

WEST WILTSHIRE PARISHES: PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS
COMMENTS OF OBJECTION AND SUPPORT

In total 56 comments were received during the consultation period (11 objecting, 45 supporting)

Atworth No comments were received for proposals in Mead Park

Dilton Marsh

Road	Objections	Support
High Street / Ateyeo Close		2
High Street / The Hollow	1	
High Street / St Marys		2
	1	4

Edington

Road	Objections	Support
Westbury Road	3	3
Tinhead Road		1
	3	4

Sutton Veny

Road	Objections	Support
Best Lane/High Street junction	5	
Outside Primary School		6
	5	6

Winsley & Limpley Stoke

Road	Objections	Support
Bradford Road North	1	1
Winsley Hill	1	30
	2	31

Dilton Marsh – High Street / The Hollow

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
DMO 1	<p>Objection</p> <p>I have lived on the junction of High St and The Hollow for more than ten years. When the area is busy due to school / church activity etc the traffic is naturally slowed through the constrictions generated by parked cars. Pedestrians are able to cross relatively safe from the hazard of speeding motorists. Motorists on The Hollow are able to turn on to High St with greater confidence they are not going to be hit by a vehicle speeding towards them.</p> <p>Outside of these busy times barely an hour passes without a horn being sounded on The Hollow / High St roundabout. With no restriction some motorists drive fast Westwards along High St. The nature of The Hollow junction means that a road user that wants to join High St from The Hollow cannot see vehicles from their right until they have pulled on to the roundabout. They also risk being hit by vehicles speeding Eastwards along High St, that either ignore the roundabout and the narrow pavement, or brake sharply at the last minute as they notice a car / bicycle waiting to join High St.</p> <p>In conclusion, it is clear that many motorists will drive as fast as they possibly can with no regard for fellow motorists or pedestrians or cyclists. They need to be slowed by good road design.</p>	1	<p>The Parish supported calls for better visibility at this junction and the proposals were developed on this basis and further to site observations by engineers.</p> <p>Restrictions to protect the approach the junction, will ensure clear visibility along the High Street on exiting The Hollow.</p>
DMS 1	<p>Supports but also requests more</p> <p>With respect to the proposal to introduce a prohibition of waiting and stopping I am broadly in favour, especially with respect to it's introduction towards the end of the High Street near the Hollow and St Mary's Lane junctions.</p> <p>However, towards the western end, and the prohibition around Atyeo Close, I wanted to highlight that this is likely to push parking at busy times further down the High Street and towards Park Road. Currently parking for school goes up to and sometimes beyond number 125 High Street and outside numbers 80/82, which usually have cars/lorries parked outside. Already there are some issues coming out of Park Road, so I wanted to highlight the implications of stopping parking around Atyeo Close without other mitigations. I feel that parking around Atyeo Close is better than around Park Road due to the volume of vehicles using both streets.</p>	1	<p>Comments of support are noted.</p> <p>When a Traffic Regulation is advertised for public comment, it is not possible, within the Procedure Regulations to alter a proposed restriction to one of a greater severity (ie: further restrictions, longer hours) without recommending the legal procedure by consulting and re-advertising the restrictions.</p>

Dilton Marsh cont...

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
DMS 2	<p>Full support for all proposals The Parish Council considered the proposed TRO's relating to Dilton Marsh at a meeting held on 20th April 2023.</p> <p>Members identified that the proposals were as a result of a request from the PC in 2019 and therefore the proposals are supported as outlined.</p>	1	Comments of support are noted.
DMS 3	<p>Support – but concerned parking will move elsewhere. I am very supportive of your proposal in principle. However, the effect of the proposed restrictions is that people will simply park further down St Mary's Lane than they do at present. My only concern relates to the very small section of road between Dutts and No. 11 St Mary's Lane.</p> <p>There is no difficulty in allowing people to park outside our house (No. 2) on the SW side of the road, but if parking is also allowed on the NE side between Dutts and No. 11, it creates a very narrow "pinch point". On a number of occasions when cars have been parked on both sides, I am fairly sure that a fire engine or dustcart, for example, would not be able to get through. Certainly there have been occasions when delivery lorries have not been able to.</p> <p>I therefore ask you seriously to consider extending the parking restriction to include a section of the NE side of St Mary's Lane for a distance of approx 50ft from the telegraph pole near No. 11 to the corner of Dutts.</p>	1	<p>Comments of support are noted.</p> <p>When a Traffic Regulation is advertised for public comment, it is not possible, within the Procedure Regulations to alter a proposed restriction to one of a greater severity (ie: further restrictions, longer hours) without recommencing the legal procedure by consulting and re-advertising the restrictions.</p>
DMS 4	<p>Supports but also requests more I am in support of both sets of No Waiting restrictions proposed for Dilton Marsh on the High Street junctions with Atyeo Close, St Marys Lane / The Hollow - and the separate order for Clay Close. Parking around these junctions are obscuring visibility with an increasing potential for accident.</p> <p>However, I do not understand why similar restrictions are not being proposed on the High Street at the Park Road junction where the visibility for cars exiting the junction is often worse than at the other locations as parking is predominantly on the South side of the road here so cars pull out blind. There has already been one accident here in the past year. The parking also inhibits the Bus Stop here.</p>	1	<p>Comments of support are noted.</p> <p>See comment DMS 3 above.</p>

Edington

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
EO 1	<p>Objection There is very limited parking in the village Edington and this restriction will simply displace parked vehicles to other areas of the village. The vehicles that park in the restricted area proposed are immediately coincident residents to the proposed restricted parking area.</p> <p>The current parking area provides for a natural traffic calming measure particularly on the B3098 from vehicles travelling from the Erlestoke direction. The removal of the parking area will increase the likely speed of traffic through the village and increase the possibility of accidents.</p> <p>The parking restriction proposal in front of the bus stop cuts across a number of residents drives as well as the bus stop and it is not clear how these combined restrictions will work in practice as the bus stop area is not sufficiently long to accommodate a bus that has stopped to pick up and drop off passengers.</p>	1	<p>The Parish supported calls for better visibility round the bend between Tinhead Road and Long Hollow and the proposals were developed on this basis and further to site observations by engineers.</p> <p>The proposed restrictions will clear parked vehicles from the bend enabling through traffic to see clearly round the bend before deciding to proceed.</p> <p>Under the provisions of the No Waiting restrictions, vehicles will still be able to load/unload goods and for passengers to board/alight.</p>
EO 2	<p>Objection Road safety is the greatest of our concerns living in Edington. Vehicles passing through the village do so at considerable speed, well above the 30mph limit. The junctions of the roads of Long Hollow, Tinhead Road east and west, Charlton Hill and resident's properties onto Westbury Road are all blind junctions. The parked at the top of Tinhead Road on Westbury Road acts as traffic calming, forcing vehicles to slow or stop when entering this area, whether to turn into Tinhead Road or continue along Westbury Road.</p> <p>Turning out of Tinhead Road onto Westbury Road is made safer and easier by the parked vehicles on Westbury Road due to slower traffic speeds or that traffic stops to allow contraflow. When there are only a couple of vehicles parked in the area, as will be permanently the case after the proposed changes, vehicles pass through almost unhindered at much greater speeds, which given the blind junctions increases the danger to motorists and pedestrians considerably.</p> <p>The Police have also advised that double yellow lines would not be enforced in a village setting rendering their effectiveness at best, cosmetic. As previously advised by Wiltshire Police, the lines would be unenforceable, this may not deter them from parking in the affected area.</p>	1	<p>See comment EO 1 above.</p> <p>Vehicles should not be parked within 10 metres of a junction and the proposed restrictions enforce this, ensuring that vehicles exiting side roads have sufficient visibility when undertaking the manoeuvre.</p> <p>Parking is now a decriminalised offence; therefore, Wiltshire Police no longer enforce parking restrictions.</p>

Edington cont...

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
EO 2 cont...	<p>The Parish Council have not provided a solution to parking in other areas in the village, and this proposal will create yet more problems. The vehicles that currently park in the north Tinhead Road area will not evaporate; they will have to park somewhere, moving this parking elsewhere causing further parking pressures.</p> <p>The proposal to install road markings in the areas indicated will adversely affect the visual aesthetics of the village; I find it concerning that in our conservation area, the thought of additional unnecessary permanent road markings is incongruous with the conservation status bestowed upon it.</p> <p>I would like to raise a question of due process with regards to this proposal. The Parish Newsletter, the proposal was due to be advertised from the 7th April to the 8th May. The notices were affixed in the areas affected on the 22nd April. Comments have to be filed by the 1st May to allow 7 days for processing to meet the deadline of 8th May 2023.</p> <p>Given that people holiday, are away on business or are serving forces personnel, should the physical notices have not been displayed with more than a week's notice to meet the deadline for comment?</p>		<p>Parking on the public highway is, not a right. Wiltshire Council nor Edington Parish Council have a duty to provide parking for individuals. Wiltshire Council as Highway Authority has a statutory duty is to maintain the right of passage along the highway and ensure that any parking takes place is a safe place so as not to cause obstruction.</p> <p>Road markings will be sympathetic to the village environment, ie: using a lighter shade of yellow (Primrose yellow).</p> <p>All processes regarding Traffic Regulation Orders are carried out following the statutory regulations as set out in legislation under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.</p> <p>When proposing a Traffic Regulation Order, Wiltshire Council consults with statutory consultees and inform members of the public, allowing for comments, for a minimum period of 21 days. Given the holiday period, we allowed an additional week for comments.</p> <p>Whilst Wiltshire Council do not have a statutory obligation to post notice on site, we do this as standard practice as acknowledges that not everyone reads the local newspaper, and it has proven to be very effective in reaching as wide an audience as possible.</p>

Edington cont...

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
EO 3	<p>Objection</p> <p>I live approximately 100 yards further along the B3098 towards Erlestoke from the area of proposed restrictions I have lived there for 21 years, and both walk and drive through the affected area on a daily basis.</p> <p>The primary reason for my objection is the evidence that the restriction of parking in this area has the potential to actually increase the risk to road users, and I do not believe that this evidence has been taken into account in the assessment that led to the decision to introduce double yellow lines. To be clear, my primary objection relates specifically to the proposals for the B3098 itself.</p> <p>The reason given for the parking restrictions is to improve safety, but to my knowledge there has never actually been an accident in the area on the B3098 where the lines are proposed. However, in significant contrast, there have been numerous accidents on the section immediately to the East of this area, along the stretch running from my property up to the top of the hill in the Erlestoke direction.</p> <p>The proposed parking restrictions will extend the current 'clearway', where accidents are actually occurring, into the area of the proposed parking restrictions where no accidents have yet occurred. The result is that the repeated collisions that are already occurring on this adjacent stretch of the B3098 are also then more likely to occur where the parking restrictions have been imposed.</p> <p>The restriction as proposed would open up the opportunity for the speeding motorists that have caused the numerous accidents on our stretch of road to continue at speed, adopting a 'racing line' to whip through the area with double yellow lines. Because this section has road junctions and greater pedestrian use, the likelihood of a collision leading to more serious casualties becomes significant.</p> <p>I do understand that there is occasional inconsiderate parking outside the bus stop, and directly opposite Charlton Hill. Such inconsiderate parking is not a regular occurrence, and would normally be managed in a much less heavy-handed way, for example through the use of yellow "Bus Stop" markings on the road at the Bus Stop itself and/or the use of white "Keep Clear" markings on the relevant sections of road.</p>	1	See comments EO 1 & 2 above.

Edington cont...

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
ES 1	<p>Support Resident states they fully support the proposed restrictions.</p>	1	Comments of support are noted.
ES 2	<p>Support Having lived on Charlton Hill for over 30 years, I can only state that traffic through the village including HGV's has not only increased but despite the speed limit has got faster over recent years and that is despite the village speed watch scheme.</p> <p>The development in the village, increased car use and businesses running out of residential properties that have no parking has resulted in regular parking opposite the junctions of Charlton Hill and Tinhead Road, this has not only been inconsiderate but in some cases deliberate to antagonise neighbours.</p> <p>The number of near misses exiting from Charlton Hill onto the B3098 with vehicles speeding into the village from the east moving out into the opposite side of the road well in advance of the parked vehicles to pass at speed makes every exit from Charlton Hill hazardous. The limited visibility to the east when exiting Charlton Hill also increases the hazard. The increasing use of electric vehicle and bicycles mean that you are unaware of them approaching as you cannot hear them coming. When vehicles are parked opposite Charlton Hill, I have had to carry out a three-point manoeuvre to exit onto the B3098 as there is insufficient room to carry out a straightforward turning manoeuvre in particular when turning right.</p> <p>My understanding is that the proposal is to introduce a 'No waiting at any time' restriction on and around the junctions on the B3098 with Charlton Hill, Tinhead Road and Long Hollow. I fully support this proposal and trust that once introduced that it will be enforced.</p>	1	<p>Comments of support are noted.</p> <p>These proposals are as a result of such reports and requests.</p>
ES 3	<p>Support Vehicles are regularly parked opposite the Charlton Hill and Tinhead Road junctions with the B3098 making manoeuvring safely very difficult. When vehicles are parked here this causes other vehicles driving through the village to be on the wrong side of the road to overtake, meaning that exiting and entering Charlton Hill and Tinhead Road can be very dangerous.</p>	1	<p>Comments of support are noted.</p> <p>These proposals are as a result of such reports and requests.</p>

Edington cont...

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
ES 3 cont...	<p>Support cont... When vehicles are parked here it means there is not a clear view of the road and hazards such as pedestrians or cyclists cannot be seen. Also there is no room to swing a larger vehicle around to enter or exit. Even with a smaller vehicle you need to pull out onto the B3098 then reverse to straighten up to get past poorly parked vehicles. This also means that vehicles entering the village from the direction of Coulston are already on the wrong side of the road in anticipation of overtaking.</p> <p>Vehicles are regularly parked near and on the Long Hollow junction with the B3098. This makes exiting Long Hollow very dangerous as the visibility is poor when no vehicles are parked here. This also means that hazards such as pedestrians or cyclists cannot be seen.</p> <p>There have been numerous near misses which can be avoided if people are discouraged from parking on and opposite these junctions. Double yellow lines should be enough of a deterrent to stop this. Thank you.</p>	1	

Sutton Veny

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
SVO 1	<p>Objection Cars do park close to this junction on High Street, but you can see past them to check that the road is clear. To my knowledge there has never been accident at this junction in many decades (if ever), possibly because of the proximity of vehicles on the High Street causing drivers to slow down as they pass or pull out.</p> <p>The resident's already parked cars on High Street mixed with temporarily parked cars of parents dropping children into the school and walking parents and children present hazards along the length of the High Street at those times. As a result, everyone slows down and carefully negotiates their way through.</p>	1	<p>Wiltshire Council has no duty to provide parking for individuals; its statutory duty is to maintain the right of passage along the highway.</p> <p>Further to comments raised it is considered appropriate to reduce the extent of the proposed restrictions but to maintain those in the immediate area surrounding the junctions. Details can be found at Appendix 4.</p>

Sutton Veny cont...

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
SVO 1 cont...	<p>Objection cont...</p> <p>It was made clear by the Sutton Veny School Headmaster, at a Parish Council meeting on 4 May 2023, that the school only requires zig-zag markings between the Bests Lane, High Street junction to the school entrance. This would formalise the current informal no stopping zone (currently encouraged through cone placement at the side of the road) to enable the safe drop off / pick up of children. I am entirely supportive of the placement of the zig-zag lines.</p> <p>However, to suggest that applying 24 hr by 365 day per year restrictions at the High Street, Bests Lane junction is required to provide safety or enhance traffic flow for the short periods of school run on school days is disingenuous.</p> <p>The placement of double yellow lines as proposed will have a very negative impact for a number of the residents that live close to this junction. Some residents will be forced to park their vehicles elsewhere on the High Street. This will close gaps between parked cars in other areas along the High Street giving less spaces for moving vehicles to pass each other during the school run periods, creating additional hazards. This will also cause aggravation for other residents along the High Street as these displaced cars are forced to park outside other properties and also devalue some of the properties near the junction as a result of the reduced availability of on-street parking.</p> <p>There has been very little, if any, formal consultation on this proposal with local residents. The local village newsletter stated this would be discussed at a Parish Council meeting on 4 May, yet despite local objections this was approved.</p>	1	<p>All processes regarding Traffic Regulation Orders are carried out following the statutory regulations as set out in legislation under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.</p> <p>When proposing a Traffic Regulation Order, Wiltshire Council consults with statutory consultees and inform members of the public, allowing for comments, for a minimum period of 21 days. Given the holiday period, we allowed an additional week for comments.</p> <p>Whilst Wiltshire Council do not have a statutory obligation to post notice on site, we do this as standard practice as acknowledges that not everyone reads the local newspaper, and it has proven to be very effective in reaching as wide an audience as possible.</p>
SVO 2	<p>Objection</p> <p>After listening to the views from the residents who would be affected by the proposed double yellow lines I must object to your proposal.</p> <p>It must be taken into account the difficulties these residents would experience trying to park their cars away from their homes. It isn't the cars parked on the junction, that causes drivers to be cautious, but where the cottages are built. Like so many villages the roads were not built for today's traffic & sensible villagers know how to navigate these places. I understand that some of your criteria is based on past 'accidents' & to my knowledge (living in SV for 35 years!) I cannot recall an accident/incident.</p>	1	See comment SVO 1 above.

Sutton Veny cont...

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
SVO 3	<p>Objection - the cost involved with the present economic crisis I feel needs addressing.</p> <p>I would also like to make the comment that the speeds of traffic that drive through the village can reach well over the current limit. While we have cars/vehicles parked along the High Street, to some level this discourages such speeds.</p> <p>I have lived here for some 20+ years and have never found a problem with safety at the junction. The effect of displacing vehicles will only make congestion worse.</p>	1	See comment SVO 1 above.
SVO 4	<p>Objection</p> <p>I have lived in the village for 25 years and for the last 10 years have never had any issue with anyone dropping off pupils, parking illegally or causing a nuisance either on Hill Rd or on the High St. There has, to my knowledge, never been any accident on the High St or on Hill Rd and any restrictions would inevitably cause more problems not less.</p> <p>Please leave any parking issues to the school who now have everything perfectly under control.</p>	1	See comment SVO 1 above.
SVO 5	<p>Support for proposals outside the school but not the junction</p> <p>We are fully supportive of waiting restrictions with the relevant road markings on this section of road limited to school drop off and pick up times, However, the Head Master also stressed that he would not want the waiting restriction to extend beyond the entrance to the School/Village Hall car park.</p> <p>We do not however support the proposals at Bests Lane/High Street/Hill Road Junction. We have lived on the junction in one form or another for over 44 years and sent 2 children to the school for a combined 10 years and we are not aware of any accidents or incidents on the junction.</p> <p>We do not consider that the potential risk at this junction is any different to risk up and down the length of the Sutton Veny High Street at busy times, or indeed risk in the majority village locations in our area.</p>	1	See comment SVO 1 above.

Sutton Veny cont...

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
SVO 5 cont...	<p>We would argue from experience that gaps between cars parked in the area provide welcome 'refuge' at the busy school drop off and pick up times.</p> <p>We would argue that cars parked by the side of the road have a 'calming effect' on motorists driving the High Street and that wider roads with no cars could encourage motorists to drive too fast for the conditions; the road is wider in this area than much of the High Street.</p> <p>We have to question who is going to police any restrictions imposed, the Police are fully stretched. Yellow lines were introduced at the top end of the Village around the now closed Pub and there is regular parking on those lines.</p> <p>We live in a Village and like most villages, particularly villages with schools we have traffic issues and accept that there has to be compromises, we all work together to make Village life work.</p>		
SVO 6	<p>Support for school proposal but concern that parking will be shifted elsewhere in the village</p> <p>I have lived in the village for 15 years and traffic outside my house has been a problem during school drop off and pick up throughout that time. As there is no pavement through the village this is a particular problem for pedestrians. My house is a "pinch point" on the High Street and so I don't park directly outside my house in order to keep the road clear for large vehicles moving through. A car parked outside my house, particularly the northwest corner of my house, blocks access for eg. buses, large farm machinery or emergency vehicles. My neighbours and I therefore park on the road outside The Knapp, where the High Street is wider and there is better visibility.</p> <p>The occupants of 48 and 49 High Street have few parking options and currently use the area of the High Street where double yellow lines are now proposed. If they are unable to park there they will have to use the road outside the school (which will not help the school meet their aims of improving safety for pupils and their parents) or park in the area used by the occupants of 78, 79 and 80 High Street.</p>	1	See comment SVO 1 above.

Sutton Veny cont...

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
SVO 6 cont...	<p>Additional parking in the area of the High Street close to and outside 78, 79 and 80 High Street will simply make the High Street more dangerous for traffic and pedestrians in the narrowest section of this part of the village. Double yellow lines may improve visibility immediately around the junction of Bests Lane and the High Street but the additional parking that will result further up the High Street will result in poorer overall visibility for traffic moving in both directions between The Knapp and the junction with Bests Lane. I believe that adding double yellow lines to the High Street at the junction with Bests Lane will result in the High Street becoming more dangerous, not less, and strongly oppose this suggestion.</p> <p>I fully support the rest of the proposals put forward to improve safe access to the school.</p>	1	See comment SVO 1 above.
SVO 7	<p>Objection to proposals at the junction, yet support for those outside the school</p> <p>While I can understand the justifications for the waiting restrictions along High Street, the proposed double-yellow lines around the Best Lane, High St, Hill Rd junction are entirely unnecessary.</p> <p>If put in place, it is unlikely that they will be effectively enforced, and the potential cost of this change would, in this financial climate, be much better spent addressing less controversial maintenance issues such as filling potholes which we know improves the safety of drivers, cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>The residents most affected by the potential changes are vehemently opposed to the current proposals; this, coupled with the limited evidence provided by or consultation conducted by the PC to support this part of the proposal, suggests that the introduction of double yellow lines is not in the best interests of the village. Engagement from villagers at large with the proposals has been notably apathetic this is not enough to justify intervention that will have such a detrimental aspect to the finances and everyday life of the residents and homeowners around this junction.</p> <p>Going forward, I would suggest that the application for timed waiting restrictions and zig zags goes ahead to improve safety and congestion around school times ASAP, yet the other proposals at the junction be rejected, as there is not enough evidence to suggest that this proposed change is representative of villagers' interests or justified in the interests of traffic safety.</p>	1	See comment SVO 1 above.

Sutton Veny cont...

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
SVO 8	<p>Objection to proposals at junction yet some support for those outside the school</p> <p>As a Child minder living in the village and do daily drop offs and pick-ups at the village school as a pedestrian with children and pushchairs, so I am aware of the problems in this area. The School have been proactive in managing the car movements with guidance on where it is safe for parents to park and an effective 'stop and drop' at the school entrance in the morning.</p> <p>The extent of the Proposal made by county I feel would not improve the situation and would reduce the already limited space for parents to park safely in front of the school. There do need to be Parking restrictions at the junction to help with visibility at the junction and to stop cars parking on the High Street between Bests Lane and the school, this forces pedestrians out into the road into the path of traffic. It also causes traffic jams with parents' cars and busses moving in both directions at peak times.</p> <p>Having parking restrictions (zig zag school markings with time limitations) along the High Street from Bests lane to the start of the school entrance would provide pedestrians a clear passage and still allow the stop and drop to flow freely.</p> <p>Parking outside of school drop off and pick up times would be allowed therefore causing minimal inconvenience to those wishing to park here. The road fronting the school has a pavement and the road here is wide enough to allow traffic to move more easily so no parking restrictions should be placed on this section of the road.</p>	1	See comment SVO 1 above.
SVS 1	<p>Support</p> <p>We would like to add our support to this proposal. The area outside the school is a nightmare and whilst we appreciate the cars will still come into the village and park, at least the area directly in front of the school and on the road between Best Lane and the school entrance will be clear.</p> <p>Attempting to exit from Hill Road with cars parked opposite, blocking the mirror that is there to assist drivers, is an accident waiting to happen. Cars are forced to come through the village (From the Woolpack down to the school) on the right-hand side of the road, this gives no hope to cars attempting to exit Hill Road blind. Children exiting the school cannot cross the road without exiting within parked cars, there is only a small number of pavements within the village and no way to cross from them free of cars.</p>	1	<p>Comments of support are noted.</p> <p>These proposals are as a result of such reports and requests.</p>

Sutton Veny cont...

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
SVS 2	<p>Support</p> <p>As someone who lives on the corner of both the High Street and Hill Road, with access to my property from both roads, I believe this proposal would greatly benefit safety within this area. Currently there seems to be little regard for rules about not parking directly opposite or within a certain distance of a junction, and although there is a mirror situated on the High Street to enable visibility in one direction for those exiting Hill Road, this is often obscured by cars and vans who have parked across it.</p> <p>Additionally, with cars parking on the corner of the High Street and Bests Lane, directly opposite our driveway it makes exiting for us extremely perilous and it means traffic from both directions travelling on the side nearest to our exit point and with limited visibility anyway, this makes it incredibly dangerous.</p>	1	<p>Comments of support are noted.</p> <p>These proposals are as a result of such reports and requests.</p>
SVS 3	<p>Supportive of No stopping (zig-zag markings) restrictions outside the school</p> <p>I am the headteacher of Sutton Veny CofE Primary School and we firmly believe that there should be waiting restriction placed between the junctions of Best Lane / Hill Road, running down the village up to the junction of the school car park. Our preference would be have have Zig-Zag lines along this short stretch of road that impose restrictions around school drop-off and pick up times. Two time windows in the day, 8.30 - 9.30am and 2.30 - 3.30pm, would be sufficient.</p> <p>This would prevent cars stopping here, meaning that school traffic would flow smoothly and that pedestrians/school children would not have to walk out into the middle of the road to pass and parked cars, thus ensuring the safety of the school children who walk to and from school. This would also minimise the impact on local residents who may need to park there at different times of the day, or during school holidays.</p> <p>We strongly oppose any waiting restrictions outside the school itself, as we run a successful meet and greet drop-off system, where parents pull in on the side of the road and staff open car doors to allow the children to get out of the car and walk into school. Any restrictions outside the school itself, would impact on our ability to run this service and this would have a negative impact on the traffic situation at school drop-off and pick-up times.</p> <p>We also have two school buses which need to stop in this area to drop-off and collect the children. It would be preferable from the school's perspective to have a designated bus stop marking on the road outside the school. There is one there now, but this needs remarking.</p>	1	<p>Comments of support are noted.</p> <p>Please comment SVO 1 above regarding the reduction of proposals detailed in Appendix 4.</p>

Winsley and Limpley Stoke – B3108 Winsley Hill

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
WO 1	<p>Objection So the NIMBYS of Limpley Stoke are at it again trying to keep the canal to themselves and not allow people from outside to park so that they can enjoy the delights of the canal and river.</p> <p>It does not surprise me at all that this is their attitude, the Parish Council operates like this all the time. Perhaps they would like to provide an alternative car park covering a lovely field for the others to park.</p> <p>We can walk to the canal and river, so it does not affect us but we are not so selfish that we think no one else can come to the beauty spot which is out of Limpley Stoke and Winsley main villages.</p>	1	<p>The proposals were developed further to concern raised by Winsley Parish Council, that parking half on and half off the footway and on a bend, was hazardous to pedestrians wishing to access the canal or to continue up Winsley Hill.</p> <p>Officers considered that proposals needed to be taken further to prevent displacement to another dangerous location on the hill.</p>
WS 1	<p>Support I am a local resident, living in Murhill and use Winsley Hill regularly. I am aware that very often cars are parked on the pavement, the painted walkway, the grass verge and on the road at the bottom of Winsley Hill by the bridge that passes over the canal.</p> <p>Consequently, this area becomes very dangerous at times with traffic coming in both directions around the bend in the road. The cars that are parked, narrow the width of the road which creates a danger but more significantly cause pedestrians to have to step into the road in order to get by.</p> <p>This area is a designated area of outstanding natural beauty and so is very popular with walkers plus the attraction of the canal. This hazardous area is even more dangerous for people with small children or anyone using a wheelchair or mobility scooter.</p> <p>Action needs to be taken to avoid a serious accident and Double Yellow Lines and appropriate No Parking signs would be very welcome to prevent this.</p>	1	<p>Comments of support are noted.</p> <p>These proposals are as a result of such reports and requests.</p>

Winsley and Limpley Stoke – B3108 Winsley Hill cont...

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
WS 2	<p>Support I live further up Winsley Hill and drive, walk and cycle in the area on a daily basis, so I see disproportionately more of the local impact of dangerous and inconsiderate parking in this area than the average commuter passing through.</p> <p>Cars parking on the pedestrian areas tends to happen when there are a larger number of 'non-tourist' canal boats, where a car accompanies the boat, and over weekends as a no-cost alternative to the pay and display parking at Dundas for cyclists and walkers.</p> <p>Unfortunately, what those leaving there cars don't see is pedestrians with young children routinely forced into the middle of a 40mph carriageway for stretches of 30-50m. Or, cars forced to pass on the wrong side of carriageway on a blind corner. The risk is severe during shorter days because the area is not lit.</p> <p>The only reason there hasn't been a fatal accident is the farmer has had the good sense to cut the hedge-line back to virtually nothing to allow downward traffic to see more of the approaching hazard - something he is not obliged to do and isn't always practical.</p> <p>The impact of double yellow lines on those parking in the area described would simply be relocating them to designated, safe parking areas. The benefit to everyone else using the pavement as intended would be enormous.</p>	1	<p>Comments of support are noted.</p> <p>These proposals are as a result of such reports and requests.</p>
WS 3	<p>Support In July 2019, a pavement was installed in the layby area adjacent to the canal bridge which provided a safer route for people walking to and from the canal, whereas previously pedestrians had to step out into the busy road to squeeze past vehicles parked in the lay-by. However, local residents and visitors who attempt to access the canal and river know a dangerous situation still exists when the layby is full of vehicles and cars are parked on the pavement, verge, painted walkway and road. Pedestrians are then forced to walk in the road to navigate parked vehicles, often round bends with little visibility and into fast-moving traffic. It is an accident waiting to happen as parents with pushchairs, and wheelchair and mobility scooter users, are even more at risk. Double yellow lines on this stretch of Winsley Hill, from Crockford Farm to the railway bridge, should hopefully make it safer for all users of this road.</p>	1	<p>Comments of support are noted.</p> <p>These proposals are as a result of such reports and requests.</p>

Winsley and Limpley Stoke – B3108 Winsley Hill cont...

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
WS 4	<p>Support Resident wished to express their full support for the proposals on Winsley Hill.</p>	1	Comments of support are noted.
WS 5	<p>Support I support the proposed introduction of double yellow lines on Winsley Hill.</p> <p>On sunny days many cars are often parked near the canal on pavements, narrow stretches of road, blind corners and even the canal bridge. This is dangerous for other drivers, cyclists and especially dangerous for pedestrians. A serious accident is overdue.</p>	1	<p>Comments of support are noted.</p> <p>These proposals are as a result of such reports and requests.</p>
WS 6	<p>I wish to support the proposal for double yellow lines on the Winsley Road from the railway bridge to Crockford Farm.</p> <p>I regularly see people parking inappropriately on the side of the road making it hazardous for pedestrians to pass. It is particularly difficult for people with young children, pushchairs, wheelchairs and mobility scooters.</p> <p>One particularly dangerous place is on a narrow verge just past the canal bridge on a blind bend. Pedestrians and cyclists are forced out on to the road in order to get past the parked vehicles risking their lives. Any traffic approaching the corner from either way are not able to see them until the last minute.</p> <p>Double yellow lines will benefit not only residents of Limpley Stoke and Winsley Hill but also visitors, walkers and cyclists.</p>	1	<p>Comments of support are noted.</p> <p>These proposals are as a result of such reports and requests.</p>
WS 7	<p>I support any ideas to stop vehicles blocking pedestrians from walking between the railway bridge and up Winsley Hill. If the only way possible is with double yellow lines, then I support this.</p> <p>Recently, people have not only been parked blocking the path, but also driving over the grass verge, ruining it by turning it to mud and parking on the path and over the verge into the road.</p> <p>Pedestrians have to dangerously walk fully into the road, around a bend, into traffic.</p>	1	<p>Comments of support are noted.</p> <p>These proposals are as a result of such reports and requests.</p>

Winsley and Limpley Stoke – B3108 Winsley Hill cont...

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
WS 8	<p>Support I totally support the proposal for double yellow lines on Winsley Hill. I live near the bottom of the hill between the river bridge and the canal bridge and as a pedestrian I have to walk on the road because cars are parked on the pavement and the painted walkway near the Kennet and Avon Canal. The cars are a hazard because pedestrians have to walk on the road on blind bends, with cars coming from behind if walking from Limpley Stoke. It is even more hazardous for people with children and pushchairs or people using wheelchairs or mobility buggies.</p> <p>The B3108 is a busy road and a lot more HGV's are using it since the Clean Air Zone in Bath and the closure of Cleveland Bridge. This makes it more hazardous for pedestrians when they have to walk on the roadside of parked cars.</p> <p>The double yellow lines will make walking to the canal safer for pedestrians, but I hope that in the future the speed limit will be reduced to make it even safer. There is a car park at Dundas for people who want to enjoy the canal or the river. It's only a 20 minute walk along the canal path to get to the river. There is no need for people to park on the pavement or the road.</p>	2	<p>Comments of support are noted.</p> <p>These proposals are as a result of such reports and requests.</p>
WS 9	<p>Support I would like to support the proposal to have double yellow lines from the railway Bridge to Crockford Farm.</p> <p>We walk this way nearly everyday and cars parked uphill of the canal bridge on the footpath are a constant irritation and really quite dangerous. Sometimes there can be several cars forcing walkers into the road. With the fast speed of some cars coming down the hill, the cars driving up the hill get forced dangerously close to the walkers. Elderly and those with push chairs and very vulnerable.</p> <p>Please note, double yellows by the canal bridge will mean more people will probably park irresponsibly in the bus stop lay-by outside Crockford Farm and so double yellows in the bus stop (if that is possible) will help mitigate this risk.</p>	1	<p>Comments of support are noted.</p> <p>When a Traffic Regulation is advertised for public comment, it is not possible, within the Procedure Regulations to alter a proposed restriction to one of a greater severity (ie: further restrictions, longer hours) without recommending the legal procedure by consulting and re-advertising the restrictions.</p> <p>Displaced vehicles are expected when any parking restrictions are introduced or amended, therefore we always monitor their effect after implementation.</p>

Winsley and Limpley Stoke – B3108 Winsley Hill cont...

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
WS 10	<p>Support I strongly support the proposal. I live on Murhill which is just up Winsley hill and cycle or run along the canal on a daily basis.</p> <p>Currently there are cars/vans parked on a daily basis on the road on the north side of the canal and yesterday were parked on the pavement on the south side. This means pedestrians or child cyclists coming down the hill are forced into the middle of the road to get around the cars that are blocking the path.</p> <p>This is simply dangerous and i have personally seen a number of near misses between cars and pedestrians. Cars partly blocking the road also force cars or vans into the middle of the road which can cause issues with vehicles coming down the hill. particularly if there is a bus. The current situation is dangerous and actively discourages people from access the canal on foot.</p>	1	<p>Comments of support are noted.</p> <p>These proposals are as a result of such reports and requests.</p>
WS 11	<p>Support My wife is a wheelchair user, as are three others in Limpley Stoke. We have great difficulty in accessing the canal towpath and the footpath above the canal road bridge due to cars parked on the pavement and footpath respectively.</p> <p>We are forced to gain access to the road where the roadside kerb is reduced for access to a field. This is just beyond a bend in the road and makes one incredibly vulnerable. Any plan to remove this hazard would be supported by the community.</p>	1	<p>Comments of support are noted.</p> <p>These proposals are as a result of such reports and requests.</p>
WS 12	<p>Support Would you please note our strong support for the plan to prevent parking on the road, verge and footpath on the stretch either side of the canal bridge on Winsley Hill.</p> <p>This is currently very dangerous for pedestrians and other walkers, and the prevention of random parking would reduce the level of risk considerably.</p>	1	<p>Comments of support are noted.</p> <p>These proposals are as a result of such reports and requests.</p>

Winsley and Limpley Stoke – B3108 Winsley Hill cont...

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
WS 13	<p>Support Thank you for improvements to safety in this location in recent years.</p> <p>As Limpley Stoke residents who often walks that road we think the yellow lines are essential in reducing the risk of pedestrian injury or fatality for those walking up the hill from the canal bridge.</p> <p>Also, any further measures that would stop cars from speeding down the hill at that location would also help. The SLOW markings on the road do not always have the desired effect.</p>	1	<p>Comments of support are noted.</p> <p>Unfortunately reducing the speed limit at this location is outside the scope of these proposals.</p> <p>Requests for a reduction in the speed limit can be made via the Parish Council and Local Highways and Footway Improvement Group (LHFIG).</p>
WS 14	<p>Support I absolutely support these. We are residents on the Hill and walk that route very often and have done since we moved in and over the years this has included walking with prams, buggies, scooters and bicycles. I have wished so often for double yellow lines to make this route safer.</p> <p>Cars travel at a speed greater than the speed limit; the road is narrow (particularly over the canal) and the road bends so that visibility for motorists is poor. This is aggravated when cars park on the road and footpath up from the canal, narrow the road even more and push pedestrians out onto the road.</p> <p>This all makes walking quite hazardous along this stretch which is a shame as I think it puts people off accessing the canal or the walk by the river but more importantly it is putting the lives of those who do walk it at risk.</p>	1	See WS 13 above.
WS 15	<p>Support I use the pavement over the canal bridge and down Winsley hill regularly and it is frustrating and dangerous to have cars parked on the verge and across the pavement as seen in the photo I have provided. As a pedestrian I have to walk into the road to pass.</p> <p>I would also like to see the replacement of the marker posts along the verge, many of these have lost their reflective markers.</p>	1	<p>Comments of support are noted.</p> <p>Our Highways Maintenance Team will be instructed to replace/repair the verge marker posts mentioned.</p>

Winsley and Limpley Stoke – B3108 Winsley Hill cont...

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
WS 16	<p>Support I wish to support the plan for yellow lines at the bottom of Winsley a hill by the canal in Limpley Stoke. I often walk up the hill and the footpath is blocked regularly by cars parked over it on the left going up.</p>	1	Comments of support are noted.
WS 17	<p>Support As a resident of Lower Limpley Stoke I would like to add my name to the list of local residents who are urging Wiltshire Council to support our request for double yellow lines at the bottom of Winsley Hill.</p> <p>The number of pedestrians, of all description, whether visitors, residents, children or the elderly who now try and access the canal or Winsley Hill, has grown hugely and the presence of cars parked on the narrow verge, particularly on the bend, and it is just a matter of time before there is an accident. Please do what you can to avert this horrible and increasing possibility.</p>	1	Comments of support are noted.
WS 18	<p>Support We support the proposal to place double yellow lines on Winsley Hill from the railway bridge to Crockford Farm.</p> <p>Cars and vans are being parked on the pavement, the verge, the painted walk way and the road blocking all access to the pathway thus forcing pedestrians, cyclists, buggy pushers and so on into the road to face accelerating oncoming traffic on a largely blind bend. Such parking is anti-social and dangerous.</p>	1	Comments of support are noted.
WS 19	<p>Support Regularly I have to step off the walkway into the road when walking from Limpley Stoke to the canal and Conkwell. This is very dangerous when cars are regularly parked on the painted walkway, verge and the road.</p>	1	Comments of support are noted.
WS 20	<p>Support I support the campaign for yellow lines on Winsley Hill to make it safer for pedestrians to walk. The parking bay also needs to be timed as it seems to be permanently occupied by people who live on canal boats giving nowhere for visitors to park.</p>	1	Comments of support are noted.

Winsley and Limpley Stoke – B3108 Winsley Hill cont...

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
WS 21	<p>Support My wife and I are residents on the hill and make daily walks to the canal and along for our exercise. It is often unsafe when facing oncoming traffic.</p> <p>Whilst I am fully supportive of taking appropriate measures to protect pedestrians from harm from traffic coming from Winsley Bridge to Crockford Farm I would also like to see double yellow lines (or bollards) extending from the bridge up the hill for about 60 yards. This section of road is being abused by cars/vans who are parking on the verge and restricting the safe passage for pedestrians who have to walk into oncoming traffic ON THE ROAD as cars have parked over the current walk way right up to the stone wall. Sometimes this is a nightmare during heavy traffic flow especially if there are several cars/vans parked bumper to tail.</p> <p>This short section of road does not seem to be in the remit of this consultation but I believe it is just as important for consideration for the safety of all concerned. I hope it will not be dismissed entirely.</p>	1	<p>See comment WS 9 above.</p> <p>Comments of support are noted.</p>
WS 22	<p>Support My wife is a wheelchair user, as are three others in Limpley Stoke. We have great difficulty in accessing the canal towpath and the footpath above the canal road bridge due to cars parked on the pavement and footpath respectively. We are forced to gain access to the road where the roadside kerb is reduced for access to a field. This is just beyond a bend in the road and makes one incredibly vulnerable. Any plan to remove this hazard would be supported by the community.</p>	1	<p>Comments of support are noted.</p>
WS 23	<p>Support I agree with the proposal whereby 'No Waiting at any time' lines will be installed along the B3018 as described in the Order by West Wiltshire. These lines should prevent further dangerous parking by vehicles near the river and canal.</p> <p>However, the danger to pedestrians and cyclists along this stretch will only be seriously reduced when the speed limit is cut from 40mph.</p>	1	<p>See comment WS 13 above in reference to the speed limit.</p> <p>Comments of support are noted.</p>

Winsley and Limpley Stoke – B3108 Winsley Hill cont...

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
WS 24	<p>Support Inconsiderate and dangerous parking on Winsley Hill is a growing problem, on weekends cars are often parked straddling the verges, blocking one lane of traffic going up the hill and cutting off pedestrian access across the canal bridge.</p> <p>The road can be difficult to navigate as a pedestrian on an average day due to the highspeed limit (40mph) and lack of clear view due to the bends in the road when crossing. Having to walk out into the road, and oncoming traffic, because of parked cars is an extra hazard.</p> <p>In an effort to reduce air pollution and carbon consumption, I feel strongly that we should be encouraging walking and cycling and should make sure that any walking and cycling routes are safe to use.</p> <p>There are good links by bus and train to the area for walkers and the canal offers a safe route to the village for cyclists.</p>	1	Comments of support are noted.
WS 25	<p>Support At present cars and vans are often parked on the verge to the east of the bridge obstructing the footpath. My wife and I live on Winsley Hill and like to take walks along the canal. With the current haphazard parking it is often difficult to walk around these vehicles to reach the towpath in safety. I suffer from arthritis in my knees which makes walking difficult, although necessary for me, and I often have to use walking poles. If there are 3 or 4 parked vehicles bunched, this means having to walk fairly slowly out in the road for a long stretch on a blind bend. The situation for wheelchair users and children's buggies is obviously more precarious.</p> <p>The present arrangement is undoubtedly dangerous; the proposed parking restriction, if enforced, would improve the position. A reduction in the 40 mph speed limit would make it even more effective.</p>	1	<p>See comment WS 13 above in reference to the speed limit.</p> <p>Comments of support are noted.</p>
WS 26	<p>Support I heartily support double yellow lines on Winsley Hill. My family have lived in this house since 1942 we've seen many changes, increase of traffic and people wishing to park near to the canal. People now park wherever they are whether they can on bends, pavements bridges endangering all concerned.</p>	1	Comments of support are noted.

Winsley and Limpley Stoke – B3108 Winsley Hill cont...

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
WS 27	<p>Support I have been a resident in Limpley Stoke for 23 years. Pedestrians have to walk on the road often round a blind corner because people are parking on the road and also on the pavement, which is unsafe! It becomes completely unacceptable for those disabled residents on their motor scooters or indeed those with small children.</p>	1	Comments of support are noted.
WS 28	<p>Support Every day I walk down to the canal and almost everyday my way is impeded by cars and vans parked on the pedestrian footpath which means I have to walk out into oncoming traffic coming round a blind bend.</p> <p>I am therefore really pleased to hear that you are proposing the installation of double yellow lines along this stretch of road. I completely support this proposal.</p>	1	Comments of support are noted.
WS 29	<p>Support The parking is becoming so bad, especially given the recent sunny weather, that I am unable often to walk along the pavement to get from my house by the railway bridge to the canal path. I have to stop, pick up my dog, and run around the parked cars, hoping that a car doesn't come flying around the bend at rush hour doing 40mph (as they are allowed to do so).</p> <p>Whilst I am able bodied, this is still incredibly dangerous given the lack of visibility on that corner, and I can't imagine how difficult it must be for those with pushchairs / wheelchairs etc.</p>	1	Comments of support are noted.
WS 30	<p>Support The proposals for the B3108 would stop parking along this stretch by the canal where vehicle parking blocks the footpath as well as pushing road users out into the middle of a 40mph stretch of road on a difficult bend.</p>	1	Comments of support are noted.

Winsley and Limpley Stoke – Bradford Road, Winsley village

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
WBRN 1	<p>Objection</p> <p>I write to object (in part) to the proposed parking restrictions in Winsley old village. Whereas the proposal to limit parking outside the church gate and opposite the coach house building at 126 Winsley make sense, we think that the extension of the restrictions around the curve of the churchyard wall is excessive and counterproductive.</p> <p>As the owner occupiers of 126 Winsley since 1958, we have never had any concerns around the parking on the churchyard corner (which is opposite our gated entrance). We are concerned however that the proposed restrictions will encourage parking on the narrower part of the road and on the pavement outside 126.</p> <p>Accordingly, please limit any new restrictions to the narrow section of the road between the churchyard and the 126 coach house.</p>	1	<p>The proposals were developed following concern raised by Winsley Parish Council that parking at this location causes obstruction.</p> <p>Engineers who visited the site agreed that restrictions were necessary to protect driveways opposite and access to Bradford Road North towards Bradford Road.</p>
WBRN 2	<p>Support</p> <p>The proposals for Bradford Road North would stop parking on a short stretch on a narrow junction where any parking can cause an obstruction.</p>	1	<p>Comments of support are noted.</p>