

Appendix 3 – Comments and Officer Response

Comments in support of the proposals for Southbroom Road & Victoria Road

Ref.	Comments in support	Officer Response
1.	<p>With reference the order in the email below I support all the Devizes North proposals with these proposed amendments:</p> <p>Southbroom Road – Loading only Please can this be time limited to between 9am and 4pm to allow residents and those access the takeaways to park after peak hours.</p> <p>Victoria Road – No Waiting At Any Time The intention here was to give time limited stopping/parking to allow residents/families and carers to access the Alms houses. Are there any other options which can be used here?</p>	<p>Comments of support noted.</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 yet we can reduce the effect of the proposal.</p> <p>Therefore, it is considered appropriate to reduce the restricted loading only on Southbroom Road to only be operational between 9am and 4pm. As will keep the bay free for loading/unloading purposes during the working day and then provide a safe parking area for patrons of the takeaway in the evenings.</p> <p>After further consideration it is recommended that the proposal on Victoria Road be amended and the 11.5m length of No Waiting At Any Time, not be implemented and remain un-restricted. This will allow parking for residents and visitors to take place. The other proposed No Waiting At Any Time along this section of Victoria Road, should go in as advertised.</p> <p>These recommended amendments are detailed in Appendix 4.</p>
2.	<p>Southbroom Road – Loading only In our original request we asked that that the loading bay be on a peak time basis, ie 8am to 4pm, to ensure that evening parking is available to residents and customers of the nearby food outlets.</p>	<p>See above comments.</p>

Appendix 3 – Comments and Officer Response

Comments of objection to the proposals for Hopton Road

Ref	Comments of objection	Officer Response
3.	<p>I am writing in my capacity as the Health, Safety and Environment Manager for Bakkavor Devizes, the large industrial bakery employing around 600 people, located in the centre of the proposal area. Whilst we absolutely welcome and in fact asked for the double yellow lines around the entrance to our site, the full coverage of this area leaves us with some challenges.</p> <p>Our site operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week and only closes on Christmas day and Easter Sunday, as such we receive a considerable number of deliveries and collections, whilst the majority of these activities are confined to the curtilage of our site we do routinely have drivers waiting to gain access to our site. These drivers currently wait adjacent to site in the area proposed for “No waiting at any time”. In order to maintain safe yard practices, we are unable to accommodate every vehicle that arrives immediately and whilst we do carefully schedule vehicles arriving and departing site, this schedule can be easily affected by the challenges faced navigating the highways.</p> <p>It is with this in mind that we ask if you could give consideration to a delivery zone, or limited time waiting zone that we could utilise to accommodate delivery drivers that are not able to immediately access site to enable them to wait on Hopton Road?</p> <p>Further to this to reduce vehicle numbers on and off site we provide a subsidised bus for employees, this bus parks directly outside the site on Hopton Road to allow people access and exit site via our pedestrian gate. Potentially this too would be affected by the proposal, although from the diagram it appears that an area of roadway outside the factory fall outside of the proposal or has been purposely omitted. The bus arrives at site at around 05.45hrs departing shortly after 6.10hrs and again at 17.45hrs departing shortly after 18.10hrs potentially this too could make use of a limited time waiting zone or allocated bus stop.</p>	<p>This proposal was developed further to reports of vehicles parking causing obstruction.</p> <p>Parking on the public highway is not a right. Wiltshire Council has no duty to provide parking for individuals; but 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>The proposals are to ensure that any parking that takes place does so in appropriate places that would not block access for large vehicles, such as delivery, refuse or crucially emergency services vehicles.</p> <p>There remains plenty of parking opportunities elsewhere along Hopton Road for vehicles to wait while not causing an obstruction to other businesses.</p> <p>There is an exception in the Order for persons being able to board/alight, load/unload from double yellow lines therefore your bus service will still be able to operate from this area.</p>

Comments of objection to the proposals for Roseland Avenue

Appendix 3 – Comments and Officer Response

Ref	Comments of objection	Officer Response
4.	<p>Proposals for Roseland Avenue</p> <p>I live on Longcroft Road and often park on Roseland Avenue as do a lot of my neighbours. I can understand having some parking restrictions around the junction to Nursteed Road but why is this extended along Roseland Avenue? After 10 years of living here I have not seen any problems with traffic on Roseland Avenue. Could you explain the reasons for the change?</p> <p>It appears that there was very little consideration for surrounding residents parking situations as a lot of houses are terrace and do not have driveways. We were also not informed directly despite the effects the proposal could have on us as local residents. I can only see one small sign on one side of Roseland Avenue which none of my surrounding neighbours had noticed. I am concerned the proposed parking restrictions will cause more difficulties parking on surrounding roads as more people will attempt to park along Longcroft Road and Longcroft Avenue.</p>	<p>This proposal was developed further to reports of vehicles parking too close to the Nursteed Road junction and of obstructed accesses on Roseland Avenue.</p> <p>While undertaking site assessments engineers felt that additional restrictions were required to prevent further obstruction from displaced vehicles to prevent them blocking the access to The Moonrakers Pub and nearby residential accesses whilst retaining a length of unrestricted parking opposite the pub adjacent to the post box.</p> <p>Parking on the public highway is not a right. Wiltshire Council has no duty to provide parking for individuals; but has a statutory duty 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>Wiltshire Council does ensure that all processes regarding Traffic Regulation Order's are carried out following the statutory regulations as set out in legislation under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.</p> <p>We are required, when proposing a Traffic Regulation Order, to consult with statutory consultees (Town/Parish Councils, Councillors etc) and inform members of the public, allowing for comments, for a minimum period of 21 days.</p>

Comments of objection to the proposals for Roseland Avenue cont...

Ref	Comments of objection	Officer Response
-----	-----------------------	------------------

Appendix 3 – Comments and Officer Response

4. cont...		<p>In terms of consulting with the public we publish a public notice within a newspaper circulating within the area (specified in the Regulations), we ensure maximum circulation of this by using the figures of highest selling publication within the area to which the TRO relates.</p> <p>Whilst we do not have a statutory obligation to post notice on site, we do this as standard practice as we recognise that not everyone reads the local newspaper and it has proven to be very effective in reaching as wide an audience as possible.</p>
5.	<p>Whilst I support the idea of much shorter double yellow lines on the junction of Nursteed Road and Roseland Avenue, the proposed area is excessive. It is quite clear that there isn't enough parking in this area as it is and the removal of this parking would be detrimental to the residents. If the area is visited after 6pm, the council would see just how detrimental this would be.</p> <p>Roseland Avenue would become much more of a rat run between Windsor Drive and Nursteed Road without parked cars to slow drivers down. Despite cars parked on both sides of the road, larger vehicles (ambulances etc) are still able to use road. Bin lorries shouldn't have much issue as they come during the day when most people are at work.</p> <p>Preventing parking in this area will push residents to park on other nearby streets which are already at maximum capacity with the cars of those who live there. This could cause disputes between residents of particular streets where there is already a high number of cars parked on the street. Furthermore, this may even cause people to park along Nursteed Road which is much more dangerous and already causes issues when people do park on this road, one of the main roads in/out of Devizes. Preventing waiting/parking on Nursteed Road alone would be much more beneficial.</p>	<p>See above comments.</p> <p>The retained parking will still serve to slow vehicles along the road, yet the proposals will address parking close the junction causing obstruction/visibility issues.</p> <p>As the proposals do retain some parking opportunities along Roseland Avenue, it is considered vehicles would not displace onto Nursteed Road. The scheme will be monitored and any unforeseen issues relating to the proposals will be assessed.</p>

Comments of objection to the proposals for Sheep Street

Ref	Comments of objection	Officer Response
-----	-----------------------	------------------

Appendix 3 – Comments and Officer Response

<p>6.</p>	<p>I live in Morris Lane, a pedestrian only lane with no available parking which is adjacent to the parking bay(s) proposed for removal. Street parking in this area of Devizes is very limited and is never sufficient to satisfy the needs of local residents. To lose these bays will make a bad situation worse. As a resident of Morris Lane I depend on having some nearby parking available, particularly when unloading and these bays are my nearest parking spaces. It will be a serious inconvenience to lose them.</p> <p>I understand this proposal arises following a request by residents living in Lansdowne Grove whose access point from Sheep Street, it was claimed, is sometimes obstructed by bad parking across their drive entrance. I have lived close to the area under discussion for a number of years and so am familiar with its comings and goings. To my knowledge vehicles parking so as to block access to Lansdowne Grove is very rare indeed and when it occurs it is usually a transient event such as a delivery van parked for a short time. To consider removing parking bays in this area for the occasional convenience of residents of Lansdowne Grove seems unreasonable to other residents in this area who already have difficulty with parking. After all, the Lansdowne Grove people have adequate parking of their own, right next to their homes.</p> <p>Further, it's not clear how removing these parking bays will actually help to relieve the conceived problem of access. Parking in the existing Sheep Street bays is almost always well contained within the existing white lines. A much simpler and more effective solution may be to paint a white line (or yellow lines) across the entrance to the access road to highlight that this an entrance road. There are currently no markings at all. I suggest this would be a more effective solution and would have the benefit of preserving the present parking areas in Sheep Street for other residents.</p>	<p>This proposal was developed due to the parking on Sheep Street, often overhanging the access to Lansdowne Grove and Morris Lane.</p> <p>The proposal does not remove the existing parking bays, but introduces No Waiting At Any Time across the access to Lansdowne Grove to ensure the access is kept clear and that vehicles are not blocked in.</p>
-----------	--	--

Comments of objection to the proposals for Sheep Street cont...

Ref	Comments of objection	Officer Response
-----	-----------------------	------------------

Appendix 3 – Comments and Officer Response

7.	<p>Many thanks for supplying the requested information. The reasons stated unfortunately do not align with my or fellow residents observations of traffic flow in Sheep St. I therefore wish to raise my objections to the proposals as stated below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic fluidity is not affected by cars parked in the marked bay by domestic, commercial traffic or emergency services. 2. Access for residents again has not been an issue. If a vehicle is parked and overshoots the marked lines relief normally occurs due to the waiting time restrictions and the patrol of parking enforcement officers. 3. For many residents on Morris Lane and Sheep St., the bay provides welcome parking to allow unloading of their vehicles for shopping etc. 4. Now that there is a reduction in the town centre speed limit to 20 mph having parked cars acting as sleeping policemen should be welcomed as I do not understand how this lower speed limit will be enforced. 5. As a market town with many residential properties within the town centre is this restriction being imposed by those who have access to off road parking without understanding the need for on street parking; especially for the dwellings on Sheep St. that consist of blocks of flats? <p>My observations and points are based on my knowledge from the previous eight years living in Bridewell St. when I first moved to Devizes and had no designated parking.</p>	See above comments.
----	---	---------------------

Comments of objection to the proposals for White Horse Way

Ref	Comments of objection	Officer Response
8.	Proposals on White Horse Way	This proposal was developed due to long standing concerns regarding the parking on the estate causing

Appendix 3 – Comments and Officer Response

	<p>I formally object in part to the proposal on the grounds that for the areas circled in red on the map attached there has been no parking on those areas since I moved into White Horse Way as one of its first residents in 2007.</p> <p>Some questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Why therefore is there a need to do this now for the areas circled red? 2) Is there evidence supporting the need to do this for the areas circled red? 3) What is the cost of the Order and the installation of yellow lines and associated signage? <p>As there has been no parking in the areas circled red, the use of yellow lines will be a waste of council tax resources red when funding is so scarce. I cannot comment on the other areas marked as these are further from my property, but I can clearly observe parking behaviours near my own house.</p> <p>Can you also confirm that the yellow lines proposed are only on the opposite side of the road to 15 White Horse Way and similarly on the opposite side of the road to 17 to 28 White Horse Rd and not on both sides of the road.</p>	<p>access issues for large vehicles, such as delivery, refuse or crucially emergency services vehicles. There are also reported instances of parking preventing access to residential parking areas. These proposals are considered to be the minimum required to aid access for larger vehicles and are supported by our Waste Services team.</p> <p>All properties on the estate have access to off-street parking; these proposals will encourage better use of these existing facilities.</p> <p>The Devizes Local Highway & Footway Improvement Group (LHFIG), agreed to fund the assessment of new and outstanding requests across the town. The LHFIG is a sub-group of the Community Area Board which deals specifically with highway issues.</p> <p>A discretionary highways budget has been allocated to each Area Board by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport. Devizes LHFIG has an annual budget of £31,398. Waiting restriction schemes such as this can cost in the region of £6,000. The legal traffic regulation order £3,000, implementation on the ground between £2,500 to £3,000, with the lining at White Horse Way, if approved, costing approx. £300.</p> <p>As with all LHFIG schemes, the appropriate Town or Parish Council, in this case Devizes Town Council, will contribute 25% of the overall cost.</p>
--	---	---

Comments of objection to the proposals for White Horse Way cont...

Ref	Comments of objection	Officer Response
9.	I am writing in regard to the proposed measure you are considering for the above area. I am a fairly new resident to the development, 2 years, and retired here with my husband to enjoy the beautiful town of Devizes and surrounding countryside.	See comments above.

Appendix 3 – Comments and Officer Response

<p>The estate itself I believe was built in 2007 when 1 car per household was more the norm and cars were smaller which I take into account. However, I am on the section of White Horse Way facing farmland and a view of Roundway and the White Horse, part of the appeal on purchasing, the parking at present has infrequent effect on us at this time and with the driveway provided I have parking available for visitors and family outside my house.</p> <p>However, with the implementing of no waiting anytime measures cars from neighbours on the estate will end up outside my house on a far more permanent intrusive basis with my countryside view marred by unknown vehicles as my room is set so I can look out that way. Also my and my neighbours to the left are the only houses on this section of road where cars can park kerbside, the other houses on their section have drop kerbs and speed bumps to prevent parking. If cars were parked on this section on a more permanent basis there would be concerns of safety for the children who walk this way to access the park and service vehicles to access the estate. This issue by the way would have consequences for the whole estate from looking at your proposed plan. I am sure we are not the only people here who will incur a hugely disappointing knock-on effect.</p> <p>Has anyone been on the estate to survey the alleged issue and the consequences of yellow lines on a lovely estate! Moreover, would the cost involved be more wisely spent on the appalling state of Folly Road itself as it is proving to be a deadly hazard with large potholes and heavy dented roadside dips and wear due to the huge amount of Lorry usage!! Or maybe put double yellow lines on the right-hand side of Folly Road, on the approach to Roundway to prevent cars parking opposite the entrance to White Horse Way which is illegal anyway and causes dangerous exiting from the estate especially when lorries park adjacent to the car lot!</p>	<p>The carriageway outside a property is highway and the visual impact of vehicles using the highway on visual amenity from adjacent properties cannot be deemed a material consideration or substantive reason for this not to go ahead.</p> <p>With regards to comments about Folly Road, then a request can be made to Devizes Town Council for further formal restrictions.</p> <p>Individuals may Report a highways improvement issue, which should then be submitted to their town or parish council. Only those issues which are supported by the town or parish council may be considered by the LHFIFG.</p> <p>https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/article/6149/Local-Highway-and-Footway-Improvement-Groups</p> <p>Concerns relating to the carriageway surface can be reported to us via our website as follows;</p> <p>http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/mywiltshire-online-reporting</p>
---	--