

MELKSHAM:
PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS
COMMENTS OF OBJECTION AND SUPPORT

Contents

Church Walk 3
Church Lane Junctions with Crescent Road and Savernake Avenue 8
Roundponds 10
Union Street..... 11

53 Comments received from 50 people (50 objecting, 0 supporting and 0 commenting on)

Breakdown by road			
Road	Objections	Support	Comments
Church Walk	48	0	0
Church Lane / Crescent Road	2	0	0
Church Lane / Savernake Avenue	1	0	0
Roundponds	1	0	0
Union Street	1	0	0

Church Walk

Ref	Comment Received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
CW1	<p>Will permits be provided for residents living in Church Walk as the proposed restrictions will limit parking</p> <p>Could the northern end of Church Walk become a residents parking only area?</p> <p>.</p> <p>It certainly doesn't take into consideration the needs of the residents, especially those on the east side of Church Walk, some of whom do not have access to off street parking facilities. These residents would have to park some distance from their house in a public parking, which is far from ideal for the single ladies and the families with children which will be affected. The nearest parking for these residents is the Church Street car park.</p> <p>To make matters worse, I understand that with regard to Church Street Car Park, resident permits have been phased out and that season tickets are unavailable. Thus leaving Lowbourne or King Street car parks as the only other options. Should this proposal go ahead, I believe that the situation of the affected residents of Church Walk is completely unacceptable and certainly flies in the face of the Council motto – "Where everybody matters".</p>	3	<p>There are no proposed permits for residents of Church Walk. This would require the development of a Residents' parking Scheme which is beyond the scope of this project.</p>

Ref	Comment Received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
CW2	<p>Where are residents expected to park if proposed restrictions go ahead? Not all residents of Church Walk have off road parking.</p> <p>Firstly, these restrictions will create a drastic inconvenience for me to get two young children (along with changing bag, school bags and my own handbag) over to the nearest place where I can park my car for free (which I am lead to believe is at least a 10 minute walk away), every morning for school/nursery run, and then the same hassle on the reverse back home.</p> <p>On a personal note I am a single woman who lives on her own. I do not feel that the council are being 'reasonable' by expecting myself and other residents to park away from our properties where we may not feel that our cars, personal effects and our person be safe. I am both a teacher and an equine therapist which requires me to carry around a great deal of expensive equipment. Had I of known that parking was not allowed outside Number 12 Church Walk, I would not have purchased the property in the first place. I feel very let down by the council for putting myself and all residents involved in this position.</p> <p>Finally, where are the council proposing that residents park if this order were to be enforced? The car park in Melksham has limited permits available and they are extremely expensive. The roads around the area are NOT safe especially those near the 'round house' by the edge of the Post Office in Church Street. There are</p>	10	<p>It is recognised that the introduction of parking restrictions can often lead to displacement of parking. However, the proposed restrictions in Church Walk will look to remove parking at the junction of Church walk and Cannon Square where the road is too narrow for vehicles to access Church Walk.</p> <p>The Highway Code also states that drivers should not park within 10 metres of a junction</p> <p>The revised proposal to only extend the restrictions some 32 metres into Church Walk will minimise the loss of available parking places in Church Walk to a minimum. However, this will be at the expense of turning space within Church Walk.</p> <p>It should be noted that Wiltshire Council has no duty to provide parking for individuals; its statutory duty is to maintain the right of passage along the highway.</p>

Ref	Comment Received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
	<p>always people loitering and drinking in this area and I feel it rather unfair of the council to suddenly make this a daily journey for any of the residents after we have specifically chosen a safe, community based street on which to live.</p>		
<p>CW3</p>	<p>Rather than put parking restrictions throughout the whole length of Church Walk, can it be shortened to the pinch point only?</p> <p>I recognise that on occasions there has been difficulty of access for refuse vehicles, but this has been caused by parking in the pinch point at the start of Church Walk. Extending the existing double yellow lines on the east side of the street to the same length that is already covered by double yellow lines on the west side of the street , would obviate the need for the refuse vehicles to use the pavement to gain access further down Church Walk</p> <p>As a bare minimum, residents parking for the use of residents on the east side of the street who have no alternative parking available (including those who are affected by my suggestion of slightly extending the double yellow lines) should be provided, this would still enable access for emergency and refuse vehicles.</p> <p>I do feel that it would be a good idea to restrict the</p>	<p>15</p>	<p>Church walk is an old narrow Cul-de-Sac with two way traffic in the middle of Melksham. It is fronted on both sides by residential properties, some of which have no off street parking available. Historically, residents have parked outside their properties having the effect of restricting traffic even more. A single footway to the West side of Church walk exists that has undergone significant repairs due to the over run of vehicle on it. Turning of vehicles in order to exit Church Walk is very difficult. At the junction of Church Walk from Cannon Square at the Southern end of Church Walk the carriageway is too narrow for a length of approximately 32 metres and it is only possible for single lane traffic to access and egress Church Walk at this point.</p> <p>After comments received from residents after the consultation period, the design to prevent parking throughout the length of Church Walk has been modified to only restrict parking at the entrance of Church Walk for a section 32 metres in length on</p>

Ref	Comment Received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
	<p>parking in the aforementioned 'bottleneck' on the currently unrestricted eastern side of the road. This is because cars parking here effectively block access to Church Walk for large vehicles, such as commercial vans, refuse trucks and emergency services. Moreover, it also forces smaller cars and vans to mount the pavement, creating both a hazard to pedestrians and damaging the pavement itself. One way of resolving that issue may be to extend the double yellow lines on the eastern side of the road, which presently stop short of No 2, so that they match those existing on the western side of the road adjacent to No 3 Church walk.</p> <p>I recognise that on occasions there has been difficulty of access for refuse vehicles, but this has been caused by parking in the pinch point at the start of Church Walk. Extending the existing double yellow lines on the east side of the street to the same length that is already covered by double yellow lines on the west side of the street , would obviate the need for the refuse vehicles to use the pavement to gain access further down Church Walk. If access for refuse vehicles is still seen as a problem it could be overcome by the use of a mini refuse vehicle, which has on occasion been used in Church Walk or as a last resort request residents to move their vehicles for a set period of time on refuse collection days.</p> <p>The major issue that I see is that Church Walk is entered via a very narrow gap between a wall and a house on the corner of the walk, this narrow gap is not only vehicular access but also a footpath, it is in this gap that any parked vehicle inhibits access to the walk and</p>		<p>both sides, to allow vehicles to access properties in Church Walk.</p> <p>Smaller refuse lorries have been requested but the access is still very limited and as a minimum the first 32 metres of Church Walk will need to have the parking restriction imposed to gain access for any vehicle.</p> <p>Comments observed and noted. The revised proposal mitigates for this.</p>

Ref	Comment Received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
	<p>forces vehicles to mount the kerb, very often the refuse collection vehicles cannot access the walk and heaven help us if there was an emergency because inordinate delays to fire or ambulance would be caused by this consistent inconsiderate parking.</p> <p>We conclude with the recommendation that the current yellow lines are extended at the entrance to Church Walk just far enough to remove any possible restriction. Again, this is clearly demonstrated in the photographs. Should the 'double yellow' lines be even on both sides of the road traffic will egress easily whilst remaining wholly on the highway.</p>		<p>The revised proposals mitigate for this comment.</p>
<p>CW4</p>	<p>If the proposed parking restrictions were implemented throughout the whole length of Church Walk, traffic speeds and flow would increase</p> <p>With parking restrictions in place, the traffic flow would increase while residents dropped off shopping, goods etc before going elsewhere to park their vehicle. I am sure this is contrary to current thinking where we are encouraged to make less journeys, not more.</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Due to the geometric layout and width of Church Walk, traffic speeds are well below the speed limit along this section of road. The volume of traffic is unlikely to increase due to the implementation of any parking restriction within Church Walk.</p>

Church Lane Junctions with Crescent Road and Savernake Avenue

Ref	Comment Received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
CL1	<p>The proposed restrictions will remove spaces in front of resident's properties which will compound the parking problems.</p> <p>I object strongly to the proposed changes as the traffic speeds along the Church Lane, the parked cars act as a calming measure. The changes will affect me as I will no longer have anywhere to park close to my home , I have fibromyalgia and I need to have my car close for loading & unloading shopping.</p> <p>I want to register my disgust at the plans to put double yellow lines on sections of Church Lane, Crescent Road and Savernake Avenue, Melksham. The plans make no provision for the residents and their visitors who currently park in those areas and it has the potential to seriously devalue surrounding properties as they will no longer have convenient parking. Where will the cars currently parked there go? Large parts of the immediate area are already no waiting at any time areas. These plans have been proposed to improve traffic, yet reducing parking areas will only worsen this. These plans are extremely short-sighted to the detriment of residents in these areas and the surrounding area as well as through traffic in these areas and they punish people without off-street parking on their property.</p>	2	<p>The proposed parking restrictions are aimed at trying to allow uninhibited access on the Highway for other road users. There is no 'Right to Park' on the Public Highway.</p> <p>The highways primary function is to allow vehicles to pass and re-pass. Church Lane 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 junctions but also keep on-road parking spaces where possible.</p> <p>Parking at this location opposite the junctions has caused significant issues for motorists trying to access and egress the side streets from Church Lane due to restricted turning circle caused by parked cars.</p> <p>The Highway Code also advises motorists not to park within 10 metres of a junction, for this very reason and that parked cars force vehicles onto the wrong side of the road as they approach the junctions and restrict visibility at the junction, which is a safety issue.</p>

Ref	Comment Received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
CL2	<p>By removing parked vehicles from Church Lane traffic will speed up</p> <p>All this means far fewer spaces available for the cars that are left. We get people parking in Church Lane because they can't park in Forest Road. We get parents parking in Church Lane for the dance school on the Forest Road junction.</p> <p>I live opposite the Crescent Road junction. It gets quite snarled up with the increased traffic. But it SLOWS THE TRAFFIC DOWN.</p> <p>In the grand scheme of things of course we want people to be safe crossing the road and I am only complaining about not being able to park outside my house, like most people can, down our road. But I really am concerned that with these proposals - Crescent and Savernake Roads - the traffic will be even faster down our road, and therefore people will be more at risk.</p>	2	<p>A 30 mph speed limit exists at this location and drivers are supposed to drive within the speed limit and conditions on the road.</p> <p>Congestion caused by parked cars at the junctions with Church Lane and both Crescent Road and Savernake Avenue, caused by parked cars on Church Lane, the restriction proposed are to minimise parking that are obstructing both sight lines for drivers access Church Lane and allowing clear access to vehicles in and out of the junctions.</p> <p>The Highway Code stipulates that parking of vehicles should not be within 10 metres of any junction.</p>

Roundponds

Ref	Comment Received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
RP1	<p>By imposing the new parking restrictions it will have the effect of moving parked cars further into the estate roads.</p> <p>Whilst I agree fully with the intention of placing yellow lines on the entrance to Roundponds, perhaps 20m either side, thus improving visibility and thus safety. I regard extending these yellow lines any further a great mistake as all this will achieve is pushing parking farther into the estate and thus blocking roads and driveways. The situation is already bad at times, due to the fact the adjacent care home was allowed to be built on it's car parks allowing no, or limited parking for its staff and visitors, this will only exacerbate the situation and make things worse for Roundpond residents. Please leave as is.</p>	1	<p>Parking on Roundponds has increased significantly due to a number of factors including the construction of a new residential home in Bath Road.</p> <p>Currently, cars are parked on the east side along a long length of Roundponds at its junction with Bath Road. In order to rationalise the parking, bays have been proposed with a 2 hr waiting limit to prevent all day parking.</p> <p>Also, double yellow lines have been provided at the Junction with Bath Road to protect sight lines and stop parking within the junction splays.</p> <p>Double yellow lines have also been proposed to the northern end of Roundponds to prevent parking on the bend. The proposed restrictions provide restricted parking in safer areas of Roundponds and clear areas on bends or entrance points.</p> <p>The proposal has been put forward as a suitable balance to protect the junction but also keep on road parking spaces where possible.</p>

Union Street

Ref	Comment Received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
UN1	<p>Space required to access garage at 50 Union Street</p> <p>We are concerned about the proposed new parking bay outside 50 Union Street which is next to our garage entrance as this will impact our visibility when driving in and out of our garage especially with our business van and considering the high pavement opposite.</p> <p>As I have lived in Union st since 1968 and our business has been here since 1932 I am well aware of the parking problems in our street.</p> <p>Also this will make it very difficult to get deliveries to our and other businesses in the street as if all the bays are full there will be nowhere for lorries or vans to stop. We feel that there needs a gap to remain to accommodate this.</p>	1	<p>The Engineer has re inspected the site and measured the available space at the access point to the garage, being 5.9 metres in width. This is sufficient as to not impede access and egress from the garage into Union Street.</p> <p>The proposed new restricted parking bay outside 50 Union Street will have a 2 hour waiting limit within it. Chip shop deliveries currently are carried out on double yellow lines. The proposed single parking bay has been provided to assist residents and customers of the area and deliveries could still take place.</p>