

WEST WILTSHIRE PARISHES: PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS**COMMENTS OF OBJECTION AND SUPPORT****Atworth – 9 letters of representation received****Bath Road/Mead Park** (6 letters - 5 objecting, 1 supporting)

Principle of Objection	Officer Comment	Comment reference
<p>Residents of Bath Road</p> <p>The parking on Mead Park acts as traffic calming on the bend, drivers take the bend more cautiously if there are parked vehicles.</p> <p>Many properties on Bath Road do not have parking so Mead Park offers some space close to peoples homes.</p> <p>Also residents of Bath Road prefer to park in Mead Park as it is off the busy main road where some have had their vehicle hit by passing vehicles.</p>	<p>Vehicles should not park within 10 metres of junction and the proposed restrictions are there to prevent this. The proposals were extend to include the bend as it was felt that any parking in this area hampered visibility when approaching the junction with Bath Road.</p> <p>Wiltshire Council has no duty to provide parking for individuals; its statutory duty is to maintain the right of passage along the highway. It is the responsibility of the owner/keeper of the vehicle to find somewhere safe to park the vehicle and it is something for which the Council cannot take responsibility.</p> <p>However, it is considered that the proposed restrictions could be shortened just to protect the crucial immediate area at the junction with Bath Road.</p> <p>See Appendix 3 for details of the proposed revisions.</p>	A
<p>Residents of Bath Road</p> <p>Believe that by removing these spaces in Mead Park will only push parking further into Mead Park and cause conflict with residents further into the road. Are also concerned that the proposal offers no alternative space for residents to park.</p>	See comment A above.	
<p>Resident of Bath Road</p> <p>Whilst agreeing that when cars park too close to the junction it can cause issues for vehicles turning in from Bath Road, this number is small. However the majority of residents parking here do so away from the junction itself and observe the highway code.</p> <p>Therefore they support restrictions, but only to reinforce the requirement of not parking close to junctions.</p> <p><i>(Similar comments were made by 2 other residents)</i></p>	See comment A above.	

Atworth cont...

Comments of Support	
<p>Resident of Bath Road</p> <p>Support the proposals, however requests they extend further to cover some driveways on the north side of Bath Road.</p>	<p>At this stage of the process, we cannot increase the proposals without re-advertising the proposals, at further expense and would further delay the implementation of the restrictions for the rest of the West Wiltshire Parishes and whilst this may seem a request for a small addition, it will require an amendment to the whole Order.</p> <p>White advisory markings can be installed to protect drives from obstruction.</p>

Bradford Road (3 letters - 3 objecting, 0 supporting)

Principle of Objection	Officer Comment	Comment reference
<p>Residents of Bradford Road</p> <p>Many properties on Bradford Road and Bath Road do not have parking. Removing the parking here will mean congestion elsewhere in the village.</p> <p>Also residents of Bath Road prefer to park in Bradford Road off the busy A365.</p> <p>The solution is not to remove parking but to create parking spaces.</p> <p><i>(Similar comments were made by 1 other resident)</i></p>	<p>Vehicles should not park within 10 metres of junction and the proposed restrictions are there to prevent this. The proposals were extend to include the stretch between Coronation Road and Bath road as it was felt that any parking in this area hampered visibility when exiting Coronation Road.</p> <p>Wiltshire Council has no duty to provide parking for individuals; its statutory duty is to maintain the right of passage along the highway. It is the responsibility of the owner/keeper of the vehicle to find somewhere safe to park the vehicle and it is something for which the Council cannot take responsibility.</p>	<p>B</p>
<p>Residents of Bradford Road</p> <p>Sometimes residents have no other choice but to park on the junction as everywhere else is full.</p> <p>If you apply restrictions at the junction you have to take into consideration that potentially up to 8 vehicles will need to be accommodated elsewhere on Bradford Road which is unmanageable.</p> <p>They ask if funding could be sourced to create parking on some 'wasteland' opposite the clock tower for the residents to park, or for arrangements to be made with the local chapel.</p>	<p>With regards to funding of parking spaces on private land, this would need to be discussed as a community with the land owner and is not something that Wiltshire Council can comment on or influence.</p> <p>Also see comment B above.</p>	<p>C</p>

Hilperton – 38 letters of representation received

Church Street (5 letters - 3 objecting, 2 supporting)

Principle of Objection	Officer Comment	Comment reference
<p>Residents of Church Street</p> <p>If the time limit on Church Street is removed, then vehicles will be parked day and night and would free up parking for visitors or trades-people.</p> <p>Suggested that a 1 hour restriction should remain until the Hilperton Relief Road is open and then review the parking again.</p>	<p>The request for the removal of the time limit came via the Parish Council on behalf of residents, primarily due to the local shop/Post Office being closed for some time, therefore the turnover of spaces was no longer required.</p> <p>The removal of the time allows for residents and their visitors to park for longer, and is considered more convenient for the majority of residents.</p>	<p>D</p>

<p>Resident of Church Street Support the removal of the time limit however is concerned by the expansion of double yellow lines without extra provision made. They assumed that when the Hilperton Relief Road was opened that double yellow lines would be removed to enable more parking.</p>	<p>Wiltshire Council has no duty to provide parking for individuals; its statutory duty is to maintain the right of passage along the highway. It is the responsibility of the owner/keeper of the vehicle to find somewhere safe to park the vehicle and it is something for which the Council cannot take responsibility.</p> <p>There are no proposals to change the existing yellow lines in Church Street, they are required to maintain the clear sight lines and prevent obstruction.</p>	<p>E</p>
<p>Resident of Church Street Has requested that the parking bays be extended to provide more parking for residents, particular those properties who do not have parking outside their homes.</p>	<p>See comment E above.</p>	

<p>Comments of Support</p>		
<p>Resident of Church Street supports the proposal as car park outside the permitted hours anyway now the shop has gone.</p> <p>But has noticed vehicles parking beyond the designated spaces which causes an issue particularly at the bend which then becomes effectively a blind bend and asks for better spacing to allow vehicles to pull in.</p>	<p>When a Traffic Regulation is advertised for public comment, it is not possible, within the Procedure Regulations to alter a proposed restriction to one of a greater severity (ie: further restrictions, longer hours) without recommencing the legal procedure by consulting and re-advertising the restrictions.</p>	
<p>Resident of Church Street welcomes the change to unrestricted parking. The time limited bays are historic when the Post Office was in situ and therefore make good sense for these to be made available for residents.</p>		

Devizes Road (4 letters - 4 objecting)

Principle of Objection	Officer Comment	Comment reference
<p>Residents of Ashton Road Supports the proposal in principle however is considered that they will displace the issue further into Ashton Road, where it can already be difficult to exit driveways and ask that the proposed restrictions be extended.</p> <p>They also believe that the Council should consider a more holistic approach to reducing traffic volumes along Devizes Road.</p>	<p>At this stage of the process, we cannot increase the proposals without re-advertising the proposals, at further expense and would further delay the implementation of the restrictions for the rest of the West Wiltshire Parishes and whilst this may seem a request for a small addition, it will require an amendment to the whole Order</p> <p>It is anticipated that the Hilperton Relief Road will reduce the volume of traffic on Devizes Road.</p>	<p>F</p>
<p>Resident of Devizes Road Objects as is considered that to remove parking along Devizes Road, the speed of passing traffic will increase, despite the existing traffic calming measures.</p> <p>They are also concerned that neighbours will lose parking opportunities close to their homes.</p> <p>They also highlight that the existing speed limit and weight limit is habitually ignored and requested more robust enforcement of these existing</p>	<p>The request for the introduction of restrictions at this junction came via the Parish Council on behalf of residents, considered about visibility when exiting the from Ashton Road onto Devizes Road, due to vehicles parking right at the junction.</p> <p>Vehicles should not be parked within 10 metres of a junction and the proposed restrictions enforce this, to provide clear visibility for vehicle exiting Ashton Road for the safety of all road users.</p>	<p>G</p>

<p>restrictions.</p> <p><i>(Similar comments were made by 2 other residents)</i></p>	<p>It is considered however that the existing parking on the north side of Devizes Road can remain, acting as a further traffic calming feature and to maintain parking availability for residents on Devizes Road.</p> <p>See also comment F above regarding the reduction of traffic volumes anticipated with the opening on the relief road.</p> <p>See Appendix 3 for details of the proposed revisions.</p>	
--	--	--

Greenhill Gardens (2 letters - 2 comments)

Principle of Objection	Officer Comment	Comment reference
<p>Resident of Hill Street Is concerned that if these proposals go ahead then parking difficulties will increase for residents on Hill Street, some including the correspondent has difficulty exiting their driveway due to vehicles parking right up to it.</p> <p>Also concerned that the bus stops are already blocked during school pick-up times, due to parents using the path from Hill Street to Newleaze.</p> <p><i>(Similar comments were made by 1 other resident)</i></p>	<p>The request for the introduction of restrictions at this junction came via the Parish Council on behalf of residents, concerned about visibility when exiting the from Greenhill Gardens onto Hill Street due to vehicles parking right at the junction and also blocking the dropped kerbs.</p> <p>At this stage of the process, we cannot increase the proposals without re-advertising the proposals, at further expense and would further delay the implementation of the restrictions for the rest of the West Wiltshire Parishes and whilst this may seem a request for a small addition, it will require an amendment to the whole Order</p>	H

Hackett Place (23 letters - 19 objecting, 3 supporting, 1 comments only)

Principle of Objection	Officer Comment	Comment reference
<p>Commuting Parent A parent of a pupil of The Mead who has no option but to drive their child to school before continuing on to work.</p> <p>The proposals will cause great inconvenience and concern about dropping children off un-supervised.</p> <p>It's not as if cars are parking all day, only for a maximum of an hour and half a day.</p> <p>These proposals will not deter parents from driving, only move them to other roads which could create more risk as the surround roads have higher speed limits and no paths.</p> <p><i>(Similar comments were made by 3 other commuting parents)</i></p>	<p>The request for the introduction of restrictions at this junction came via the Parish Council and the Mead Primary School, concerned about the traffic congestion at the start and end of each school day.</p> <p>The proposals were designed to prevent parking that causes obstruction to the school for emergency vehicles, parking at junctions which in turn cause issues for refuse collection vehicles and driveways which cause obstruction for residents.</p> <p>It is considered that a reduction in the proposed restriction could be made, to allow some parking to remain but to ensure that it only takes place in areas that do not cause obstruction or access difficulties.</p> <p>See Appendix 3 for details of the proposed revisions.</p>	I
<p>Resident of Hackett Place The parking issues only occur during the start and end of the school day when parents abandon their cars with no regard for access of emergency</p>	<p>See comment I above.</p>	

<p>vehicles or residents.</p> <p>However, feels it would be grossly unfair for residents to be further inconvenienced by the proposals. <i>(Similar comments were made by 3 other residents)</i></p>		
<p>Resident of Hackett Place Is against the scheme as it stands as would be restrictive to residents, but highlights that parents park wherever they feel at school drop off/pick up and this causes chaos.</p> <p>However does agree with proposals around the car park and drop off areas by the school entrance, and if yellow line are to be used, should only be single yellow on the main road to the school and the side road leading to the rear of Hackett Place.</p> <p><i>(Similar comments were made by 1 other resident)</i></p>	<p>See comment I above.</p>	
<p>Resident of Hackett Place Has no major concerns with the proposals on the main road to the school as provides plenty of on street parking for residents outside of school times.</p> <p>However is concerned about restricting the rear access road, as feels this would have a detrimental on residents as no family or visitors will be able to park nearby.</p> <p>Feels that the rear access road should be treated the same as the main road to allow residents to park outside of school times.</p>	<p>It is considered appropriate to reduce the proposed double yellow lines (24/7 restriction) to mirror those proposed on the main road to the school, as would enable residents and their visitors to park outside school times, but would deter parents and carers from blocking access at drop off and pick up times.</p>	<p>J</p>
<p>Resident of Staverton (Commuting Parent) Concerned that dropping their child off at the roadside is not an option. Concerned about my child's safety due to issues about strangers approaching children, therefore it is more important to drop off/pick up their child from the classroom.</p> <p>Rather than restricting the parking in this area we should focus on creating more adequate parking.</p>	<p>See comment I above.</p> <p>Also in reference to providing extra parking spaces, Wiltshire Council has no duty to provide parking for individuals; its statutory duty is to maintain the right of passage along the highway and ensure that any parking takes place is a safe place so as not to cause obstruction.</p>	<p>K</p>
<p>Resident of Hackett Place There are no traffic issues outside school drop off/pick up. Weekend use of the park and evening use of the pub, club and takeaways do not cause any problems.</p> <p>The proposed restrictions will operate all year round yet the school is only open for 40weeks, therefore for a further 12 weeks you are penalising residents and other users of parking in Hackett Place.</p> <p>Why are you not insisting that The Mead School use innovative ideas as used by other schools in Wiltshire to reduce traffic around the site?</p> <p><i>(Similar comments were made by 3 other residents)</i></p>	<p>School terms change, and Teacher Development days are determined by Head Teachers and to change parking restrictions to match, would lead to obsorbative costs to change the legal order and signage.</p> <p>It is considered that a compromise would be to restrict the parking Monday to Friday only.</p> <p>The School has an active Travel plan which seeks to encourage parents/carers to walk with their children rather than drive.</p>	<p>L</p>
<p>Resident of Hackett Place Is against the scheme as it stands as would be restrictive to residents especially those who rely on carers and doctors to visit during the day.</p>	<p>See comment J above.</p>	

Hackett Place cont...

Principle of Objection	Officer Comment	Comment reference
<p>Resident of Hackett Place Despite many fellow resident's concerns, they have to accept the fact that 430 children still need to safely get to and from the school.</p> <p>The current proposals however will cause parents to park on other roads such as Painters Mead, and then cross Leap Gate, surely this is a great danger than allowing a few cars to park on Hackett Place?</p> <p>However, if restrictions are not placed on the rear access, we could be clogged up by parents not being able to park on the main road to the school, but we don't want our houses devalued by having nowhere to park for visitors, so a daytime restriction seem logical, but only during term-time only.</p>	See comments I, J and K above.	
<p>Resident of Paxcroft Mead Felt that whilst the congestion can be dreadful, the proposals are excessive and unhelpful, given the issues to which this problem actually relates to inconsiderate and dangerous parking by a minority.</p> <p>They are in favour of penalties for those flout the highway code and park on junctions or pavements which is not uncommon in Hackett Place. Asks where is the enforcement now?</p> <p>However where will these cars go? The nearby car park by Budgens would seem logical however is restricted and maintained by a private company who fine people at will.</p>	See comments J and K above.	

Comments of Support		
<p>Resident of Hackett Place Fully supports the proposals and requests more restrictions including residents parking and that the proposed daytime restrictions should be made 24/7.</p>		
<p>Resident of Hackett Place Is in favour of the proposal as when walking their child to school feels unsafe when cars park both sides of the road.</p> <p>They feel it would be neglectful to not take any action if there were an accident it would reflect badly on the Council for not having weighed up the risks properly. The restrictions should be placed as soon as possible, there are long overdue.</p>		
<p>Resident of Hackett Place Believes the proposal is a good idea as has been blocked in by parents preventing them from getting to work on time. Double yellows at the junction will make it safer.</p> <p>Cannot see why people would oppose the scheme as most people work during the day and if anything would make it safer for residents.</p>		

Hill Street/Dymott Square (4 letters - 2 objecting, 1 supporting, 1 comments only)

Principle of Objection	Officer Comment	Comment reference
<p>Resident of Hill Street The proposals seem to be specifically targeted at properties that do not have nor can have off street parking.</p> <p>Also questions the timing of the proposals with the relief road due imminently, surely parking will become irrelevant.</p> <p>Also the parking that takes place on the road now, slows the speed of passing vehicles.</p> <p><i>(Similar comments were made by 1 other resident)</i></p>	<p>Parking near junction is contrary to the highway code. These proposals are to ensure that parking does not take place within 10 metres of the junction to Dymott Square and also ensures that vehicles exiting Dymott Square have sufficient visibility when undertaking the manoeuvre.</p>	M
<p>Resident of Hill Street Existing parking facilities within the old part of Hilperton are minimal. With relief road soon to be open how can further restrictions possibly be considered when before long it will advantageous to remove some of the current restrictions.</p>	<p>See comment M above.</p>	

Comments of Support	
<p>Resident of Hilperton Parking opposite this junction has caused several near misses of vehicle exiting Dymott Square. Also the number of vehicles parked make it a dangerous overtake as vehicles then appear quickly around the corner from Church Street.</p>	

Holt – 15 letters of representation received

Beckerley Lane (11 letters - 6 objecting, 5 supporting)

Principle of Objection	Officer Comment	Comment reference
<p>Resident of The Common Whilst agreeing in principle with the proposal as it can be a dangerous junction, believes the restriction go too far and will result in a loss of around 9 parking spaces. Properties that do not have any parking could then cause a problem elsewhere.</p> <p>Considers that some parking can remain including the advisory disabled bay which is no longer required and should've been removed 3 years ago.</p>	<p>Parking near junction is contrary to the highway code. These proposals are to ensure that parking does not take place within 10 metres of the junction to Beckerley Lane and also ensures that vehicles exiting Beckerley have sufficient visibility when undertaking the manoeuvre.</p> <p>However, it is considered that the proposed restrictions could be shortened just to protect the crucial immediate area at the junction with The Common.</p> <p>The advisory disabled bay will be removed once its current use is appraised by the Area Highways Office.</p> <p>See Appendix 3 for details of the proposed revisions.</p>	N
<p>Resident of The Common Many properties on The Common do not have parking so Beckerley Lane offers some space close to people's homes.</p> <p>Also residents of The Common prefer to park in</p>	<p>See comment N above.</p>	

Beckerley Lane as is off the busy main road where some have had their vehicle hit by passing vehicles. <i>(Similar comments were made by 4 other residents)</i>		
--	--	--

Comments of Support	
Resident of Beckerley Lane Fully supports proposals as there have been a number of near misses at the junction. <i>(Similar comments were made by 2 other residents)</i>	
Resident of Beckerley Lane Had for some time been concerned at the severely restricted view we as drivers have when exiting Beckerley Lane and contacted the Parish Council to see if anything could be done.	
Resident of Beckerley Lane Turning out of the street has always been difficult but is now becoming dangerous, therefore fully supports these proposals.	

Lions Orchard (1 letter with 18 signatures - supporting)

Comments of Support	
Letter in full support of the proposals signed by 18 residents of Lions Orchard Residents are very glad to see these proposals as have for several years suffered from inconsiderate parking making it difficult for residents to drive in or out of Lions Orchard.	

The Midlands (3 letters - 3 objecting)

Principle of Objection	Officer Comment	Comment reference
Resident of Holt Considers the proposals are not justified by the volume of traffic using the road and will cause congestion by forcing residents on the main road to the detriment of traffic flow on the classified route.	These proposals were developed due to the parking on the western side of The Midlands causing forward visibility issues for vehicles travelling along the road especially at the bend. Also parking right up to the junction with the B3107 also caused vehicles to wait at the junction overhanging into The Street when wait for vehicles to proceed past the parking.	O
Resident of The Common The proposals for the eastern access to the Midlands will just push vehicles further up which cause issues for articulated vehicles accessing the industrial Estate. An unloading area for residents would help residents and keep the road clear. <i>(Similar comments were made by 1 other resident)</i>	The proposed double yellow lines allows for loading and unloading, but keeps the junction clear at all other times, thus protecting Highway Safety.	P

North Bradley– 1 letter of representation received

Aintree Avenue (1 letter – supporting)

Comments of Support	
Business on Aintree Avenue These proposals will help large vehicles exit premises safely without the obstruction to visibility and physical obstruction of parked vehicles and therefore fully support the proposals.	

Staverton – 27 letters of representation received

Cottles Barton (8 letters - objecting)

Principle of Objection	Officer Comment	Comment reference
Resident Cottles Barton Wonders where all the vehicles will go if these proposals go ahead. Is concerns that vehicles will move and cause issues elsewhere however supports the proposal to protect the junctions.	Wiltshire Council has no duty to provide parking for individuals; its statutory duty is to maintain the right of passage along the highway and ensure that any parking takes place is a safe place so as not to cause obstruction.	Q
Commuting parent to Emmaus School Since parking restrictions have gone in on School Lane the next nearest place is Cottles Barton. Given the houses all have off street parking, by parking on the road feels they are not depriving residents of spaces as they are only here for a short time to take or collect their children from school. <i>(Similar comments were made by 2 other parents)</i>	Parking near junction is contrary to the Highway Code. These proposals are to ensure that parking does not take place within 10 metres of a junction and also ensures that vehicles exiting side roads have sufficient visibility when undertaking the manoeuvre. However, it is considered that the proposed restrictions could be shortened just to protect the crucial immediate area at the junction with New Terrace, bus stops and traffic calming. See Appendix 3 for details of the proposed revisions.	R
Resident of Cottles Barton The only issue with double yellow lines being enforced would be the speed that traffic travels down this road, speed can already be an issue and that's with one lane of traffic.	The speed limit remains at 20 mph and will continue to be monitored and enforced by the Police. The greater risk is of an incident caused by parked vehicles obstructing visibility.	S
Resident of Cottles Barton Does not feel the proposals have been considered properly and the effect on local residents would be unacceptable. Concerned if they were required to park at the rear of their property it would cause major complications, especially for residents who have young children.	Parking on the public highway is, not a right. Wiltshire Council has no duty to provide parking for individuals; but has a statutory duty is to maintain the right of passage along the highway and ensure that any parking takes place is a safe place so as not to cause obstruction.	T
Resident of Cottles Barton Considers that is unrealistic to expect residents to park their cars at the back of the house and try to load up our car with children and usually numerous bags etc. They bought their house knowing that they had the option of accessing a car from the front, and would not have bought a house in this area if parking restrictions were in place.	There is an exception in the Order for persons to board and alight on double yellows. See comment T above.	
Resident of Cottles Barton Whilst in agreement with the proposals at the very top of the road at the New Terrace junction, to have no parking at any time is absolutely ludicrous. Most	The proposals are to ensure that any parking that takes place does so in appropriate places that would not block access for large vehicles,	U

<p>of the houses one have off street parking for one car and many people have two or more. What will happen when residents have visitors?</p> <p>Is concerned that all that will happen is the cars form the top of the road will park at the bottom of Cottles Barton causing another hazard on the blind bend around Warren Road. The proposals are not at all practical for the people who live here.</p>	<p>such as delivery or emergency services vehicles.</p> <p>See comments Q and T above.</p>	
--	--	--

Marina Drive (6 letters – 5 objecting, 1 supporting)

Principle of Objection	Officer Comment	Comment reference
<p>Resident of Marina Drive As a long term resident they see no need to the proposed restrictions, it will only introduce a bigger parking issue for all residents that currently park outside their properties. There is not sufficient off street parking now, hence people are parking on the road. Doesn't believe the scheme is warranted.</p> <p>The existing parking helps slow passing vehicles and help reinforce the existing traffic calming measures.</p>	<p>Parking near junction is contrary to the Highway Code. These proposals are to ensure that parking does not take place within 10 metres of a junction and also ensures that vehicles exiting side roads have sufficient visibility when undertaking the manoeuvre.</p> <p>The speed limit remains at 20 mph and will continue to be monitored and enforced by the Police. The greater risk is of an incident caused by parked vehicles obstructing visibility.</p>	V
<p>Resident of Marina Drive Asks where are residents expected people to park? Garages are too small to put cars in so house owners only have one space and most have two cars. Where do visitors go? House prices will be devalued and the parking actually slows vehicles down so if these proposal go in traffic will speed up.</p> <p><i>(Similar comments were made by 2 other residents)</i></p>	See comment V above	
<p>Resident of Marina Drive As a disabled resident with a Blue Badge, is concerned that the proposals do not provide any disabled bays. With only 1 space to the rear of the property means that they rely on the parking on-street at the front of the house.</p> <p>They also question the need for the proposals in the first place.</p>	<p>The proposals are to ensure that any parking that takes place does so in appropriate places that would not block access for large vehicles such as delivery or emergency services vehicles.</p> <p>There is an exception in the Order for persons being able to board/alight, load/unload from double yellow lines and for blue badge holders to park for up to three hours on double yellow lines if the vehicles does not cause an obstruction.</p>	W

Comments of Support	
<p>Resident of Marina Drive Wholeheartedly agrees with the proposals and has wondered if it would take a bad accident before anything was done about this menace.</p> <p>They are sick of people parking on the traffic calming pads.</p>	

Maunder Drive/Blackthorn Way (7 letters - 6 objecting, 1 supporting)

Principle of Objection	Officer Comment	Comment reference
<p>Resident of Maunder Drive These proposals will not relieve congestion or make roads safer and asks where visitors/family will park? And if the Council are going to build a car park for those displaced? Believes the proposals will affect those that work from home and/or have families if they cannot park outside our homes, which may also lose value too.</p>	<p>In consideration to the level of objections to the scheme it is proposed the scheme is limited to protecting the junction Maunder Drive/Blackthorn Way.</p> <p>See Appendix 3 for details of the proposed revisions.</p>	<p>X</p>
<p>Resident of Maunder Drive Thinks the proposals are terrible and asks where all the cars that currently park on the road move to? Concerned that they will just move further into Blackthorn Way where there's already no space. Where will people even be able to drop off their shopping? Restrictions would also adversely affect the value of properties.</p>	<p>See comment X above.</p>	
<p>Resident of Bulrush Place The posted notice requests that comments should be given with reasons why, this is difficult because the notice gives no reason why this order is considered necessary. They see no reason for such restrictions and is concerned with the knock-on effect in surrounding roads, if these proposals are implemented.</p>	<p>See comments X above.</p>	
<p>Resident of Blake Court Due to their disability the ability to park outside their property is a lifeline. Also relies on family being able to park outside the house to take them to hospital appointments etc.</p>	<p>See comment W above.</p>	
<p>Resident of Maunder Drive These proposals will not relieve congestion or make roads safer in fact they will have the opposite effect. Parking currently slows vehicles down, if these proposals approved, you create a danger rather than reduce one. No thought has been given to where the displaced vehicles will move to and nowhere for people to stop and drop people off.</p> <p>On occasion there is inconsiderate parking, but these proposals will cause real friction amongst in the community. Residents currently deal with inconsiderate parking between themselves.</p> <p>There has also been no consultation, they have not been directly consulted about these proposals unlike in planning cases.</p>	<p>See comments T and W above.</p> <p>Wiltshire Council does ensure that all processes regarding Traffic Regulation Order's are carried out following the statutory regulations as set out in legislation under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.</p> <p>We are required, when proposing a Traffic Regulation Order, to consult with statutory consultees (Town/Parish Councils, Councillors etc) and inform members of the public, allowing for comments, for a minimum period of 21 days.</p> <p>In terms of consulting with the public we publish a public notice within a newspaper circulating within the area (specified in the Regulations), we ensure maximum circulation of this by using the figures of highest selling publication within the area to which the TRO relates.</p> <p>Whilst we do not have a statutory obligation to post notice on site, we do this as standard practice as we recognise that not everyone reads the local newspaper and it has proven to be very effective in reaching as wide an audience as possible.</p>	<p>Y</p>

Maunder Drive/Blackthorn Way cont...

Comments of Support	
<p>Resident of Blackthorn Way These restrictions cannot come a moment too soon.</p> <p>Far too many people with off-road parking seem to feel they have a right to park outside their front doors which routinely leads to dangerous situations (short sightlines, blind corners and restricted access)</p>	

Thestfield Drive area (6 letters - 5 objecting, 1 supporting)

Principle of Objection	Officer Comment	Comment reference
<p>Resident of Staverton Estate Enforcing these proposals will create an opportunity for those who already ignore the 20mph speed limit to speed through the estate.</p> <p>They see no reason for such restrictions and is concerned with the knock-on effect in surrounding roads, if these proposals are implemented.</p> <p>Contends that parking restrictions should have been considered on the bridge over the canal where parking can reduce the visibility on the brow of the bridge.</p>	<p>See comments T and V above.</p> <p>When a Traffic Regulation is advertised for public comment, it is not possible, within the Procedure Regulations to alter a proposed restriction to one of a greater severity (ie: further restrictions, longer hours) without recommencing the legal procedure by consulting and re-advertising the restrictions.</p>	
<p>Resident of Bishopsmead Whilst realising parking on the estate is a problem, doesn't believe these proposals are the answer.</p> <p>Most people seem to have more than one car and most homes only have space for one car, hence they park on the road.</p>	<p>See comment W above.</p>	
<p>Resident of Staverton Estate The cars parked in the proposed places for restrictions do not cause congestion but if they have to move they will cause issues elsewhere potentially causing congestion where there is no problem now. Where will all these car park instead?</p>	<p>See comment T above.</p>	
<p>Resident of Thestfield Drive Having lived in this house since it was built they can understand that some people park inconsiderately but only a few. Parking currently slows vehicles down, if these proposals are approved, it will create a danger especially to children. Also asks where the displaced vehicles will go?</p>	<p>See comments T and V above.</p>	
<p>Resident of Staverton Estate Questions the need for such restrictions as has not witnessed or heard of any near-miss accidents.</p> <p>They also question the consultation procedure as there were only flyers on lampposts and household were not individually advised.</p>	<p>See comments T and Y above.</p>	

Thetfield Drive area cont...

Comments of Support	
<p>Resident of Vinescroft Asks if the proposals at Thetfield Drive/Vinescroft could be replicated at the Vinescroft/Cygnnet Way junction.</p>	<p>When a Traffic Regulation is advertised for public comment, it is not possible, within the Procedure Regulations to alter a proposed restriction to one of a greater severity (ie: further restrictions, longer hours) without recommending the legal procedure by consulting and re-advertising the restrictions.</p> <p>This request for additional controls will be considered during a future review</p>

Winsley – 13 letters of representation received

Bradford Road (13 letters – 6 objecting, 7 supporting including a letter signed by 12 residents)

Principle of Objection	Officer Comment	Comment reference
<p>Resident of Winsley The proposed restriction will cause considerable inconvenience for users of the Methodist Church. A number of church members rely on transport to get to church and need to park nearby.</p> <p>Church members are fully aware of the parking limitations and have for many years parked outside no.120 where there is sufficient space for 4/5 cars without causing obstruction to traffic including buses.</p> <p>It is pity that a need for such parking restrictions has been raised.</p>	<p>The proposals are to ensure that any parking that takes place does so in appropriate places that would not block access for large vehicles, such as delivery vehicles, public transport or crucially emergency service vehicles.</p> <p>However, it is considered that the proposed restrictions could be shortened to enable more residential parking but not at the detriment to highway safety, therefore the proposals at key areas to protect junctions, bends and narrow points along Bradford Road.</p> <p>See Appendix 3 for details of the proposed revisions.</p>	Y
<p>Resident of Winsley Whilst understanding the difficulty for the bus services if cars are parked on the narrower stretches of the road, sees no justification for banning the use of the lay-by just east of the Murhill junction. As it is wider at this section and provides useful parking for residents.</p>	See comment Y above.	
<p>Resident of Winsley Again understanding the difficulty for the bus services if cars are parked on the narrower stretches of the road, there has never been a problem at the wider section east of the Murhill junction. This area also provides the only available parking for residents at this end of the village.</p>	See comment Y above.	
<p>Resident of Winsley Whilst recognising there have been some issues caused by careless parking they have concerns that as parking is already very limited, these proposals is merely moving parking without making any provision for alternative parking.</p> <p>Asks where cars will be expected to park given that no alternatives and how the restrictions will be enforced.</p>	<p>Wiltshire Council has no duty to provide parking for individuals; its statutory duty is to maintain the right of passage along the highway. It is the responsibility of the owner/keeper of the vehicle to find somewhere safe to park the vehicle and it is something for which the Council cannot take responsibility.</p> <p>In terms of enforcement, it is Wiltshire Council parking officers who would enforce any approved restrictions.</p>	

Bradford Road cont...

Principle of Objection	Officer Comment	Comment reference
<p>Resident of Winsley Considers that yellow lines have no place in a conservation area and that a compromise could be reached on the section between the Murhill junction and the Methodist Church.</p>	<p>Winsley is a conservation area and therefore as is other areas such as Lacock and Castle Combe, narrow pale yellow (primrose) lines would be painted to reduce the visual impact of the restrictions.</p>	Z
<p>Resident of Winsley Winsley is a beautiful village and the painting of bright yellow lines well be highly detrimental to its charm and character and asks why it is necessary to paint them along the entire length of the road when only certain parts cause obstruction issues.</p> <p>Concerned also that there will be greater demand for the spaces that are left, resulting in residents having to park further and further away from their homes which would be especially difficult for families with young children.</p>	<p>See comment Z above.</p>	

Comments of Support	
<p>Resident of Winsley Whilst agreeing that is probably necessary to impose restricted parking, does not believe this will solve the problem, it could even become worse.</p> <p>The simple fact is that there are more cars in the village than there are spaces to accommodate them and no one will sell their car just because of some restrictions.</p> <p>Eventually the village will have to recognise that the motor car is here to stay and we will have to create a village car park. However, right now, the proposals are probably essential.</p>	<p>With regards to funding of parking spaces on private land, this would need to be discussed as a community with the land owner and is not something that Wiltshire Council can comment on or influence.</p>
<p>Resident of Winsley Fully supports the proposals saying that it is essential that the indiscriminate parking of vehicles needs to be stopped, as such parking regularly affects the free passage of public transport.</p>	
<p>Resident of Winsley Considers these proposals are essential as those who do not have car rely on buses and the bus is constantly being obstructed by cars parking in narrow areas and bends. This causes the driver to get out and seek out the vehicle owner before being able to proceed.</p>	
<p>Resident of Winsley Agrees wholeheartedly with the proposals as feels they will make the village safer and avoid the constant problems which the bus drivers encounter.</p>	
<p>Letter in full support of the proposals signed by 12 residents of Winsley But asking for further restrictions between the Bleak House and the War Memorial.</p> <p>They also request that existing highway signage "No vehicles except for Access" must be refreshed and improved as these are constantly ignored.</p>	<p>Concerns regarding existing signage has been passed on to the Highways Maintenance team.</p>

<p>Resident of Winsley Support the proposals however wish to see the parking between Bleak House and War Memorial reduced as allowing car to park too close to the bend would force drive to negotiate the corner on the opposite carriageway, therefore exposing them to risk.</p>	
<p>Resident of Winsley The proposals are essential to maintain access and safety in the 'Old village' and will reduce instances where the bus has been severely obstructed.</p>	