


**Malmesbury – parking restrictions and prohibition of motor vehicles on various streets within Bloor Homes development at Filands**

Name	Address	Objection/Support/Comment	Officer's Response
Resident Devereux Mews	Email	<p>Objection Thank you for considering the safety of drivers &amp; pedestrians in the Filands View estate. I would like to make the following comments with regards to the proposed no waiting zone intended for Devereux Mews. I can understand the requirement for such measures at the junction with Wheeler Way as vehicles do often block visibility when driving at the junction, however I believe extending this zone 40m down the road will lead to less considerate parking further down the road. This will make access to residents driveways harder in an already congested area. I do not see what benefit this now airing zone away from the junction provides, with only one or two driveways affected this would appear to be the safest place to park on the road currently. I would instead like to invite the council to review restrictions at the easterly end of the Devereux Mews road where there is a junction with Wheeler Way, often vehicles are parked on this Junction in the Wheeler Way road which leads to oncoming vehicles being in the wrong side of the road for the low visibility junction creating serious safety concerns; which appear to have been over looked in this report. Happy to speak over the phone if my comments aren't clear. Many thanks.</p>	<p>The restrictions proposed will help to mitigate the impact of inconsiderate on-street parking on vulnerable road users (child pedestrians).</p>
Malmesbury Town Council	letter	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Malmesbury Town Council</b> (ENGLAND'S OLDEST BOROUGH - CHARTER GRANTED 880)</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width: 30%;"> <p>Richard Spencer-Williams Town Clerk</p> <p>Telephone: (01666) 822143</p> <p>E-mail: <a href="mailto:claire.mann@malmesbury.gov.uk">claire.mann@malmesbury.gov.uk</a></p> </div> <div style="width: 10%; text-align: center;">  </div> <div style="width: 30%;"> <p>The Town Hall Malmesbury Wiltshire SN16 9BZ</p> </div> </div> <p>Traffic Order Team, Sustainable Transport, County Hall, Bythesea Road, Trowbridge, BA14 6JN</p> <p>2<sup>nd</sup> September 2020</p> <p><b>Ref. HKB/TRO/MALM.</b></p> <p>The Planning &amp; Environment Committee of Malmesbury Town Council met on the 25<sup>th</sup> August to discuss the proposed TRO. It was resolved to submit the following comments to the consultation.</p> <p><u>Carnival Close</u> After considering Councillor feedback following a visit to the location, Committee could see no logical reason for the request and expressed concern that the proposed 'No waiting at any time' would in fact lead to further parking issues in other areas of the Close. Malmesbury Town Council requests evidence from WC to justify the TRO.</p> <p><u>Devereux Mews</u> Members had no objection to the proposal.</p> <p><u>Gilmore Road</u> Members had no objection to the proposal.</p> <p><u>Prohibition of all motor vehicles – Webbs Way/Snell Avenue</u> Malmesbury Town Council fully supports the proposal and has raised the issue with Wiltshire Council on numerous occasions.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Claire Mann, Deputy Town Clerk Malmesbury Town Council</p>	<p>Malmesbury Town Council was consulted in September 2019 regarding the planned scheme. In October 2019 a response was sent to the Town Council giving additional information stating that the scheme was drawn up in response to both resident concerns and by Highways Officers conducting on site visits at various times of the day.</p> <p>The prime concern of the LHA is highway safety and there was evidence of the turning head in Carnival Close becoming an ad-hoc parking space for visits to the adjacent public open space. It appears that people who visit the POS are parking in the</p>

Name	Address	Objection/Support/Comment	Officer's Response
			<p>turning head potentially obstructing refuse vehicles and resident access. With on-street parking prohibited any future permanent pedestrian link for users of the POS can be safely used.</p>
Resident Devereux Mews	Email	<p>I think the entire Filands estate needs to be evaluated as there are a number of issues with current parking etiquette such as parking on blind bends, opposite road junctions and on junctions as well as double parking where the visitor parking is, even when there are spaces available. All of this makes it difficult to navigate the estate. Quite frankly there is no excuse for this behaviour as there is plenty of parking available for each property as well as the additional parking, all of which is unusual for a new build estate.</p> <p>WRT Devereux Mews, I would prefer the entire road to have parking restrictions. My main concern with only having part of the road restricted is that it will move the problem further down the road.</p> <p>Cheers</p>	<p>The restrictions proposed will help to mitigate the impact of inconsiderate on-street parking on vulnerable road users (child pedestrians).</p> <p>The effect of the restrictions on displaced parking will be monitored.</p>
Resident Devereux Mews	Email	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to pull together the proposals for the Filands View estate. I live at Devereux Mews with my husband and two young children.</p> <p>My comments on the proposals are that I am grateful for them. There are some issues across the estate and I wonder if the proposals could go slightly further? Currently there seems to be a trend of parking on pavements/roads yet the majority of drives take at least two cars - when we bought Bloor told us all houses had parking for two to three cars and I am a bit surprised as to how many cars there are on the roads outside of the designated parking areas. I find the parking issue particularly problematic when walking with my toddler or pushing a pram as we end up in the road when on the way to the parks or town. The top of Devereux Mews does seem to be one of the worst areas but people also regularly park opposite the junctions. It is really hard to explain road safety to a two year old generally (!) and even harder when you</p>	<p>The restrictions proposed will help to mitigate the impact of inconsiderate on-street parking on vulnerable road users (child pedestrians).</p> <p>The design of the roads, including minimal sightlines and offset junctions fulfils the criteria outlined in Manual for Streets which uses design to encourage low vehicle speeds. This development meets these requirements and as such is acceptable for a 20-mph zone, without the need for vertical traffic calming. A 20-mph zone will be in place prior to or on adoption of the</p>

Name	Address	Objection/Support/Comment	Officer's Response
		<p>then have no choice but to dart into the road. This is a bit dangerous and it just seems really unnecessary on an estate with ample safe parking. I am sure it's nothing other than a lack of thought about the impacts of how cars have been parked and I don't think restricting parking will cause much of an issue other than people will just need to use their drives more. Cars also tend to drive fairly quickly so it might be helpful if the estate could be signed as 20mph.</p> <p>Thinking about Devereux Mews, please could you consider giving the entire road parking restrictions? The houses on this particular street do appear to have parking for two cars so I'd hope this wouldn't be a real problem for anyone. It's become an increasingly worse problem over time - people seemed to be much more up for using their drives when we all first moved in! It could be a case of seeing one household park on the road and then the rest joining in outside their own houses. My main concern with only having part of the road restricted is that it will move the problem down the road - people have already shown a slight lack of common sense given the existing state of affairs. The restrictions could possibly just be down the side with the pavement so cars don't simply block the pedestrian route? I really wouldn't like to cause any households issues but if we could get to a place where pavements could be used as pavements rather than being blocked by parked cars that would be great!</p> <p>Many thanks for considering my comments.</p>	<p>development roads.</p> <p>The effect of the restrictions on displaced parking will be monitored.</p>
Resident Devereux Mews	email	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>Unfortunately your website for traffic orders is not working (see attachment screenshot) so I am emailing you with our views and requests on the proposal HKB/TRO/MALM.</p> <p>The proposed waiting area outside number will prevent affect my ability as a disabled driver to park outside my house. There is a serious parking congestion issue around the house with several cars parked on the pavements and parking on the road at the end of the driveway which prevents me as a disabled driver from using the driveway. This means that I MUST park</p>	<p>Vehicles with Blue Parking Badges are able to park within waiting restrictions.</p> <p>The resident has been advised on Wiltshire Council services that can assist in discretionary disabled parking assessments.</p> <p>The restrictions proposed will help to mitigate the impact of inconsiderate on-street parking on, in particular, vulnerable road users.</p>

Name	Address	Objection/Support/Comment	Officer's Response
		<p>outside the main entrance to the house at the front of the front door at Devereux Mews. If you put a waiting zone outside the front door of parked where the waiting area is proposed I will be unable to park.</p> <p>Therefore I request that a parking space designated as a disabled bay outside the front of I attach a copy of my disabled badge issued by you.</p> <p>I have spoken to the neighbours at as they have 4 cars (two on the driveway and two on the road opposite the driveway - see photos below where they grey car is mine and the blue car is one parked at the end of the driveway belonging to preventing a reversal or move forward given my limited moving circle) and they have refused to park elsewhere. This means that I cannot use the driveway as I have mobility issues in both arms - one arm is missing congenitally) and it is impossible to drive into or out of the driveway with my mobility issues due to where they park (see attached photos). Even if they moved their cars it is still a mobility problem to move in and out of the driveway as the driveway is shared with the neighbours directly next to us.</p>	
Resident Carnival Close	email	<p>As a resident I object to the proposed parking restrictions on our estate.</p> <p>I am resident on Carnival Close.</p> <p>At the moment the estate enjoys a feeling of great community through our face book page and general well being towards each other.</p> <p>I strongly believe these measures will not solve the problem but they will have a detrimental effect on the good will enjoyed here by all.</p> <p>When Bloor planned the estate they allowed for plenty of resident spaces close to respective homes and visitor spaces were also created.</p> <p>I'm not denying there is a problem. However it would appear tandem drives</p>	<p>Covenants and the Highway Code are not enforceable by the Council's enforcement officers. The restrictions proposed will help to mitigate the impact of inconsiderate on-street parking on vulnerable road users (child pedestrians).</p> <p>The effect of the restrictions on displaced parking will be monitored.</p> <p>The Council has consulted along the lines of statutory consultation which involves the positing of site notices and press notices in the local newspapers. Wiltshire Council does not letter drop as part of</p>

Name	Address	Objection/Support/Comment	Officer's Response
		<p>have seen residents take up a visitor space or park awkwardly on roads permanently, rather than shunt the cars.</p> <p>The Highway Code is not adhered to in respect of parking too close to the main junction or opposite turnings.</p> <p>Surely a better solution would be to write to all residents reminding them of the covenants placed on the estate by Bloor regarding the visitor spaces(not 24hrs), Plus the Highway Code infringements.</p> <p>As it stands, the proposed measures will simply move the parking issues onto the other roads and cause friction where there is presently none.</p> <p>This would be a good opportunity to remind us residents of the rules and covenants set by Bloor and to park safely within the Highway Code statute.</p> <p>I therefore strongly object to the proposed measures.</p>	<p>their statutory consultation.</p>
Resident Carnival Close	Email	<p>We strongly object to the proposal to restrict street parking, as we do not believe there is a problem. Builders, Bloor Construction, intended to allow adequate visitor parking and, to all intents and purposes, they achieved that with the layout that all residents bought into.</p> <p>There have been little or no problems with parking except where residents have tried to lay claim to unallocated bays, I.e. those intended for visitor parking.</p> <p>To invoke formal restrictions as you propose is an overreaction and will detract from the neighbourly cooperation that is enjoyed most of the time.</p> <p>I hope will reconsider this proposal</p>	<p>The prime concern of the LHA is highway safety and there was evidence of the turning head in Carnival Close becoming an ad-hoc parking space for visits to the adjacent public open space. It appears that people who visit the POS are parking in the turning head potentially obstructing refuse vehicles and resident access. With on-street parking prohibited any future permanent pedestrian link for users of the POS can be safely used.</p>
Resident Carnival Close	Email	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed parking restrictions on the Filand's View Bloor homes estate, specifically the proposals for Carnival Close. I do not believe the proposed no waiting restriction is proportionate or necessary for the area.</p> <p>First, I would like to note that the council in its administration of this proposal has created significant anxiety and bad feeling amongst residents in Carnival Close, several</p>	<p>The prime concern of the LHA is highway safety and there was evidence of the turning head in Carnival Close becoming an ad-hoc parking space for visits to the adjacent public open space. It appears that people who visit the POS are parking in the turning head potentially obstructing refuse vehicles and resident access. With on-street parking prohibited any future</p>

Name	Address	Objection/Support/Comment	Officer's Response
		<p>of whom are elderly and infirm, at a time of already great stress given the current climate in the midst of a global pandemic. None of the residents directly affected by the proposed restrictions have raised any issues with the parking situation in the Close, so we were all surprised to find your notices on several lamp posts in the close arrive on the 12th August.</p> <p>I was present when the council's representatives surveyed the area (as were most residents as we were still largely in lockdown/most workers still furloughed) at which time I pointed out the fact that access was not restricted despite all residents being at home and there was no obstruction to pavement or residences. This continues to be the case now. It also appears easy to infer that if parking in the area is not causing issues during a unique event like lockdown, when more regular service resumes parking in the area would be even less of an issue.</p> <p>Thankfully we are not an area that suffers from non-resident use of the Close for parking (for Dyson employees for example), and all residents and their visitors park considerately without causing an obstruction. We have two vehicles, one of which fits on the driveway, the other is parked in the street. Our garage is too narrow / low for our vehicles to park in. We have a small child and regularly use the footpaths in the Close and on the estate in general without issue or having to deviate from the path; the one exception to this is on Devereaux mews, where there are on occasion cars parked on the footpath, however the council would do better to simply ask residents to park on the road, rather than the planned no waiting restriction in that area - I believe there is information / order traffic signage available that would achieve this. We also feel quite safe using the block paved shared space 'carriageways' on foot, and many of the residents' children play in the street without issue. There have been several instances of emergency service vehicles attending properties in the Close over the last 12 months and at no time has access ever been an issue; weekly refuse collections have</p>	<p>permanent pedestrian link for users of the POS can be safely used. The effect of the restrictions on displaced parking will be monitored.</p> <p>While parking standards can be negotiated at the planning stage, issues such as obstructive parking can often only be evidenced after occupancy.</p> <p>The restrictions hereby proposed have been initiated after residents' complaints of inconsiderate parking and were developed after highway officers conducted site visits at different times of the day and evening, including weekends. Subsequent walking inspections informed the officers that these measures were necessary.</p> <p>The prohibition of motor vehicle order at the boundary of Snell Avenue and Webbs Way as proposed has become desirable to prevent parked vehicles from restricting access to pedestrians and cyclists. This was deemed necessary after resident complaints of cyclists mounting the kerb and causing a potential danger to pedestrians as the road was obstructed by parked vehicles. The intent is for the bollards to discourage cars and to encourage cyclists to use the roadway as designed.</p> <p>The Council has consulted along the lines of statutory consultation which involves the positing of site notices and press notices in the local newspapers. Wiltshire Council does not letter drop as part of their statutory consultation.</p>

Name	Address	Objection/Support/Comment	Officer's Response
		<p>never been affected by an obstruction - I have even questioned the refuse collectors regarding the proposed restrictions and they told me that this is the least likely area to need any form of enforcement in the town.</p> <p>There is no visitor/additional parking in the immediate area, so the proposed restrictions will simply mean residents and their visitors will have to park vehicles that would have been safely parked in the proposed zone further around the Close, which would likely create more of an inconvenience for other residents. Ourselves and neighbours regularly receive visitors who currently park on the street without issue or obstructing the road/footpaths and the proposed restrictions will cause significant difficulties for them. Our extended families are regular carers for our son, and the restrictions will have a significant negative impact on their ability to park in our section of the Close.</p> <p>This is a brand new estate, of mainly 3-5 bed houses; promotional material from the developer expressed that the development's cul de sacs were created as shared spaces with dropped curbs that allowed pedestrians unrestricted access to all areas and that parking for residents wouldn't be an issue. I believe the council's highways department would have been consulted as part of the planning process, and it's not hard to envisage this exact situation arising; that large multiple occupant houses with one or two parking space allocations would need more space than this. As a matter of some urgency, given there are now proposals to develop land to the east of this development, the council's planning department must consider parking as a priority when assessing future developments so future owners of these potential dwellings are not also inconvenienced by this shortsighted lack of parking on new housing estates. I also question why the majority of the restrictive proposals are in areas adjacent to the affordable housing on the development; are we being unfairly targeted because we live opposite/ near this required housing?</p> <p>When we purchased our property we asked</p>	

Name	Address	Objection/Support/Comment	Officer's Response
		<p>specifically about potential parking issues and was told by the developer that there wouldn't be an problem as the estate had been designed sympathetically, in full consultation with Highways, with plenty of additional on street parking. Whilst I understand it will be of no concern to the council, the proposed restriction will likely have a negative impact on the future sale of my property as well as the others in the Close. It will also increase my insurance premium as I would have to park my vehicle further away from my house. The signage and yellow lines on the block paving will also look unsightly and not at all in keeping with the area.</p> <p>Parking for many in the town is already a significant issue, but thankfully Carnival Close does not suffer from insensitive or obstructive parking, or non-resident parking in the area; it therefore appears that this measure is entirely punitive on the residents and the proposal should be abandoned.</p> <p>I shall comment more generally on the proposals for other areas of the development: I've already mentioned Devereaux Mews, and suggest enforcing non-pavement parking in this area; the no waiting area in Gilmore road seems overly large, however stopping vehicles from blocking the field entrance in that area seems sensible; the prohibition of driving signage at the bollards separating snell ave. and Webbs Way seems superfluous as there is a physical barrier to vehicles in this area. I have twice witnessed delivery vans attempt to mount the pavement to drive round these bollards to avoid having to proceed around the Reeds Farm estate to reach Finland's View. If the plan is to further deter this, a 'no motor vehicle' sign is unlikely to achieve this. Additional bollards and enforcement through current dangerous driving legislation could be used in these instances. Please explain why this prohibition is considered necessary.</p> <p>I ask that you acknowledge receipt of my objection to the restrictions in Carnival Close; and provide answers to the questions raised, particularly why these measures are</p>	



Name	Address	Objection/Support/Comment	Officer's Response
		<p>considered for Carnival Close; how many complaints regarding parking in Carnival Close were received to trigger this consultation and proposal? Is the council's approach to simply 'move these vehicles on', or is there a more holistic approach; if the latter could the council please offer suggestions for residents and their visitors as to where they can safely park their vehicles in the Close that isn't considered an obstruction (as it appears that the lack of physical obstruction is not a sole criterion).</p>	
Resident Carnival Close	email	<p>I am writing to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed parking restrictions on the Filand's View Bloor homes estate, specifically the proposals for Carnival Close. I do not believe the proposed no waiting restriction is necessary for the area.</p> <p>As a new mother the proposed restrictions will be unnecessarily restrictive and have a negative impact on our family and the other residents of Carnival Close. I've not experienced any issues with the parking in the proposed area of the restrictions, as a pushchair user I've not come across any obstructions to the pavements, and a no waiting restriction will make my life so much more difficult, not being able to park outside my own property.</p> <p>It will also mean when our parents come to visit or to look after my son they will not be able to park near our house. This seems so unnecessary as there is more than enough room on the street for cars to park and other residents to access their properties. I've lived here since the estate opened and we've never experienced any issues with parking: our driveway or house has never been obstructed and having spoken to our neighbours there appears to be unanimous agreement that the restrictions will have a negative impact to the Close. Having been on maternity leave and then furloughed, I have a unique perspective in having largely been at home for the last 12 months and I can categorically state that there has not been any instance of vehicles (including ambulances or bin lorries) being impeded / not being able to access the Close. I can even provide the last 30 days' CCTV</p>	<p>The prime concern of the LHA is highway safety and there was evidence of the turning head in Carnival Close becoming an ad-hoc parking space for visits to the adjacent public open space. It appears that people who visit the POS are parking in the turning head potentially obstructing refuse vehicles and resident access. With on-street parking prohibited any future permanent pedestrian link for users of the POS can be safely used.</p> <p>The Council has consulted along the lines of statutory consultation which involves the positing of site notices and press notices in the local newspapers. Wiltshire Council does not letter drop as part of their statutory consultation.</p> <p>The restrictions hereby proposed have been initiated after residents' complaints of inconsiderate parking and were developed after highway officers conducted site visits at different times of the day and evening, including weekends. Subsequent walking inspections informed the officers that these measures were necessary.</p>

Name	Address	Objection/Support/Comment	Officer's Response
		<p>footage of the Close that proves there has been no obstruction to the Close's road or pavements.</p> <p>I am also disappointed at the council's timing of the consultation and lack of prior notification. I appreciate that this is a consultation process, however this is a dead end Close, with no access to the adjacent parkland so these restrictions will only affect the residents of the Close and their visitors. The council could have easily written to residents to inform them that presumably there had been a complaint about parking in the area. Having spoken to the majority of residents now, all are horrified at the proposal and given the tight-knit community spirit, the manner of the consultation has created significant bad feeling and anxiety amongst residents.</p>	
Visitor to Carnival Close	email	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed parking restrictions on the Filand's View Bloor homes estate, specifically the proposals for Carnival Close. I do not believe the proposed no waiting restriction is necessary for the area. We are regular visitors to my son and his family and the proposed restrictions will create a significant and in my opinion unnecessary inconvenience to visitors like us to the Close.</p> <p>We, and other cars seen parked in the Close, are always parked considerately and we have not witnessed any obstructions in the area. There is no alternate parking in the area so the restrictions will have a significantly negative impact to the area and its residents.</p>	<p>The prime concern of the LHA is highway safety and there was evidence of the turning head in Carnival Close becoming an ad-hoc parking space for visits to the adjacent public open space. It appears that people who visit the POS are parking in the turning head potentially obstructing refuse vehicles and resident access. With on-street parking prohibited any future permanent pedestrian link for users of the POS can be safely used.</p>
Resident Carnival Close	email	<p>I have two specific objections to this proposal.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) As per the diagram below the area highlighted in green falls directly behind my private driveway. I regularly use this space for secondary/third vehicle parking causing no impact to any other road users. The area highlighted would only impact one person on this estate - myself - and therefore I see no reason for double yellow lines in this space. The green area highlighted is</li> </ol>	<p>The restrictions proposed will help to mitigate the impact of inconsiderate on street parking on vulnerable road users (child pedestrians).</p> <p>The effect of the restrictions on displaced parking will be monitored.</p> <p>Access to private drives and parking will not be affected by this proposal.</p> <p>The LHA agrees to an</p>

Name	Address	Objection/Support/Comment	Officer's Response
		<p>not a through road to any location, and no-one would be driving on this space other than to access my private driveway. Therefore I request that a 2 car length exclusion of the yellow lines is permitted directly behind my driveway to allow for parking to continue.</p> <p>2) In addition to this, I am not happy with the proposal for no wait time for the area highlighted in orange. As this proposal only covers one side of the road I anticipate cars and vehicles will simply move their parking in response to the new lines to directly in front of my main front window - area highlighted in blue. In doing this this will greatly impact my quality of life as sunlight and any external views would be completely blocked by vehicles. I have no issues with where they are being currently parked.</p>	<p>amendment to the advertised proposal and has removed a section of parking restrictions along the south side of Carnival Close. This amendment is in response to resident's comments and will still protect the turning head while on-street parking remains. The amendment is proposed in Appendix 3.</p>