

COMMENTS

<u>Ref</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
1	<p>At present vehicles parked here do not cause any danger or create problems to pedestrians or other vehicles. There are no congestion problems either. Restricting parking will cause problems for all the residents living in Chantry Lane and Church Street.</p> <p>Parking is a premium in Church Street and although difficult now. This will just increase the problem if spaces are restricted.</p> <p>If restrictions are made outside the houses of Chantry Lane where would their visitors park? This would cause considerable problems for residents of Church Street.</p> <p>At present 3 parking spaces (as hatched on proposal plan), are used at the entrance of Chantry Lane and occasionally a car will park further up the road due to no other spaces being available for Church Street residents. Parking is becoming increasingly more difficult in the past year.</p> <p>If these restrictions are imposed, please could you advise where the residence of Church Street are supposed to park when the spaces outside our houses are taken up with people who work in Westbury, (parking their cars all day), residents of properties along the Church area and people attending the swimming pool, also the visitors of Chantry Lane residents . Also residents at the entrance of Church Street and Maristow street park outside our houses.</p> <p>On a weekly basis the refuse collection vehicle reverses up Chantry Lane, with no problems. They have to reverse due to a small cul-de-sac at the end of the Lane, whether there were cars at the entrance of Chantry Lane or not this would not cause a problem.</p>	<p>Residents of Chantry Lane report difficulties entering/exiting their properties as a result of parked vehicles. In addition, Wiltshire Council Waste Management team report difficulties experienced by the refuse collection vehicle whereby access to Chantry Lane is not possible or the vehicle must be manoeuvred in a manner that is deemed unsafe.</p> <p>Residents of Chantry Court report concerns relating to the increased potential for conflict between vehicles entering and exiting Chantry Court due to the need for vehicles in both directions to utilise one lane of the carriageway on Chantry Lane due to parking. Visibility at this point is impeded due to the geometry of Chantry Lane and vehicles are unable to see oncoming vehicles.</p> <p>In addition, concerns have been raised regarding the potential conflict between pedestrians entering and exiting Chantry Court via Chantry Lane.</p> <p>Off street parking is available at nearby car parks at High Street and Westfield House in addition to availability on street in Market Place and other locations. The current available on street parking on Church Street will remain.</p>
2	<p>As this is a cul-de-sac there is minimal traffic entering this lane. There is a perfectly good pavement for pedestrians to use avoiding any road traffic. I feel, therefore, that this is a very heavy handed approach to an increasing</p>	<p>See comment 1.</p>

<u>Ref</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
	<p>problem of parking. There is already a significant area of Church Street marked as a "no waiting zone" and with many houses having no off-street parking. I, therefore, feel that the introduction of these zones in Chantry Lane would make it increasingly difficult for residents in both streets to park their cars. It would also make it impossible for anyone to have visitors unless pre-planned and visitors advised to go to the town centre car park. By introducing these zones you are also making the houses in Church Street with no off- street parking almost unsaleable as there are very few families in this day and age that do not have a car. I do understand that the increasing problem with parking in heavily populated areas but this is not the solution.</p>	
3	<p>We are very keen to see "no waiting" at Chantry Lane, as parked cars cause obstruction to Chantry Lane and we regularly get no bin collections, due to rubbish lorries unable to access the lane, and we are worried that parked cars may obstruct any emergency vehicles who may need access.</p>	Comments noted.
4	<p>As a recent resident of Chantry Court, and both a motorist and a pedestrian, the traffic dangers of entering or leaving the Court are considerable. Because of the cars parked on the left hand side of the entry to the Lane, driving in means you are on the wrong side of the road, with a blind spot - until turning right -and it is the same for drivers coming out. Chantry will be erecting a convex mirror - on private land - which will help, but not solve the problem so these double yellow lines are essential - not only for motorists, but for the pedestrians who leave the Court and have to walk into the path of possible on-coming traffic which they can't see.</p>	Comments noted
5	<p>I as Manager of Chantry Court Retirement village full support the above action</p>	Comment noted
6	<p>I object to both No Waiting Zones at Chantry Lane as proposed in LJB/TRO/WEST4 because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Unrestricted public parking in Westbury town center is already heavily restricted and should not be made worse over the long term 	Residents of Chantry Lane report difficulties entering/exiting their properties as a result of parked vehicles. In addition, Wiltshire Council Waste Management team report difficulties experienced by the refuse collection vehicle whereby access to Chantry Lane is not possible or the vehicle must be

<u>Ref</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
	<p>without fully considered and sound Westbury Town/general public and not private reasons (the view from one's property and one's own preferences are not good reasons). The residents of Chantry Lane have no singular right to what will essentially become a private road run at public cost.</p> <p>2. There are already laws in place dealing with parking on pavements and blocking roads so any perceived H&S justification is not a reason but, I believe, an excuse.</p> <p>3. Parking restrictions and otherwise were painstakingly considered during the planning phase of Chantry Court and public parking in both proposed zones on Chantry lane were considered available and acceptable, and interestingly uncontested. Nothing unexpected has changed since other than the increased desire for residents of Chantry Lane to enjoy a funded public road for themselves. Should these proposals have been made during the intensely debated planning phase of Chantry Court, which they were not, then planning permission may not have been granted as it was.</p> <p>4. It is noteworthy that vehicles currently parking in the proposed zone closest to the junction with Church Street actually have a real calming effect on traffic which otherwise are likely to drive faster around the corner. In addition there is, without question, plenty of room for this current unrestricted zone to remain which makes me wonder what reasoning is driving these two No Waiting proposals.</p> <p>5. While public roads are for the public, one should consider local residents and visitors to Westbury beyond those residents of Chantry Lane. Should these proposals go ahead visitors to residents of Chantry Lane will seek to park in the few remaining unrestricted zones on Church Street, and for some time, making life for those residents and visitors to Westbury even more difficult? It seems the residents of Chantry Lane want it all their own way, in my humble opinion.</p>	<p>manoeuvred in a manner that is deemed unsafe.</p> <p>Residents of Chantry Court report concerns relating to the increased potential for conflict between vehicles entering and exiting Chantry Court due to the need for vehicles in both directions to utilise one lane of the carriageway on Chantry Lane due to parking. Visibility at this point is impeded due to the geometry of Chantry Lane and vehicles are unable to see oncoming vehicles.</p> <p>In addition, concerns have been raised regarding the potential conflict between pedestrians entering and exiting Chantry Court via Chantry Lane.</p> <p>Parking on the highway is at the discretion of the Highway Authority and is not a condition of a road being adopted highway.</p> <p>It is within the power of the Police to issue penalties to drivers whose vehicles are parked such that they are causing an obstruction however enforcement is dependent upon police resources and priorities.</p> <p>It is understood that parking restrictions and other planning matters were considered during the planning phase of the development of Chantry Court however, as with many developments, it is found that a review of parking restrictions is required in light of how the location operates in practice following completion of the development.</p>

<u>Ref</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
	<p>No Waiting proposals should only be approved in the interests of the wider public and town, and not for the convenience of the residents of Chantry Lane.</p>	
7	<p>We the undersigned, being residents of Church Street Westbury BA13 and members of the Church Street Residents' Association, wish to object most strongly to Wiltshire Council's plans to further restrict on street parking in the vicinity of Church Street and Chantry Lane - planning reference LJB/TRO/WEST4.</p> <p>We appreciate that the width of the road at the easterly end of Chantry Lane means that parking can sometimes create an obstruction. We would accept that double yellow lines painted along the hedge side of this road only would help prevent the chicane parking which sometimes happens there.</p> <p>However we do not accept the proposal for 'No Waiting' at any time on the other (north) side of the road.</p> <p>Moreover, we do not feel this proposal is in any way justifiable at the lower, much wider end of Chantry Lane where there is currently space for 3 cars to park.</p> <p>Many households in the area, including 17 members of Church Street Residents' Association, have no recourse to garages or off street parking and rely on the availability of parking spaces both on Church Street and Chantry Lane.</p> <p>It is particularly galling to learn of these proposals given that within the past two years 4 parking spaces have already been removed and replaced with double yellow lines.</p> <p>We feel that there has been a lack of consideration for other measures of road management which would improve the safety of road users at this junction, for example 'Give Way' markings to clearly show right of way from Church Street onto</p>	<p>Wiltshire Council Waste Management team report difficulties experienced by the refuse collection vehicle whereby access to Chantry Lane is not possible or the vehicle must be manoeuvred in a manner that is deemed unsafe.</p> <p>Residents of Chantry Court report concerns relating to the increased potential for conflict between vehicles entering and exiting Chantry Court due to the need for vehicles in both directions to utilise one lane of the carriageway on Chantry Lane due to parking. Visibility at this point is impeded due to the geometry of Chantry Lane and vehicles are unable to see oncoming vehicles.</p> <p>In addition, concerns have been raised regarding the potential conflict between pedestrians entering and exiting Chantry Court via Chantry Lane.</p> <p>Alternative or additional measures to manage vehicular traffic have been considered and highways officers have offered advice to Chantry Court residents highlighting how they may make improvements to alleviate some of the concerns raised.</p> <p>The installation of a 'give way' marking at the junction of Chantry Lane and Church Street is feasible and can be taken forward, however this will not eliminate the problems faced by vehicles that will remain in conflict with oncoming vehicles due to the narrowing of the road by parking. Signing to indicate which traffic direction has priority at this location would not be suitable. A priority give-way system such as that suggested requires a) space in which vehicles may wait to give way to oncoming traffic and b) visibility between vehicles at either end of the system. Neither of these is possible at this location.</p> <p>A speed bump at the entrance to Chantry Court, either on highway or within the Court, would not be appropriate due to the nature of the development. Vertical deflection can cause discomfort for those with muscular/skeletal disorders and is not favoured by emergency services, particularly the ambulance service due to the discomfort patients may</p>

<u>Ref</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
	<p>Chantry Lane, something that was proposed at a CSRA meeting in February 2014 and subsequently suggested to the Council by letter with no response received.</p> <p>Maybe a speed bump at the exit of Chantry Court? Or speed restricted to 5 mph on that stretch of lane between Chantry Court's exit and Church Street? Perhaps signage to show in which direction traffic has priority?</p> <p>All would seem more likely to produce traffic calming than the removal of four parking spaces.</p> <p>Wiltshire Council, 'Where everybody matters', appears to have totally disregarded the needs of Church Street residents and their visitors.</p> <p>To reiterate the comment when similar proposals were made in 2011, we "object to the proposal on the grounds that it reduces the amenity for residents while doing nothing to improve road safety, congestion or facilitating passage on the road.</p>	<p>experience. Additionally, the introduction of calming measures would not alleviate the conflict between vehicles on Chantry Lane between the Court and Church Street, which is the objective of the proposed restrictions.</p> <p>A 5 mph speed limit is not a legally recognised limit and therefore cannot be implemented. As with calming measures, a change of speed limit would not alleviate the conflict between vehicles on Chantry Lane.</p>
8	<p>I feel very strongly that there is already a lack of parking in Church Street. This is a problem for tradespeople, people visiting the swimming pool, or friends of residents in the area. I am unclear as to why the loss of spaces is being proposed and also where the council are proposing that people should park?</p>	<p>Please see comment 1.</p>
9	<p>I do not believe adding any more parking restrictions along Chantry Lane is in the interests of the public or Westbury Town. Chantry Lane is no different to any other cul de sac in Westbury but is closer to the important town centre - others do not have full parking restrictions so why this one? To suggest there are safety issues in Chantry Lane when the public road is no different to others is ludicrous. The residents of Chantry lane have no right to expect clear views from their property, or especially wide roadways. When Planning permission for Chantry Court was approved local public parking issues and its impact were painstakingly considered and nothing has changed now, other than the Chantry lane residents' desire for a private</p>	<p>These comments have been addressed in response to comment 6.</p>

<u>Ref</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
	<p>road, in my opinion. Traffic to and from Chantry Court and local public parking was considered in detail less than 10 years ago appropriately during the planning phase and their entrance has not changed - nothing has changed in regard to traffic.</p> <p>Finally, while public parking is for all and not only residents, the opposite effect is also true - residents of Chantry Lane do not have any right to a quiet public road at the expense of others, and Chantry Court developers and others had carefully considered their entrance prior to construction.</p> <p>In my opinion this proposal re., both Zones for Chantry Lane is yet another selfish nail in the coffin of Westbury.</p>	
10	<p>Adding the two no parking zones as proposed will make Chantry Lane more dangerous not safer, particularly in winter when there is snow and ice on the hill and outside the entrance to Chantry Court. Vehicles currently parked on Chantry Lane slow traffic down, in particularly traffic coming down Chantry Lane hill, and sweeping in and out of Chantry Court. Most vehicles parking on the roadside on Chantry lane belong to visitors (private and trade/services). Where will they go if this proposal goes ahead: Church Street parking will likely be full.</p>	<p>Off street parking is available at nearby car parks at High Street and Westfield House in addition to availability on street in Market Place and other locations.</p>
11	<p>I am in favour of double yellow lines as my bin collection has been disrupted on several occasions and people have parked in front of my drive, they also park on the pavement in chantry lane which means elderly residents are sometimes walking in the road. The road to too narrow for parked cars and vans.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
12	<p>Cars and Vans currently obstruct my drive way day and at night, also the bin collection is sometimes missed as the bin lorry cannot access chantry lane due to parked cars, the binmen have to make several attempts in order to collect the rubbish - this is wasting the binmens and councils time having to make repeat journeys because someone has parked their car/van and blocked the lane. I am in</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

<u>Ref</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
	<p>favour of double yellow lines as this will make it safer for the residents of chantry lane who live there.</p>	
<p>13</p>	<p>The proposals for Chantry Lane as in above report will exacerbate the limited parking already available. As you are aware when the residential home development was proposed a limited number of car spaces were allocated as part of this agreement to provide for homes in Church Street.</p> <p>Church Street residents considered this insufficient at the time and experience has proved this to be the case. The number of homes on Church Street with no off street parking numbers are in excess of 20 with an average of car ownership being 2, this leaves no facilities for parking for visitors. Chantry Lane offers parking for both temporary visitors and residents. Without this there will be insufficient parking which as long-term residents age will make it impossible for easy access to our homes.</p> <p>In addition the carriage of shopping and goods will become even more challenging.</p> <p>The proposals as stated in your report lack any 'vision', are short-term, and reflect the views of a minority of road users and visitors to the area.</p> <p>In terms of the Council's business plans as outlined in your report the justification offered is simply wrong. These proposals will exacerbate the safety and difficulties faced by residents. The Council's decision to award planning permission for a residential home has directly exacerbated the issue of parking.</p> <p>The residents of Church Street have submitted the rejection of the proposal for a TRO or other measures that will compound problems, not resolve them, in a joint letter. This is an additional such rejection.</p> <p>The perception referred to in the report is not based on any evidence. Because of this I requested, by Freedom of Information Act, to see any evidence and correspondence as to the issues suggested to in the report. Upon</p>	<p>The formal advertisement of the proposed Traffic Regulation Order satisfies the requirements for consultation with residents. Site notices were erected during the consultation period to alert residents and advertisements placed in the local press directing the public to view the relevant documentation either online, at the local library or by contacting the Traffic Regulation Order team. In addition, the town council was directly consulted as part of this process as the elected body representing the residents of Westbury.</p> <p>A previous iteration of the proposal was also advertised in December 2014 during which time no comments were received from residents of Church Street, either in objection or support of the proposals. Those proposals were not taken forward as the residents of Chantry Lane did not feel they were sufficient and objections were received accordingly. A decision was made by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport to proceed with the advertisement of a revised proposal.</p>

<u>Ref</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
	<p>the receipt of these, I additionally found it alarming that the Council's officers have failed to engage with the residents of Church Street who are directly affected by these proposals, but have engaged with a limited number of residents in Chantry Lane. This is a breach of your own business plans and objectives as outlined in your report. It is disappointing to find that the Councilor Gordon King failed to consult all the residents in the area as it is plainly obvious to any passer by that any TRO will impact on the whole area and not the residents he did consult, and who all have private parking.</p> <p>In conclusion these proposals are not supported and should be rejected as detrimental to the safety and needs of local residents; and as a measure that will deprive local residents of parking facilities on a public highway in an area where the Council's earlier decisions have reduced capacity for parking.</p>	
14	<p>With reference to the above, I have the following concerns about losing three parking spaces from the end of Chantry Lane. I would be interested to know the thoughts behind this change as there are many cul-de-sacs in Westbury, none of which have these restrictions.</p> <p>As a resident of Church Street, I am personally aware of the lack of parking in the area, not only for residents, but visitors, tradespeople and people visiting the swimming pool.</p> <p>Also, as a resident of Church Street, I believe that the decrease in parking spaces will lead to a further lack of parking and a subsequent loss of value to properties in the immediate proximity.</p> <p>For these reasons, I would ask that the loss of these parking spaces be reconsidered for the benefit of all concerned.</p>	<p>Every location must be considered on its own merit with regard to waiting restrictions and the experiences of all road users at that location. There is not a blanket approach to cover any particular type of street.</p>
15	<p>I was delighted to read that you are planning to paint double yellow lines all along both sides of Chantry Lane.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

<u>Ref</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
	<p>My wife and I have lived here at Chantry Court for nearly two years now, and every time we negotiate the blind corner leading in to Chantry Court either on foot or in a car, we do so with great caution, because with cars parked on the left side as one comes in, the road is reduced to single lane, and there is a significant danger of a collision occurring. This is particularly the case with delivery vans, because they tend to approach at speed, and could not possibly brake in time.</p> <p>I look forward to the implementation of your planned improvement of the safety of the residents of the 68 apartments here at Chantry Court.</p>	
16	<p>With regard to the possible proposed double yellow lines on both sides of Chantry Lane at the entrance to Chantry Court, I would like to express my strong support for this idea.</p> <p>Due to the narrowness of the entrance because of cars parked at the junction of Chantry Lane with Church Street, residents leaving Chantry Court have the choice of either walking down the left hand side which can be dangerous, not only because of the traffic but also, because of the somewhat precipitous angle of the leaning out wall but more because of the fact that many of the elderly residents leaving and entering Chantry Court are using walkers and trolleys who take up quite a lot of the road and could easily be hit. If they walk to the right of Chantry Lane, they are also vulnerable because of the parked cars and with no dropped curb on the right.</p> <p>Even considering only cars, they also have a completely blind approach and exit and, often driving too fast, they are not aware of pedestrians. The situation is of 'an accident waiting to happen'.</p> <p>Please give this matter your serious consideration. Double yellow lines and getting rid of the parked cars would considerably alleviate this dangerous situation.</p>	Comments noted.

<u>Ref</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
17	The Committee have no objections to the proposals although they are aware of comments made by those living in or close to Chantry Lane.	Comments noted.