilst no restrictions are proposed outside his food outlet on Lysander Road, displaced parking could make it difficult for his customers to park and therefore affect his business.

COMMENTS ON OBJECTIONS

- A** The two-hour limit was proposed to provide a turnover of spaces for those visiting businesses but, in view of the objections, can be deleted from the proposals. Mr. Clover agrees this deletion will overcome his concerns and those of his employees.
- B** The restrictions are proposed to prevent parking on the outside of the sharp bend and it is considered they need to be so extensive to prevent displaced vehicles parking near other junctions and bends. See above for a comment on the two-hour parking. The public advertisement is the opportunity for the businesses to see and comment on the proposals.
- C** There are still long lengths of kerb where lorries can park and night-time surveys have indicated only three or four lorries parking overnight, none of which were at locations where the restrictions are proposed.
- D** A one-way system would increase journey distances to or from the majority of the businesses and the illuminated signing required would be extensive and expensive to install and maintain. Traffic speeds would be likely to increase unless complementary traffic calming is installed. Vertical measures create noise when vehicles, particularly heavy goods vehicles, slow/accelerate to negotiate the features and would be very expensive to install. Such a scheme is not economically viable at this location.
- E** No significant parking takes place on the highway at this end of the estate and traffic volumes are less than at the northern end. Restrictions are not considered necessary.
- F** The highway is for the passage/repassage of vehicles and parking can be condoned where it does not impinge on this right of passage. It is considered that there are sufficient kerb lengths remaining for employees to park where they cannot be accommodated within their places of work. The highway cannot be used as an extension of a business property.
- G** It is not considered that significant long-term displaced parking will relocate to this area, but the matter will be kept under review.