

**CORSHAM AND CORSHAM WITHOUT:  
PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS  
COMMENTS OF OBJECTION AND SUPPORT**

**Contents**

Arnolds Mead.....	3
Hastings Road .....	4
High Street.....	5
Kings Avenue.....	7
Lacock Road.....	8
Lypiatt Road.....	29
Park Lane .....	31
Paul Street .....	33
Pound Pill.....	34
Priory Street.....	36
Station Road .....	41
Stokes Road .....	44
The Tynings .....	46

**84 Comments received from 75 people (63 objecting, 11 supporting and 10 commenting on)**

<b>Breakdown by road</b>			
<b>Road</b>	<b>Objections</b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Arnolds Mead	0	0	1
Hastings Road	1	0	0
High Street	2	0	0
Kings Avenue	1	1	1
Lacock Road	38	4	3
Lypiatt Road	1	0	2
Park Lane	1	0	0
Paul Street	3	1	0
Pound Pill	2	0	0
Priory Street	1	1	1
South Street	1	0	0
Station Road	1	2	1
Stokes Road	1	2	1
The Tynings	10	0	0

## Arnolds Mead

Ref	Comment Received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
AM1	<p><b>Will permits be provided for residents living in Arnolds Mead as the proposed restrictions will limit parking</b></p> <p>If you are going to put yellow lines all around the bend, will you be giving permits to the residents that live on that corner to park there?</p>	1	<p>There are no proposed permits for residents of Arnold's Mead. This would require the development of a Residents' parking Scheme which is beyond the scope of this project.</p>
AM2	<p><b>Where are residents expected to park if proposed restrictions go ahead.</b></p> <p>If you put this yellow lines down I will have nowhere to park my car so can you please let me know what I can do. Is there a chance we could have residents only parking there and have permits?</p>	1	<p>It is recognised that the introduction of parking restrictions can often lead to displacement of parking. However, the proposed restrictions in Arnolds Mead will look to remove parking near to junctions and also to formalise parking on one side of the road. The loss of available parking places in Arnold's Mead is therefore minimal.</p>

## Hastings Road

Ref	Comment Received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
HR1	<p><b>The proposed restrictions will remove spaces for local residents which will compound the parking problems</b></p> <p>The need to allow access for emergency vehicles is of course paramount but you will also know that by slowly shutting off more places for folk to park on the streets you are compounding an already increasing problem. From the top of South Street to half way down at #17 there are more cars needing to park than there are spaces on the road.</p>	1	<p>The proposed restrictions in Hastings Road are to protect the junction of Hastings Road and South Street. This will in turn improve visibility for vehicles using these roads.</p> <p>The Highway Code states that vehicles should not park opposite or within 10 metres of a junction.</p>
HR2	<p><b>New Waiting Restrictions do not solve the problems presented in the street.</b></p> <p>I fully appreciate that there are decisions that need to be made here and it would be good to see some of them being taken proactively rather than simply painting more double yellow lines about the town.</p>	1	<p>The highways primary function is to allow vehicles to pass and re-pass. Hastings Road presents its own challenges in that there is very minimal off-road parking. The proposal has been put forward as a suitable balance to protect the junction but also keep on-road parking spaces where possible.</p>

## High Street

Ref	Comment Received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
HS1	<p><b>There are already plenty of car parking spaces provided in the centre of Corsham in the car parks.</b></p> <p>I understand that the justification for the extra spaces relates to congestion. I do not understand this as there are plenty of parking spaces available in the adjacent car parks.</p> <p>Moreover, there is plenty of parking available in local car parks which generate revenue for Wiltshire. Road users parking in the Newlands Road Long Stay Car Park, for example, can gain easy access to the High Street at the point parking is proposed, through walking a few yards down Hobbes Walk.</p>	2	<p>It is recognised that there is already parking available within Corsham for vehicles to park. That being said the introduction of a very small section of time limited parking will allow increased access to the high street and nearby amenities.</p> <p>The proposed restrictions offer a formalised parking solution for disabled and elderly vehicle users who struggle to walk extended distances.</p>
HS2	<p><b>Removal of double yellow lines will reduce the amount of space available for disabled drivers who can currently park here</b></p> <p>We currently park on the yellow line opposite our house, using a disabled parking badge. This is essential so we can maintain adjacent vehicle access for my husband. If the yellow line is converted to a parking bay, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to park opposite the house.</p> <p>At the moment, our neighbours regularly park a vehicle opposite the entrance (using a disabled badge).</p>	2	<p>The current restrictions that are proposed to be removed from High Street are single yellow line restrictions with a time based order attached.</p> <p>Whilst it is recognised that those with a Blue Badge are able to park on double yellow lines they must do so without causing an obstruction.</p> <p>Consideration has been given in Appendix 3 to retaining the existing parking arrangements in the High Street whilst</p>

	<p>Although this is sometimes inconvenient, we can at least go next door and ask them to move their vehicle, if needed. If the proposed new parking bay goes ahead, anyone could park there during the day and we will not know whose vehicle is blocking our entrance if we need to get in or out. Our neighbours benefit from being able to park on the existing single line and it means the person with the disabled badge can currently walk the few yards to and from their house. This benefit will be lost if the proposal goes ahead.</p>		<p>protecting accesses.</p>
HS3	<p><b>The proposed restrictions do not relate to the reasons given in the 'Statement of Reasons'</b></p> <p>The proposed new parking bays will not reduce danger to persons or traffic and the High Street does not suffer from congestion.</p>	1	<p>The proposed parking bays were advertised to formalise the available parking in the High Street.</p> <p>It is understood through the Town Centre Parking Review that congestion does occur around this junction hence the introduction of increased restrictions and formalised parking.</p>
HS4	<p><b>Proposed restrictions will remove vehicular access to properties along the High Street.</b></p> <p>More specifically, our house has enjoyed vehicular access for over 100 years and the proposal will impede our right of vehicular access to our property. This is the only way we can gain vehicular access. The High Street is at its most narrow point outside our property. We struggle to gain vehicular access, if a car is parked opposite the entrance, as we have to execute a multiple point turning manoeuvre to get in or out.</p>	1	<p>It is not the intention through this proposed traffic order to remove access to private property off the highway.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that suitable amendments will be made to the proposed plan as shown in Appendix 3.</p>

## Kings Avenue

Ref	Comment Received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
KA1	<p><b>Proposals do not go far enough and further restrictions should be put in place.</b></p> <p>Whilst the proposed restrictions will help, it does not go far enough. Extensions are needed on priory street section from the A4, from Kings Avenue into priory street and also from Charles Street round into Priory Street.</p>	1	<p>Whilst there are proposals for restrictions on Priory Street junction with the A4 and also at Kings Avenue, these proposals are to help protect the access and ingress of traffic at the key junctions.</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 (i.e.: further restrictions, longer hours) without recommencing the legal procedure by consulting and re-advertising the restrictions.</p>
KA2	<p><b>Where will residents park if restrictions are put in place</b></p> <p>You may also need to consider that if double yellow lines are put in where else will residents park – then causing problems elsewhere on Priory Street.</p>	1	<p>The proposed restrictions around Kings Avenue are to improve the access in and out of the junction on the High Street. Furthermore, this will allow easier access for buses that currently use this route.</p> <p>The restrictions proposed are not extensive and do not seek to directly remove on-street parking options.</p>

## Lacock Road

Ref	Comment Received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
LR1	<p><b>A time limited restriction would be better for parents in the area than a full time restriction</b></p> <p>I feel strongly that further double yellow lines on the Lacock Road will only worsen the problem parents already face when dropping off / picking up their children from street Patrick's school. Please could you consider just imposing a waiting limit.</p> <p>You would be better off placing a time limit on parking on the Lacock Road. That would stop office workers parking there all day but allow parents to safely drop off and collect their children from school.</p> <p>A solution would be to introduce onto the Lacock Road a waiting time limit which would free up parking spaces used by workers in the town and allow parents to park close to the school and walk their children safely to the school</p> <p>I propose a limit on waiting time limit for parking on Lacock Road: as a parent of St Patrick's we need somewhere to park and it's too expensive to keep paying for parking in town.</p> <p>Changing to a limited waiting zone along the full 365m from the junction with South Place would reduce the congestion; say 15 min 08:00-09:30 &amp; 15:00 - 16:00.</p>	22	<p>The points raised as per a time limited restriction have been considered and whilst on the surface the option would make sense, there are further concerns that this would create.</p> <p>The introduction of a time limited bay on the southern side of the road would not be suitable. There is no formal footway on the southern side of the road, hence making this option unsuitable for pedestrians. It is recognised that vehicles currently park on this side of the road and walk along the verge; this is done so at their own risk and is not encouraged.</p> <p>The initial proposal did not show any restrictions on the northern side of the road. At this stage we are not able to increase restrictions. Therefore, the introduction of restrictions or time based restrictions on the south side of the road may lead to increased parking and a bigger issue on the north side of the road, this would have been the case also with the initial proposal.</p> <p>Finally, the initial proposal was raised to aid access into properties adjoining the highway. The introduction of a time limited bay would go against the original request</p>



	<p>The parking would be better as a ten minute wait time</p> <p>It should be requested that it is a 30 minute stopping point to help with school drop off and pick up.</p> <p>The most effective way to clear Lacock Road would be to impose a waiting time limit as parking in Lacock Road closest to Corsham is mostly taken by people parking all day.</p> <p>It would make much more sense to limit parking along there to a maximum of 30 minutes as it is for other parts of Corsham. This would enable parents to safely drop off their children and give them plenty of places to park where currently spaces are used by those working in Corsham all day.</p> <p>I think it would be fairer to have a limited waiting time, say 30 minutes. This would also free up spaces outside the school taken by people who work in the town.</p> <p>I understand local home owners frustration at the volume of traffic outside of their homes. I would therefore suggest that parking be limited to either a maximum 30 minute period, or parking only be permitted during recognised school drop off and pick up times. This would allow a safer drop off of children to St Patrick's school and also relieve the volume of traffic</p>		<p>and increase access issues.</p> <p>If in time a formalised footway is developed on the south side of the road then a time limited parking arrangement could be considered.</p> <p>Considering the options available it appears necessary to make changes to the initial proposal, the changes can be found in Appendix 3.</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>parking on Lacock Road except for vital times.</p> <p>We need a timed waiting time outside the school along Lacock Road.</p> <p>I believe a waiting time limit on the Lacock Road by St Patricks school, would be more appropriate. Then parents can safely drop their children off at school. This would free up spaces on the road because currently there are a lot of workers from the town that park on the Lacock Road, which makes it difficult to park to drop children off. I feel 10 minutes waiting time would be sufficient!</p> <p>The best option for the parking restrictions on this part of Lacock Road would be to have a 30 minute waiting limit. Parents dropping off or picking up children from St. Patrick's primary school or Mansion House nursery need to park somewhere. There are already a lot of problems with this and the suggested 'no waiting at any time' plan would further complicate matters and effect child safety.</p> <p>Prefer to see limited time parking from the roundabout away from town that would allow a controlled parking area.</p> <p>We would like Lacock Road available when dropping and picking up our child from school. It is already very difficult to park and restricting this Road will make it even more difficult. There is a car park which quite far but hasn't got enough space. My suggestion would be</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>to have the road available for a specific time when dropping and picking up the children's.</p> <p>I would suggest making it a restricted time parking area would stop workers leaving their cars there all day but would allow parents to drop their children at St Patrick's school more safely and less chaotically than is the case at present.</p> <p>There are much better options available, such as implementing a waiting time limit or supplying a turning circle. I urge you to consider other options rather, than just using this as an excuse to make money out of parents via parking charges.</p> <p>It would be sensible to restrict parking on the Lacock Road to 30mins /1 hour during term time. This will ensure greater ability to park during crucial period (as at present most cars parking outside the school are from workers in the town who park all day).</p> <p>Solution would be limited waiting time as proposed by the school</p> <p>My preference would be to have a restricted waiting time between 8.20am and 9am introduced instead, to increase the turnover of vehicles during this time and prevent cars staying for long periods of time. I think a waiting time limit would be a much more reasonable solution so parents are able to get children to school but it would stop the issue of people parking there all day.</p> <p>We do not agree with the proposals of making the</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>whole of Lacock Road becoming double yellow lines however a 30 minute parking restriction would allow parents to safely drop their children for the intended purpose of school and not an all-day usage by local workers.</p> <p>Could It be possible to create 20 minute waiting times on the proposed area of the road and no permanent parking, instead of no waiting at all if the council are adamant on cutting parking down in this section of road. This would stop the town workers parking all day, create more spaces for safer delivery of children to school and leave the road clear for the majority of the day. Our families are only here for two 20 minute windows at the start and end of the school day.</p>		
LR2	<p><b>Further traffic calming would be useful in the area</b></p> <p>I also think there should be speed bumps as people drive incredibly fast down there and several families I know have had near misses with kids.</p> <p>In addition to this and to enhance this proposal, I would favour extending the 30mph limit from its existing position near St. Patrick's School to the Westrop crossroads. This would have the benefit of slowing vehicles along an increasingly busy road, which not only has the school, but the rugby and football clubs and the Corsham Estate car park. The footpath is only on one side and is narrow.</p> <p>I believe you should make the paths wide concrete paths and not slippy muddy ones that cars drive over and mount the make shift pavements. If you made a</p>	4	<p>It is recognised that further traffic calming maybe useful in this area. Any such requests should be made through Corsham Community Area Transport Group - <a href="http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/highways-community-transport-group">http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/highways-community-transport-group</a></p> <p>Unfortunately this project is only looking at proposed parking restrictions. Whilst the proposed restrictions can be reduced to a lesser extent, we are unable to expand on restrictions to a more severe outcome.</p>

	<p>real wide high concrete path from the car park next door to Corsham Town FC to the St Patricks school it would encourage parents to park there and walk down a safe nice path that children could safely use scooters on.</p> <p>As far as easing congestion, why not have double yellow lines at intervals either side of the road, to provide passing points for traffic? This would help slow traffic completely, which would contribute to everyone's safety.</p>		
LR3	<p><b>Restrictions previously introduced have made crossing the road much more difficult. Extending them will add to the problem.</b></p> <p>The introduction of double yellow lines last year has made crossing the road significantly more dangerous than before. To think that you might extend this restriction is horrifying</p> <p>I have been a parent in St Patrick's school for 6 years and things have got worse since additional double yellow lines were introduced.</p> <p>There are on-going safety issues concerning the Lacock Road at drop off &amp; pick up times. The car parks are too far. Forcing parking further down the Lacock road when the pavement is quite narrow &amp; scary for parents with pushchairs &amp; young children. Cars often travel fast and are quite close to you. It does not feel safe!</p>	5	<p>Unfortunately this proposal is unable to alter existing parking restrictions further along Lacock Road.</p> <p>It is not for Wiltshire Council to create car parking spaces along Lacock Road; its primary purpose is to allow the passing and re-passing of traffic along this road whilst maintaining access to properties.</p> <p>The issue as to whether it is safety issue parking at this location cannot be viewed differently whether this is someone parking to use the school or for any other reason.</p>

	<p>The council has already put in place double yellow lines on a section of the Lacock road which has impacted on parking for parents taking small children to school, especially as town workers take up a lot of the free spaces at the moment.</p> <p>However, there has clearly been a decrease in safety with the current no waiting restrictions as the parked cars have simply relocated further down the road, into the 60mph zone, causing small children to now have to walk from their cars along a very narrow footpath next to a national speed limit road.</p>		
LR4	<p><b>Proposed restrictions will force people to parking in dangerous locations further from the school.</b></p> <p>Firstly, by extending the parking restrictions you will force parents to park further from school, to the east towards Lacock. The road bends to the south, further from school, and therefore you will be forcing parents to park on a blind bend. Not wise</p> <p>The lack of any alternative provision of parking for St Patrick's School is short sighted. As usual with changes of this kind, they will not solve the problem, but merely move it elsewhere whilst inconveniencing many.</p> <p>This proposal removes access to the schools but does not provide any alternatives to reduce the congestion or dangers. Extending the no waiting zone on Lacock Road will make it difficult to access St Patrick's Primary School and Mansion House Pre-School.</p>	12	<p>The parking restrictions on Lacock Road have been developed to allow access and egress into nearby properties and to improve the visibility issues currently caused in this area.</p> <p>The highways primary function is to allow the passing and re-passing of vehicles. Where possible on-street parking may be possible. If, however, it is deemed an issue then Wiltshire Council can take action to introduce parking restrictions.</p> <p>Wiltshire Council does not force people to park in any location which they deem unsafe; this is for the discretion of the driver.</p> <p>In the case of Lacock Road an issue has been raised concerning visibility in the area and local access, the proposal has therefore</p>

<p>This may force me to park further along the road within a 50mph zone with no road crossing facilities and I (and others) will have to contend with inadequate, poor condition footpath which offers no kerb protection whatsoever. Extremely risky to walk along with children.</p> <p>Parking is very limited already with workings in the town taking the free ones pushing the zone down into the 60 zone will be very dangerous.</p> <p>I wish to dispute the proposal for no waiting time to be placed upon the Lacock Road. This will push any parked traffic further up the road towards Lacock. There is a dangerous bend which cars fly round, very rarely adhering to the 30mph limit. Parents walking with children are constantly in danger of being hit by traffic as the footpath is so narrow.</p> <p>Any other parking would involve significantly increasing the risk of having to walk a large number of children across numerous busy roads at times of very high traffic volume.</p> <p>Simply pushing the problem down the road, which maybe slightly wider but still not wide enough to maintain traffic flow in both directions is not the answer to this problem.</p> <p>Parking is difficult enough as it is without extending the no wait area further along Lacock Road. All this will achieve is to push the problem further along the road. This will mean parents with young children having to walk even further along the narrow road.</p> <p>To impose a blanket parking restriction (and the many</p>		<p>been developed on these grounds.</p> <p>The school offer a number of alternatives for parking including a limited number of parking permits for use in Town Centre Car parks. Furthermore, the School has a travel plan which promotes walking to school where possible and car sharing for journeys which can't be walked.</p> <p>The comments received here and elsewhere in the document deem it necessary to make changes to the proposed restrictions – this is highlighted in Appendix 3.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>others proposed in Corsham) with no accompanying positive proposals will either lead to accidents (i.e. parking further down the Lacock Road on the bend) or real difficulty for some parents.</p> <p>However, if your proposal goes ahead, cars will be forced to park even further down the Lacock road, away from the new 'zig zag lights' that have been installed to try to slow traffic to 20mph. The only available parking will be away from these new measures further down the Lacock Road. Cars will park along the bend in the road, where drivers have limited vision and where small children will be put directly next to cars travelling at 60 mph.</p>		
LR5	<p><b>The restrictions do not take account of which side of the road people park on.</b></p> <p>The only pavement is on the opposite side of the road and so parents cross the road twice -. This is dangerous. The parking restrictions should be on the school side of the road or better still, a pavement put in on the school side (south) of the road.</p> <p>Would it be possible to change the double yellow lines to the opposite side of the road as the cars use this pavement to get round cars, if the parking was changed the verge is too high to mount to pass cars.</p> <p>For this scheme to make any difference at the very least it should be on both sides of the road and occasionally policed.</p>	5	<p>It is recognised that the restrictions do not take into account which side of the road people park on.</p> <p>Through the correspondence received during this consultation it is understood that most vehicles park on the south side of the road where the restrictions have been proposed.</p> <p>Wiltshire Council does not advise people where to park their vehicles. If anyone feels unsafe parking on Lacock road then they should not park there.</p> <p>It is considered that if restrictions are implemented on the south side of the road</p>



	<p>At the moment, where parents park, at least they can walk along the "soft" footpath on the school side of the road and keep their children relative safe from the traffic (as they are protected by the row of parked cars). If this proposal goes ahead, it is my belief that young children and their parents will be put at significantly greater risk of harm than they are currently.</p> <p>Therefore the council's proposal will be forcing parents to make their children cross a busy road (there are no pavements on the nearside Kerb on Lacock Road travelling towards Corsham, so anyone wanting to park, would have to cross a road which has a 60 mph limit. The road at this point is a sweeping left hand turn with overhanging trees and bushes meaning the road ahead is unsighted and dark. Children and parents would have to then walk on a narrow and uneven pavement with cars leaving Corsham accelerating into the 60mph zone.</p>		<p>that this may have an adverse impact, to which parking may start on the north side of the road.</p> <p>The comments received here and elsewhere in the document deem it necessary to make changes to the proposed restrictions – this is highlighted in Appendix 3.</p>
LR6	<p><b>Current parking restrictions are not enforced</b></p> <p>If you do increase the parking restrictions on the Lacock Road, enforced the ruling. Drivers parking illegally on the double yellow lines makes crossing the road far more dangerous than I'd it were clear or full of parked cars nose to tail, parked orderly in a line. The illegally parked cars are dangerous - enforce the law!</p> <p>However those parents who park outside the school gates on double yellow lines will not be persuaded to use a car park and will continue to do so until there is proper enforcement by police/traffic wardens.</p>	9	<p>The issue of non-enforcement will be raised with Wiltshire Council's enforcement team, who will be asked to step up their targeted enforcement within the area.</p>

	<p>Why extend the no waiting zone WHEN AT THE MOMENT THERE IS ZERO ENFORCEMENT OF THE CURRENT ZONE? Surely the effect of the current zone cannot be realised to true effect if the council have no interest in policing its current measures! Until this is done, the current zone should not be extended.</p> <p>More of Corsham Town workers park their cars along this road and a huge number of parents park on double yellow lines and the police do nothing at all even if they do turn up.</p> <p>The Lacock Road proposals look sound, the extension of double yellow lines is a good one, however they need to be enforced. there are often multiple cars parked along the double yellow lines at school drop off and pick up times. These cars make it dangerous for children crossing and walking along the road.</p> <p>There is also the possibility that due to the lack of policing of the parking restrictions, particularly during the school run, vehicles will still park on the new no waiting scheme as they know that the risk of being caught is minimal given the relatively short period of time they are parked.</p> <p>Also worth noting that the council doesn't appear to enforce its existing no waiting restrictions e.g. the ones outside the school on the Lacock Road.</p> <p>Additionally, at present we've been told that the cars that are parked on the existing double yellows cannot be penalised because the lines are obscured by leaf</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>mulch? If this is the case, could we also explore ways of enforcing the ruling better as its blatantly being ignored at present and parking has once again become very dangerous along the stretch outside the school entrance</p> <p>I do not think that increasing the amount of double yellow lines will remove the traffic from the road - indeed lots of cars ignore the waiting restrictions and there is never any traffic patrol officer monitoring those breaking the rules. Can this not be considered as a necessary step towards increasing road safety?</p>		
LR7	<p><b>There should be a designated drop off/pick up point for parents to the school.</b></p> <p>There needs to be a drop off/pick up zone for children outside their school.</p> <p>Could the council consider using parking bays so children can be dropped off but have spaces in between so traffic can pass and not be inconvenienced during school pick up drop off.</p>	2	<p>The proposals outlined in this scheme are for parking restrictions only.</p> <p>Any requests for a drop off/pick up point should be directed through the school in the first case for consideration.</p> <p>It is noticed that the Local School has a school travel plans and would like to reduce the number of car journeys to the school where possible. The introduction of a drop off point would counteract this school travel plan and increase the number of vehicles in the area.</p>
LR8	<p><b>Further Restrictions are required past the school</b></p> <p>Also there needs to be double yellows and no parking or stopping all past the school</p>	5	<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 (i.e.:</p>

	<p>A half hour limit on the parking outside the Alms houses and to the left of St Patrick's would help to relieve the school parking.</p> <p>Therefore we would like you to consider a 'no waiting or parking' area to also be put outside of the rugby club gates running approximately 15 meters in each direction. As a club providing sport for the community and running teams from U6 through to U18 as well as two senior teams we have a duty of care to ensure our club entrance is kept free so that emergency services can gain unrestricted access and also that persons entering and exiting the premises are able to do so as safely as possible.</p>		<p>further restrictions, longer hours) without recommencing the legal procedure by consulting and re-advertising the restrictions.</p> <p>Any further requests for parking controls should be directed to the local Town Council as part of the Town Centre Parking Review Procedure.</p>
LR9	<p><b>Free parking within the Town Centre is required.</b></p> <p>It is my strong opinion that these changes should be delayed until, at least, a sensible alternative parking solution is provided for school drop off and pick up. This should include free parking in town car parks (removed in 2007) either full time or, failing that, at school run times.</p> <p>Introducing free parking before 09:00 would encourage the use of the car parks although these are generally full (the one by the Methuen Arms certainly is).</p> <p>Also we need a return to an hour or even 1/2 hour free</p>	5	<p>The local school already offers a limited number of parking permits which can be used in Town Centre Car Parks.</p> <p>The introduction of free car parking in town centres as a general rule is beyond the scope of this scheme and should be raised with the local Town Council who can prioritise this should they see it necessary.</p>

	<p>parking in town to reduce congestion on Lacock road. The new gate and path is perfect but more people would use this if they could park for free.</p> <p>I would suggest that one obvious change could be more use could be made of the High Street Car park, near the Methuen Arms, and if parents were issued with 'free parking permits' for limited times of the day perhaps they could be encouraged to use the car park and walk a little further into the school.</p> <p>Suggest that to encourage parking away from the school, parking charges in public car parks need to be suspended during school drop off and collection times or a strict time limit imposed on waiting times.</p>		
LR10	<p><b>Proposed restrictions will make the road unsafe.</b></p> <p>I think making Lacock road into a clearway with no waiting will make the road far more dangerous. Cars parked along the road make traffic slow down as its turns it into a single carriage way. I do not think this will stop with the introduction of more double yellows it will push the problem closer to school gates and make it a more dangerous situation.</p> <p>The pavement from the Lacock Road (cemetery?) car park to the schools is too narrow and not safe for children to be walking along in a national speed limit area.</p> <p>Without the cars parking up for school I think this will</p>	12	<p>The proposed restrictions are to stop parking in certain locations. Wiltshire Council is not forcing anyone to park in an unsafe location. Driver discretion should be exercised when deciding the most appropriate place to park their vehicle.</p> <p>Lacock Road currently has speed limit in place to slow vehicles down. Whilst it is recognised that in some cases the removal of parked cars can lead to increased traffic speeds. This must be considered alongside the visibility issues caused by parked cars that drivers need to contend with.</p> <p>The enforcement of speed limits currently sit</p>

<p>make other drivers speed in the 20 zone and it's so dangerous to walk along that pavement</p> <p>If this happens, you will force children to have to park further up the road; with the danger of the cars speeding as there is no cars parked to slow them down. This road is known for cars trying to go faster and the parked cars force them to slow.</p> <p>This would be too dangerous for a no parking zone on the Lacock Road safety of the kids it what is most important here. Cars will drive faster if no cars are there as they do before they approach the parked cars.</p> <p>It would be extremely dangerous to put double yellow lines further along the Lacock Road as parents who need to drive to drop their children at school will be forced to park further along (out of Corsham) where the road becomes national speed limit. The pavement is narrow and walking children along there will be extremely dangerous.</p> <p>The car parking along the side of the road actually slows passing cars down. If a car sees an open stretch of road they will put their foot down increasing speeding in the area.</p> <p>Simply making the south side of the road no waiting at any time will result in the vehicles being parked on the unrestricted north side of the road and the road will still be partially blocked preventing traffic flow. Some may well argue that it is worsened as the vehicles travelling along the road will not be able to mount the pavement to get passed.</p>		<p>with Wiltshire Police to enforce. Any reports of speeding should be directed in this way.</p> <p>The comments received here and elsewhere in the document deem it necessary to make changes to the proposed restrictions – this is highlighted in Appendix 3.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>This will have significant impact on St Patrick's School parents and increase risk to children and parents crossing Lacock Road at morning drop off and pick up times.</p> <p>The council's recommendation will endanger the lives of a large number of school children and potentially their parents, by forcing cars away from a section of Lacock Road which is closest to the school and onto a section of road with a high speed limit, with poor visibility and lighting and dangerous pavements.</p> <p>Hazardous/unsafe parking as a result. To have to park within the national speed limit, on what is a dangerous and blind bend will without doubt; put the safety of parents and children in danger. Although a speed limit is in force, I have witnessed cars speed along far in excess of the limit.</p> <p>Parents would end up parking further up the road which falls under the national speed limit, and it would be dangerous for both pedestrians and motorists if this happened. It is on a bend so visibility is poor, there is only a pavement on one side and it is an accident waiting to happen if this became the option for parents. We would feel that parents will be coerced into this scenario directly if the proposal went ahead due to the Council's actions</p>		
LR11	<p><b>Where are parents expected to park/drop off students to the school?</b></p> <p>Even with the current available parking area (which you</p>	14	<p>It is understood that available parking near to the school is at a minimum.</p> <p>The proposed restrictions were advertised</p>

<p>plan to decrease) at peak school run times both the Methuen and the Coop car park can be full. I do not believe that there is enough Town parking to accommodate the cars that will be affected by your proposed measures.</p> <p>For the last 5 years I have regularly picked up my grandchildren and I expect to be able to park outside their school. I work fulltime and therefore have time restrictions when picking them up. If I was to have to park elsewhere it would make things extremely difficult indeed.</p> <p>I do not feel it is acceptable to park a distance away. I feel it is essential that parking is available outside the school for a number of reasons such as, weather conditions, lack of ability to walk long distances, safety and the right.</p> <p>In my opinion the non-considerate drivers are causing those of us who choose to abide by the rules to be penalised. I travel from Melksham to bring my children to school and Am required to be at work myself by 9am. I would not have enough time to park in the town centre car park, walk my children to school , walk back to my car and drive to work to get there in time for 9 o'clock as the school gates do not open until 8:40</p> <p>Having the ability to park on Lacock Road during times of school drop off and pick up is essential as there is not enough parking available within a reasonable walking distance of St Patrick's school to cater for this</p>		<p>to improve access and visibility in the area and not to remove on-road parking for no reason.</p> <p>Considering the available parking spaces and large catchment of the school it is considered appropriate to make changes to the original proposal - the changes s are highlighted in Appendix 3.</p>
--	--	---



	<p>busy time and for individuals parking/working in Corsham town.</p> <p>I don't think that making this part of Lacock Road 'no waiting at any time' will serve anyone very well and will surely just displace traffic to other parts of Corsham.</p> <p>I have to travel more than 5 miles to St Patricks primary School as it is the nearest catholic school in the area. Therefore I would expect to be able to park outside it.</p> <p>This proposal will not benefit anyone. I am a parent of a child that attends St. Patricks Primary School &amp; with nowhere to stop, I will not be able to drop him off and get to work on time.</p> <p>As a parent of a child that attends the school, there is no parking nearby. Solution proposed appears to be to use the car park near the cemetery but that is a very long walk for small children.</p> <p>I occasionally need to park on Lacock Road as my daughter attends St Patrick's school &amp; I also have to drop my son at his childminders once a week which is the other end of Corsham. So due to the time constraint the only way I can do both in the time I have is to drive &amp; park on Lacock Road. Putting double yellow lines there would mean I would be unable to get my daughter to school on time on those days.</p> <p>There is no alternate on street parking, and car parking in Corsham town centre is expensive and there is not the capacity in the High Street car park to allow for the</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>number of car spaces which the proposal will remove. A car park which is further along Lacock Road, which belongs to Corsham Court, is (according to Google maps) 0.4 of a mile from the school and an 8 minute walk along the narrow, badly made up pavement.</p> <p>No option for reducing traffic to the school. As has been previously pointed out, our school also serves children from outside Corsham, and you will remember that some years ago, Wiltshire Council withdrew funding for coach transport for children attending this school. These children's parents now have no option but to drive their children to school - they will have nowhere to park with safety while they see their children safely into school (much town car parking is (quite rightly) taken up by those who work in town.</p> <p>If this proposal was to go ahead, there would literally be no parking anywhere for any parents bringing their children safely to school. We have tried to raise funds to install a turning circle on our land which would mean alleviation of the issues on the road, but it is too expensive and we cannot raise the funds needed. Therefore this proposal if it went ahead would be disastrous for our school community.</p> <p>There is no other available parking near the school. The short stay car park in Corsham, behind the Methuen Arms, is already full at school drop off time with no further space for additional cars. It is a fact of life that parents drop their children at school and then go on to work, meaning they have to drive as there is no time for parents to be walking an additional 20 minutes (10 minutes each way) to use one of the other town centre car parks and so inevitably parents must park outside</p>		
--	--	--	--

	the school.		
LR12	<p><b>Wiltshire Council Discrimination</b></p> <p>Wiltshire council seem hell bent on killing of faith schools in the county; at first you take away bus transport which has made a big impact on the roads and now act to deny parents parking on a stretch of road near the school. I'd like to object and wonder when is this discrimination going to end.</p>	1	<p>Wiltshire Council as part of this proposal was simply exercising its power to introduce new parking restrictions.</p> <p>The request has been made by the Local Corsham Community as a parking problem location. It was therefore taken forward and advertised by Wiltshire Council. This is the same procedure that would be followed anywhere in the county regardless of the amenities nearby.</p>
LR13	<p><b>Support for proposal</b></p> <p>On behalf of the rugby club we welcome this proposal as it clearly is attempting to provide the children of St Patrick's School a safe route to school.</p> <p>I am writing in my capacity as Secretary of Corsham Rugby Football Club. On behalf of the rugby club we welcome this proposal as it clearly is attempting to provide the children of St Patrick's School a safe route to school</p>	3	Comments of Support are Noted.
LR14	<p><b>Has School travel plan being taken into account.</b></p> <p>St Patrick's has completed and submitted a travel plan to Wiltshire Council - has this been taken into account?</p> <p>St Patrick's has a Travel Plan which we submitted to</p>	2	<p>The School Travel Plan and the schools continued communications with parents concerning parking arrangements has been taken into account.</p> <p>Whilst the School Travel Plan promotes</p>

	<p>the Council Our catchment covers Corsham and surrounding towns and villages as we are a Catholic School and use Parishes as our boundaries, hence we have children coming from as far as Bradford On Avon and Melksham to the school.</p>		<p>healthy ways of travelling to school including walking where possible, it is understood that this is not always possible.</p>
LR15	<p><b>No contact has been made to discuss options with St Patricks school</b></p> <p>I am the Vice Chair of Govenors at St Patrick's Catholic Primary School on the Lacock Road in Corsham. I have been made aware today of the proposed restrictions on the Lacock Road via a parent. The council did not send the school any notification of this proposal of which I am aware, which I think is madness due to the impact it would have on our school.</p>	1	<p>When advertising proposed parking restrictions, Wiltshire Council follows a set procedure. The advertisement will be put in the local paper, online and also hard copies posted on nearby furniture.</p> <p>Whilst it is recognised that no formal contact was made with the school during the advertisement stage. We have still received a large amount of correspondence from those with interest in the school. Unfortunately, due to the number of parking restrictions Wiltshire Council implements each year it would be highly difficult to consult on a one to one basis with all of those that maybe impacted.</p>

## Lypiatt Road

Ref	Comment Received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
LY1	<p><b>The proposal appears extensive and would be of little benefit to the residents in the area.</b></p> <p>It would seem to me that we can achieve the objective of making the junction safer but also respect the needs of local residents (on Pound Pill) for on-road parking with a 15-20 metre length of restriction. I hope this can be considered.</p> <p>The extent of the restrictions will reduce the parking places for local residents and move the available parking further up Lypiatt Road. This will make it a greater distance to carry shopping and luggage for the residents of Pound Pill, such as myself. In general, I avoid unloading outside my house at 11 Pound Pill as it causes congestion and annoyance to the traffic there.</p>	2	<p>The proposed restrictions on Lypiatt Road / Pound Pill have been put forward to remove obstructions at the junctions in the area. It is anticipated that should the restrictions be installed then manoeuvring around both junctions will be improved.</p> <p>The proposed restrictions are minimal in terms of parking spaces lost. It is considered that there will still be a large area suitable for on-road parking even with the introduction of proposed restrictions.</p>
LY2	<p><b>Parked cars help to reduce speed along this road</b></p> <p>Cars often tend to be driven too fast along Lypiatt Road when there are no cars parked but parked cars have the effect of reducing the speed.</p>	1	<p>It is recognised that in some cases parked vehicles do have the effect of slowing down moving vehicles. However, the proposed restrictions around junctions look to balance the need for parked cars with the need for visibility when pulling in and out of junctions.</p>

<p><b>LY3</b></p>	<p><b>Extent of Restrictions seem unnecessary</b></p> <p>I thought we were simply going to restrict parking on the first 10 metres which would ensure that illegal parking didn't take place adjacent to the junction on the south side of Lypiatt Road (which I believe is within 10 metres of a junction?). I certainly don't want to lose this restriction altogether but are we able to compromise and shorten the length of the restriction to 10 -20 metres from the junction?</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>It is considered appropriate for the restriction which is being extended to protect the junction to match that on the north side of the road.</p> <p>The amendment to the proposed restriction can be found in Appendix 3.</p>
-------------------	--	----------	---

## Park Lane

Ref	Comment Received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
PL1	<p><b>The proposed restrictions will have a detrimental effect on the nearby St Patrick's Roman Catholic Church.</b></p> <p>The proposed parking restrictions for Park Lane will have a limited detrimental impact on the congregation of St Patrick's Church. In particular, during weekend services (Saturday evening &amp; Sunday morning) and, especially so, during the main Christian events of Easter &amp; Christmas, when the congregation increases exponentially!</p>	1	<p>The proposed restrictions on Park Lane have been put forward to protect the junction with Purleigh Road where currently vehicles have problems when exiting the junction.</p> <p>Whilst it is recognised that the proposed restrictions will take away car parking locations this is done so on a safety basis. There is plenty of on-street parking available in the nearby area that is away from the junctions.</p>
PL2	<p><b>Further parking is required in the area to alleviate the pressure on the church at peak times</b></p> <p>We will endeavour to inform our parishioners and to manage our parking in regard to any new restrictions. However, we would urge the local council to consider providing additional parking on the triangular grass verge to the east-side of the business park and between the intersections of the A4 &amp; Park Lane. Such additional parking would greatly improve the safety of both St Patrick's Parish and the users of the business park.</p>	1	<p>Unfortunately, this scheme is dealing with the proposed introduction of parking restrictions in and around Corsham. It is outside the scope of this project to provide parking arrangements.</p> <p>A new parking area would be for the local business park and church to consider and not for Wiltshire Council to deliver at this current stage.</p>

<p>PL3</p>	<p><b>New developments nearby are going to cause the parking issue to get even worse.</b></p> <p>St Patrick's Parish is also concerned about the residential development planned for the north-side of the A4, opposite the church grounds. We fear that this development will, in the long term, have further detrimental impact to the congregation and additional parking, as suggested, may go some way to alleviate such concerns.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Each planning permission will look at highway considerations including parking and make the necessary comments.</p> <p>Any comments concerning new developments should be directed through the official planning process where the comments will be taken into consideration before a decision is made.</p>
------------	---	----------	--



## Paul Street

Ref	Comment Received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
PS1	<p><b>Could the restrictions be reduced to allow for extra car parking spaces</b></p> <p>I welcome this Proposal but wonder whether there is scope to allow parking south of my drive just before the turning circle so that a current street parking space is not lost to residents without drives.</p>	1	<p>Whilst the request appears understandable the removal of restriction at this location would reduce the effectiveness of the turning head which is trying to be protected.</p> <p>Furthermore. the space would be available for anyone who wanted to park there and would not be specifically reserved for residents.</p>
PS2	<p><b>Notices were not displayed within the street where restrictions are proposed.</b></p> <p>Also, this Proposal is not displayed in Paul Street so residents may not be aware.</p>	1	<p>It is Wiltshire Council practice to display notices in the street where they are proposed. They would also be made available in the local paper and also online.</p> <p>The point will be raised with our traffic order team concerning no site notices in Paul Street itself.</p>

## Pound Pill

Ref	Comment Received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
PP1	<p><b>Proposed parking restrictions will only make current parking situation more difficult.</b></p> <p>Creating further parking restrictions is neither supportive to parents, carers, children or the school when there are already parking concerns.</p>	1	<p>It is recognised that increased parking restrictions will lead to less options for those wanting to park in the area.</p> <p>That being said the extension of restrictions is minimal and is not being proposed to remove mass parking but rather to provide better visibility in the area.</p>
PP2	<p><b>A larger scheme should be advertised to adequately counter the issues presented in this area.</b></p> <p>This scheme should be scrapped / revoked and new scheme presented in which the whole section of road between the Lacock Road and The Old School Yard should be a 'No waiting at any time' zone on both sides of the road.</p>	1	<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 (i.e.: further restrictions, longer hours) without recommencing the legal procedure by consulting and re-advertising the restrictions.</p>
PP3	<p><b>Alternative parking is available nearby</b></p> <p>After all alternative public car parking is available nearby in the High Street and Main Town car parks along with some spaces in Station Road alongside the</p>	1	<p>It is not the intention of this proposal to remove all available parking options in this area but rather to improve the sight lines for those pulling in and out of their access.</p>

	cricket grounds.		Anyone is welcome to park in the nearby parking amenities should they wish to.
PP4	<p><b>Parking spaces should be removed on busy road to improve traffic flow</b></p> <p>I am aware of the arguments that parking spaces will be lost, which I acknowledge is a shame. However the reality should be acknowledged that compromises have to be made with volume of traffic using our road system and that it is not in the general public interest to have such a small number of spaces causing a bottleneck reducing a main artillery two way carriageway to a single carriageway.</p>	1	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 (i.e.: further restrictions, longer hours) without recommencing the legal procedure by consulting and re-advertising the restrictions.
PP5	<p><b>Vehicles do not park in this area and therefore the proposed restrictions are not necessary</b></p> <p>I don't recall seeing vehicles parked on the part of Prospect indicated on the plan so it seems a waste of time going to the expense of introducing restrictions there.</p>	1	<p>It is evident by the request and backing from the local council that parking does occur in this area.</p> <p>The proposal will aid those using the access onto the road.</p>

## Priory Street

Ref	Comment Received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
PR1	<p><b>The proposed restrictions will remove parking spaces for those who are unable to park cars off the road.</b></p> <p>The additional non waiting around the entrance to new priory road and 118 to 114 priory street is of Concern. Living very close to this section I have never experienced any problems with this short section of effectively single carriageway between the two lines of parked cars and people sensibly give way in each direction and buses lorries etc. have no difficulty navigating through this section. The introduction of the no waiting is unnecessary and will remove a number of important parking spaces to an area with a lot of properties with no off road parking and very little alternative parking nearby.</p> <p>We need more parking spaces, not fewer. If the proposals go ahead we will lose 4 spaces in this one area alone</p> <p>To my shock I now discover that you are to put more parking restrictions at the top end of the street, i.e. where the police station used to be. This will only move more cars down into the middle of the street.</p>	4	<p>It is recognised that the introduction of new parking restrictions will reduce the number of available parking spaces. This is the nature of the proposal.</p> <p>It is also understood that many of the properties along Priory New Road do not have alternative parking arrangements.</p> <p>The proposal was developed to protect junctions and accesses to improve visibility for those using the areas.</p>

	<p>I wish at this stage to provide my feedback as there is already an issue with lack of parking available especially during evenings, overnight and weekends for the residents of this area. A number of cars use the current areas to park who don't live in the immediate vicinity of the allowed parking areas on the road due to parking restrictions further down Priory St. you are now proposing to make the situation even more difficult by substantially reducing the parking available yet again.</p>		
PR2	<p><b>Extent of restrictions should be increased to tie in with other restrictions in the immediate vicinity.</b></p> <p>This end of Priory Street would be much safer if the proposed no waiting at any time near Priory New Road and around the corner of the junction between Priory Street and Kings Avenue were elongated to meet each other.</p>	1	<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 (i.e.: further restrictions, longer hours) without recommencing the legal procedure by consulting and re-advertising the restrictions.</p>
PR3	<p><b>Restrictions should extend into new residential area within Kings avenue to stop the displacement parking that will inevitably happen</b></p> <p>The little road leading into the new development which was the police station is private property. Therefore the no waiting at any time should also be extended into this section of road to stop people from parking there who have been displaced by the new road markings. Not only would this cause further issues as children also play along this section of tarmac, it is in fact private property and any persons parking there who do not live in the houses would be trespassing.</p>	1	<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 (i.e.: further restrictions, longer hours) without recommencing the legal procedure by consulting and re-advertising the restrictions.</p>

PR4	<p><b>The proposed restrictions will only benefit a few residents within Priory New Road and not those located along Priory street itself.</b></p> <p>There have not been any accidents at this spot and it appears to be for the convenience of a couple of houses that will impact on the whole of the rest of the street.</p>	1	<p>The proposed restrictions are to help protect junctions and accesses in the area. Regardless of the number of people using the junction anyone has the same Highway rights to be able to pass and re-pass without obstruction.</p>
PR5	<p><b>Proposed Parking Restrictions will result in increased speeding along this stretch of Priory street.</b></p> <p>Also, the proposed changes will probably have the effect of encouraging drivers to speed along this stretch, something that already happens but is inhibited somewhat by cars on both sides of the road.</p>	1	<p>In some circumstances speeding may occur where parked vehicles are being removed.</p> <p>Priory Street is a 30mph speed limit and will continue to be so. Any issues with speeding should be reported to Wiltshire Police who can take enforcement action.</p> <p>The removal of vehicles will improve the visibility in the area which is a balance that has to be found between leaving vehicles parked in obstructive positions or complete removal.</p>
PR6	<p><b>The issue could be dealt with locally if residents of New Priory Street trimmed back vegetation to improve sight lines in the area.</b></p> <p>I feel that it would be a waste of public finances to do this when they have not tried to improve the situation by trimming the extensive vegetation they have planted at the mouth of the road. If the hedges were cut back it would make a massive difference and would not cause disruption to</p>	1	<p>Whilst the cutting back of vegetation would certainly improve some of the visibility issues in the area, it would not completely solve the problems experienced.</p> <p>There is a wide footway between the road and access which has to be travelled across before entering the main highway of which parked cars would still cause an obstruction.</p>

	the residents who have to park on Priory Street.		
PR7	<p><b>A survey needs to be undertaken within Priory street to understand the requirements of those living in the road.</b></p> <p>Could I please ask if, before any more restrictions are introduced, that a survey of parking in the whole of Priory Street is undertaken.</p>	1	<p>The parking restrictions in Priory Street are being considered as part of the Town Centre Parking Review 2016/17. These schemes involve the decision making of the local town council.</p> <p>It would be impractical to carry out a survey at every location for parking restrictions, considering the large number that Wiltshire Council delivers each year.</p> <p>This consultation acts in part as a survey to understand the objections to any new restrictions.</p>
PR8	<p><b>A Residents parking scheme is required in Priory street to solve the current parking problems.</b></p> <p>Would it be possible to give out residents' parking permit? I suggest this as (only this morning) someone told me they park in the street when visiting the vet in the High Street.</p> <p>Can I please request that you review this increase in restriction and also consider other alternatives to relieve the parking issues such as a Residents Parking Only Permit scheme for this area with maybe residents being able to apply for a maximum of 2 permits per household. In this way you will be limiting the migration of the parking issue into surrounding areas.</p>	2	<p>There are a number of criteria and requirements to be met when developing residents parking zone, including sufficient support for a scheme to make it self-funding, this is achieved through a lengthy process of consultation. The revenue raised from the take up of permits for a scheme has to be able to fund the implementation and enforcement of the project, residents' parking schemes should basically only be implemented at a nil cost to the Highway Authority as it is not the Highway Authorities responsibility to provide on street parking.</p> <p>The first stage would be to understand the</p>

			<p>favourableness of a residents' parking scheme within the road, if this is something that the vast majority of the road would like, then it may be worth taking forward to the Town Council. From this point the Town Council can choose to take the matter forward to the CATG meeting (Community Area Transport Group) as a proposed future scheme.</p>
PR9	<p><b>The increased restrictions either side of Priory New Road are unnecessary and will cause strain on the local residents</b></p> <p>I completely understand and agree with replacing the white lines (which people now park over) with double yellow lines, however the increase each way by 10m causes less parking to be available for all residents who currently have no off-road parking available to them, but particularly immediately outside the row of terrace houses for 112-116.</p>	1	<p>The restrictions on Priory Road near to Priory New Road are not being implemented to remove mass parking availability for residents but rather the improve the visibility for those using the junction.</p> <p>There is already an advisory white bar marking in place which has not provided enough awareness in the local area hence the requirement for an enforceable restriction.</p>



## Station Road

Ref	Comment Received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
SR1	<p><b>Proposed Restrictions will directly hit local businesses</b></p> <p>Established local business, station road garage, will directly be impacted by the reduced parking spaces available on station and stokes road. Customers use these roads to drop off and local their cars for serving and repairs by this thriving local business, supplying a fantastic service and providing skilled local employment. By reducing the parking option available will directly impact the survival of this local firm.</p>	1	<p>The highways primary function is to allow vehicles to pass and re-pass. The current issues in Station Road mean that this is not always possible and as such parking restrictions have been proposed.</p> <p>The parking restrictions are to enable the free movement of traffic at pinch points and to improve the overall visibility.</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that this proposal will remove parking spaces that may be used by business in the local area, it does not remove all parking in the area.</p>
SR2	<p><b>Proposed Restrictions do not go far enough</b></p> <p>On Station Road between the "works" (car garage) and the junction with South Street, this should surely impose waiting restrictions at all times on both sides of the road. This is particularly narrow and presents a regular difficulty to bus drivers negotiating this stretch when any vehicle is parked. Proximity to the junction is ignored, parking on the pavement may slightly ease passage for the bus but at inconvenience and risk to pedestrians on a very narrow path and risk to a the safety of a bling lady living nearby.</p> <p>Please can you consider continuing the double yellow</p>	3	<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 (i.e.: further restrictions, longer hours) without recommencing the legal procedure by consulting and re-advertising the restrictions.</p>

	<p>lines from outside number 51 along to number 59 Station Road. The road is particularly narrow here, and with buses and the increase in heavy lorries driving along here the road gets very congested, and delays are caused when vehicles are parked along here. If this is not possible can you consider no parking between the hours of 9am and 6pm between numbers 51 and 59? Also outside number 61.</p> <p>I am in complete agreement with my neighbours who have sent you an email as to extending the double yellow lines, or at least having no parking between 9am and 6pm.</p>		
SR3	<p><b>Enforcement is required in the area for the current restrictions.</b></p> <p>Enforcement is required, the yellow lines cover parking here on the pavement, being on the public highway.</p>	1	Should a traffic order be passed and restrictions implemented in this area. Wiltshire Council's parking team will be made aware who will then be able to provide a targeted approach to enforcement in the area.
SR4	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p>We totally agree with the proposed parking restrictions in Stokes Road/Station Road. We have been saying for ages that it is dangerous crossing the road along here, and we are so pleased the Council is addressing some of our concerns but we feel the important suggestions we have made should also be put in place</p>	1	Comments of Support are Noted.

SR5	<p><b>Increased traffic calming/awareness is required in the are to increase safety.</b></p> <p>Where you intend putting in double yellow lines, there is a dropped kerb and one opposite where many mums with pushchairs and a man in a wheelchair cross the busy road. This dropped kerb needs some paving slabs by the side of it to indicate this is a crossing in line with other such areas in Corsham.</p>	1	<p>This consultation is dealing with the potential introduction of parking restrictions in the Corsham area. It is unfortunately not able to consider further requests such as traffic calming.</p> <p>Any new requests for traffic calming should be directed through the local CATG team for local consideration and development.</p>
-----	---	---	---

## Stokes Road

Ref	Comment Received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
ST1	<p><b>Recent planning permission decisions paired with proposed restrictions is going to make parking situation more difficult.</b></p> <p>Additionally, despite local objections, planning permission was recently given to turn the old sorting office on stokes road; into a nursery. One area of concern was increased traffic and parking during peak pick up and collection. The proposed parking restrictions further prove the short-sightedness of the local council and ignoring concerns of local residents.</p>	1	<p>The proposed restrictions have been developed alongside the Town Council through the Town Centre Parking Review which is a community driven scheme to help aid parking issues in an area.</p> <p>It is recognised that with any new parking restrictions there will be an element of displacement for vehicles who normally park in that area. That being said the restrictions in Stokes Road are minimal and do not seek to remove parking spaces for the sake of it but rather to improve the visibility in the area.</p>
ST2	<p><b>The proposed restrictions will do little to stop the obstructive parking currently experienced within the road.</b></p> <p>We have specific serious concern that the proposal appears to do nothing to alleviate frequent very hazardous blocking of vision of oncoming traffic from vehicles departing from our driveway. Vision to the left is blocked by vehicle(s) parked on a pavement area behind existing double yellow lines and to the right as a</p>	1	<p>Parking behind double yellow lines still constitutes the highway and is therefore enforceable under the traffic order which places restrictions on that road.</p> <p>Any new requests for further restrictions should be made to the local Town Council for consideration in the next review.</p> <p>Any requests for parking enforcement</p>

	result of vehicle(s) parked in existing permitted parking spaces.		should be made to Wiltshire Council's parking team who will be able to enforce in the area.
ST3	<p><b>Who is going to enforce the proposed parking restrictions?</b></p> <p>We further seek clarity as to who will monitor and police the restrictions implemented overall following this consultation and how they may be contacted.</p>	1	Wiltshire Council is responsible for parking enforcement where restrictions are in place. Should the restrictions be installed in this area then the parking services team will provide a targeted approach to enforcement in the area.
ST4	<p><b>Existing Restrictions in the area are badly faded and need maintaining.</b></p> <p>Finally, existing important road markings on the Station Road and Stokes Road junction are almost completely worn out and double yellow lines in front of the Wilderness driveway partially removed by utility roadworks contract activity and not replaced.</p>	1	Should the proposed restrictions be implemented in this area then Wiltshire Council will also carry out local refurbishment to those lines in need.
ST5	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p>I would recommend that double yellow lines be applied on one side to the length of Stokes Road and some enforcement would not go amiss.</p>	1	Comments of Support are Noted.

## The Tynings

Ref	Comment Received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
TY1	<p><b>Proposed restrictions will do little to stop the real issue here.</b></p> <p>Parents will still come along and ignore the yellow lines so congestion will be just the same. They stop for a few seconds and let their kids out and then go. Maybe a "no access to school" sign at the end of the road would be more beneficial and maybe deter parents from coming down the street</p> <p>The proposals will serve no useful purpose in reducing any congestion or drive blocking; they are a disproportionate response to what is now a minor inconvenience and they will waste limited financial funding and resources.</p> <p>My belief is that this will create 2 new temporary parking spaces for drop-offs and actually increase congestion during term time, the opposite of what you are hoping to achieve-under The RTRA 1984 sections 32 &amp; 35.</p> <p>As acknowledged above there have been fairly serious congestion issues in the past however much has changed since the original issues were raised back in 2013 and whilst we do still have occasional congestion it is more of an inconvenience / irritation rather than a</p>	4	<p>The restrictions proposed would look to stop parking in the area. If the main issue as suggested from response to this consultation is from vehicles dropping off rather than parking – it will then be very difficult to enforce even with a targeted approach.</p> <p>The initial request and response was due to vehicles obstructing accesses. The proposal as advertised will move obstruction into the accesses.</p> <p>It is understood from the responses received that the request may well be outdated. This will be considered when making a decision.</p>

	<p>problem and now in 2017 there is NO significant problem to address.</p>		
TY2	<p><b>Residents can't afford to lose parking spaces in this area – no alternative to park within</b></p> <p>The double yellow lines just take away 2 precious parking spaces which we can't afford to lose! Parking is already a nightmare along this road, with shoppers and workers parking here, along with numerous S&amp;K Auto cars and their workers vans who seem to think The Tynings is their overflow carpark.</p> <p>The proposal is ridiculous! This will just move the problem, How many more parking spaces are we going to lose in The Tynings?</p> <p>The introduction of further restrictions will have a significant impact on the local residents preventing them from parking across their drives and more seriously, will also reduce the on street parking which is permanently used by the local residents, town visitors and local business people.</p> <p>I live in The Tynings and not directly affected by the proposal, however I am opposed to losing yet another road parking space. This proposal to my mind does not serve any useful purpose for the community.</p> <p>We feel this proposal will just increase the pressure of</p>	9	<p>Residents of The Tynings are fortunate in that there is off-road parking available for all properties. Therefore, the loss of on-road parking whilst it may not be popular will not remove all parking for the residents of The Tynings.</p> <p>The proposed restrictions are an extension of 13 metres on the west hand side of the road. Of the 13 metre extension at least 5 metres is dropped kerb access which should not be parked across at any time. There is another small section between the dropped kerbs which would not be suitable for a parked car. The proposed restriction therefore removes around 4 metres of acceptable car parking space the equivalent of one vehicle.</p> <p>It is recognised that in general there is little support for further restrictions in The Tynings.</p>

	<p>parking on the rest of the residence in the street. As parking in the street is often inconsiderate to the residents putting further restrictions in place can only exacerbate the situation. Therefore, we object to the road markings.</p> <p>Although we have asked for a white bar across the drive due to obstructive parking (it was turned down) we would be against this proposal. It appears to remove some legitimate parking space. We or guests have sometimes to park across our drive which would become illegal under the proposals.</p> <p>The proposed restriction will unfairly penalise residents of the Tynings throughout the year just to accommodate school opening and closing times and those people who continue to use The Tynings for dropping their children off at school.</p> <p>At the current time my view is that I object strongly to the proposal as when my family or friends visit, there will be no parking outside of my residence.</p> <p>Also the introduction of further restrictions will also have a significant impact on the local residents as it will prevent the owners of the two houses from parking across their drives and it will also reduce the on street parking which is extensively used by the local residents, workers &amp; visitors to the town and local business people.</p>		
--	---	--	--



<p>TY3</p>	<p><b>The road should be a residents parking only area to stop commercial vehicles and school traffic parking within the road</b></p> <p>We have widened our drive to accommodate our own cars, but when our visitors come they have to park and pay in the car park. Residential parking only!, Stop S&amp;K Auto's parking here,!!!! and also at the bottom of the Tynings the double yellows do nothing but make it dangerous.</p> <p>Parking on The Tynings is restricted and can be difficult for residents and guests. Certain businesses use the road as a car park.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>There are a number of criteria and requirements to be met when developing residents parking zone, including sufficient support for a scheme to make it self-funding, this is achieved through a lengthy process of consultation. The revenue raised from the take up of permits for a scheme has to be able to fund the implementation and enforcement of the project, residents parking schemes should basically only be implemented at a nil cost to the Highway Authority as it is not the Highway Authorities responsibility to provide on-street parking.</p> <p>The first stage would be to understand the favourableness of a residents' parking scheme within the road, if this is something that the vast majority of the road would like, then it may be worth taking forward to the Town Council. From this point the Town Council can choose to take the matter forward to the CATG meeting (Community Area Transport Group) as a proposed future scheme.</p>
<p>TY4</p>	<p><b>Will the new restrictions be enforced to stop the ongoing issues already experienced</b></p> <p>As for the school drop off and pick up, it is quite laughable to stand and watch the struggle coming in and going out, and as for blocking our drive it is a disgrace... Who will police and enforce your decision? Please help!</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>The responsibility for enforcement sits with Wiltshire Council's parking team. Any requests for targeted enforcement should be directed to the parking services team.</p> <p>Should the proposed restrictions be implemented, a message will be sent to the parking services team who can then step up</p>

	<p>The majority of parents ignore the existing double yellow lines parking on them irrespective if they are across peoples drives or not. The parents know that there is no policing to stop them illegally parking and will therefore 'get away' with ignoring them.</p> <p>We would encourage the council to enforce existing waiting restrictions which doesn't seem to happen.</p> <p>It is highly unlikely that the restrictions will be policed. Unless there is a permanent parking warden in attendance during school time people will take the risk and park there. It's human nature.</p> <p>The current parking restrictions have been ignored since being put down and there is nothing in this proposal which will change this so extending them is a complete waste of limited public money and resources. The only way to stop the current parent behaviour completely would be to have a physical policing presence (i.e. traffic warden or policeman) handing out penalty notices to people flouting the parking restrictions.</p>		<p>enforcement.</p> <p>It is not an option to provide a full time parking attendant in the area. The resources unfortunately do not stretch that far and a targeted approach at key times will be used.</p>
TY5	<p><b>The school traffic in the area is minimal and drastic restrictions are not required.</b></p> <p>The level of school traffic using The Tynings has reduced, as it is using other school entrances, resulting congestion being significantly reduced to a 'tolerable' level with the occasional minor congestion whilst traffic is turning around.</p>	1	<p>Whilst school traffic is acknowledged as occurring in the area, the restrictions would look to protect the accesses they cover at all times and not just during the school rush.</p> <p>Following a response from Corsham School it is recognised that steps have been taken and continue to be taken in order to enable</p>

	<p>The bulk of school run traffic arrives close to school start / finish times and any inconvenience caused only lasts for about 10 minutes maximum, twice a day and only 5 days per week and during school term time.</p>		<p>the best drop off and pick up procedure at the school.</p>
TY6	<p><b>The request is outdated and came from a former resident of the road who no longer resides within the Tynings</b></p> <p>We believe this proposal has come about due to a complaint raised by a resident who has since left the street. Therefore, is this still relevant?</p> <p>I understand that this has been put in train by a request made some years ago. I am objecting because we will be losing a parking space outside my house only and I can see no reason for this.</p> <p>I have been advised by the local Corsham Town Council that this proposal is responding to a single issue raised back in 2013 by one of the residents regarding parked cars across their drive. The issue was apparently raised by the occupants of one of the houses covered in this proposal (No's 32 &amp; 34). Having discussed the issue with the current owners of both these houses neither appears to have a problem with the current arrangements. One of these houses changed hands in 2013 and there is a possibility that the original issue may have been raised by the previous owner who no longer lives in the road.</p>	3	<p>The restrictions proposed came about through the Town Centre parking reviews in which Wiltshire Council works closely alongside the local town council to develop suitable solutions to parking issues in the area. Wiltshire Council is reliant on the information provided by the local residents and in turn the Town or Parish Council in this situation that is the information that has been used to develop the proposal.</p> <p>Whether the request came from previous residents or current residents is worth taking into consideration but not the only point at play. Dropped kerbs whilst assisting vehicles enter and exit their property also provide a valuable crossing space for pedestrians, wheelchairs, pushchairs and others who may want to make use of the dropped kerb.</p> <p>Whilst the current residents may not require increased restrictions it still remains inappropriate for vehicles to park across dropped kerbs.</p>

<p>TY7</p>	<p><b>Further work is required alongside the school to find a practicable long term solution.</b></p> <p>With the support of the school, all drivers could be encouraged to drop their children off on Beechfield Road and use the traffic flow routes already in existence. By closing all pedestrian entrances to the school other than the one accessible from Beechfield Road it will hopefully remove the potential issues from developing any further on both Paul Street and The Tynings.</p> <p>Congestion only happens at school in/out times and this should be resolved by the school and not by the extension of the yellow line by about 30 feet. Please spend our money on something else!!!</p> <p>We are aware that residents and our neighbours are not wholly supportive of the proposed parking restrictions; we agree with them that the situation is much better with the campus school drop off and would get even better if even more parents were to use the campus for school drop off.</p> <p>The school has recognised that congestion does occur during the school run and in May 2016 they introduced management measures (which can be found following link <a href="http://www.corsham.wilts.sch.uk/Letters-Home">http://www.corsham.wilts.sch.uk/Letters-Home</a> "School Transport advice – May2016") to encourage greater footfall, greater use of public transport and when car travel is essential to make use of the Springfield facilities.</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>The school has and continues to take positive steps towards reducing the impact of parking around school periods.</p> <p>The access at Tynings Road is for entering only and parking is not advised on Tynings Road itself.</p> <p>Wiltshire Council works alongside schools to develop a School Travel Plan which encourages healthy ways of travelling to school. Where this is not possible other transport options are considered.</p> <p>Recent comments appear to reflect that positive steps have taken place by the school in aiding the parking situation.</p>
------------	---	----------	--

TY8	<p><b>A meeting is required with the local residents to find a suitable and agreeable way forward.</b></p> <p>I would also like to propose that you hold a meeting of those affected by the proposal as I know that my neighbours have objections too.</p>	1	<p>This consultation period is the point for anyone with comments regarding the proposal to make their thoughts known.</p> <p>No further meetings will be held in the local area.</p>
TY9	<p><b>Corsham School comments towards parking restrictions</b></p> <p>What we always wish to achieve is NO parent dropping off students in the Tynings or Paul Street due to their unwieldy turning circles.</p> <p>We want all parents to use the campus for this purpose as per design; it is much safer than any of the alternatives.</p> <p>Unfortunately we can't control the behaviour of our parents, we can only remind them of drop off preferences and hope they do the right thing.</p> <p>This we do annually and will repeat more frequently.</p> <p>I suspect that if this was running totally smoothly, there would be no need for parking restrictions.</p> <p>What might be just as effective is signage at the entrance to Paul Street and The Tynings indicating " No School Drop Off - Please Use Campus"</p>	1	<p>Comments from the school are noted.</p> <p>It is considered that Corsham School is taking a number of steps to minimise the parking issues.</p>

TY10	<p><b>The proposed restrictions are a waste of time and not required.</b></p> <p>The extension of the existing arrangements is a complete waste of time and money as they will make absolutely no difference to any congestion or blockages across drives which may occur in the future.</p>	1	<p>The proposal is part of the Town Centre Parking Review and was considered worthy of consideration.</p> <p>This process has been followed, it is not considered wasteful in going through this process to gauge the general opinion towards restrictions in the area.</p>
------	--	---	---