

COMMENTS

<u>Rep</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
1	<p>I am writing in support of the traffic order. Hilperton needs more on road parking and it would be nice to have enough to stop people in Church Street parking on the pavement.</p> <p>Hilperton now has a relief road so the passage of through traffic should be minimised. Additional parking will act as natural road calming, making Hilperton less attractive to through traffic which will be diverted onto the new relief road.</p>	The comments of support are noted.
2	<p>I am happy to repeat my support per my email for the original scheme some months ago. I was disappointed to see a few parking spaces removed in the revised proposal as the Church Street area is desperate for more on-street parking.</p> <p>The recent Parish Council meeting was well attended by members of the public with approx. nine speakers/emails in support and only one objector (who doesn't live on Church Street and who is fortunate in having off-street parking at his property). I urge the Cabinet member to 'make' this order as published.</p>	The comments of support are noted.
3	<p>Having considered the proposals for increasing the no waiting at any time further down Devizes Road than at present, we would like to suggest that the lines on the north side of Devizes Road stop at the junction side of our drive entrance. By removing parking spaces from the front of our house, it will require us to take up parking spaces further down the road. We have never had issues with people parking in front of our house, although we regularly do so. The Highway Code prohibits parking within 10m of a junction, for the safety of cars turning into or emerging from the junction. More than 30m of no waiting seems excessive for a junction into a 20mph zone.</p>	<p>The concerns relating to the proposal have been noted.</p> <p>Officers clarify that the proposal to introduce 'No Waiting At Any Time' (NWAAT) is intended to keep the junction of Church Street and Devizes Road clear of parked vehicles. Additional NWAAT in this location is anticipated to reduce the likelihood of a collision, reduce traffic congestion due to inappropriately parked vehicles and improve the safety of pedestrians crossing the road in this area.</p>
4	<p>We are writing in support of the proposed plans for additional parking to be made available on Church Street in Hilperton. However, along with other residents and neighbours, we are disappointed that it does not fully reflect the real needs of the growing community.</p>	The comments of support are noted.

<u>Rep</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
	<p>We have been residents in Church Street for 20 years. In that time the community has grown and become more diverse. We are getting older and becoming much more aware of our vulnerabilities; new families with young children have moved in; some neighbours are elderly and/or vulnerable; others have a physical impairment which can make walking any distance difficult.</p> <p>Many of our neighbours have been here for a good number of years, and those who haven't have quickly become a part of the close-knit community. In short, we all love living here in the historic part of the 'old' village, but the growing issue of the lack of adequate and acceptable parking and the increasing speed of traffic is a growing and deeply concerning problem.</p> <p>As a community we would like to have more control over the future of our area, and in this respect there are a number of reasons why more appropriate parking should be made available to Church Street residents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would effectively create a traffic calming measure and reduce the very possible risk of casualties; particularly for pedestrians and children. • It would reduce the speed of through traffic and hence improve safety, especially for vulnerable residents. • It would control the speed of drivers where they are currently excessive and/or inappropriate for the type and use of the road. • A reduction in vehicle speed would help to bring the community even more together, making the street safer and a more sociable and better place to live. • It would make walking/dog walking/running/cycling/horse riding easier, more pleasant and safer than it is now. In particular it would create an appropriate means of facilitating cycling and improve the route for many cyclists and equestrians who use the road, and who are particularly vulnerable to inconsiderate drivers. <p>There are a number of other factors to take into account, these being the lived experience as residents of Church Street:</p>	

<u>Rep</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We, along with other residents, often have to park quite some way from our houses e.g. The Knap, Devizes Road or Ashton Road. The Knap and Ashton Road have inadequate lighting making it a very unsettling experience in the dark. Personally, as a lone woman who has now reached her 60th year it is not a pleasant experience – I feel very vulnerable when walking in the dark from these areas to my house. When parking in The Knap recently, the lighting was so poor I slipped off the damaged kerb and it caused me to suffer a back injury. • We have received verbal abuse from residents in Ashton Road about parking there, even to the point of the local constable visiting us and asking us to move our vehicles, albeit legally parked, because he was getting so many emails of complaint. Our cars have suffered wilful damage when parked in this road. • It is impossible to load and unload vehicles with heavy items when the existing parking bays are full, and we have to park on the double yellow lines. • The existing parking bays are often used by visitors to residents not living on Church Street (i.e. St Michael's Close, Nursery Close) or to houses that have off-road parking available. • Local farm vehicle drivers need educating on the acceptable speed through the village, especially when in convoy. This matter has been taken up with the police, however it continues. • Many car drivers will avoid using the A361 and 'bypass' the bypass – otherwise known as "The Hilperton Relief Road"! • The '7.5 tonne only' signs are inadequate or poorly sited. HGV's still come through the village claiming to have not seen the signs. • I have witnessed an elderly neighbour too frightened to cross the road due to the speed of the traffic. • I have felt the same fear when taking my grandchildren from the house to the car and then getting them safely in the car. 	

<u>Rep</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
	<p>We are aware of the objections raised by a near-by resident of St. Michael's Close. In response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Church Street residents will still need to park their cars somewhere in the village, this won't change. • He has effectively alienated himself and his partner within the community by the delivery of his objections to all residents apart from those who would benefit from the changes. • The facts and figures within the objection, even if relative, do not outweigh the lived experience of the residents of Church Street. <p>What we want:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Hilperton to be a pleasant and enjoyable village to live in. • For the residents to live a good life in a good place. • For the local authority to invest in our community and be as proud as we are of the village. 	
5	<p>At a meeting held on the 16th October 2018, Hilperton Parish Council agreed to endorse the recommendations put forward in the Wiltshire Council Highways Traffic Regulation Order.</p> <p>However, the Parish Council would like to see some form of air quality monitoring pre and post the removal of the double yellow lines, as concerns were expressed by some members of the public attending the meeting about the possible increase in vehicle emissions caused by vehicles slowing, stopping and pulling away. We understand that these emissions are at their highest and most concentrated at the kerbside and therefore kerbside monitoring would seem to be the best way forward.</p>	<p>The comments of support are noted.</p> <p>The comments of concern raised relate to the issue of a potential increase in polluting emissions. A response to this issue can be found in paragraph 20 of the Cabinet Report.</p>
6	<p>I am writing with concern to the proposal of "the removal of waiting restrictions" on Church Street, Hilperton. I can see this is being introduced to the area to aid traffic calming which I agree is something which needs to be addressed.</p> <p>We live on Church Street. We drive off our property straight out onto the road. My concern is that of the safety of my family, the</p>	<p>The concerns regarding the proposal have been noted.</p> <p>The extension to the unrestricted parking bay, which would have removed a section of NWAAT close to No. 221 Church Street, was not included in the amended proposal. Therefore, the comments received relating to this issue are no longer relevant.</p>

<u>Rep</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
	<p>family's living behind us who use the lane alongside us and the family in the house at 221 Church Street.</p> <p>When pulling off our drive we are often met with cars swerving around the parked vehicles outside of 221/222 Church Street. Our vision is limited when pulling off the drive whether we are turning left or right. On the occasion when someone parks on the double yellow lines outside 221 Church Street the vision is then extremely limited. The time and distance of the cars swerving around the vehicles is enhanced and leaves us with minimal time to react. I would like to add here that we have had countless near misses in this situation, both with people parking on the double yellows and when not! The situation is heightened for the users of the lane, who are a good 3 metres closer to danger than we are. The situation is then borderline ridiculous for the family at 221 Church Street, who already have terrible visibility.</p> <p>A few years back permission was granted to 221 Church Street for a driveway. I do however believe it was originally declined due to presenting danger to persons or other traffic using the road. If that reason was valid then, why would this not be the case now? By bringing parked cars closer it will only cause an increase in danger to all.</p> <p>The removal of the "no waiting times" outside of 221 Church Street will put my young family (including pregnant wife) at further danger of a road accident. I genuinely cannot see the common sense here, or even why or where this idea has come from. If additional parking is being provided along the roads anyway why make one extra space at the expense of a possible road collision accident.</p> <p>Feel free to contact me if you require any additional information. Also, if you would like to view the parking situation, it's usually best to investigate on a weekend when there are various parked cars along the road. There are fewer cars on the road during the day in the working week, at these times visibility is a lot clearer to both road users and occupants. Thank you for taking your time to read this information. I hope this has raised a valid point for why removing the no waiting at any time outside 221 Church Street should not be pursued.</p>	

<u>Rep</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
7	<p>I am in favour of the extra parking spaces along Church Street. I walk to and from school (Hilperton School) everyday with my three young children. This section of the road is, by far, the worst and most dangerous part of our journey. The vehicles travel at speed along the road, especially at these busy times and we have on occasion witnessed vehicles mounting the kerb. With the high walls either side of the road, we feel very vulnerable and trapped at this particular part of the pavement. If there was parking on the road, it would act as a barrier, helping us to feel less vulnerable.</p> <p>On wet days, we often get very wet from this section of road. There is a lot of standing water on the road surface and we get sprayed, meaning the children have to go to school wet! Again, parking would act as a barrier.</p> <p>The cars also speed through the village at the busy school run times. If they are not breaking the speed limit, then 30mph is too fast. We have trouble crossing the road, so again, the parking will help to slow the traffic down, hopefully making it easier for us to cross safely.</p>	The comments of support are noted.
8	Representation 8 was extensive, comprising a report style document of 20 pages objecting to the Council's proposal. The substantive issues raised have been discussed further in paragraphs 13 - 20 of the Cabinet Report.	Refer to paragraphs 13 - 20 of the Cabinet Report.
9	<p>My family and I moved to Church St (Hilperton) in August 2008. New to the area, we were very surprised at the speed and volume of traffic that passed by our front door, day and night, seven days a week. The Hilperton Relief Road (HRR) has gone some way to alleviating these problems, although the lack of traffic calming measures (in any capacity), HGV's ignoring the weight restriction limit, and the continuation of vehicles to use the road as a 'rat run', means that we still encounter dangerous situations on a daily basis.</p> <p>Like most families on Church St, we own more than one vehicle. Whilst we are fortunate enough to have allocated parking for one vehicle, finding an adequate spot for a second vehicle is proving to be increasingly</p>	The comments of support are noted.

<u>Rep</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
	<p>difficult.</p> <p>There are minimal allocated parking bays on Church St, and what little there is tends to be occupied by the same vehicles on a daily basis. I feel it is important to increase the availability of allocated parking bays and/or remove an area of double yellow lines, as this not only serves to provide the much-needed additional parking, but also acts as a traffic calming measure whereby speeding vehicles are forced to slow down. Given the number of small children and pets in the local area, it is imperative that this issue is addressed proactively now and not in hindsight as a result of an unfortunate incident.</p> <p>Other than the very few parking bays, the only other parking area available to local residents is The Knap. Increasingly, when returning from work, The Knap is completely full – to the point where some cars are barricaded in and would be unable to exit until such time that the owners of the crucial pieces of the parking ‘jigsaw’ move their respective vehicles, thus allowing others to follow suit. On more than one occasion, I have had to abandon my car – due to it being blocked by other vehicles – and seek alternative means of transport. As The Knap is shared with the congregation of and visitors to St Michael’s & All Angels’ Church, this unacceptable situation is severely worsened during those times when church services are taking place.</p> <p>As a result of this increasingly frustrating situation, I am more often than not forced to park a long way from my house. Whilst I am relatively young, fit and able, this is certainly not the case for everybody.</p> <p>Please therefore accept my comments above in support of the proposal to remove the ‘No Waiting at any time’ restrictions in Church St, Hilperton. I feel more allocated on-street parking will help, in some way, to alleviate the increasing parking problem, as well as reducing the travel speed of vehicles passing through the village. Removing aesthetic features, such as attractive stone walls, in order to provide off-street parking is not the solution. This will only serve to further reduce the appeal of the village.</p>	
10	I am disappointed that this proposal for	The comments objecting to the proposal have

<u>Rep</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
	<p>parking does not go far enough to support the diverse community of Church Street, Hilperton or their requirements for a better quality of family life. The relationships within this small community have matured over the past few years and as a resident I can say our biggest problem is around the residential parking, speed of traffic and damage to vehicles caused by the speed of some of the traffic using the road as a rat run. Evidence has not been provided to us publicly as to why the original proposal was rejected.</p> <p>There is a clear requirement for additional residential parking within the street. The small amount of parking is used on a regular basis by persons who live in the nearby cul-de-sacs, St Michaels Close and Nursery Close, for their visitors where there is off road parking facilities for each household. Church Street is also an overflow for the Church, especially for funerals and weddings when The Knapp is partially closed to allow vehicle access. It also has to accommodate the parking for the residents of Church Street itself.</p> <p>Following Highways work in 2017, the parking bays were repainted and have already been reduced. Adjacent to 104 Church Street there was a bay which was large enough for two small vehicles, this is now only big enough for one small car. This has reduced the overall parking bay at the south end of Church Street to six parking bays when parking is optimised. This is not sustainable and new builds take this into consideration for planning applications.</p> <p>Post the opening of Elizabeth Way, we have seen a dramatic drop in the use of Heavy Goods Vehicles in Church Street, however, from time to time HGVs are still using the road due to route mismanagement. Church Street continues to be used as a rat run by commuters through to Staverton/Paxcroft and beyond, vehicles for the many industries along Canal Road, the school run, even the emergency services continue to use it as a route for emergencies outside the area. There is also a substantial amount of speeding farm traffic which has been reported to the Police on a number of occasions. I have also witnessed the local buses powering down the road. It would seem beneficial to the community as</p>	<p>been noted.</p> <p>In response to this objection, officers confirm that the amenity and safety of the residents of Hilperton has been considered as part of the amended proposal.</p> <p>There may be scope in the future, following the implementation of the proposed amendments and road users having adjusted to these changes, for officers to revisit the issue of parking within the village with a view to removing further sections of NWAAT in order to provide additional parking for residents.</p>

<u>Rep</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
	<p>a whole to use additional car parking to calm the traffic through the village. This would discourage people using it as a rat run and I believe we would see an overall reduction in traffic, which would provide a potential reduction of fumes from any traffic traversing through the area, giving the community of Church Street a win-win situation. This should be monitored as I believe there would be an opportunity to increase parking for those in the community once the traffic has been re-educated to use Elizabeth Way.</p> <p>I would like to bring the following points to the attention of the Parish Committee in favour of the new parking proposal. For residents of Church Street, this would go some way to resolve some of the current issues we have to endure with the view that further improvements to the quality of life in the street could be made if the current proposal was implemented.</p> <p>I have researched a number of papers and documents from across UK, Europe and US where residential on-street parking has been successfully used to help traffic calming.</p> <p>1) By using parked cars as a buffer zone, it has been reported that there is a reduction of accidents to pedestrians. 2) By using parked cars on the highway, it has been recorded as reducing traffic volumes, especially highways being used as rat runs. 3) By introducing traffic calming measures, traffic naturally slows down and there is a reduction of emissions.</p> <p>In addition to these, other factors should support the case for approval:</p> <p>4) Horse riding is a regular leisure activity on Church Street. 5) By having the additional parking spaces this may reduce the likelihood of increased planning applications for off-street parking which may cause more emissions immediately outside properties. 6) The proposal provides parking on an area where there are no adjacent properties. 7) Applications for off-street parking, where approved, may affect the aesthetics of the street. We are very keen on our historical surrounding, old boundary walls, the overall look and feel of the street and its surrounding</p>	

<u>Rep</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
	<p>area.</p> <p>8) This proposal, if implemented, may improve the use of the street for activities, including cycling and more walking which would be positive for any of its residents.</p> <p>9) The loading and unloading of shopping, children, aged and disabled people would be improved if less traffic is traversing the street.</p> <p>May I also remind you that Church Street became an unclassified road on the opening of Elizabeth Way, as it was expected to be a less busy road and that traffic would move to using the new road. This has happened for some vehicles accessing the surrounding areas but we have a long way to go. The use of parked cars in residential areas is the easiest and cheapest to implement traffic calming.</p>	
11	<p>Following the resurfacing of Church Street, Hilperton in October 2017, the white lines indicating the parking bays from 222 to 226 were re-installed. The lines indicating my dropped kerb driveway were not installed in the correct positions.</p> <p>I contacted Atkins by email (who were the surfacing contractors) explaining my concerns that the new white lines were not correct. The email was forwarded to you. You emailed me on 11 October 2017 stating that there would be a consultation of the parking restrictions in Church Street, Hilperton and that my concerns regarding access to my driveway would be considered as part of the review.</p> <p>I have seen the consultation document and note that the parking bay between 226 and 227 will be reduced to a one car bay (as it was in 1976 when I moved here) and that my dropped kerb driveway will be lengthened by one metre.</p> <p>I note that on several residential roads in Wiltshire where there are dropped kerbs here cars exit in a white bay parking area that double yellow lines have been added between the white line and the dropped kerb e.g. Wingfield Road, Trowbridge right hand side travelling towards the light controlled crossing from the town end.</p> <p>As part of the TRO consultation would you please consider installing double yellow lines</p>	<p>Further to a site meeting with the individual making this representation, officers agreed to include a length of NWAAT across their driveway as part of the amended TRO. The individual expressed their satisfaction at this outcome during the meeting but did not action the withdrawal of their objection. The representation has therefore been included as part of the report.</p>

<u>Rep</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
	in the marked area of my dropped kerb? This addition would be of great assistance when I am exiting and reversing my car into my driveway, as there are still vehicles that park over the white lines on each side of the dropped kerb bay.	
12	We understand that there are proposals submitted to lift the double yellow lines between St Michaels Close, The Knapp and Hill Street in Hilperton. We support the lifting of the yellow lines as they were put there so that traffic including lorries travelling through the village could have clear visibility and not be obstructed by long lines of parked cars. As the relief road has been opened this is no longer the case. The yellow lines have in fact caused immense problems to the residents of Devizes Road as the residents in Hill Street and Church Street who cannot park near their homes now park in Devizes Road which has meant there are long lines of parked cars in this road causing major obstructions.	The comments of support are noted.
13	The extra parking would cause problems with the larger lorries that have to use the village for deliveries and buses. They would have difficulties in passing, causing more pollution and traffic jams. Large vehicles accessing the businesses on Whaddon Lane need to enter from Church Street as they cannot turn left from Hill Street.	The concerns regarding the proposal have been noted. Officers comment that there are already parking bays on Church Street which demonstrate that larger vehicles are able to safely and adequately use the carriageway where there are parked cars on one side of it. Therefore, a measurable increase in congestion and polluting emissions to air are considered highly unlikely.
14	I am very much in favour of the traffic calming measures proposed for Church street in Hilperton. May I add also that I think they don't go far enough, as they will be an annoyance to rat runners, speeders and those really insanely loud exhaust pipes, but not enough to dissuade or modify such selfish and antisocial behaviour. So I hope the scheme will be monitored and improved on.	The comments of support are noted.
15	I am writing in support of the TRO for Church Street, Hilperton although I do feel that this is a poor compromise which offers a watered down version of a proposal which could have served many purposes in support of a village struggling under many traffic pressures. It was hoped that the original proposal with	The comments are noted.

<u>Rep</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
	<p>multiple, staggered parking bays would serve to slow down the traffic which continues to use Church Street as a 'rat run'. Over the past year or so a large proportion of the residents at the top end of Church Street have been in consultation with the police to try and find a solution to the persistent speed and aggressive driving which blights the village. The local PCSO has attended on numerous occasions and visits have been made to offenders. There have been many speed related accidents with resulting debris to be found in the road. It is not at all unusual for traffic to mount the pavement. There was recently an incident where a vehicle rear-ended another during the school run and drove off leaving the other with extensive damage.</p> <p>It had been hoped that the system of staggered parking bays would slow the through traffic enough to be able to consider lowering the speed limit through Church Street to 20 mph from the existing 30 mph. For some baffling reason it is proposed to shorten the bay outside 226 further, having illegally shortened it when repainting the lines after resurfacing, reducing it from potentially two spaces to one. This then leaves 6 parking spaces to serve 12 houses with approximately 16 vehicles!</p> <p>As with any thriving community the mixture of people living in Church Street is a range of ages and genders, there are young families with babies, pensioners and disabled people, as well as many single working women. All of these people need somewhere to park their cars, unload their pushchairs and shopping, help their elderly relatives into their homes, walk home from their cars in the dark carrying laptops and handbags. At present this is an issue and the concern is that the village will begin to stagnate and die. The proposal as it was would have served to provide this for residents when most needed at evenings and weekends, and during weekdays would provide access to the church for those attending weddings and funerals, where the walk from either the village hall in Whaddon Lane, or the Lion and Fiddle in Devizes Road is excessive for the elderly and infirm (the main demographic for funeral attendees). I believe this would be an invaluable amenity for this reason alone.</p>	

<u>Rep</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
	<p>Personally, despite being terminally ill with severe mobility issues, I have been reluctant to apply for a disabled parking bay on the principle that I would be removing one valuable parking bay from the general domain, when they are in such poor supply (I now have no option since walking is impossible for me, and so is parking near my house). The proposed TRO gave me some hope that this would improve. You can imagine my disappointment to see this downgraded in this fashion.</p> <p>I have spoken to the parents who walk their children to school and they tell me their concerns are for the speed at which cars and vans pass them and they genuinely fear for the safety of their children walking on the pavements in Church Street other than where they are shielded by parked cars. Without doubt there is an issue with carbon emissions everywhere, but surely the best short term solution is to reduce and slow traffic in residential areas. The development of Elizabeth Way makes this a viable alternative. A little further through Hilperton in Hill Street there are very few parking restrictions and this alone slows and reduces the traffic along that stretch of road. Long term the solution will, without doubt, be a rise in carbon reduced and carbon neutral transport.</p>	
16	<p>I strongly support the proposals in this consultation.</p> <p>I am Rector of St Michael's Church in The Knap. Those attending the regular services and church/community events in St Michaels and St Michael's room regularly struggle to park as all of the parking area in the Knap is full, often because it is the only parking available for residents in the area being considered in this consultation.</p> <p>This parking problem is especially difficult for those with young children and those with limited mobility. For festival services, events such as Art Exhibitions and for Baptisms and Funerals we often have well over 100 people attending and parking is a major problem. There have even been occasions at funerals when the hearse has struggled to get close to the church.</p> <p>I should be very grateful if the proposed</p>	The comments of support are noted.

<u>Rep</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
	<p>changes could be implemented as soon as possible. Although they won't fully resolve the parking issue I believe they will help church members, those attending events and local residents. Many thanks.</p>	
17	<p>I would like to object to the proposal to remove yellow lines in Church Street, Hilperton to make more parking spaces as I feel it will put overtaking traffic on the wrong side of the road as you come around the bend when travelling towards the Lion and Fiddle.</p> <p>There are some very large vehicles that still go down Whaddon Lane. These have to approach from Church Street as most can't get around the bend if they come up Hill Street.</p> <p>I have also had sight of a letter distributed through the village about pollution caused by 'idling' traffic and this does concern me.</p> <p>I would like to object on the above points.</p>	<p>The objection relating to the proposal has been noted.</p> <p>Please refer to paragraphs 15 and 20 of the Cabinet report, which discuss the impact of the proposal on braking distances and the potential for idling traffic and the effects to air quality of this.</p> <p>Please also refer to officer comments above in response to representation 13.</p>
18	<p>I am writing in support of the TRO for Church Street, Hilperton although I do feel that this is a poor compromise which offers a watered down version of a proposal which could have served many purposes in support of a village struggling under many traffic pressures.</p> <p>It was hoped that the original proposal with multiple, staggered parking bays would serve to slow down the traffic which continues to use Church Street as a 'rat run'. Over the past year or so a large proportion of the residents at the top end of Church Street have been in consultation with the police to try and find a solution to the persistent speed and aggressive driving which blights the village. The local PCSO has attended on numerous occasions and visits have been made to offenders. There have been many speed related accidents with resulting debris to be found in the road. It is not at all unusual for traffic to mount the pavement. There was recently an incident where a vehicle rear-ended another during the school run and drove off leaving the other with extensive damage.</p> <p>It had been hoped that the system of staggered parking bays would slow the through traffic enough to be able to consider</p>	<p>The comments are noted.</p>

<u>Rep</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
	<p>lowering the speed limit through Church Street to 20 mph from the existing 30 mph. For some baffling reason it is proposed to shorten the bay outside 226 further, having illegally shortened it when repainting the lines after resurfacing, reducing it from potentially two spaces to one. This then leaves 6 parking spaces to serve 12 houses with approximately 16 vehicles!</p> <p>As with any thriving community the mixture of people living in Church Street is a range of ages and genders, there are young families with babies, pensioners and disabled people, as well as many single working women. All of these people need somewhere to park their cars, unload their pushchairs and shopping, help their elderly relatives into their homes, walk home from their cars in the dark carrying laptops and handbags. At present this is an issue and the concern is that the village will begin to stagnate and die. The proposal as it was would have served to provide this for residents when most needed at evenings and weekends, and during weekdays would provide access to the church for those attending weddings and funerals, where the walk from either the village hall in Whaddon Lane, or the Lion and Fiddle in Devizes Road is excessive for the elderly and infirm (the main demographic for funeral attendees). I believe this would be an invaluable amenity for this reason alone.</p> <p>Personally, despite being terminally ill with severe mobility issues, I have been reluctant to apply for a disabled parking bay on the principle that I would be removing one valuable parking bay from the general domain, when they are in such poor supply (I now have no option since walking is impossible for me, and so is parking near my house). The proposed TRO gave me some hope that this would improve. You can imagine my disappointment to see this downgraded in this fashion.</p> <p>I have spoken to the parents who walk their children to school and they tell me their concerns are for the speed at which cars and vans pass them and they genuinely fear for the safety of their children walking on the pavements in Church Street other than where they are shielded by parked cars. Without doubt there is an issue with carbon emissions everywhere, but surely the best short term</p>	

<u>Rep</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
	<p>solution is to reduce and slow traffic in residential areas. The development of Elizabeth Way makes this a viable alternative. A little further through Hilperton in Hill Street there are very few parking restrictions and this alone slows and reduces the traffic along that stretch of road. Long term the solution will, without doubt, be a rise in carbon reduced and carbon neutral transport.</p>	
19	<p>Just to reiterate I would like to state the following:</p> <p>1: Both myself and my wife fully support that our fellow Church Street residents do require additional parking or even permit parking +/- one car per household only.</p> <p>2: We still feel strongly NOT for the yellow lines to be removed outside of our property on Church street firstly based on safety in terms of access to and from our house drive. It is already obstructed at times due to larger cars/vans and is a hazard. Visibility is restricted and numerous accidents have been a near miss! Currently residents ARE parking on the yellow lines (which is difficult for us to approach) and this is causing obstruction to us and other residents from 217 onwards and those of Nursery Close opposite.</p> <p>3: We have had recurrent issues with a tractor of which I have detailed in my earlier emails and again last weekend and in particular last Thursday 11th October beeping the horn at 5:30am again due to residents parking over the yellow lines outside of our property. This is understandably irritating, frustrating and distressing when you have a very busy/ need for focus job and day ahead of you-for ALL residents of Church Street. There are recorded 111 calls and meetings with the PCO officer to support this.</p> <p>We do not see that the one additional parking space on Church Street is justified to support traffic calming. Cars speed up and cut in (in front of our property) daily and the beeping of horns is a frequent thing. I fully ask for a member of the council to visit the street over a period of time and view the road traffic and behaviour of the road users. This has been a distressing year for many of us on this street and early rises! We however</p>	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>The extension to the unrestricted parking bay, which would have removed a section of NWAAT close to No. 221 Church Street, was not included in the amended proposal. Therefore, the comments received relating to this issue are no longer relevant.</p>

<u>Rep</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
	<p>recognise that our fellow residents DO require additional parking but that the current plans are not the answer to the problems.</p>	
20	<p>I feel the amended proposed TRO is quite limited given the number of residents living within the village without parking.</p> <p>As a lady living on my own, I personally feel quite vulnerable parking my car on a daily basis at quite a distance away from my home whilst carrying a work laptop/ipad etc, especially in the dark, which is most evenings.</p> <p>I also think it's inconsiderate to the elderly, disabled and families with young children and babies trying to access their homes safely with very limited parking, whilst unsafely trying to load and unload cars.</p> <p>The safety of crossing the road is a concern as Church Street is continually used as a rat run. I have witnessed many near misses and actual collisions since living here and feel that more staggered parking bays than proposed would help to reduce the speed of lorries, buses, vans, large farm vehicles, machinery and cars speeding through Church Street. With narrow footpaths, reducing speed may help with the safety of walkers with dogs, children and the elderly. So more parking bays than proposed is certainly needed on Church Street.</p> <p>We need to calm the traffic down in Church Street and staggered parking bays will help slow traffic down and discourage traffic coming through the village.</p>	<p>The comments objecting to the proposal have been noted.</p> <p>Officers would like to reiterate that the reason for removing NWAAT is to provide additional parking, thereby improving the amenity of village residents and visitors to the church; it is not directly for the purposes of traffic calming.</p>
21	<p>I enclose a photocopy of a leaflet we received through our letterbox on Friday 5th October. We cannot understand the thinking behind the Council's intention to remove some of the double yellow lines along the through road in Hilperton Village.</p> <p>We are definitely opposed to this happening and would like to register our opposition with you. The Village has become a car park and if anything needs more double yellow lines installed. It is very difficult driving through the Village with so many parked cars blocking our view and trying to pull in to make way for local buses, large delivery vans as well as</p>	<p>The comments objecting to the proposal have been noted.</p> <p>Officers comment that due to the construction of the Hilperton Relief Road, traffic flows through the village have been reduced. It is therefore no longer necessary for NWAAT to be present throughout the village. The removal of some sections of NWAAT is intended to improve the amenity for the majority of residents who do not benefit from off street parking and visitors to the church, particularly when there are services and ceremonies taking place.</p>

<u>Rep</u>	<u>Comment Received</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>
	<p>normal cars and motor bikes approaching in the opposite direction. Even the private service road down to Dymott Square has become a car park so heaven forbid if we ever need the emergency services, there would be very little room for them to manoeuvre.</p> <p>As the leaflet explains it is even more of a danger to Mums taking their young children to school as visibility is so bad with all the parked cars.</p> <p>Therefore, I repeat, we are opposed to the removal of any double yellow lines in Hilperton.</p>	
22	<p>As a visitor to residents on Church Street, it's appalling how fast the traffic fly's through. On more than one occasion I have had a lucky escape when getting out of the car. I almost got run down by a motorbike one evening flying through at speed. I have also witnessed a collision outside 108 Church Street, where the person piled into a car in front, reversed and went off at speed!</p> <p>I feel the initial plan to have more parking spaces than the reduced parking space proposal now should be reinstated. Surely more cars parked along the street will be a deterrent to cars speeding along the long stretches of road and cars will also shield pedestrians walking along the narrow footpaths, especially those taking their little ones to school!</p>	The comments are noted.