

APPENDIX 5

Additional Representations	
Support of decision	Officer Response
<p>Further to the intended decision referenced in the subject to this email, we wish to express our full support for the intended decision (to implement 'No Entry' at the top with amended waiting restrictions), and to express thanks to Cllr Dr McClelland for giving this matter his careful consideration.</p> <p>My family are residents of Whitehill</p> <p>While many Whitehill residents will no doubt prefer not to lose parking on the hill, it is our opinion that this is a fair and reasonable trade off, given 1) the overriding objective of safety (especially for children living in homes without a pavement buffer between them and the road), and 2) the need to accommodate ease of access by our elderly neighbours at no.25b Whitehill who would be adversely affected were there to be no waiting restrictions opposite their drive.</p>	<p>The comments of support are noted.</p>
<p>We are completely in favour of this sensible proposal and support it fully</p>	<p>The comments of support are noted.</p>
Support of No Entry and Objection to Parking Restrictions	
<p>Thank you for your decision on the No Entry on Whitehill.</p> <p>However, I would like to express my objections to the removal of parking spaces. There is currently barely enough parking in the road as it is, and it would cause daily problems to lose some of what we already have.</p> <p>There is no good justification for removing the parking spaces - it is perfectly easy to enter the drive to 25A and 25B whether by car or van when driving up Whitehill. I know, because I have tried it myself in both a large estate car and hire van.</p> <p>Unfortunately, by making it marginally easier (if that) for those residents of 25A and 25B to enter their own private drive, you are having a significant negative impact on the daily lives of dozens of residents of Whitehill.</p>	<p>The comments of support for the Prohibition of No Entry is noted.</p> <p>The highway network is for the passage and re-passage of users, and on-street parking is not a guaranteed right or function.</p> <p>The impact of parking removal on the residents of Whitehill and surrounding roads has been acknowledged, with proposed decision to implement a reduced</p>

APPENDIX 5

<p>Can you reconsider? Thank you.</p>	<p>schedule of restrictions compared to those originally advertised.</p>
<p>I am very much in favour of a new designation 'No Entry except for cyclists' at the top of Whitehill, Bradford-on-Avon .</p> <p>However, I strongly object to the loss of any parking spaces on Whitehill, proposed apparently to make access easier to 25a and 25b Whitehill.</p> <p>The request for 'swing space' in order to enter the drive of 25a and 25b seems unreasonable to me. The houses 25a/b have such a long drive (and OODLES of parking space off Whitehill) that in my estimation they ought to be able to shave their drive from way back nearer their own houses , and remove the big lump covered in ivy in order to enable a shallow 'fishtail' to have an entrance to their drive without a vehicle bottoming out, if this is indeed a serious problem.</p> <p>Loss of parking as described in the decision will also have a deleterious effect on the elderly residents at the top of Whitehill. Although those residents no longer drive their own cars they do need access for the arrival of carers, who are very short of time and cannot drive around in search of a space. As time moves on a resident who does use a car may well make Whitehill their home , so this issue will remain.</p> <p>This decision by Wiltshire Highways has changed what could have been a simple , inexpensive, and popular modification of signage into a complicated and divisive additional loss of parking. The loss of parking affects not only Whitehill but also Sladesbrook , New Road and Mount Pleasant. In all these streets it is difficult for residents to find a parking space.</p> <p>The decision puts the reasoning process in your department in a poor light, to say the least.</p>	
<p>In short my response would be ... Statutory NO ENTRY from the top? GOOD. Imposition of new parking restrictions opposite the drive way to #25a/b? BAD. In fact unnecessary.</p>	

In spite of the protestations of the residents of 25a/b, and indeed the daughter of one couple, I really cannot see the issue with driving UP Whitehill and entering that shared drive, and I am evidently not the only respondent to have pointed that out.

One does not need to 'veer' across the road to effect an appropriate entry line, and one cannot in fact 'veer' with vehicles parked opposite (very often mine ...) as one is in a narrow, single-line situation. One merely needs to keep over to the right and take the higher/wider line into the driveway, a somewhat simple manoeuvre that both I and my near neighbour at #25 have amply demonstrated on several occasions, he with an estate car and rented van, and me with my rather stiffly suspended Seat Leon FR.

The gouges in the driveway that are mentioned in the response from the daughter of one of the couples are quite evident, and are a very obvious demonstration that she (or somebody) has simply taken a totally inappropriate line (a short-cut) into the driveway, suffering from both the steepest slope AND a dip between road and driveway. Solution? Simply take the high and wide turn, something that I'd gladly demonstrate to anybody who might be interested. A longer term compromise could be to simply regrade that lower approach to the driveway, both easing the slope AND removing the dip ..?!?

Alternatively, simply drive past, execute a three-point turn into the start of the entrance driveway to #34/35 (or a suitable point at the top of the hill, seemingly ruled out in the decision making process), and then approach downhill.

For the latter one needs to reverse no further than the walls either side of the slip road to #34/35 (i.e. merely across what would have been the pavement) to execute the turn, although I take the point that double yellows for (say) a couple of metres at most on the two corners would improve access, a long-term pre-existing issue for the residents of #34/35, space which I already respect when parking either side of their slip road ...

I have one final and possibly new point to add, one that is very pertinent to the proposed (and unnecessary) 'No Waiting' introduction.

<p>Higher up the hill than #39 (i.e. towards the very top and just short of #25a/b) there are TWO residents of advanced age who do NOT own vehicles. One is extremely frail and never leaves the property, whilst the other is becoming ever more frail under the ravages of arthritis.</p> <p>BOTH will undoubtedly need to relocate in the foreseeable future, and will undoubtedly be replaced by new occupiers who will have AT LEAST one car per household. Neither property benefits from off-street parking, so in the very near future we will quite probably see THREE more vehicles introduced to the already busy parking stock on the upper reaches of Whitehill. This can only add to the weight of my (our ...) arguments that removing parking places in an already critically loaded domestic area makes very little sense, unless, that is, Wiltshire Council wishes Whitehill residents to have to resort to parking/leaving their vehicles in front of other properties in the surrounding streets ... as if New Road and Sladesbrook are not already critically loaded themselves.</p> <p>I offer these observations in good faith and reasoned logic. I fear that the proposed 'solution' is one that is looking for a problem that does not exist, and, as I have pointed out, will create further issues for the residents of Whitehill, including those from farther downhill that either have no access to on-street parking, or who have to access their parking places in the downhill direction (i.e. where the pavement becomes much higher from #44/45 downwards, and to access the slip-way near the bottom on the left hand side).</p>	
<p>Objection to proposed decision – all elements</p>	
<p>Most disappointing decision and difficult to justify. My observation, from our property overlooking much of the length of Whitehill, is that there is now so little downhill through traffic.</p> <p>Re my reply to the consultation, the uphill access to 25a/b will only work if the No Parking restriction is fully observed by the public at all times. Time will tell on that point.</p> <p>Also, we will see whether all the usual range of vehicles requiring access can actually make the manoeuvre. If not, it will be necessary for the County authority to implement alternative mitigation measure (s) which are effective or to reconsider the decision to install the no entry signs.</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</p>

APPENDIX 5

<p>If normal vehicles still cannot gain reasonable access, and if then necessary, I reserve my right to complain about the decision.</p> <p>I did not get a reply to the question I raised in my response to the consultation - “Our assumption- Where Traffic Regulation No Entry signs make full access to affected properties impossible, the County Council is morally and/or legally obliged to implement effective mitigation measures so as to make that full normal access possible. “Can you please confirm that we are correct in this assumption ?” I would appreciate a detailed reply to that question.</p> <p>As I say, a disappointing decision with worrying implications for our normal lives here.</p>	<p>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 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> <p>Wiltshire Council would not be responsible for providing any other mitigation measures.</p>
<p>We wish to make the following representation. We understand that the proposed changes and subsequent decision are being made based on perceived safety issues by some residents of Whitehill. We also appreciate that safety of individuals is of paramount importance. However, the changes to road use</p>	<p>Declining use as a through route, as well as the changes in parking habits, may be a result of the</p>

<p>being made are based on Whitehill becoming a more dangerous environment based on an increase in volume of vehicles passing down Whitehill at high speed. Having been residents on Whitehill for 15 years we do not feel that traffic in this time has in fact increased significantly. If anything, our perception is that use of Whitehill as a cut through or “Rat Run” route has decreased since the end of lock down as more individuals choose to work remotely from home. Can I ask what actual evidence there is for traffic flow on Whitehill to have increased to such a dangerous level that it has become such a safety issue that the proposed changes and the financial cost to Wiltshire Council are necessary?</p> <p>Upon reviewing Appendix 2 – List of Respondents, only 14 residents/households located on Whitehill have specifically stated that they would want the Prohibition of No Entry to be put implemented. All other residents/households have either objected to this action or have failed to respond. I am unsure as to the total number of residential properties currently on Whitehill, however a rough estimate is 50. Therefore 14 households are certainly not a majority and seems a low proportion of individuals actually stating they specifically want this change for it to then be implemented.</p> <p>As the proposed changes are to take place can I also ask that some consideration is made to a further change to road use that will allow access of larger delivery vehicles to properties on Whitehill? Such deliveries will now have to made accessing Whitehill from Silver Street. Often cars are parked mounted on the pedestrian pavement outside house numbers 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19. These vehicles not only block the pedestrian pavement on that side of the road but as they are opposite vehicles parked on the opposite side of the road they effectively narrow the access vehicles using Whitehill. On occasion this parking does prevent wider delivery vehicles from being able to pass up Whitehill. Is it possible for the double yellow lines that are currently running up the left-hand side of the road as you proceed up Whitehill to be extended outside house numbers 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19? This will ensure pedestrians can use the path as it is intended and ensure their safety and allow effective access for vehicles which will now have to pass up Whitehill as a result of the no access changes occurring at the top of Whitehill.</p> <p>Also, can I enquire if any thought has been made regarding the access of larger vehicles on to Whitehill from Silver Street? The turn on to Whitehill from Silver Street is considerably tighter than the turn on to Whitehill from the roundabout at the top of the hill. Previously we have always recommended that large</p>	<p>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>Using Appendix 2, 20 respondents stated residence in Whitehill. Of those, 14 supported the Prohibition of No Entry. No conclusion can be drawn regarding the views of those who did not comment. The decision must be based on the comments made by those who took part in the consultation process.</p> <p>Turning movements have been taken into consideration when reviewing this proposal.</p> <p>It will be made clear as part of information to residents that the introduction of a No Entry will not make Whitehill one-way. One-way roads are clearly marked as such with appropriate signing. This lack of one-way signing on Whitehill should be an indication</p>
---	--

APPENDIX 5

<p>vehicles access the road from the top and not the bottom due to the tight turn and sudden gradient. Presumably this has been taken into consideration during the decision-making process.</p> <p>Finally, is it possible to make it known very clearly to all road users that although the road will become Prohibited entry from the top it will remain two-way traffic up and down the hill? During the temporary Prohibited Entry during lock down we both received on numerous occasions abuse from both pedestrians and vehicle users when driving down the hill. They believed that because entry was no longer allowed from the top of the hill the road had become one-way. Clear road signage would hopefully help to prevent such incorrect perceptions. Also, we do have some concerns that changes to traffic flow may result in an increase in vehicles attempting to turn using the shared driveway to 34 and 35 Whitehill. This driveway is privately owned and should not be used for the purposes of vehicles manoeuvring. Possibly the new “no waiting” space on the public road opposite 25a Whitehill could be used for vehicles turning around and signs could be used to clearly indicate this.</p>	<p>to drivers that two-way traffic remains.</p>
--	---