

Support for Prohibition and Waiting Restrictions	
Comment	Officer Response
<p>I am writing to express my strong support for the proposals for a no entry sign and no waiting zones on Whitehill, Bradford on Avon.</p> <p>When the no entry signs were in force before, rat running down Whitehill was almost completely stopped. Since the Access Only signs have returned, increasing numbers of drivers are using Whitehill as a cut through again, often driving fast and making walking up and down the hill less safe. I am especially concerned about this as it is a route used by many children and parents on the walk to and from Christ Church school and Leigh Cottage nursery.</p> <p>I firmly believe that No Entry signs would make the road safer and encourage more people to walk, so I strongly hope to see them in force very soon.</p>	<p>The comments of support for are noted.</p>
<p>I fully support the proposal to make Whitehill no entry at the top. The current 'access only' does not work /is not enforced and makes this small road a danger to pedestrians with traffic hurtling down it at rush hour in particular. The proposed solution will make this street safer and less polluted. It will require enforcement however; even when temporarily one way, some vehicles still drove down and drivers behaved very poorly when challenged.</p>	<p>The comments of support are noted.</p>
<p>I am very much in favour of a one-system for Whitehill.</p> <p>The arguments for this have been very well aired, but I'm happy to reiterate them. Whitehill is a narrow road - a situation made worse by double parking. A two way system is dangerous - many people use Whitehill as a rat-run & because they're in a hurry (delivery vans & taxis are especially culpable) they speed up when they see a clear run. Children & the elderly use this road more than any other to walk to & from the eastern side of town - Mason's Lane is not friendly to pedestrians. There will be a fatality one day & I sincerely hope the council are not waiting for that in order to impose traffic restrictions.</p>	<p>The comments of support are noted.</p>

<p>There are a lot of fairly elderly drivers living on Whitehill (I'm one of them!) - we are not fantastic at reversing out of tight spots when two cars coming in opposite directions are involved in a 'face-off' because neither parties want to reverse. This happens frequently & it's both distressing & dangerous.</p> <p>I have been told that the major issue preventing the adoption of a one-way system is the resistance of the people living at 25a & 25b, & 34 & 35 at the top of the hill. The matter could surely be resolved by double yellow lines around each side of the entrance to the roadway leading to 34 & 35. Their (extraordinary) argument that drivers would be encroaching on their properties in order to reverse is simply not true. Neither, I'm afraid, is the claim made by 25a & b that the camber at the entrance to their drive makes it impossible to access from the left.</p> <p>I hope - the great majority of Whitehill residents hope - that you make the right call in this matter.</p>	
<p>It is imperative that the Order is implemented IN FULL, including the proposal for no waiting at any time: Whitehill – east side – from a point 68 metres south of its junction with Mount Pleasant for a distance of 16.5 metres in a southerly direction. This is ESSENTIAL, and without this I would strongly object to the Order.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <p>It must be recognised that the driveway to the two dwellings 25 a and b takes a significant number of vehicles off Whitehill, but that the access to these properties is very difficult from the south as one needs to swing out to safely enter the shared driveway.</p> <p>if safe and realistic vehicular access is not maintained to these two bungalows, not only will you be precluding access for disabled residents with mobility impairments, you will also be adding to congestion on Whitehill.</p> <p>I am carer supporting my parents to live independently at 25b Whitehill, and therefore make regular trips to their house often carrying bulky or heavy items. They have other family members and people who also help them live independently who also of necessity must come by car.</p>	<p>The comments of support are noted.</p>

<p>I have a small car but cannot access their drive from the south without risking grinding my car on the pavement (evidence of this on the tarmac) and/or risking hitting the retaining wall.</p> <p>It is imperative therefore that the no waiting as proposed opposite their drive is included in the Order, so that we and service, delivery, emergency vehicles and visitors can access the driveway of 25 a and b and park off the street. Without this these vehicles will be forced to park on the street adding to congestion, or to block the road and cause obstruction.</p> <p>I support the no waiting Whitehill – both sides – from a point 7.5 metres south of its junction with Mount Pleasant for a distance of 10 metres in a southerly direction for reasons of pedestrian safety and visibility at this junction.</p>	
<p>We are very pleased to hear that there is a traffic consulation underway for Whitehill, Bradford on Avon. We have noticed that since the no entry signs were removed that the volume of traffic using the road as a rat run has increased and people ignore that it is access only, and impossible to in force. It is often used by vans and business vehicles travelling too fast.</p> <p>We are very pleased that you are considering reinstating these signs. Multiple families use this as the only route to Christ Church primary school from town and we are keen that it returns to the safe status when the signs were in place.</p> <p>Families also live on the hill who do not have a pavement between their houses and the road and again anything we can do reduce people using this road as a rat run to keep these children safe is much appreciated.</p> <p>It is a very small road and two way traffic coming in and out of the road is not sustainable.</p>	<p>The comments of support for the proposed prohibition of no entry are noted.</p>

Appendix 3

<p>Thank you for taking this consultation seriously and hopefully returning Whitehill to being a safe, reduced pollution place to live and use. This will be much appreciated by many residents in Bradford on Avon</p>	
<p>When there was a No Entry sign at the top of Whitehill, everything was much safer for the many pedestrians, especially schoolchildren. The drivers, who previously used the road as a rat run often went at an unsuitably high speed and this was dangerous on such a narrow road. These drivers are now returning, ignoring the Access Only sign. I appreciate that people living near the top of the hill find the closure at the top inconvenient but for the majority, access from the bottom only is far safer and we do need to encourage pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>I am over 80 and so I do drive to visit my daughter who lives on Whitehill. It can be a problem turning up from Silver Street with increased traffic coming down the hill.</p> <p>please consider reintroducing closure of access from the top.</p>	<p>The comments of support for the proposed prohibition of no entry are noted.</p>
<p>I am writing to you about the proposed prohibition of entry on Whitehill, Bradford on Avon. I am very much in favour of the proposal.</p> <p>I live on Whitehill with my two young children so therefore frequently walk up and down the road. When it was temporarily made no entry during the pandemic, it became a much safer place to be. When it is 'access only' as it is currently, the road is often used as a cut through. 'Access only' is largely ignored and almost unenforceable. The vehicles using it as a cut through know that they shouldn't be, so drive quickly at a speed that is unsuitable for the road. As you will no doubt be aware, the road is much used by pedestrians including numerous school children on their way to and from school as well as people getting from the North of the town to the centre. Because of the way the pavement is arranged, you have no option other than to cross the road. To do so without the worry of a speeding vehicle is certainly preferable.</p> <p>When we conducted our own survey about the no entry, the vast majority (over 75%) of residents were in favour of it, and unsurprisingly, pedestrian users were unanimously in favour of it. I know that as a council, you are encouraging people to walk and cycle rather than relying on the car. To make this road a safer and more pleasant environment to travel around Bradford on Avon is surely something we should be prioritising.</p>	<p>The comments of support for the proposed prohibition of no entry are noted.</p>

<p>As to the question of the no waiting zones, I am not convinced about how necessary they are. I am aware that some drives/ access roads are easier to approach from one direction. I would argue that all driveways are somewhat tricky to access because of the narrowness of the hill, but they are all possible. Plus there are already some natural turning areas on the hill. At the top, about halfway down (outside my house in fact) and at the bottom near Moxhams car park.</p> <p>If they are deemed necessary, I am still in favour of the proposal. Safety should be prioritised over convenience.</p>	
<p>Support for Prohibition of Entry; Object to Waiting Restrictions</p>	
<p>Comments</p>	<p>Officer Response</p>
<p>I am writing in full support of the above mentioned proposal. As a resident on Whitehill for 30 years, the worsening situation with regard to the current 'Access only' status was only relieved during the period of the temporary Covid arrangements and the introduction of 'No Entry' at the top of the road. The persistent rat running at speed which has increased over the years, in breach of the current regulations, has created a dangerous situation for both residents and the many pedestrians who use Whitehill to walk to and from the town centre. There has been little attempt to enforce the current restriction over the years and it is widely acknowledged that it is largely unenforceable. The introduction of the 'No Entry' in August 2020 saw an immediate improvement with a significant reduction in both the number and speed of vehicles on the road.</p> <p>In response to this improvement, residents submitted a petition to Councillor Trimble proposing the retention of the 'No Entry' arrangement; this was supported by 75% of properties on Whitehill. This was forwarded to your department in September 2021.</p> <p>I note that this consultation proposes the additional introduction of two 'No Waiting' areas to allow for vehicles turning. On a road where many properties do not have on site parking and parking is already limited, this does not seem to be a sensible proposal. During the 'No Entry' trial, residents had no difficulty turning their vehicles within the highway and there would appear to be little justification for now</p>	<p>The comments of support for the proposed prohibition of no entry are noted.</p> <p>Whilst the highway network is for the passage and re-passage of users, and on-street parking is not a guaranteed right or function, the impact of parking removal on the residents of Whitehill and surrounding roads is acknowledged.</p> <p>The proposal to remove parking is to ensure there are no future issues with driveway access or turning movements, however it is noted that there were limited</p>

Appendix 3

<p>introducing a measure which will simply exacerbate an existing problem. I hope that this element will not complicate or confuse the introduction of the 'No Entry' as soon as possible after the close of the consultation.</p>	<p>issues with this during the prohibition of no entry introduced as part of the social distancing measures.</p> <p>The objection to the proposed 'No Waiting at Any Time restrictions' is noted.</p>
<p>I email, you to express my support of this change although I don't really think that the 'no waiting' areas are necessary.</p>	<p>The comments of support for the proposed prohibition of no entry are noted.</p>
<p>I write to express my strong support for the No Entry sign to be placed at the top end of Whitehill for the safety of residents and all who use the road.</p> <p>In September last year Councillor Trimble delivered a petition which showed over 75% of the residents were in favour of the No Entry sign. During the Covid restrictions with the signs in position, the rat runners were few and far between making it so much safer for the many school children and elderly residents who walk up to school or down into town. The Access Only signs are mostly ignored and vehicles speed excessively down the hill with no consideration for cyclists or pedestrians.</p> <p>I am personally not convinced there is a need to lose parking spaces at the top of the road. Already on some parts of the road cars park on both sides, including the pavement, sometimes causing hold ups for larger delivery/refuse vehicles who are unable to pass. If there are less spaces at the top of Whitehill more cars will use both sides of the road causing more chaos. I am regularly unable to access my drive, due to the angle when cars are parked both sides, and therefore drive up to the top, where there is no problem turning by the 'Martins' entrance without actually accessing their road, as do other neighbours, so can see no reason for taking away parking opposite nos 25a and 25b as those residents can do the same. Are you able to re-consider the No Waiting aspect?</p> <p>I would ask that you proceed with the No entry signage as soon as possible after close of consultation.</p>	<p>The comments of support for the proposed prohibition of no entry are noted.</p> <p>Whilst the highway network is for the passage and re-passage of users, and on-street parking is not a guaranteed right or function, the impact of parking removal on the residents of Whitehill and surrounding roads is acknowledged.</p> <p>The proposal to remove parking is to ensure there are no future issues with driveway access or turning movements, however it is noted that there were limited issues with this during the</p>

	<p>prohibition of no entry introduced as part of the social distancing measures.</p> <p>The objection to the proposed 'No Waiting at Any Time restrictions' is noted.</p>
<p>I note with interest and some concern the proposals that Wilts Council Highways have come up for the implementation of a statutory No Entry at the top of Whitehill, BoA to get rid of the potential rat-run; not that it will prevent a hardened minority of white-van drivers from driving straight through, as was proven recently during the temporary changes to mitigate for CV-19.</p> <p>Interesting, very interesting and also somewhat worrying.</p> <p>My first reaction is "... and so you're going to simply sacrifice 3 or 4 parking spaces (more ..?) at the top of the hill when there is in fact no need to ..?", spaces that we can already ill afford to lose given that I (and others) already regularly struggle to park up here (I'm in #37), and probably have to look further afield in New Road, Sladesbrook (and even Woolley Street on a few occasions) on at least 1/3 of my returns to base, even before the necessary (and rather smart) rebuilding work at #25 required space to pass skips etc, losing four parking spaces for several months ...</p> <p>A tad selfish on my behalf? Perhaps, but very realistic, and I would make the following points:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is very evident that access to the properties on the small slip road to the right of the hill (driving up) near the bottom of Whitehill need downhill access to their tricky slip road, so something would have to be done IF the No Entry from the top was to be applied. 2. It is far less evident that access to Mullions/25a & 25b toward the top of the hill (on the left-hand side driving up) needs only access driving downhill, something that I have proven to myself many times in my relatively stiffly suspended Leon FR by simply driving up the hill and straight into the entrance. 	<p>The comments of support for the proposed prohibition of no entry are noted.</p> <p>Whilst the highway network is for the passage and re-passage of users, and on-street parking is not a guaranteed right or function, the impact of parking removal on the residents of Whitehill and surrounding roads is acknowledged.</p> <p>The proposal to remove parking is to ensure there are no future issues with driveway access or turning movements, however it is noted that there were limited issues with this during the prohibition of no entry introduced as part of the social distancing measures.</p>

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. In spite of point 2, there is certainly no need whatsoever to apply a 'No Waiting' zone opposite the entrance to Mullions/25a & 25b anyway, if there is already (or to be ...) a turning area of whatever form (see my next point) just a little higher up the hill. 4. There is in fact already a turning point further up the hill, this being the slip road to #34&35, one that I use regularly with no inconvenience to the respective property owners. I do however accept that it is quite possible that this slip road could be 'private'; I do not know whether that is the case, and note that there is not a 'No Turning' sign attached anywhere. 5. If there is indeed a privacy or access issue with the above slip road (point 4), then maybe the only option (if required) would be for the addition of a turning point such as the one that is marked on the plan at the very top of the hill. Either way the residents of #25a/b merely either need to prove to themselves that access to their drive is perfectly feasible driving UP the hill (it most certainly is; please see my second point above), or simply drive past, turn around at the top, and then enter their drive downhill. 6. If there is indeed a move to remove several parking spaces, a move that I and others will most vociferously oppose (a loss of only one at the very top MIGHT be OK ...), then the Council really has no option but to introduce Residents' Parking Only on/in Whitehill. 7. At present we have signs whose meaning are NO ENTRY TO MOTOR VEHICLES; EXCEPT FOR ACCESS at both ends of the hill. Just in case you are not aware of that definition, Whitehill already should be accessible ONLY by residents or those needing to access properties on or immediately off of the hill, that is the technical meaning of the signs at top and bottom. i.e. it is NOT a thoroughfare for just anybody to drive through, neither should it be accessed for people to drive into, park, and go to work, the Castle, MPSC, or wherever (they have no business in the restricted area). Logically it is therefore already in effect for Residents' Parking anyway, but of course it is sadly not given that status by our stubborn and apparently blinkered Council. Convert the signs at the top to statutory No Entry, which would be a good thing, and that situation should really be reinforced ... 	<p>The objection to the proposed 'No Waiting at Any Time restrictions' is noted.</p>
<p>I am a resident of Whitehill in Bradford on Avon (I live at no 25) and would like to comment on the proposed no waiting and prohibition of entry.</p> <p>Prohibition of entry:</p>	<p>The comments of support for the proposed prohibition of no entry are noted.</p>

<p>I full support this measure. The road is a quiet residential street with many children and many vehicles cut through on a daily basis. We saw during the temporary no entry signs that these vehicle numbers were dramatically reduced. A no entry sign is far more effective than an access only sign.</p> <p>No waiting I strongly object to the loss of any parking spaces in the road. We are already short and if space for around four parked cars is removed from the space, then increasingly significant numbers of residents will not be able to park in their own road. This is unacceptable.</p> <p>I understand that some residents in side roads have trouble turning in when driving up the hill. That means they need to turn round in the road so they can enter their side roads from uphill. I turn round in Whitehill on a daily basis using the side road on the east side near the top of the road. I barely enter the side road, but just use it to turn at right angles to Whitehill, and then reverse out again. Anyone else who needs to turn can use this too. There is no need to add extra turning space on a road already short of parking</p> <p>The small side road on the east side of Whitehill near the bottom is indeed difficult to turn into when coming up the hill. However, the private road giving access to the 25A and 25B is NOT difficult to turn into. To prove the point I have driven both my car and a transit van into the very start of the drive while driving uphill - it is perfectly feasible, in fact very easy, and there is absolutely no need for a no waiting space to be created opposite the entrance. If they moved their large planter from the entrance it would be even easier, and adjusting the camber of the drive would make it simple for even the most anxious or poorly skilled driver</p> <p>In other words, the only people who really need to turn around are those living in the side road near the bottom of the hill. Such a small number of people can surely use the existing side road near the top to turn round, as I do. Removing four or more parking spaces would mean creating a much larger problem to solve a minor issue.</p>	<p>Whilst the highway network is for the passage and re-passage of users, and on-street parking is not a guaranteed right or function, the impact of parking removal on the residents of Whitehill and surrounding roads is acknowledged.</p> <p>The proposal to remove parking is to ensure there are no future issues with driveway access or turning movements, however it is noted that there were limited issues with this during the prohibition of no entry introduced as part of the social distancing measures.</p> <p>The objection to the proposed 'No Waiting at Any Time restrictions' is noted.</p>
--	---

<p>Even if a new turning area must be created, it should be no more than space for a single car to park and should be located at the very top of the hill.</p> <p>I am aware that many other residents strongly object to losing any parking spaces. This is particularly important for elderly residents, those who have daily visits from carers, and those with young children.</p> <p>Please do not create serious parking problems to solve a very minor issue for a very small group of residents - something that is not in fact an issue at all, as I know through daily personal experience of turning round quickly and easily in the side road near the top.</p>	
<p>Dear Sir or Madam, Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed traffic orders for Whitehill, Bradford on Avon.</p> <p>My comments are as follows :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I support the proposal to have a no entry sign at the top of Whitehill. 2. I think that the need for a turning area at the top justifies the loss of 10 metres of kerb parking. 3. The proposal to facilitate entry to a private driveway (serving only two households) through the loss of 16.5 metres of kerbside parking is totally unreasonable and unjustified. The driveway entrance could be reconfigured through the removal of rocks, and the reprofiling of the tarmac slope to facilitate direct access from an uphill direction. <p>A rough mental calculation shows that 33 households on Whitehill have no offstreet parking, whereas 17 households do have private parking. I think it would be very undemocratic for those that rely on onstreet parking to lose 3 or 4 spaces (16.5 metres) just to facilitate access to a private driveway for two households.</p>	<p>The comments of support for the proposed prohibition of no entry are noted.</p> <p>Whilst the highway network is for the passage and re-passage of users, and on-street parking is not a guaranteed right or function, the impact of parking removal on the residents of Whitehill and surrounding roads is acknowledged.</p> <p>The proposal to remove parking is to ensure there are no future issues with driveway access or turning movements, however it is noted that there were limited issues with this during the prohibition of no entry</p>

	<p>introduced as part of the social distancing measures.</p>
<p>A) NO ENTRY at top</p> <p>I write to express my strong support for the proposed regulation.</p> <p>You have the petition delivered to Councillor Trimble in September last year, which showed strong support amongst the residents.</p> <p>During the temporary ‘Covid’ arrangements, No Entry proved effective in overcoming the long-standing and dangerous problem of illegal through-running.</p> <p>B) WAITING RESTRICTIONS</p> <p>The proposed two areas of No Waiting are causing concern, as they merely exacerbate the problem of lack of parking, in Whitehill and across the town.</p> <p>I, and neighbours, found it perfectly possible to turn our vehicles, including a long-wheelbase van, on the highway where it meets the access to ‘Martins’; and similarly, to enter the bell mouth leading to properties 25a and b from uphill or downhill, with current parking spaces occupied.</p> <p>Would it be possible to re-consider the No Waiting aspect?</p> <p>Either way, I ask that you proceed with the No Entry signage as soon as possible after close of consultation.</p>	<p>The comments of support for the proposed prohibition of no entry are noted.</p> <p>Whilst the highway network is for the passage and re-passage of users, and on-street parking is not a guaranteed right or function, the impact of parking removal on the residents of Whitehill and surrounding roads is acknowledged.</p> <p>The proposal to remove parking is to ensure there are no future issues with driveway access or turning movements, however it is noted that there were limited issues with this during the prohibition of no entry introduced as part of the social distancing measures.</p> <p>The objection to the proposed ‘No Waiting at Any Time restrictions’ is noted.</p>

<p>I'm emailing to add my comments to the proposal to put a No Entry sign at the top of Whitehill. I fully endorse this part of the proposal. My only concern is with the loss of valuable parking spaces through the addition of no waiting areas at both the very top and especially, opposite no.s 25a and 25b. As far as I'm aware, there is not an issue turning into this slipway, other than the skills of the drivers to these properties. Other neighbours who have more difficult entryways on the hill, manage to do so without a problem.</p> <p>Otherwise and to reiterate, it would be a vast improvement if the No Entry sign goes up and should, in my opinion, be a priority.</p>	<p>The comments of support for the proposed prohibition of no entry are noted.</p> <p>Whilst the highway network is for the passage and re-passage of users, and on-street parking is not a guaranteed right or function, the impact of parking removal on the residents of Whitehill and surrounding roads is acknowledged.</p> <p>The proposal to remove parking is to ensure there are no future issues with driveway access or turning movements, however it is noted that there were limited issues with this during the prohibition of no entry introduced as part of the social distancing measures.</p> <p>The objection to the proposed 'No Waiting at Any Time restrictions' is noted.</p>
<p>I'm writing to support the proposed TRO LJB/TRO/BRAD4 for Whitehill, Bradford-on-Avon.</p> <p>As a resident of the road, I strongly support the reinstatement of the No-Entry signs at the top of the road. When these were put in place as part of social-distancing measures, they were transformative for the</p>	<p>The comments of support for the proposed prohibition of no entry are noted.</p>

<p>safety and amenity of the road. Through-traffic was reduced, and the road was safer for pedestrians and cyclists. Deliveries and emergency service vehicles were not greatly inconvenienced, and even parking was easier. Making the signs No-Entry, rather than the current Access Only, was much more effective.</p> <p>I'm guessing the No Waiting zones are to enable turning. I'm not sure they're needed, and would welcome some clarity over how many parking spaces will be removed and if both are necessary. If they are needed, then I'd be prepared to accept them in order to have the No Entry restored.</p> <p>Last year a number of residents sent a questionnaire to all houses on the road canvassing views on the No-Entry signs, which resulted in a very strong majority in favour. I hope that the decision will take into account the strength of feeling of the road's residents, who have been working for a solution to the longstanding traffic issues for some time.</p>	<p>Whilst the highway network is for the passage and re-passage of users, and on-street parking is not a guaranteed right or function, the impact of parking removal on the residents of Whitehill and surrounding roads is acknowledged.</p> <p>The proposal to remove parking is to ensure there are no future issues with driveway access or turning movements, however it is noted that there were limited issues with this during the prohibition of no entry introduced as part of the social distancing measures.</p> <p>The objection to the proposed 'No Waiting at Any Time restrictions' is noted.</p>
<p>Re: No Entry at top.</p> <p>I am in favour of the proposed regulation for No Entry at the top of the road.</p> <p>The petition submitted via councillor Tim Trimble last September recorded some 75% of residents in favour of the proposal.</p> <p>The No Entry experience during the Covid temporary arrangements provided the opportunity for residents to see how the measure could work towards resolving the dangers related to downhill vehicle rat running. As per the subsequent petition the overwhelming view is for the No Entry to be permanent.</p>	<p>The comments of support for the proposed prohibition of no entry are noted.</p> <p>Whilst the highway network is for the passage and re-passage of users, and on-street parking is not a guaranteed right or</p>

<p>Re Two No waiting areas.</p> <p>a, Vehicles currently wishing to turn round on the top half of the road normally use the area that leads to the driveway marked 'Martins'. There is sufficient turning space up to the inside edge of the public pathway and without need to enter into the actual private drive. Consideration could be given to new yellow lines on the corners of the path either side of 'Martins' to stop vehicles parking too close to the ends.</p> <p>The proposal for the removal of two spaces at the top achieves the same turnaround opportunity as 'Martins' but removes the parking spaces.</p> <p>b, The proposal to put two no waiting areas opposite the entrance to property numbers 25a and 25b loses two very usable resident parking spaces. The residents of 25a&b say their driveway angle does not allow for entering from arriving upwards. Whilst difficult to accept their argument to access then surely if it is as difficult as stated then they will just need to turn round at 'Martins' or the new spaces proposed at the top and enter with their direction of choice. (I often have to turn round somewhere on the road to enter my driveway due to vehicles parked on the path reducing the angle of entrance).I suggest the removal of these two spaces will have greater negative impact to resident parking than the driveway entrance preference of 25a and 25b.</p>	<p>function, the impact of parking removal on the residents of Whitehill and surrounding roads is acknowledged.</p> <p>The proposal to remove parking is to ensure there are no future issues with driveway access or turning movements, however it is noted that there were limited issues with this during the prohibition of no entry introduced as part of the social distancing measures.</p> <p>The objection to the proposed 'No Waiting at Any Time restrictions' is noted.</p>
<p>Objections</p>	
<p>Comments</p>	<p>Officer Response</p>
<p>I am concerned that the removal of parking space at the top of Whitehill will impact on parking on New Road and Sladesbrook. These roads are already busy for parking and any loss of parking at the top of Whitehill will only increase the pressure.</p>	<p>Whilst the highway network is for the passage and re-passage of users, and on-street parking is not a guaranteed right or function, the impact of parking removal on the residents of Whitehill and surrounding roads is acknowledged.</p>

<p>With respect to the proposed No Entry sign at the top of Whitehill. I disagree with the proposal as it is giving in to people who don't observe the Access Only sign and the proposal will inconvenience some of the residents.</p> <p>I have lived on Whitehill for 30 years and managed ok with the current traffic regime, this proposed change will affect the access to our private road and means that every time I return home I will have to go to the top of the hill and come almost all the way back down again to turn into our access road therefore doubling the amount of road use.</p> <p>The proposal makes the already difficult action of moving house ridiculously hard.</p> <p>It could also adversely affect property prices for some properties because of access issues.</p> <p>With respect of taking away parking spaces opposite the access to 'The Mullions and 25B this seems unnecessary as other parts of Whitehill have similar problems and deal with it.</p> <p>Although it doesn't affect me the withdrawal of those spaces will certainly affect residents of Whitehill who will have less spaces to park on their own hill.</p> <p>If drivers don't respect the Access Only sign I can't see them paying attention to the No Entry sign for as the current sign has not been enforced by the authorities no doubt neither will they for the new sign unless they are planning to install cameras.</p> <p>If there are not going to be cameras or enforced action why would you expect me to abide by the No Entry sign and inconvenience myself by not accessing from the top, something I have been doing, mostly without incident for 30 years.</p>	<p>Enforcement of prohibitions of motor vehicles and prohibition of entry restrictions currently sit with Wiltshire Police. In practical terms, it is much simpler for enforcement of a Prohibition of Entry to be undertaken as there can be no doubt that motorists passing the signed No Entry are in contravention of the legal order. With the existing restriction – Prohibition of Motor Vehicles – Except for Access – officers must establish that the vehicle did not have a legitimate reason for accessing Whitehill before any enforcement can take place.</p> <p>The concerns regarding the waiting restrictions and loss of parking are noted.</p>
<p>I have several concerns about the above proposal.</p>	<p>Additional No Entry signing was introduced as part of the social distancing arrangements. This</p>

<p>1. I'm puzzled by the need for this. I regularly use Whitehill to walk into town and there is hardly any traffic. My partner uses this route to walk to the station twice daily and has also observed very little traffic. The latest signage, put in place last year I think, appears to be doing a good job. I presume there is an actual count of the number of vehicles using Whitehill, to use as evidence for the proposal.</p> <p>2. Losing 4/5 parking spaces will likely impact parking on New Road/Sladesbrook, if residents/deliveries/carers etc are having to find alternative parking.</p> <p>3. As a consequence of closing Whitehill at the top, either New Road-Springfield-Silver St or Mason's Lane-Market St-Silver St will have to shoulder more traffic. It hardly seems a holistic approach to the town's traffic issues.</p> <p>4. I believe the proposal will create more problems to the surrounding road network. This proposal is trying to solve a situation, where there isn't a particular issue in the first place. The town has many traffic issues; this isn't one of them.</p>	<p>has since been revoked however this proposal seeks to reintroduce that restriction.</p> <p>Whilst the highway network is for the passage and re-passage of users, and on-street parking is not a guaranteed right or function, the impact of parking removal on the residents of Whitehill and surrounding roads is acknowledged.</p>
<p>The proposal will remove valuable parking spaces from the properties on Mount Pleasant that have rear access from Whitehill,</p> <p>This would considerable inconvenience and on some occasions undoubtedly result the inability to park within a reasonable distance of the properties. There are a number of young families that would be affected by this change.</p> <p>This is further a concern as the spaces on Mount Pleasant would very possibly be removed if a future one way system becomes a reality.</p> <p>I have seen or heard no clear explanation or reason why the spaces should be removed and strongly object to this happening.</p>	<p>Whilst the highway network is for the passage and re-passage of users, and on-street parking is not a guaranteed right or function, the impact of parking removal on the residents of Whitehill and surrounding roads is acknowledged.</p> <p>The objection to the proposed 'No Waiting at Any Time restrictions' is noted.</p>

<p>I oppose this change to be honest I am not sure what the overall benefit is ? I have lived over many years at a couple of houses on whitehill.</p> <p>By creating a one way up the hill you are increasing traffic either mason lane or new road Very few cars access the hill inappropriately and by displacing parking spaces for no waiting to allow turning would then create more of a problem further down the hill with double parking . This is more of a problem with it being tight for a car never mind a van etc .</p> <p>When the road was changed before we had terrible problems with deliveries with even small vans struggling to turn from silver street to whitehill and getting very frustrated when they did manage it getting stuck half way up due to double parking .</p> <p>The no waiting areas look as if they may displace 5-6 cars depending on parking of others .</p> <p>We also had two deliveries who got here then literally drove off as they said they couldn't access our house . I am not sure how it would work if anyone needed to move and needed a lorry to access from the bottom nigh on impossible I would say ?</p> <p>Also at the entrance to 34/35 whitehill is a private road and the likelihood is that people would use that as well as they did when road was changed last time causes more wear and tear and at times preventing us leaving our properties .</p> <p>I know the majority on whitehill want this one way change but at the loss of valuable parking I am not sure that is a positive change for the majority.</p> <p>I sincerely hope you weigh up not just numbers of pro the change and against but the impact this will have on the overall hill. I am so disappointed it has worked as it is for years so why change at cost and stress to others ? Not progression for me I am afraid</p>	<p>Whitehill would still be subject to two-way traffic however access into Whitehill would be from Silver Street only.</p> <p>The concerns regarding loss of parking and displacement are noted and will be considered.</p> <p>With regard to removals and delivery vehicles, access will remain possible from Silver Street with exit onto Mount Pleasant ensuring no turning is needed for these larger vehicles.</p>
<p>I would like to comment on the proposed Traffic Orders with respect to Whitehill, Bradford on Avon.</p> <p>1) I particularly object to the 16.5 metres of parking spaces removed from the east side of Whitehill opposite a private driveway. It should not be right that so many people on the hill should loose</p>	<p>Whitehill would still be subject to two-way traffic however access into Whitehill would be from Silver Street only.</p>

<p>spaces,when the people living up this driveway could turn at the top of the hill like everyone else would be expected to do.</p> <p>2) To loose 10 metres of spaces at the top of the hill is too many for a road with so little parking. So I would like Whitehill to remain as an access only street for this reason</p> <p>3} I would say no to any proposed one way system on Mountpleasant/ Silver street etc. as this will encourage rat runners,as well as making it hard for whitehill cars getting out. I think this one way decision should be decided by the very local people,not by people who want to get through town quickly. I know the one way issue seems not to related to whitehill,but its tied up with the whitehill proposal.</p>	<p>The concerns regarding loss of parking and displacement are noted and will be considered.</p>
<p>My objections to the Whitehill LJB/TRO/BRAD4 scheme are: There is no need for yet further restrictions on vehicle access to Whitehill as the latest set of Access Only signage (installed very recently) is doing a very effective job of restricting traffic to residents-only use. I walk up and down Whitehill very frequently and barely see any through traffic at all, which suggests to me there must be higher priorities for spending public money than yet more new signage and road markings there.</p> <p>The proposed restrictions on parking in Whitehill will probably displace 5 or 6 cars that will need to find spaces on New Road and Sladesbrook. As there are only about 25 spaces between Sladesbrook and the shop opposite Highfield Road this could have a significant impact on availability for New Road residents. When business is at 'normal' levels in Bradford visitors and workers often park on New Road and walk into town causing a shortage of parking availability for residents. As a New Road resident, in busy times it is sometimes necessary to park in Woolley Drive (250 yards away) which makes things very difficult when carrying heavy shopping. We cannot afford to lose parking spaces caused by residents' cars displaced from Whitehill. A residents parking scheme would need to be introduced.</p> <p>Whitehill residents contribute a significant amount of traffic in the town by their own car usage and the service traffic generated to their properties. It does not seem a fair deal to just route this additional traffic onto the New Road, Springfield and Silver Street as if traffic levels here do not matter and incidentally where no traffic management improvements have been made for decades.</p>	<p>Additional No Entry signing was introduced as part of the social distancing arrangements. This has since been revoked however this proposal seeks to reintroduce that restriction.</p> <p>Whilst the highway network is for the passage and re-passage of users, and on-street parking is not a guaranteed right or function, the impact of parking removal on the residents of Whitehill and surrounding roads is acknowledged.</p>

<p>The creation of what are effectively private roads (Wine Street, Woolley Street and Berryfield will possibly follow) using public funds seems quite divisive particularly as we are at this moment in the middle of a transport consultation that should be involving the whole community.</p>	
<p>The proposed alterations have been put in place to firstly act as traffic calming measure to prevent traffic using Whitehill as a short cut (Rat run) and to allow residents some form of turning cycle to gain access to their properties. I can appreciate that some residents of Whitehill have concerns regarding inappropriate access of the road resulting in heavy flow of traffic at certain times of the day, although in my experience this is not the case, and certainly not for the vast majority of time throughout any day of the week. I therefore do not consider the benefits of these changes outweigh the negative impact such changes will cause.</p> <p>My main concerns are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Access of large Emergency Vehicles and Delivery Vehicles. Such vehicles will have to negotiate the full length of Whitehill which can be difficult considering the number of parked cars on the road including those double parked near the bottom of the hill outside house numbers 15 to 19. Although this will have greatest impact to the residents furthest up Whitehill it will have a detrimental impact on all residents as vehicles will undoubtedly cause congestion. The current situation does allow some vehicles to turn using the entrance road to 34 and 35 Whitehill, thereby reducing their need to travel along the whole length of Whitehill. 2. Reduced parking for residents The installation of the no parking and no waiting area near the top of Whitehill will reduce the amount of parking on the hill for residents. There is already limited parking available. A reduction in parking will lead to considerable inconvenience for residents and potentially increase the double parking mentioned already which will only make worse the access issues past parked cars outside house numbers 15 to 19. I strongly suggest that if the proposed measures do take place then double yellow lines are placed outside house numbers 15 to 19 to prevent severe congestion and limited access for larger vehicles. 	<p>Whilst the highway network is for the passage and re-passage of users, and on-street parking is not a guaranteed right or function, the impact of parking removal on the residents of Whitehill and surrounding roads is acknowledged.</p>
<p>No Entry Signs We have been advised by County Council officials on a number of previous occasions that No Entry signs at the top of Whitehill were put there in 2020 for the sole purpose of preventing non-Whitehill residents ('rat-runners') from using Whitehill as a through route from Mount Pleasant to Silver Street. Presumably their proposed reinstatement is for the same purpose.</p>	<p>The introduction of a no right turn into Whitehill from Mount Pleasant is unlikely to resolve the issues raised by residents concerned that drivers are</p>

<p>WE DO NOT AGREE to their reinstatement as we consider it to be too heavy handed response to a diminished problem, post-Covid. Work patterns have chnaged and vehicle usage with it.</p> <p>Over 14 years of day to day experience, living near the intersection with Mount Pleasant (and always using the roundabout to leave home and return home) our experience is that nearly all non-residnts using Whitehill as a through route come from the Christ Church direction and even those numbers have declined in recent months. It has also become noteworthy that more than half the vehicles parking in the top 100m of Whitehill now normally park facing uphill, rather than downhill as used to tbe the case.</p> <p>Our recommendation The solution to the above ‘rat runner’ problem, such as it is, is to install No Right Turn signs from Mount Pleasant into Whitehill and retain access only signs at the top of Whitehill. Apart from solving the problem, residents would then retain the flexibility to enter Whitehill from Sladesbrook and New Road, saving them much unnecessary inconvenience.</p> <p>NO ENTRY SIGNS – NECESSARY MITIGATION <u>if</u> the decision is made to reinstate the signs:</p> <p>Current situation The houses at 25a/25b Whitehill lie with their entrances more than 40metres from Whitehill and up a long steep drive leading to garages and extensive parking/turning area. Vehicle access is ESSENTIAL for normal life there – cars, service vehicles (window cleaners, gardeners etc) delivery vehicles (Waitrose etc). For the past forty years, that normal range of vehicles has easily made access to the drive entrance in a downhill direction. Also, however, for most of those vehicles, uphill aces has been impossible due to the design/contouring fo the drive entrance and because cars or vans are always parked opposite the entrance.</p> <p>Our assumption Where traffic regulation no entry signs makes normal full access to affected properties impossible, the County Council is morally/legally obliged to implement effective mitigation measures so as to make that normal full access possible.</p>	<p>contravening the current prohibition of motor vehicles (except for access) restriction.</p> <p>Declining use as a through route, as well as the changes in parking habits, may be a result of the prohibition of no entry implemented as part of the Covid-19 social distancing changes. This would demonstrate that the restriction was effective when in situ.</p> <p>With regard to access to the driveway of 25a/25b, it is considered by officers that access will not be impeded by the proposed prohibition of entry and that vehicles will be able to access the driveway either from the uphill approach, or reversing into the driveway or by turning at the top of Whitehill and entering from the downhill approach.</p> <p>In terms of mitigation, to aid access a short length of waiting restrictions are proposed opposite and it is recommended</p>
--	---

<p>Throughout our extensive 2020/22 correspondence with County Councillors and officials, we have worked on that assumption. Can you please confirm that we are correct?</p> <p>Proposed No Waiting at any time opposite 25a/25b</p> <p>It is quite possible that this measure would be effective in restoring normal access, subject to: Full observance of no waiting by drivers (please n.b. below) Effective enforcement as necessary The no waiting area, and its design, actually being shown in practice to make normal full access possible</p> <p>n.b can a box junction type cross hatching on the carriageway, or some other method, be used as an additional deterrent to drivers tempted to park illegally?</p> <p>The continuance of the above longstanding normal life at 25a/25b depends on these provisos. In view of this, a two months trial would be prudent before making any no entry signs permanent.</p> <p>If the 25a/25b No waiting area is in practice NOT fully effective and visiting vehicles had to park in the already congested road, or even refuse to do business with us, it would be necessary for the County authority to implement alternative mitigation measure(s) which are effective or to reconsider the original decision to install no entry signs.</p> <p>Hopefully this would not be necessary and the proposed no waiting area would be effective. However, if it proved necessary, we would be happy to help in discussing alternatives.</p>	<p>that these restrictions proceed to implementation. This would result in the loss of approx. 3 parking spaces on-street.</p> <p>The owners of the driveway may also further improve access by making changes to the driveway layout. The southern edge of the driveway splay currently houses planting and a rockery. If this was converted to a hard surface, level with the rest of the driveway, this would facilitate easier turning movements into the driveway from the uphill approach.</p>
--	--