

WEST LAVINGTON: PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS
COMMENTS OF OBJECTION AND SUPPORT

31 Comments received (15 objecting, 13 supporting and 3 commenting on)

Road	Objections	Support	Comments
Duck Street / Stibb Hill, West Lavington	4	7	2
High Street, Littleton Pagnell	5	4	1
High Street, West Lavington	3	1	
Sandfield, West Lavington	3	1	
	15	13	3

Duck Street / Stibb Hill, West Lavington

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
DS 1	<p>Whilst I appreciate that the current parking situation in Duck Street leading to Stibb Hill, West Lavington is not ideal the affect that these restrictions will have on the Nursing Home (Dauntsey House) has not been considered. There is no parking available to the front of the home due to it being situated on a busy main road (A360) Staff, doctors, Ambulances and resident's visitors (some who travel very long distances) all rely on the limited parking outside of the rear entrance to the home in Duck Street. As the majority of the residents of Dauntsey House are very vulnerable the attendance of physios, nursing staff, and other medical staff are regular events. This is in addition to hairdressers, podiatrists etc...</p> <p>It is also unreasonable to expect the staff (particularly in the winter) to walk from distance to their place of work in the dark (night shifts) as well as potentially unsafe. I believe that some years ago off-street parking for the home was suggested but was objected to by neighbouring residents. This home has been there for many years (long before some of the neighbouring properties) and provides an excellent service to our community. I feel that the provision of 8 allocated parking spaces (minimum) for the home should be included in any plans. In conclusion I hope that ALL the people affected by these plans have been considered.</p>	1	<p>Parking on the footway at the Church Street junction restricts visibility and pedestrian movement. Parking along Duck Street causes obstruction for farm vehicles and other vehicles accessing further along Duck Street and on to Stibb Hill.</p> <p>Wiltshire Council has no duty to provide parking for individuals or businesses; the statutory duty, as Local Highway Authority, is to maintain the right of passage and re-passage along the highway. Parking is only tolerated in areas where access across dropped kerbs or the passage of through traffic is not inhibited.</p> <p>The proposals seek to strike a reasonable balance and retain parking where it does not cause obstruction, within the lay-by area immediately adjacent to Dauntsey House.</p> <p>Where businesses operate and need to provide parking opportunities for its employees and visitors, it is the reasonability of the business to do so and cannot expect this to be provided by use of the Highway.</p>
DS 2	<p>I work at Dauntsey House and am myself elderly and I need somewhere to park outside my place of work. I am unable to walk up the hill to find parking in the village hall. I am concerned about the verbal abuse I encounter from neighbours of Dauntsey House, as well as how our residents will manage to get in and out of the house as many are not mobile.</p> <p>Visitors will struggle to park and visit their families, which could result in them not being able to have visits, which is vital to their mental wellbeing. We have doctors</p>	1	See comment DS 1 above.

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
	and district nurses and undertakers visit and they would struggle to access us and do their jobs. I feel that we are being picked out as a result of neighbours complaining about having a care home in their road, a care home that has been here since 1963.		
DS 3	<p>I work at Dauntsey House Care Home and am extremely concerned about the effects of reduced parking around this site. As a care home, with many residents accessing the building who suffer mobility issues (amongst other conditions such as Dementia) I am very worried about a decrease, in what is already very limited parking, outside and near the home and the further degradation to safety margins that will result.</p> <p>We have 'Day Care' visitors from the community who come to Dauntsey House for the day and often require the use of wheelchairs or are unable to walk any distance. Reduced parking will impact their ability to access our services and support, which many rely upon.</p> <p>Relatives already struggle to park when visiting their loved ones and staff (who work long hours - up to 12-hour shifts) will have to park a long way from the house and face walking back to their cars alone, at night, in the dark (with poor lighting up the main road). Added to this, we have regular (sometimes daily) visits from medical professionals (District Nurses, GPs, occasional ambulances etc) who need to park near to the home. We also have regular deliveries (MediQuip, food, necessary resources, pharmacy deliveries etc) to the care home.</p> <p>Reducing already limited parking will make a tricky situation worse. I urge you to consider extending the proposed parking around Dauntsey House in Duck Street.</p>	1	See comment DS 1 above.
DS 4	<p>I am an employee at Dauntsey House Nursing Home. If the parking spaces are to go alongside the wall to the nursing home in Duck Street, please will the council put in a streetlight along the wall to West Lavington Manor as in the dark you cannot see in that area and it is made safe for staff to walk there on a cold and dark winters night. Staff work long hours and deserve a lighted area in which to walk to their cars on a bad winters' night at 8pm</p> <p>I think the car parking spaces adjacent to the nursing home should be kept enabling District Nurses, Doctors and Family to visit their end-of-life relatives.</p> <p>I feel that newcomers who buy houses close to the nursing home can see there is a nursing home there and it will involve cars and activity at certain times and think about this and not buy a house so close to this sort of business. Dauntsey House Nursing Home has been in Duck Street for many years and it is all a sad state of</p>	1	See comment DS 1 above.

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
	affairs it has come to this because of the new residents buying houses in Duck Street.		
DSS 1	<p>Kelston Farms Ltd wholly supports the proposal of double yellow lines along the length of Duck Street, West Lavington. As a local landowner and farmer, we use Duck Street on a regular basis to access our land at the intersection of Duck Street and Stibb Hill. Our agricultural contractors also use this route with their tractors, sprayers, combines and agricultural equipment. The road is simply not suitable to accommodate moving traffic and parked vehicles. All too frequently it has not been possible to access our land resulting in financial loss. Beyond our own reasoning there is the safety of the residents living along the Street. On frequent occasions parked vehicles would have almost certainly hindered access for emergency vehicles if required.</p> <p>To confirm, we fully support the installation of double yellow lines along the length of Duck Street, West Lavington.</p>	1	<p>The comments in support of the proposal are noted.</p> <p>These proposals are as a result of such reports and requests as outlined by the Parish Council.</p>
DSS 2	<p>We live on Duck Street and have done for a number of years. Parking at the A360 entrance to Duck Street is very dangerous – cars park on the corner and on a number of occasions there have been near misses here.</p> <p>Outside the nursing home on Duck Street, the cars park in such a way that emergency vehicles cannot pass – potentially causing life threatening situations.</p> <p>The problem continues down Duck Street where cars park in inconsiderate ways. The farmers are also unable to pass. The proposal for double yellow lines will create a more harmonious, safer place to live and we thank Wiltshire Council for this.</p>	1	<p>The comments in support of the proposal are noted.</p> <p>These proposals are as a result of such reports and requests as outlined by the Parish Council.</p>
DSS 3	We support the proposal for Duck Street and Stibb hill due to the numerous blockages caused by badly parked cars.	1	Comments of support are noted.
DSS 4	<p>The current proposal is that double yellow lines will be provided on both sides of the road along Duck Street as far as its eastern end, and will also extend a short distance up Stibb Hill, but only on the western side.</p> <p>However, currently vehicles park on the roadway/grass verge on the eastern side of the lower stretch of Stibb Hill, which impedes the passage of both emergency vehicles accessing Stibb Hill and large agricultural vehicles accessing the farm track at the end of Duck Street. The provision of double yellow lines along Duck Street will likely lead to more vehicles being parked in this 'non-restricted' section, increasing the risk of emergency vehicles being blocked from accessing properties on Stibb Hill and</p>	1	<p>When a Traffic Regulation Order is advertised for public comment, it is not possible, within the Procedure Regulations to alter a proposed restriction to one of greater severity (i.e.: further restrictions, longer hours) without recommencing the legal procedure by consulting and re-advertising the restrictions.</p> <p>The Highway Authority can only place parking restrictions on publicly maintained highway and</p>

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
	impeding farming activities more frequently.		<p>have done so in accordance with the records of the maintainable highway.</p> <p>Owners / those responsible for land outside of the maintainable highway may introduce restrictions and infrastructure they deem necessary subject to any planning obligations and legal requirements.</p>
DSS 5	With ref to the Duck Street proposals, I fully support the proposal as it has always worried me how emergency services might get through and also the inconsiderate parking meaning traffic has to mount the grass banks to get past, damaging the banks.	1	Comments of support are noted.
DSS 6	<p>With reference to the proposal for Duck Street, I would urge you to consider adding double yellow lines on the eastern side of the junction of Duck Street and Stibb Hill. To extend around the corner of Duck Street and onto Stibb Hill to finish at the same point as the lines on the western side.</p> <p>The reason for this is the verge on the eastern edge which is often blocked by parked cars that restrict emergency Vehicle and farm access onto Stibb Hill.</p>	1	See comment DSS 4 above.
DSS 7	I have viewed the proposed traffic restrictions for the parish of West Lavington of no waiting or parking at any time & fully support the implications. In particular the issues of parking in Duck Street & blocking access to residents' property & access for large emergency vehicles & farm machinery.	1	Comments of support are noted.
DSC 1	<p>Some restrictions are needed, to make sure vehicles can get along Duck Street, and up Stibb hill. Access, particularly to larger vehicles such as Ambulances, tractors, delivery lorries and fire engines, is often impossible.</p> <p>However, I feel there should be a limited number of reserved parking spaces, alongside Dauntsey Care Home, to ensure that staff and medical personnel can park. For these, the care home should devise a label that only they can issue. It is a place of work, and as such, is important to local people. There could also be a single disabled space so that residents or their visitors who have very limited mobility can be brought to near the gateway.</p>	1	<p>Comments of support are noted.</p> <p>The placement of restrictions on the parking within the lay-by area was considered at draft proposal stage and not taken forward following comments received from the Parish Council.</p> <p>If the proposed restrictions are approved, the monitoring of their effect will determine if further restrictions are required in the future.</p> <p>The provision of spaces specifically for</p>

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
			employees or visitors of an independent business are not permitted on the Highway, with the exception of on duty Doctors. Where a business needs to provide parking for its employees and visitors it should do so within the confines of its own site.
DSC 2	I should like to suggest that the area marked 'Proposed parking, unrestricted' should be restricted to ambulances/doctors and timed drop offs. If the parking is unrestricted, carers who work at Dauntsey House will park there for up to 12 hours a day. This will doubtless result in people parking on double yellow lines to gain emergency and disabled access to the Home.	1	See comment DSC1 above.

High Street, Littleton Pagnell (Lay-by adjacent to no. 40)

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
HLP 1	<p>Objection</p> <p>I have lived in West Lavington and Littleton Panell all my life – some 74 years. The house I live in has no parking facilities at all – my wife and I have parked our cars in the 40 High Street Littleton Panell lay-by for some 36 years – yes 36 years! For some 18 years – 1987 to 2005 – we had no parking issues at all!</p> <p>The only thing I am aware of is the gentleman from number 40 High Street asked my wife to park her car nearest to his drive, because it was the smallest of the cars parking there. He also asked my wife if she would park it a little way from his drive – he marked the pavement curb stone with white paint – to indicate where she needed to park – this then gave him the perfect view to exit his drive.</p> <p>My wife has always complied with his request – so I do not see there are any issues with his vision on exiting his drive and joining the carriageway.</p> <p>Also, the gentleman put up a mirror the other side of the road opposite his driveway – this went missing for some time – I wonder if this was to influence the Highway engineers in their decision in his favour – I must add this mirror is now back in place – so, even better views on exiting his driveway.</p> <p>I must also point out that the gentleman in 40 High Street on a couple of occasions has tried to sell his house – to no avail as he was asking too much for it. So, no doubt he will be trying again and if successful he will be gone from the village!! So no need for any changes to the lay-by.</p> <p>Please, please do not make cars park on the road because you are making the lay-by smaller – this is very much more dangerous for everybody – please leave the lay-by as it is – the gentleman at 40 High Street has always been able to exit his drive safely without problems!!</p>	1	<p>Parking within the lay-by can at times cause visibility issues for the property no.40 accessed via the lay-by.</p> <p>The proposals seek to strike a reasonable balance and retain parking where it does not cause obstruction to visibility and ensure the access is kept free of physical obstruction also.</p> <p>Having reviewed the comments it is considered that the proposals can be reduced to the where the where the neighbours have informally agreed to park. Thus, retaining parking for properties in the area with no-street parking opportunities and to maximise the visibility for vehicles exiting the driveway to no.40.</p> <p>See Appendix 3 for confirmation of the proposals to be reduced.</p>

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
HLP 2	<p>Objection</p> <p>With regard to the proposal by Wilts Council Highway engineers to partially close 40 High Street Littleton Panell lay-by – I totally object to this.</p> <p>I can't understand how they came to their decision by just looking at said problem regarding the gentleman's (who lives at number 40's) access on to the main road. I have been parking in the lay-by for some 36 years without any problems, in fact years ago a white line was painted on the kerb by number 40 for me to park behind - to help his sight line out of his drive.</p> <p>I have never abused this request, also many years ago there was a mirror put up opposite 40's drive to help his view, which went missing for many years, but now a new mirror has been put up.</p> <p>Who decided that 19 meters was what was required for better visibility, it's been perfectly adequate up to now with less space needed.</p> <p>Also, it would mean my car and even others to park on the main road which would be far more hazardous for all concerned.</p> <p>The gentleman at number 40 has the luxury of having safe parking on his own property, we don't, other than in the lay-by.</p> <p>One person's view of said situation should "NOT" be allowed to override the rest of the local residents' opinions in this matter. Please let sanity prevail in this case and reject the proposal.</p>	1	See comment HLP1 above.
HLP 3	<p>Objection</p> <p>I find this a ridiculous proposal which ultimately removes a number of off-street parking spaces for residents that have no off-street parking of their own at their properties.</p> <p>All this proposal achieves is more parking on the road, not only by residents but also their visitors which can only cause more concerns of damage and safety within our community.</p> <p>The main issue which is continually overlooked is the speeding which, overtime has become a great concern with vehicles of all sizes driving well in excess of the speed limit.</p>	1	See comment HLP1 above.

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
HLP 4	<p>This proposal is, at best, excessive and would severely restrict the use of the layby for perfectly legal use. As is well known, many properties within Littleton Panell have no off street parking and the layby currently provides valuable space for up to three cars to be parked out of the flow of traffic, all of which are parked with a great deal of consideration to the owner of number 40, with care being taken to not obstruct the entry to the property in any way - even going so far as to park behind a line the owner of number 40 painted on the kerb to ensure adequate visibility.</p> <p>The proposal to restrict 19 metres from the boundary of numbers 38a and 40, is excessive, effectively halving the size of the useable space in the layby which will no doubt end up with one or two cars being parked in the main carriage way potentially putting them at risk of damage or causing traffic flow obstructions. This does not help the wider community in the village.</p> <p>The main users of the layby have been parking there for over 36 years with no issues (aside from the owner of number 40 not trimming back front garden shrubbery that over hangs the pavement to the extent that walking along the pavement is nigh on impossible) and have previously engaged with the owner of number 40 to ensure access and visibility is maintained to and from the property. They agreed to heed the line painted on the kerb and have followed this for many years.</p> <p>On these grounds and as local long-term residents with a vested interest in the village of Littleton Panell we must object to this excessive restriction on the basis that the problem being used to justify the restriction is either non-existent or not supported by evidence. It also serves to benefit only one resident rather than serving a wider group within the village. When proposals are made that only serve one person it is not in the greater good, especially when the justification if flawed and the perceived issue being used is not supported by facts. The use of the layby for parking for over 36 years with no significant issues proves there is no issue to address aside from convenience to the owner of number 40.</p>	1	See comment HLP1 above.

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
HLP 5	<p>Now had detail letter from the Parish council where it shows the distance to be 19 metres Why is it so long when further down the A360 for Fieldside it is only 10 metres?</p> <p>The 19 m will take up most of the layby, even now we get vehicles unable to park in the layby parking on the pavement outside our property No 38 restricting our view. Most vehicular accesses to properties along the A360 are between 4 – 6 m so why is 19 m outside no 40?</p> <p>I have lived here for 43 years and as far as I am aware there has never been any incident of vehicles going in/out of No 40, the owner knew the layby was there when he bought the property, but he seems to think he owns it – even painting a white line beyond the drop kerb and leaves rude notes if you park beyond the line even if you are within the dropped kerb. He has a better view than most properties along the A360.</p> <p>I agree with most of the other proposals but how can Wiltshire Council spend time and money to satisfy personal whims under the current financial restrictions and state of the A360 from Tilshead to Devizes.</p>	1	See comment HLP1 above.
HLPS 1	<p>I have been a visitor to this property for many years and the visibility problem on leaving the property is extremely difficult. An increase in fast traffic and poor visibility from the right is dangerous. I have noticed that the problem has become worse in recent years because of parked vehicles in the layby (right) which means drivers have to pull far out into the very busy road, with oncoming traffic, to get any proper visibility for turning right.</p>	1	<p>Comments of support noted.</p> <p>See comment HLP1 above.</p>
HLPS 2	<p>It has always been awkward exiting the property given there is a vehicle permanently parked in the layby (assume it must be used as a residents parking space), which with a bend in the road heading southbound, means you have to edge into potential incoming traffic to ensure it's safe to pull out. This is very dangerous and only a matter of time before there is an accident.</p> <p>Lastly, on more than one occasion, the drive has been blocked when trying to enter by delivery vehicles for houses around my parents; clearly the fact there is a layby but no spaces available to use it as such, delivery drivers feel compelled to block the driveway.</p>	1	<p>Comments of support noted.</p> <p>See comment HLP1 above.</p>

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
HLPS 3	<p>The lay-by has 3 cars permanently parked there. They are only missing for very short periods during the week. Dangers exiting onto busy major road turning right - south bound. Because these vehicles are permanently parked in this layby, we have to pull right out into the road to see northbound traffic from the right as the road from this direction has an incline and a kink/bend in the road within it (see pictures attached)</p> <p>Similarly, delivery vehicles to other residents in the area, pull-up across our entrance because they cannot use the lay-by. Car drivers also pull up in front of our access to use mobile phones, again because they cannot use the lay-by. On one occasion someone pulled up with a flat tyre and called for Road Assistance! There is clear signage asking people not to park or turn, but this is ignored.</p> <p>On many occasions we have held up traffic returning home from both directions, because vehicles are parked across our entrance, and we cannot access our driveway. We literally have to wait until the driver re-appears because we have no idea to whom they are delivering and this is also causing us to obstruct traffic, thus causing a further hazard.</p>	1	<p>Comments of support noted.</p> <p>See comment HLP1 above.</p>
HLPS 4	<p>I write in support of this application. I've been a frequent visitor to this property over many years and it is hazardous exiting the drive due to poor visibility from the right. This is caused by cars parked in the layby meaning the owner of the property often comes out into the road to see me safely pull-out.</p>	1	<p>Comments of support noted.</p> <p>See comment HLP1 above.</p>
HLPC 1	<p>The Parish Council supports the residents' views, in that the yellow lines should stop at white mark not the proposed 19 meters.</p>	1	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See comment HLP1 above.</p>

High Street, West Lavington (Lay-by adjacent to Fieldside)

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
<p>HSWL 1</p>	<p>For the most part it is used by nearby High Street residents and their visitors who live opposite or adjacent to it and it is already the case that when the bays are occupied some households park on the main road.</p> <p>On Sundays, it is used by those attending the services at the adjoining Baptist chapel. It is clear that several of these people have mobility issues, and frequently their vehicles are double parked in the layby or parked outside the chapel door on the main road. It is used by delivery/works vehicles, often to take a break to eat/drink and to use the nearby shop. It is not likely they will take notice of yellow lines for their short visits.</p> <p>I can understand that the rationale for the proposed changes is probably line of sight for those pulling out of Fieldside due to parked vehicles. However, personally I would not consider it worse than many residential junctions especially as it is such a deep layby that allows drivers to pull forward beyond the parked cars. The main difficulty is for checking for traffic from the right, which the chapel, its wall and its vegetation obscure anyway.</p> <p>My concern is that by removing this parking space it will pressure its users to park on the main road (A360 High Street), namely local residents and chapel goers. Some might say they can park in Holmfield (already very full) or Sandfield (facing its own restrictions), but the reality is that they won't; the precedent is already set.</p> <p>In summary, the parking and traffic flow just about works at present, but only just. Losing the space will mean more people in the vicinity will start parking on the A360 High Street. This will affect traffic flow and will not solve the issue of line of sight for those pulling out of Fieldside. It will only make matters worse.</p> <p>Might I suggest a solution for improvement? If parked bays were marked so as to be parallel with the road it would reduce vehicles parking at an angle and obscuring vision. I've marked the attached photo to help explain.</p> <p>May I also request that, if the TRO goes ahead, you consider including double yellow lines on the A360 between No 27 and No 29 so that cars are not parked opposite the Fieldside entrance and so that both households can always access their own driveways safely.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Parking within the lay-by can at times cause visibility issues for Fieldside accessed via the lay-by.</p> <p>The proposals seek to strike a reasonable balance and retain parking where it does not cause obstruction to visibility and ensure the access is kept free of physical obstruction also.</p> <p>When a Traffic Regulation Order 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> <p>If the proposed restrictions are approved, the monitoring of their effect will determine if further restrictions are required in the future.</p>

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
HSWL 2	<p>I am writing to object to part of the proposed restrictions, specifically the partial closure of the layby by Fieldside. I live close to the layby. I do recognise that the current arrangements make exit from the junctions difficult, though I am not aware of any accidents resulting from the current lay out.</p> <p>It is my firm belief that closing part of the layby will cause issues elsewhere. I know already that when this layby is full some residents park their vehicles on the A360 itself resulting in a narrowing of the road as cars obstruct the traffic flow, similar to parking outside Cost Cutter. I can supply photos if that is helpful. I believe that this causes the following issues:</p> <p>Creation of traffic as a result of a choke point. When cars are parked on the section of road, they force traffic to come to a standstill if there is two way traffic, which there frequently is. As a result of this there is a significant amount of noise and air pollution created as cars move round the obstructions.</p> <p>Personally, this causes our family issues as cars parked on the A360 often obstruct our view of the road, making entry and exit from our driveway difficult. In addition, cars parked on the A360 at this point obstruct the recommended crossing points and make crossing the road more difficult.</p> <p>Alternative parking away from the A360 is available in the village hall car park, however this is out of sight, poorly lit and I would be concerned about the security of vehicles left there.</p> <p>Whilst I understand that under the current set up that entry and exit from Fieldside can be made difficult when cars are parked in the layby, I believe closing part of the layby will push the issue onto the road opposite, making it difficult for another group of residents to access their driveways and additionally create traffic flow issues on the A360. I would like to know if other measures to aid exit from Fieldside could be considered, such as a convex mirror opposite or marked bays.</p>	1	<p>See comment HS1 above.</p> <p>We do not endorse mirrors to be erected on the highway. This is because experience shows that rather than improving safety, a mirror could increase safety risks, e.g:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reflect light and interfere with a driver's vision, • reduce the ability to judge an oncoming vehicle's speed, • create an unreasonable dependence on the mirror, • if dirty, distorts or restricts the view, • be an easy target for vandals. <p>Individuals may erect mirrors on private land should they wish to do so, and subject to any planning permission requirements.</p>

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
<p>HSWL 3</p>	<p>Proposed 'no waiting at any time' at the inset of the road a few yards from the Ebenezer Church.</p> <p>This is a sort of 'lay by'. As you approach the church on the left and go a little further on the left is an inset for about 3 cars.</p> <p>Without this inset the cars need to park on the road and thus create a delay in the traffic as they have to stop and allow oncoming traffic approach. This happens along the A360 quite often now and is a danger and nuisance, given it is a main road. Thus parking, I agree along the A360 is quite a hazard, the inset after the church gives the users of the church a benefit to keep off the main road. This could be anytime during the week.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>See comment HS1 above.</p>
<p>HSWLS 1</p>	<p>For many years, the thoughtless parking of others at this location has caused a hazard for residents and visitors to Fieldside attempting to emerge onto High Street.</p> <p>The problem is that when vehicles are parked there, it is impossible to see southwards along the main road in order to safely pull out from Fieldside.</p> <p>We should not have to hope that drivers travelling north on the A360 are driving within the speed limit and are alert in order for us to 'inch' out for a view without being involved in a collision, but that is currently the reality.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Comments of support are noted.</p> <p>These proposals are as a result of such reports and requests as outlined by the Parish Council.</p>

Sandfield / High Street

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
SF 1	<p>Objection</p> <p>I moved into Sandfield West Lavington in January 2013 & I have always parked my car outside my home. In this time, I have never had any complaints & my car has never been hit.</p> <p>Emergency services can get past my car, as do dustcarts, coaches for the school, lorries etc. My car does not cause an obstruction.</p> <p>I saw 2 police officers on 9th August 2023 at Market Lavington (1 of which used to be a traffic warden). I showed them where I park my car, both said I am not obstructing Emergency vehicles & I have every right to park outside my home.</p> <p>As I do not obstruct any vehicles passing what regulation am I in breach of - especially in respect of the 1984 Road Traffic regulation Act? What legislations / rules are you using to implement the installation of yellow lines outside my home, specifically relating to the 2004 Traffic Management Act.</p> <p>As I understand it, you have had some complaints about my parking none of which have been raised with me & therefore, I can only assume that I am being victimised & discriminated against. Both myself & my husband have health issues and need my car outside my home for getting heavy shopping in & emergencies etc.</p> <p>Failing to park outside my home will mean I will have to park further down the road which means cars will still have to slow down to pass which really defeats the object of yellow lines outside my home as well as causing us unnecessary stress when we have enough health issues to worry about. Safety measures such as double yellow lines should work for the safety of people not against them.</p>	1	<p>The proposals have been developed in response to concerns raised by the Parish Council of the overrunning by large vehicles, especially coaches, due to parking on the bend.</p> <p>On site evidence suggests that parking does cause obstruction to larger vehicles such as coaches, refuse collection etc, with significant over-run damage of the verge on the inside of the bend. See Appendix 3 for site photos.</p> <p>Relocating on street parking to the straight section of Sandfield will help large vehicles negotiate the bend and avoid over-running the nearside verge.</p>

Ref	Comment received	No. of times received	Officer Comment
SF 2	<p>Objection</p> <p>My concern is that I ride horses down the A360 from Sandfields to White Street. The traffic can be fast as the speed limit is 30. Your proposal will see traffic speeding up from the north going south as the occasional parking which slows it down is prohibited.</p> <p>I object to your proposed traffic order as I believe traffic flows will be faster and traffic turning right out of Sandfields will back up - the school run traffic in the mornings and afternoons is heavy.</p>	1	<p>Proposals were developed primarily in response to concerns raised by the Parish Council of the overrunning by large vehicles, especially coaches, due to parking on the bend. The proposals were then further extended to avoid displaced vehicles parking on the A360, causing greater potential issues with regard to visibility.</p> <p>The proposal should also address concerns in relation to the busy school drop off and pick up times, ensuring the bend on Sandfield and its junction with A360 – High Street is not obstructed.</p> <p>It is considered that the proposal on A360 High Street be reduced to protect the immediate 10 metres at the junction only.</p> <p>See Appendix 3 for confirmation of the proposals to be reduced.</p>
SF 3	<p>Objection</p> <p>I am the owner of garage opposite Sandfield and sometimes our customers park on High Street or Sandfield never for long and it seems to cause no issue, and as for the High Street parked cars are the only thing slowing the crazy speeds people drive through village, I think this change in parking is solving a problem that doesn't exist. In fact, may make High Street more dangerous.</p>	1	See comments SF 1 and SF 2 above.
SFS 1	<p>Support</p> <p>Hi, we live at 2 Sandfield and find that parked cars adjacent to our property causes considerable congestion, we frequently encounter difficulty in accessing or exiting our driveway. The problem is exacerbated when the volume of traffic increases with the school run to Dauntseys Primary which can only be accessed via this road.</p> <p>We feel that the use of double yellow lines to stop vehicles parking in this location will improve traffic flow considerably and improve overall safety.</p>	1	Comments of support are noted. These proposals are as a result of such reports and requests.