

CALNE:
PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS
COMMENTS OF OBJECTION AND SUPPORT

Contents

Guthrie Close / Porte Marsh Rd	1
Lake View	2
Springfield Drive.....	4
Stockley Lane	11

26 Comments received (13 objecting, 13 supporting)

Breakdown by road			
Road	Objections	Support	Comments
Guthrie Close / Porte Marsh	0	4	1
Lake View	3	6	1
Springfield Drive	9	3	2
Stockley Lane	1	0	0

Guthrie Close / Porte Marsh Road

Ref	Comment Received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
GC	<p>Supports proposals and requests further restrictions</p> <p>We fully support this proposal. All too often drivers trying to exit Guthrie Close have their view of Porte Marsh Road dangerously obscured in both directions by vehicles parked right up to the corner of the road.</p>	4	<p>Comments of support are noted.</p> <p>At this stage of the legal process, we cannot increase the extent without re-advertising the proposals, at further expense and would further delay the implementation of the restrictions for the rest of the Calne proposals and whilst this may seem a request for a small addition, it will require an amendment to the whole Order.</p>

Lake View

Ref	Comment Received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
LV1	<p>Objections - Nowhere safe to park</p> <p>Objections were raised due to there being limited parking opportunities nearby. Parking elsewhere like on the A4, is not safe. There is no need for the yellow lines as its not close to the town or any work facilities, it is only used for people living in the area to park for their homes!</p>	3	The proposed restrictions on Lake View were developed to deter parking on both sides of the road and stop pavement parking. This will allow easier passage for the bus and emergency services as well as better visibility when going round the bend into the estate.
LV2	<p>Supports proposals and requests further restrictions</p> <p>Traffic control action has been required for many years at the entrance to Lake View. The proposal however is only half hearted in that as only one side of the road will be "no waiting" cars will simply park on the uncontrolled side therefore having no positive effect on the current problem.</p> <p>They welcome the fact that at last serious consideration is being addressed to this very dangerous area but believes the proposals do not go far enough.</p>	2	<p>Comments of support are noted. At this stage of the legal process, we cannot increase the extent without re-advertising the proposals, at further expense and would further delay the implementation of the restrictions for the rest of the Calne proposals and whilst this may seem a request for a small addition, it will require an amendment to the whole Order.</p> <p>Further to the comments received, it is recommended that the proposal be introduced as advertised and parking behaviour monitored after implementation.</p>
LV3	<p>Currently, cars tend to park on the right hand side of the road. When they do park on the left hand side it creates significant difficulties for other road users who have to navigate around them. We respectfully suggest that any extension should be on the left hand side along the front of 56 Lake View rather than the right hand side or, ideally, extended equally on both sides.</p>	1	See comments LV2 above

Lake View cont...

Ref	Comment Received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
LV 4	<p>Based on the proposal drawing surely this should however be extended to both sides of the road?</p> <p>Most of the vehicles which park in these areas are often for residents of the properties along the A4 rather than short term waiting or temporary parking. Our concern is that with the new no waiting restrictions, vehicles will now be pushed down into Lake View ultimately moving the problem rather than resolving it.</p>	1	See comments LV2 above
LV 5	<p>We are very grateful that you are planning to introduce a no waiting along the entrance road to our estate.</p> <p>However, on turning into the estate it is usual to find cars parked along the L side of the road as far as the first bend, and on the R side of the road after the first bend. Only occasionally are there cars parked on both sides of the road after the first bend. Access to the estate involves navigating 2 right-angle bends and with cars parked on either side of the road causes an obstruction and inconvenience. Your proposal will only prevent cars parking on both sides of the road. This is important because this causes an obstruction for all of us, blocks access to the estate for larger vehicles and is potentially dangerous in the event of the emergency services requiring access. The proposal will simply mean that cars parked on the R side of the road after the first bend will park on the other side of the road.</p> <p>We suggest that you extend your proposal on both sides of the road as far as the second bend.</p>	1	<p>Your comments and observations are noted.</p> <p>See comments LV2 above</p>

Lake View cont...

Ref	Comment Received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
LV 6	Fully agree this proposal. Cars currently parked there present hazards for drivers and pedestrians especially transiting into LV and around the bend into the estate. The situation is exacerbated by the lack of a formal roundabout directly outside LV on the A4. Unfortunately this results in continual turning in the LV entrance instead whilst 2 way traffic negotiates in and out of LV with the additional hassle of parked cars in the same vicinity	1	See comments LV2 above

Springfield Drive

Ref	Comment Received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
SD 1	<p>Objection</p> <p>We believe the proposal in its current form will not solve the parking and safety issues created by vehicles parking at the A4 junction of Springfield Drive. Extending the length of the no waiting at anytime will only move the problem to a different location on SD.</p> <p>The issue is caused by parking restrictions and inadequate parking for residents on the A4 who use the entrance to SD to park their vehicles. People will still want to park in SD and will park at the end of the no waiting at anytime where the road is narrower and with parking available on both sides of the street access for emergency and recycling vehicles will be restricted.</p>	1	<p>Requests from residents, supported by the Town Council expressed difficulties accessing the road due to cars parking close to the junction with the A4.</p> <p>Engineers then visited the site to make their own assessments and the proposals were developed and were ratified by the Town Council prior to the formal consultation.</p> <p>In considering the comments raised concerning the proposals, it is recommended that these proposals be reduced, this can be found in Appendix 3.</p>

Springfield Drive cont...

Ref	Comment Received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
SD 2	<p>Objection</p> <p>Stopping parking at the end of Springfield drive will just push people to park further up causing residents parking problems and possible congestion.</p>	2	See comments SD1 above
SD 3	<p>Older properties Curzon Street have no parking and therefore due to the double yellow lines on the main A4, rely on the parking availability on Springfield Drive.</p> <p>Concern was raised in this objection about a Springfield Drive resident who has been harassing people parking and also about the source of these proposals. They were concerned that the particular resident of Springfield Drive raised this non-issue and has somehow made it on to the proposals.</p>	1	See comments SD1 above
SD 4	<p>Residents of Curzon St have parked on Springfield drive opposite their properties for many years without any issue.</p> <p>What do we do if the proposal goes ahead. Do we try to find parking spaces away and out of sight of our properties in another street or a state further into town? Myself and other neighbourhood neighbours I have spoken to have had cars vandalised when forced park elsewhere out of sight of our properties. We believe the council have a duty of care to plan and consider the parking needs of existing residents.</p>	1	<p>See comments SD1 above</p> <p>It is the responsibility of the owner/keeper of the vehicle to find somewhere safe and legal to park their vehicle, although I accept in many cases this will be difficult, but it is something for which the Council cannot take responsibility.</p> <p>Resident season ticket parking is available in Wiltshire Council car parks in the town.</p>

Springfield Drive cont...

Ref	Comment Received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
SD 5	<p>Objection</p> <p>I can see no reason why you have chosen to put yellow lines in Springfield Drive only to restrict parking which is a premium in this area. There are no safety hazards. Springfield Drive is wide and can easily accommodate parking. The access or vision to the main road is not compromised. This is a ridiculous proposal and serves to cause further parking congestion in this estate further along the road as people still need to park their cars.</p>	1	See comments SD1 above
SD 6	<p>The way in which people currently park in Springfield Drive does not block access to the road (even for larger vehicles such as bin lorry's), it causes no harm to pedestrians and no issues for residents.</p> <p>The parking is sensible and necessary. As there are already severe restrictions on the A4 some houses understandably must park their vehicles within the entrance to Springfield Drive. Curzon Street currently has a no waiting zone Mon-Fri between 8am and 6pm. How is it that you are able to propose such severe measures of no waiting at any time on a residential street with minimal traffic yet on the main A4, one of the busiest roads in Calne, there is still parking allowed within specific hours?</p> <p>I believe this logic is flawed and an extreme measure to take when parking has not been an issue. All this proposal will do is create issues.</p>	1	See comments SD1 above

Springfield Drive cont...

Ref	Comment Received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
SD 7	<p>Objection</p> <p>I see no need for such restrictions. The entrance to the estate where clear access is necessary already has sufficient double lines installed. Parking has and does not cause an obstruction for residents or passing vehicles. As such I cannot see the requirement to implement such severe restrictions.</p> <p>A4 Curzon Street has daytime restrictions only, allowing residents to park of an evening, why are Springfield residents not to be awarded the same?</p> <p>I cannot understand why both sides of the road require restrictions, as unlike newer developments within Calne this section of Springfield Drive is of generations proportions, enabling parking and still uninhibited access for larger vehicles such as emergency services.</p>	1	See comments SD1 above
SD 8	<p>I strongly oppose this proposal. Even when the road is full of cars the council dust carts and emergency vehicles are still able to pass through without obstruction.</p> <p>My drive is never blocked and I can still safely see to reverse out of my drive, unhindered even with parked vehicles in the road.</p> <p>Drivers that currently park in the proposed area will naturally seek parking further into the estate. The proposal seems to address a problem that does not exist but instead could potentially create a real problem. How is it feasible to propose stronger restrictions on a housing estate than those that already exist on the A4?</p>	1	See comments SD1 above

Springfield Drive cont...

Ref	Comment Received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
SD 9	<p>Support & Comments</p> <p>I agree it is good idea to stop the junction being blocked by parking, we have had problems getting off the main road into Springfield Drive.</p> <p>But, there is an oncoming problem with parking in Springfield Drive, from the junction up to the top of the road as it turns into the small green area. This will just push the extra parked cars up the street. This small area of Springfield Drive has been at times, overwhelmed with vehicles, that have parked overlapping into driveway areas, parking in people's parking spaces - (not all homes have garages or a driveway), blocked the road creating problems for the refuse/ recycling lorry and also delivery people with larger vehicles.</p> <p>Could I suggest some type of restrictions on parking. Perhaps, free up the street in the evenings for residents as some don't have a garage or driveway, stop the people leaving vehicles for long periods of time. Perhaps look into the alternative parking areas for the residents that lost theirs.</p>	1	Comments of support are noted.

Springfield Drive cont...

Ref	Comment Received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
SD 10	<p>Support for proposals</p> <p>The reason for this is if it is effectively enforced by Wiltshire Council it will prevent longstanding problems of cars from the A4 on Curzon Street parking on both sides of Springfield Drive, including dangerous and inconsiderate parking to block pavements and sightlines, because of the bend on entering Springfield Drive</p> <p>This type of parking has been going on ever since the introduction of single yellow lines on Curzon Street. Our comments made at that time drew attention to the likelihood of this type of displacement parking.</p> <p>We suggest that a 'sheltered parking scheme' be introduced for the properties in Curzon Street that do not have any parking other than on street where the existing single yellow lines run currently.</p> <p>We believe that St Mary's School should also be consulted to see if they are willing to allow any off street car parking for any Curzon Street residents living next to the single yellow line. If these measures are not taken then it is likely that displacement parking from the A4 will continue and move further up Springfield Drive inconveniencing residents, pedestrians, cyclists, road users and importantly safe access for all the emergency services through and into Springfield Drive.</p>	1	<p>Comments of support are noted.</p> <p>At this stage of the legal process, we cannot increase the extent without re-advertising the proposals, at further expense and would further delay the implementation of the restrictions for the rest of the Calne proposals and whilst this may seem a request for a small addition, it will require an amendment to the whole Order.</p>

Springfield Drive cont...

Ref	Comment Received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
SD 11	<p>Support & Comments</p> <p>We are positive and negative for the proposals as we do agree that the pinch point at the junction needs to be sorted out, and would like to see some minor changes to the proposal which as well as keep the junction clear, will mean that we will not have to park our cars further up Springfield Drive cause further problems for access vehicles.</p> <p>We suggest putting yellow lines on the inside of bend, but only to the first dropped curve and not all of the way down. This will alleviate the pinch point, although much of the time this junction is clear, it seems to be more of a problem at certain times caused by displacement parking from non-residents of Springfield Drive. (Particularly at the weekend)</p> <p>St Marys agreed to provide 15 car park spaces for the residents on the A4 which park in Springfield Drive. We understand that the A4 residents and visitors abuse this, and end up parking where they should not, which causes the problem for the junction access as well as us.</p> <p>Could you make the 2 car spaces outside no.2 resident permit holder only and advise the displacement parking people from the A4 that they have permitted parking at St Marys and need to park at the back of their houses in Curzon Park and not on the main road or displaced elsewhere by the junctions.</p>	1	Comments of support are noted and see comments SD1 above.

Stockley Lane

Ref	Comment Received	Number of Times Received	Officer Comment
SL 1	<p>Moving the lines further down the road will bring the vehicles to the end of our drive, possibly both sides of the drive, which will make it almost impossible to drive out safely as our vision will be blocked.</p> <p>There rarely appear to be any problems with traffic flow along the road with them parked where they are at the moment. We would be grateful if you would re-consider your decision please.</p>	1	<p>The proposals were developed following concern about parked vehicle impeding the free flow of traffic by vehicles displaced by the existing restrictions at the junction with the A4.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed restrictions in Stockley Lane are excessive and therefore it is recommended that this proposal be withdrawn.</p> <p>A revised drawing can be found in Appendix 3.</p>

No comments were received to the following proposals;

- Church Street
- Lockett Way / William Street
- Silver Street

These proposals will therefore be implemented as advertised.