

CHIPPENHAM TOWN CENTRE: PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS

COMMENTS OF OBJECTION AND SUPPORT – TOTAL OF 212 COMMENTS RECEIVED

Road and Proposed restriction	Total received	Support	Object	Supported with caveats	Summary of objections/support	Officer comments
Allington Way and Pipsmore Drive: No waiting at any time	1	0	1	0	<p>Objection 1: A disabled resident, who has a Blue Parking Badge said that they already find parking difficult in the area.</p> <p>Their neighbours in Allington Way are also concerned. Most residents have off- street parking, but this resident does not as their front garden is too small and worries that if the parking proposals are implemented that that would have to park some distance away from their property</p>	<p>Vehicles should not park within 10 metres of a 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 for vehicles travelling along Allington Way.</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, in response to the objections received it is considered that the proposed restrictions could be shortened to only protect the crucial immediate area at the junction with Allington Way and Pipsmore Drive.</p> <p>See Appendix 3 for details of the proposed revisions.</p>
Birch Gr, Clift Ave, Langley Rd, and Pew Hill: No waiting at any time and No waiting between 8am and 6pm Monday to Saturday	5	2	3	0	<p>Objection 1: Would prefer no waiting from 0800 to 1800 hrs Monday to Friday, but supports the no waiting near the junctions.</p> <p>Objection 2: Considers that congestion is not a factor at all. Langley Road traffic is not that heavy and the road is wide enough to accommodate parking.</p> <p>Objection 3: Displacement as a result of these proposals will shift parking to Birch Grove, which is narrower.</p> <p>Supporting comments: Residents constantly face the challenge of exiting their drive ways and access roads on to a very busy road made extremely dangerous by long stay parking restricts the view in either direction which means running the gauntlet of oncoming traffic.</p>	<p>The proposals for the western side of Langley Road is for No Waiting between 8am to 6pm Monday to Saturday and the No Waiting at Any Time on the eastern side for junction visibility in order that be maintained at all times for highway safety reasons.</p> <p>After further consideration the proposals for Monday to Saturday should be reduced to Monday to Friday, as the commuter issue tends to be limited to week days only.</p> <p>Also the proposed No Waiting at Any Time between Clift Avenue and Wade Mews outside Nos. 63 to 67 Langley Road, could be reduced to Monday to Friday 8am to 6pm. But the No Waiting at Any Time to remain at the narrow access to Wade Mews and either side of the Clift Avenue junction.</p> <p>See Appendix 3 for details of the proposed revisions.</p>

Road and Proposed restriction	Total received	Support	Object	Supported with caveats	Summary of objections/support	Officer comments
Bristol Rd, Middlefield Rd, and Middle Leaze: No waiting at anytime	5	0	4	1	<p>Objection 1: These proposals will result in displacement into the nearby estate and onto the main Bristol Road.</p> <p>Objection 2: People visiting the Lloyds Pharmacy and Hathaway Medical Centre cause the problem not the residents (this was mentioned in all the objections received to this proposal).</p> <p>Objection 3: This resident felt that the proposals will severely penalise residents (in particular those properties opposite the Surgery).</p> <p>Objection 4: There is 40+ parking spaces behind Hathaway Surgery that is not well signposted and under-utilised. The Medical Centre should advertise this better and encourage their visitors/clients to use this instead of parking dangerously on the road near the Bristol Road junction.</p>	<p>These proposals were developed following requests to prohibit the parking opposite the medical centre and at the junction with Bristol Road. 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 Bristol 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>On reviewing the comments made, it is considered that the proposals could be reduced so that residents are not adversely effected, but not at the detriment to highway safety; therefore, the proposals at key areas to protect junctions should remain.</p> <p>Requests will be made to the Hathaway Medical Centre to advise their patients of the car park to the rear.</p> <p>See Appendix 3 for details of the proposed revisions.</p>
Bumpers Way: No waiting time	0	0	0	0	No comments of objection or support were received for this proposal.	Proposals will proceed as advertised
Charter Road: Limited parking 2 hours, no return within 4 hours	1	0	1	0	<p>Objection 1: A resident that lives next to the layby has a garage and only one space on driveway. As their family live outside of Wiltshire they will have nowhere to park when they visit.</p> <p>As Charter Road is blocked up with cars from early morning to evening because commuters working in Chippenham town centre, ask "Where can my family park?"</p>	<p>This proposal was developed following requests to provide short-term parking in the area due to the commuter parking already occurring on Charter Way. This short term bay will give the opportunity for visitors to park and not for the bay to be parked up all day with commuters.</p> <p>We could remove the time limit to give any visitors more time within the bay; however, it could then be filled all day by commuters and others.</p> <p>See Appendix 3 for details of the proposed revisions.</p>

Road and Proposed restriction	Total received	Support	Object	Supported with caveats	Summary of objections/support	Officer comments
Cocklebury Road and College Close: No Waiting At Any Time	10	8	0	2	<p>Objection1: There is at least one disabled resident in College Close who has care visitors every-day, requests 2 additional time limited spaces outside numbers 11,13, and 15 College Close.</p> <p>Objection 2: The proposed 2-hour parking bay is not long enough.</p> <p>Objection 3: Cocklebury restriction will simply push commuters further into the estate causing the same problems in other streets.</p> <p>Supporting comments: Currently it is very dangerous to leave Esmead on to Cocklebury Road because of the obstruction to see oncoming traffic caused by vehicles parking on Cocklebury Road. This is worsened by the slight bending of Cocklebury Road, which reduces the level of vision.</p> <p>Supporting comments: The current parking between Esmead and Downham Mead makes it difficult for the residents living opposite to drive in and out of their properties and will in turn help residents on the south side of the road to see clearly when exiting their drives.</p>	<p>Cocklebury Road proposals were developed following concerns raised by residents when exiting Esmead onto Cocklebury Road and by residents having difficulty reversing out of their driveways due to parked vehicles opposite.</p> <p>The proposals for College Close were developed following requests to prevent obstruction to large vehicles such as delivery, refuse collection and emergency services vehicles, as a result of a lamp column being knocked over by a refuse collection vehicle trying to manoeuvre around parked cars in the close.</p> <p>It was therefore proposed to introduce a day-time parking restriction in the majority of College Close as all the properties have sufficient off-street driveway parking, but to also create a short-term parking bay that would give the opportunity for short-term visitors to park. The location and size of this parking bay was determined by the distance from the Cocklebury Road junction and driveways on College Close.</p>
Darcy Close: No Waiting At Any Time and Short term parking proposals	2	0	2	0	<p>Objection 1: The proposals will deny residents of Darcy Close the use of lay-bys.</p> <p>Objection 2: Proposals will not solve the problem as would just displace commuters into the residential spur road. Instead asks for restrictions of 2 hours from 8am to 6pm, Monday to Friday, for the whole of the approach road and the spur roads, with double-yellows on Cocklebury Road.</p>	<p>This proposal was developed following requests to provide short-term parking in the area due to the commuter parking already occurring in Darcy Close.</p> <p>The proposed short term bay would give the opportunity for visitors to park and not taken up all day with commuters. In light of the comments received it is recommended for this proposal to be removed and left for anytime residential parking.</p> <p>See Appendix 3 for details of the proposed revisions.</p>

Road and Proposed restriction	Total received	Support	Object	Supported with caveats	Summary of objections/support	Officer comments
<p>Downham Mead and Sadlers Mead: No Waiting At Any Time and short term parking bays</p>	9	3	6	0	<p>Objection 1: The two-hour parking proposals are unnecessary as few people from outside the estate park long-term.</p> <p>Objection 2: A resident of Downham Mead states is concerned that the proposed restrictions on Sadlers Mead will just displace the problem to Downham Mead, a narrow road with no parking restrictions. They wish to see further single yellow lines along Downham Mead.</p> <p>Objection 3: Proposals are inadequate - and will make things worse rather than better. Residents want a more effective solutions that addresses the commuter problem.</p> <p>Objection 4: Sadlers Mead is busy and too narrow for any parking - parked cars (commuters) make it difficult for residents to exit and enter driveways and that the parking bays will decrease the road width.</p> <p>Objection 5: A Sadlers Mead resident states that: 'restricting parking further will increase speeds and place children, older people and cyclists at greater risk.'</p> <p>Objection 6: The availability of parking in Sadlers Mead is a resource for residents and the wider community and should not be reduced.</p> <p>Rather than the 2-hour restriction, why not have 'No parking from 08.00 to 10.00 and 12.00 to 15.30'? This would prevent parents stopping outside the school and commuter parking.</p>	<p>This proposal was developed following requests to prevent obstruction caused by parking for the local bus, refuse collection and emergency services vehicles.</p> <p>This parking bay proposals on the stretch outside Monkton Park Primary School was developed following requests to provide short-term parking in the area due to the commuter parking already occurring in the area. This short term bay will give the opportunity for visitors, in particular parents dropping off or collecting children to park and not for the road to be parked up all day with commuters.</p> <p>We could remove the time limit to give any visitors more time within the bay; however, it could then be filled all day by commuters and others.</p> <p>After further consideration the proposals for Monday to Saturday should be reduced to Monday to Friday, as the commuter issue tends to be limited to week days only.</p> <p>With regard to requests for further restrictions, at this stage of the process, we cannot increase the proposals without re-advertising the proposals.</p> <p>See Appendix 3 for details of the proposed revisions.</p>

Road and Proposed restriction	Total received	Support	Object	Supported with caveats	Summary of objections/support	Officer comments
Downham Mead and Sadlers Mead: cont...					<p>Strong support was received from residents:</p> <p>Supporting comment 1: Road width is narrow and emerging from driveways can be dangerous as weekday commuters occupy the available parking all day</p> <p>Supporting comment 2: Trades vehicles frequently pull onto pavements in an attempt to keep the road clear</p> <p>Supporting comment 3: Proposals will improve safety as people will no longer be driving into narrow gaps.</p> <p>Headteacher of Monkton Park Primary School – supporting comments:</p> <p>The Primary School supports the proposals, as are concerned about speed of traffic outside the school and in some ways congestion does slow everything down so we support the proposed parking on opposite sides of the road.</p> <p>We appreciate that congestion is an issue at the beginning and end of the school day. Over time this has been exacerbated by some commuters parking for long periods of time in Sadlers Mead. We therefore strongly support the two hour parking restrictions.</p> <p>They would value a lower speed limit but acknowledge that this would entail additional consultation etc.</p>	

Road and Proposed restriction	Total received	Support	Object	Supported with caveats	Summary of objections/support	Officer comments
Eastern Avenue: No waiting at any time	2	0	1	1	<p>Objection 1: Resident at 90 Eastern Ave wants to see 2-hour parking from the corner of Eastern Ave to the end of the boundary of their property. Cars are parked outside residents' property all day.</p> <p>Supporting comments: A resident asks is it planned to have parking restrictions along the entire length of Eastern Ave to remove commuter and other non-local parking?</p>	<p>This proposal was developed following requests to prevent obstruction to the rear school gate adjacent to the junction of Lady Coventry Road, on the grounds of highway safety...</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 Chippenham proposals 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>
Farnwell Close and Goldney Avenue: No waiting time	1	0	1	0	<p>Objection 1: Removing parking will lead to increased speeds, thereby contradicting the Council's intention to 'avoid danger to persons...' This proposal will also inconvenience's local residents who are adversely affected by people using Spanbourn Avenue and Goldney Avenue as free-parking when using the railway station and visiting the Town Centre.</p>	<p>This proposal was developed following requests to provide better junction visibility of drivers exiting Farnwell Close and restrict parking on the bend on the approach to Spanbourn Avenue.</p>
Hawthorn Road and Tugela Rd: Removal parking restrictions	1	1	0	0	<p>One letter of support received:</p> <p>A resident was very pleased that the outdated parking restrictions in the road were under consideration to be removed. As with the new flats in the old matrix building, parking is at a premium in the road and the removal of the restrictions will ease the parking problems.</p>	<p>Support is noted – the proposals will proceed as advertised.</p>

Road and Proposed restriction	Total received	Support	Object	Supported with caveats	Summary of objections/support	Officer comments
Ladyfield Road, Sheldon Road, Stonelea Close, Westminster Gardens: No Waiting At Any Time at the junctions	1	1	0	0	<p>One letter of support received:</p> <p>Whilst the addition of no parking at the entrance to Stonelea Close is an excellent idea, but does not feel it goes far enough and asks if the no parking area be extended up Stonelea Close to its junction with Andrews Close.</p> <p>The resident mentions that as cars are regularly parked in Stonelea Close from its junction with Sheldon Road up to its junction with Andrews Close, it reduces Stonelea Close to one lane, reducing visibility to cars travelling toward Sheldon Road and to leave Stonelea Close you have to drive on the wrong side of the 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 in Chippenham and whilst this may seem a request for a small addition, it will require an amendment to the whole Order.</p> <p>Support for the proposals noted – proposals will proceed as advertised.</p>
Louise Rayner Place: No Waiting At Any Time	1	0	1	0	<p>Objection 1: These proposals will affect occupants of the area and limit the possibilities for visitors to park their vehicles. It will not improve the safety of the road, neither the congestion. Since the road is in a cul-de-sac area.</p> <p>Making this change will cause problems with unauthorised parking on allocated parking places. Furthermore, it will lead in to parking in non-parking spots the allocated parking area. Limiting getting in and out of the allocated parking areas.</p>	<p>This proposal was developed following requests to prevent obstruction to large vehicles particularly refuse collection vehicles. As reports have been received by residents and verified by the Council's Waste Team that collections have been missed, due to the vehicle unable to get through.</p> <p>Our concern was also that if a refuse collection vehicle was having difficulties manoeuvring around parked cars, then emergency vehicles would also.</p>

Road and Proposed restriction	Total received	Support	Object	Supported with caveats	Summary of objections/support	Officer comments
Newbury Drive and Sandown Drive: No waiting at any time	3	0	1	2	<p>Objection 1: The proposed restrictions should be extended down the entire length of Sandown Drive. Currently road users have to overtake parked vehicles on a blind bend. This situation is dangerous.</p> <p>Supporting comments: The restriction on Newbury Road should be extended to prevent further dangerous parking near the roundabout.</p> <p>Supporting comments: The restrictions on Newbury Drive need to be extended as far as the speed bump.</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 in Chippenham and whilst this may seem a request for a small addition, it will require an amendment to the whole Order.</p> <p>Support for the proposals noted – proposals will proceed as advertised.</p>
Rowden Hill, St Lukes Drive & St Francis Avenue: No waiting at any time	15	2	12	1	<p>Objection 1: This will displace the parking to Rowden Road, St Lukes Drive and St Peters Close.</p> <p>Objection 2: St Mary's Catholic School is a faith school and the pupils do not live locally and therefore parents have to drive and park near the school: 'I cannot walk them to school, walk back to pick up my car and get to work on time.'</p> <p>Objection 3: Stopping parents parking in the area will create a bigger problem elsewhere and will put children at greater risk.</p> <p>Objection 4: This will anger residents in the area who will be subject to more parking. Why not transform local green spaces and the area in front of the hospital into car parking spaces?</p> <p>Objection 5: Why not allow parking in the Staff Area for the surgery which at present is under-utilised?</p> <p>Supporting comments: Parents with children at the school have stated: The current parking in the area is made dangerous by other parents parking for the school run and that these proposals are needed.</p>	<p>This proposal was developed following requests to prevent obstruction to visibility to vehicles exiting St Luke's Drive onto Rowden Hill.</p> <p>The proposed restrictions were developed to prevent parking between the Rowden Hill junction and St Francis Avenue. The proposals were extended further into St Francis Avenue to prevent parking being displaced further into the hospital access.</p> <p>However, on reviewing the comments made, it is considered that the proposals could be reduced but not at the detriment to highway safety; therefore, the proposals at key areas to protect junctions should remain.</p> <p>With regards to the use 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>See Appendix 3 for details of the proposed revisions.</p>

Road and Proposed restriction	Total received	Support	Object	Supported with caveats	Summary of objections/support	Officer comments
Station Hill: No Waiting At Any Time and short term parking bays	154	154	0	0	<p>Supporting comment 1: We support the proposal of removing the top two parking spaces on Station Hill. Also to create two new ones lower down the hill.</p> <p>Supporting comment 2: I fully agree with the removal of these two spaces as they are the cause of congestion at the top of the hill where buses are caused delay due to inadequate space to manoeuvre.</p> <p>Supporting comment 3: Very supportive of the removal of the spaces as the location is very dangerous as have had a few near misses as people lose patience and drive through a narrow gap. As the new Sainsbury's matures this area is only going to get busier and more congested and in my view raise the likelihood of an accident happening especially at afternoon rush hour.</p> <p>A petition letter supporting these measures was also received with 132 signatures.</p>	Support is noted – the proposals will proceed as advertised.