

**COMMENTS RECEIVED IN OPPOSITION TO / COMMENTING ON THE COUNCIL'S  
PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTION AMENDMENTS AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS, TIDWORTH AND LUDGERSHALL**

Comment Ref. No.	Comment	Officer Response
1	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>My name is ? of ?, Ludgershall.</p> <p>I am writing to you to put my concerns across to you with regards to the proposal of an extension of Double Yellow Lines on the corner of Dewey's Lane and Castle Street. These residents have purchased the properties with the full intention to be able to park outside their own houses and if the lines are extended then this will push the parking further up the road as there is no other area for them to park in. I definitely feel that a 10 metre extension is more than enough to allow the corner to be free to turn into.</p> <p>I would like to bring to your attention that I am in the process of trying to get the speed reduced on Dewey's Lane as it is a built up residential area with quite a few elderly people residing here and it is a main commute road for parents walking their small children to and from the local primary school who live at this end of the village and local children playing on the recreation ground that runs parallel to the road.</p> <p>This is the 2nd time that I have requested to have some form of speed calming bumps or islands just to try and get the local traffic to slow down. When the drivers turn in off Castle Street up into Dewey's Lane they take the corner very fast and not always realising that there are cars parked outside residents houses. Which I think is a good thing that the residents can park there at the moment as that does provide some form of natural slowing process for the cars that are driving into Dewey's lane from Castle Street as they have to pull in to give way of the vehicles driving down Dewey's Lane to access Castle Street, I feel that if the Double Yellow Lines are extended to a 22 meter stretch and the residents of that area are unable to park outside their own properties, as these properties in question do not have off road parking facilities at all, with that this will just encourage the speeding drivers to put their foot down even earlier whilst driving up Dewey's Lane than they do now which will definitely mean they will reach a speed of at least 50mph up a 30mph road by the time they reach recreation road at the top of Dewey's Lane. One day there will be a fatality (It's an accident waiting to happen) all be it an animal, we are always scraping up dead squashed hedgehogs off the road that have been run over during the night (there are plenty of cats crossing that road too)</p>	<p>The comments within this response are noted however highway law states the public highway is for the passage and repassage of persons and goods. There is no legal right for motorists to park on the public highway, nor obligation upon Wiltshire Council (as the local highway authority) to provide parking. Parking within the confines of the public highway is tolerated so long as it does not impede the right of passage along it.</p> <p>This consultation does not consider the implementation of a lower speed limit nor has a formal request yet been received to consider doing so. This would need to be considered by the Town Council who in turn can raise the matter via the Local Highways Footway Improvement Group (LHFIG hereafter) process if they wish to pursue this matter.</p> <p>Without waiting restrictions, only the police are able to enforce speeding and dangerous parking at locations where members of the public are driving.</p>

	<p>and/or a child as we have many that don't like to use the pathway that is provided for them to use.</p> <p>I witnessed a car the other day coming to a sudden stop as there were a couple of young boys on these push scooters rolling down the middle of the road, which I had already warned them it is very dangerous to play on the actual road that is as busy as it is.</p> <p>My house is actually situated on Dewey's Lane and we have to pull out of our drive on to that road and have to edge out very slowly because you can look one way then the next and back to the opposite side to check for traffic before you pull out, then all of a sudden there is a car that wasn't there 2 seconds ago because they are travelling at some speed and just don't expect cars to be pulling out of private driveways.</p> <p>I have actually experienced on a couple of occasions a very near miss to the front of my car due to speeding vehicles.</p> <p>I really do hope that the Double Yellow Line extension is really thought about with great consideration on the corner of castle street and Dewey's lane as at the moment it is big help to the rest of the road,</p> <p>I would like to request that 20 is definitely plenty on this road and would love to see a reduced speed limit actioned , I am hoping that it is going to be brought up in the next council/transport mtg that is due to be held in October ??</p> <p>I have managed to put a petition together of 43 signatures from residents that would also love to see the speed reduced for their own safety.</p> <p>I look forward to an acknowledgement of this email very soon.</p>	
2	<p>Re: Restriction on Deweys Lane, Ludgershall</p> <p>We think that the residents parking needs are as least as important as traffic flow along the streets of this area of Ludgershall.</p> <p>The older houses with little or no driveways do need to be considered. During the 24 years that we have lived here there has been a slowly worsening daily/evening battle to park here, with more vehicles and no extra spaces, not helped by the loss of the Castle Club carpark whose staff and customers now take spaces along these streets too.</p> <p>We feel that 10 metres, not 22 meters of yellow lines would seem to be a sensible compromise for both traffic flow on the corner and to leave some much needed parking space along Deweys Lane.</p>	<p>The comments within this response are noted however highway law states the public highway is for the passage and repassage of persons and goods. There is no legal right for motorists to park on the public highway, nor obligation upon Wiltshire Council (as the local highway authority) to provide parking. Parking within the confines of the public highway is tolerated so long as it does not impede the right of passage along it.</p> <p>There are already 10m of restrictions present at the junction; however, this does not prevent the width of the road being reduced to one car width. Ludgershall Parish Council have requested that the restrictions within Deweys Lane are removed following the consultation.</p>
3	<p>I am writing to object to one particular aspect of the above proposal, namely the proposed length of extension to double yellow lines on Deweys Lane.</p>	<p>The comments within this response are noted however highway law states the public highway is for the passage and repassage of persons and goods. There is no legal right for motorists to park on the public highway, nor obligation upon Wiltshire Council (as the local highway authority) to provide parking. Parking</p>

	<p>At a Ludgershall Town Council meeting on Monday 9 September, this issue was discussed thoroughly between Town Council members, a representative of Wiltshire Council and the general public. It was overwhelmingly agreed by vote that an extension of a further 10 metres to the existing lines, making 21 metres in total would be quite sufficient to resolve any traffic flow and visibility for vehicles at the junction while offering residents the maximum benefit of street parking, which is vital to their needs and lifestyles as the houses in this area have no driveways because of their age.</p> <p>A longer stretch of a further 22 metres as per the current proposal was rejected on this basis and also on the grounds that it would encourage motorists to take the bend at faster speeds, something that is very undesirable as there is a recreational park for children and we are in a conservation area for animals and speed reduction is at the heart of all the residents.</p> <p>We also have 3 cottages in line with these proposed double yellows and the extension of them means the residents potentially have their parkings taken away and 3 of the 4 are blue badge holders and do not have allocated residence permits.</p> <p>I agree with all of the above points and would request that the length of double yellows on Deweys Lane be reduced accordingly to a further 10 metres only.</p> <p>Yours faithfully,</p>	<p>within the confines of the public highway is tolerated so long as it does not impede the right of passage along it.</p> <p>There are already 10m of restrictions present at the junction; however, this does not prevent the width of the road being reduced to one car width. Ludgershall Parish Council have requested that the restrictions within Deweys Lane are removed following the consultation.</p> <p>In terms of Blue Badge parking an approved parking place can be marked out on the road outside the applicant's property. Where a property does not have direct access to the road, consideration will be given to a bay within 50m of the property.</p>
4	<p>We wish to object to the above Road Traffic Order, specifically the proposed extension of double yellow lines by a further 22 metres (to the existing 11 metres) on Deweys Lane at the corner with Castle Street/High Street.</p> <p>Following some extensive traffic monitoring by residents, we believe that a 10 metre extension to the existing 11 metres of double yellows on the corner is quite sufficient to significantly improve traffic flow and visibility. The issue here has always been cars legally parking very close to the corner of the junction reducing visibility, and this extra 10 metres we propose eliminates that possibility.</p> <p>Your current proposal of a 22 metre extension to double yellows on Deweys Lane is a bit too excessive and does not take into account the need for essential residents' roadside parking. This is critical for these old houses situated there, as they have no driveways due to their age. They rely totally on street parking and your current proposal removes vital, non-contentious roadside parking unnecessarily.</p> <p>We are also concerned that a longer stretch of yellows as currently proposed will only serve to encourage motorists to drive faster around the bend and into Deweys Lane and beyond. This is a situation which we want to avoid, as overall traffic speed is a concern to many residents of Deweys Lane, and this is currently being discussed with Ludgershall Town Council.</p> <p>So, in short, we object to a further 22 metres of double yellows at this junction but would support a further 10 metres instead. This then strikes a good</p>	<p>The comments within this response are noted however highway law states the public highway is for the passage and repassage of persons and goods. There is no legal right for motorists to park on the public highway, nor obligation upon Wiltshire Council (as the local highway authority) to provide parking. Parking within the confines of the public highway is tolerated so long as it does not impede the right of passage along it.</p> <p>There are already 10m of restrictions present at the junction; however, this does not prevent the width of the road being reduced to one car width. Ludgershall Parish Council have requested that the restrictions within Deweys Lane are removed following the consultation.</p>

	<p>balance between traffic flow/visibility and the needs of residents in the immediate vicinity, many of whom are elderly or have medical conditions, and who deserve the opportunity to park close to their houses without unduly affecting traffic flow.</p> <p>At their meeting on Monday 9 September, Ludgershall Town Council reviewed the data and endorsed/supported this alternative 10 metre extension as outlined above. We understand that they will be contacting Wiltshire Council directly to either amend or withdraw their original request and replace it with a new request for 10 metre extension only. However, as we are in a formal consultation period with Wiltshire Council on this matter, we feel obliged to raise our objection directly with yourselves.</p> <p>Kind regards</p> <p>Further to our recent objection to you on 11 September regarding the above TRO, I would like to add some further information by way of Appendices which give more detail regarding recent traffic monitoring at Deweys Lane and also more information regarding the Ludgershall Town Council discussion and decision regarding this on 9 September.</p> <p>These appendices are attached and are highly relevant to the TRO. I would be grateful if you would add these to our original objection, for consideration by Wiltshire Council.</p> <p>Many thanks</p> <p>I sent an amended objection to your office (detailed on the attachment) with further details of our traffic monitoring on Thursday 19 September. Looking at my emails, I did not receive an acknowledgement (I did for the first communication on 11 September), so on phoning Wiltshire Council, they advised me to resend the email.</p> <p>Hence I am resending and hope you receive it in due course.</p> <p>Kind regards</p>	
5	<p>We are extremely concerned that a 22 metre extension of double yellow lines is proposed in Deweys Lane Ludgershall. The concern is due to the increased speed of traffic coming in from Castle Street meeting traffic coming towards the junction with nothing to slow it down.</p> <p>We appreciate the improvement a 10 meter extension might well make as a driver would still have to corner carefully thus slowing the speed.</p> <p>Our other concern is that local residents living in houses built in less congested times have a great need to park their cars. By removing the only place available within reasonable walking distance, you would be causing deep distress and a reduction in value of homes.</p> <p>Please consider 10 meters only. Great idea!</p> <p>Thanks.</p>	<p>It is recognised that as a result of the proposals, parking could potentially be displaced elsewhere and that currently parking acts as informal traffic calming. Should the introduction of these restrictions result in a negative impact further measures can be discussed via the LHFIFG and it may be the case the introduction of further waiting restrictions is reduced or that formalised traffic calming measures could be considered. Requests for these measures should be raised via the Parish Council.</p> <p>The comments within this response are noted however highway law states the public highway is for the passage and repassage of persons and goods. There is no legal right for motorists to park on the public highway, nor obligation upon Wiltshire Council (as the local highway authority) to provide parking. Parking within the confines of the public highway is tolerated so long as it does not impede the right of passage along it.</p>

6	<p>Good afternoon My Wife and I live at ? Central Street Ludgershall ?... On the lamp post outside our property is the notification of proposed parking restrictions... Please could you extend the restrictions further up Central St. ?? For visibility and safety reasons...</p> <p>At various times of day this area becomes gridlocked... This Street is a main access road to Doctor's surgery, Chemist School Traffic...also Ambulances ...please contact me if you require additional information regarding this matter...</p>	<p>This consultation does not consider the implementation of further waiting restrictions nor has a formal request yet been submitted to do so. This would need to be considered by the Town Council who in turn can raise the matter via the Local Highways Footway Improvement Group (LHFIG hereafter) process if they wish to pursue this matter.</p>
7	<p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>In relation to the proposed "no waiting at any time on Coronation Road and Pennings Road" I would like to submit the following comment:</p> <p>The proposed no waiting time reaches its boundary at ? Pennings Road, a property subject to a large volume of waiting vehicles as a result of a child minding business the occupants operate.</p> <p>Both my property, ? Pennings Road, and my neighbour's property, ? Pennings Road, are already subject to an increased number of waiting vehicles as a result of No ?'s child minding business. To introduce a no waiting at any time, culminating at No 9's address, would only increase the volume of waiting vehicles outside the properties peripheral to that address, thus further limiting access to the occupant's driveways and visibility upon exit.</p> <p>I would ask the following courses of action be considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Extend the boundaries of the no waiting at any time to incorporate numbers 8, 7, 6, 5, and 4 Pennings Road.</li> <li>2) Extend the boundaries of the no waiting at any time to incorporate numbers 8 and 7 Pennings Road.</li> <li>3) Do not introduce a no waiting at any time restriction on Pennings Road.</li> </ol> <p>Should one of the above courses of action not be introduced, the already large volume of vehicles blocking access to properties neighbouring 9 Pennings Road will only increase, further reducing visibility when occupants from adjacent properties exit their driveways and likely culminating in increased instances of road traffic incidents.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p>	<p>The comments within this response are noted however highway law states the public highway is for the passage and repassage of persons and goods. There is no legal right for motorists to park on the public highway, nor obligation upon Wiltshire Council (as the local highway authority) to provide parking. Parking within the confines of the public highway is tolerated so long as it does not impede the right of passage along it and parking currently has been affecting the visibility from Coronation Road onto Pennings Road.</p> <p>This consultation does not consider the implementation of further waiting restrictions nor has a formal request yet been submitted to do so. This would need to be considered by the Town Council who in turn can raise the matter via the Local Highways Footway Improvement Group (LHFIG hereafter) process if they wish to pursue this matter.</p> <p>It is recognised that as a result of the proposals, parking could potentially be displaced elsewhere and that currently parking acts as informal traffic calming. Should the introduction of these restrictions result in a negative impact further measures can be discussed via the LHFIG and it may be the case the introduction of further waiting restrictions is reduced or that formalised traffic calming measures could be considered. Requests for these measures should be raised via the Parish Council.</p>

<p>8</p>	<p>I live at No. ? Andover Road, Ludgershall, which is just a few metres from the proposal to introduce 'No waiting at any time' restrictions on Central Street.</p> <p>I have no objection to this proposal, but would like to draw your attention to a current obstruction on the A342 just metres from the junction of Central Street and the main road A342, travelling East towards Andover.</p> <p>More often than not there are 3 or 4 cars parked either on the pavement or on the side of the main road, potentially causing the following hazards:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The A342 is a very busy trunk road, therefore traffic travelling East towards Andover has to stop to allow oncoming traffic to proceed.</li> <li>2. Any traffic travelling down Central Street to the junction with the A342 has its vision severely obscured by these parked cars.</li> <li>3. The residents that live along Andover Road on the South side, when exiting their driveways, have to be extra cautious because of traffic travelling East having to overtake these parked cars.</li> </ol> <p>Would it be possible therefore to extend the 'No waiting at any time' restrictions to include this section of the A342 where these cars are parked, thereby making it illegal for them to park in the future?</p> <p>Many thanks</p>	<p>This consultation does not consider the implementation of further waiting restrictions nor has a formal request yet been submitted to do so. This would need to be considered by the Town Council who in turn can raise the matter via the Local Highways Footway Improvement Group (LHFIG hereafter) process if they wish to pursue this matter.</p>
<p>9</p>	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I write in response to the notice of proposed parking restrictions as detailed above.</p> <p>Highway code rule 243 states that one should not park or wait opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space, therefore I understand why an extension to the parking restrictions is being proposed. I have myself on occasion noticed vehicles parked far too close to this junction- drivers who obviously have little regard for the highway code and might need reminding of the rules. I would support an extension of the restrictions to 10 metres from the junction which would no doubt provide more visibility and a safer crossing for pedestrians.</p> <p>However- I believe that the proposed extension to 22 metres, more than twice the usual distance of 10 metres to be excessive. I really cannot see the need for this on Deweys Lane, which is actually a very quiet, residential road. In addition, since this is within the conservation area of Ludgershall, the occupants of the historic houses, which have never had their own driveways, do not have the option of constructing off road parking on their property. Many of those affected are retired, and need their cars to be parked close to home. Beyond the 22 metre mark those residents already struggle to find spaces, so</p>	<p>The comments within this response are noted however highway law states the public highway is for the passage and repassage of persons and goods. There is no legal right for motorists to park on the public highway, nor obligation upon Wiltshire Council (as the local highway authority) to provide parking. Parking within the confines of the public highway is tolerated so long as it does not impede the right of passage along it.</p> <p>There are already 10m of restrictions present at the junction; however, this does not prevent the width of the road being reduced to one car width. Ludgershall Parish Council have requested that the restrictions within Deweys Lane are removed following the consultation.</p> <p>This consultation does not consider the implementation of residential parking permits/bays and if this is something the resident would like to request, this would need to be considered by the Town Council who in turn can raise the matter via the LHFIG for further support and consideration. It should be noted that even if a residents parking scheme was introduced it will not guarantee a parking space outside of the residents property. The scheme is a chargeable service and requires over 50% of residents to support the introduction of such a scheme.</p>

	<p>removing the option for the house on the corner to park alongside their own property will cause a lot of distress.</p> <p>With an extension to 10 metres, I would also advocate the provision of "residents only" parking bays just beyond the 10 metre mark to allow the property owners to park their own vehicles and prohibit casual visitors, such as users of the High St, or the pub opposite, from blocking the spaces.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of the above. I would be grateful if you could confirm receipt of this email. Yours,</p>	
10	<p>In my view a 22m extension to the no waiting area exceeds the needs of road traffic law and, once again increases the issues related to resident parking. When permission was granted by the council to build upon parking for the Castle Club we were re-assured that there would be no impact for local residents. This was not so.</p> <p>Further reducing the parking available will surely increase the pressure on the limited convenient parking available to residents of Castle Street and will likely result in the residents of the impacted house parking their cars outside my house.</p> <p>Surely reducing the distance of restriction by a couple of car lengths and perhaps providing a residents only parking bay would be a less intrusive and equally compliant change?</p>	<p>The comments within this response are noted however highway law states the public highway is for the passage and repassage of persons and goods. There is no legal right for motorists to park on the public highway, nor obligation upon Wiltshire Council (as the local highway authority) to provide parking. Parking within the confines of the public highway is tolerated so long as it does not impede the right of passage along it.</p> <p>There are already 10m of restrictions present at the junction; however, this does not prevent the width of the road being reduced to one car width. Ludgershall Parish Council have requested that the restrictions within Deweys Lane are removed following the consultation.</p> <p>It is recognised that as a result of the proposals, parking could potentially be displaced elsewhere and that currently parking acts as informal traffic calming. Should the introduction of these restrictions result in a negative impact further measures can be discussed via the LHFIG and it may be the case the introduction of further waiting restrictions is reduced or that formalised traffic calming measures could be considered. Requests for these measures should be raised via the Parish Council.</p> <p>This consultation does not consider the implementation of residential parking permits/bays and if this is something the resident would like to request, this would need to be considered by the Town Council who in turn can raise the matter via the LHFIG for further support and consideration. It should be noted that even if a resident's parking scheme was introduced it will not guarantee a parking space outside of the residents property. The scheme is a chargeable service and requires over 50% of residents to support the introduction of such a scheme.</p>
11	<p>Ref: LJB/TRO/LUDG/TIDW</p> <p>I am writing to you to express our concerns regarding the above proposal to extend the existing double yellow lines a further 22 metres along Dewey's Lane from the Castle Street junction and to strongly object to this proposal.</p>	<p>In terms of Blue Badge parking an approved parking place can be marked out on the road outside the applicant's property. Where a property does not have direct access to the road, consideration will be given to a bay within 50m of the property.</p>

	<p>I understand that there is a need to prevent cars parking too close to the junction and obstructing the traffic flow, but by dealing with this problem you are creating another.</p> <p>The 4 Dewey's Lane cottages (and I am including 2 Castle Street as they also park on Dewey's Lane) have no off-street parking. The houses are very old - as indeed are most of the residents, two of which are Blue Badge holders.</p> <p>We personally have lived at No ? Deweys Lane for over twenty years and during that time, although neighbours have come and gone, we have all managed to be considerate and flexible to each others parking requirements.</p> <p>This new proposal to increase the double yellow lines from the Castle Street junction to the boundary of our house will remove two precious parking spaces for the Dewey's Lane cottages.</p> <p>These cars will then need to be parked further up Dewey's Lane, or in the surrounding lanes e.g. Chapel Lane and Church Lane. Thus creating congestion in other areas of the town.</p> <p>A sensible solution would be to extend the double yellow lines far enough to prevent visitors to the businesses in the High Street parking too close to the junction, whilst preserving the first two parking spaces on Dewey's Lane for resident's continued use.</p> <p>Our neighbours have carried out extensive research of the traffic in and around Ludgershall and we fully support the proposal of increasing the double yellow lines from Castle Street along Dewey's Lane by a maximum of 10 metres. Thus preventing obstruction of the junction whilst retaining the very necessary parking for local residents.</p> <p>I understand that Ludgershall Town Council recently endorsed this amended approach at their monthly meeting. We would also support any future proposal to reduce the speed limit on Dewey's Lane from 30mph to 20mph.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of this matter.</p>	
12	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>From ? and ??, ? Byron Close, Ludgershall, ? Reference - LJB/TRO/LUDG/TIDW</p> <p>We live in Byron Close, which is part of Deweys Lane, and would like to object on the proposed 22m extension for double yellow lines on the Deweys Lane / Castle Street junction. This gives traffic the means to enter Deweys Lane at a faster pace which is not really wanted.</p>	<p>The comments within this response are noted however highway law states the public highway is for the passage and repassage of persons and goods. There is no legal right for motorists to park on the public highway, nor obligation upon Wiltshire Council (as the local highway authority) to provide parking. Parking within the confines of the public highway is tolerated so long as it does not impede the right of passage along it.</p> <p>There are already 10m of restrictions present at the junction; however, this does not prevent the width of the road being reduced to one car width.</p>



	<p>A suggestion of a 10m extension would give traffic less space for speeding into the lane, but would also be able to see along the lane. It would also enable more space for residents to park near their own homes, which is what they need, as there are no driveways.</p> <p>We need to keep the speed low, 20mph is plenty and a 10m yellow line extension will help achieve this.</p> <p>Thank you for taking our comments and objections into consideration.</p> <p>Best regards</p>	<p>Ludgershall Parish Council have requested that the restrictions within Deweys Lane are removed following the consultation.</p> <p>This consultation does not consider the implementation of a lower speed limit nor has a formal request yet been received to consider doing so. This would need to be considered by the Town Council who in turn can raise the matter via the Local Highways Footway Improvement Group (LHFIG hereafter) process if they wish to pursue this matter.</p>
13	<p>Dear Consultation board, I wish to object to the double yellow lines being extended by so far as proposed as I feel it's not necessary for that length and will impact greatly on residents who park near their properties. I have lived on Castle Street for over 20 years and have never seen any vehicles backed up. The homes were here long before the roads were and feel that it's totally unfair to make it difficult for residents (with no driveways) to not have access to their properties. I also feel that it does have a speed calming effect as the cars have to slow down by the Queen's head gates to negotiate the situation in the other direction. Please leave space for residents to park their cars and do not over kill on the length of the lines proposed. Regards</p>	<p>The comments within this response are noted however highway law states the public highway is for the passage and repassage of persons and goods. There is no legal right for motorists to park on the public highway, nor obligation upon Wiltshire Council (as the local highway authority) to provide parking. Parking within the confines of the public highway is tolerated so long as it does not impede the right of passage along it.</p>
14	<p>I am writing to object to your proposal regarding the proposed extension of double yellow lines on Dewey's Lane. The proposal removes some vital roadside car parking spaces. These are very important as the houses here, including my own, are old and rely totally on roadside parking so we can live our lives in a normal manner.</p> <p>I am a blue badge holder, and the current proposal means that there will be more competition for parking spaces outside my house, both from other residents and also the workers and clients of nearby businesses. I anticipate that this will make my life much more difficult.</p> <p>I am also concerned about the safety aspect of cars being encouraged to drive faster around the Deweys Lane/Castle Street bend with the proposed double yellow extension, as it would give them a clear run of open road almost right up to my house.</p> <p>My understanding is that at a recent Ludgershall Town Council meeting, Councillors (including one from Wiltshire Council) and residents agreed that extending the double yellow lines an additional 10 metres from the existing, instead of the current proposal of 22 metres, would give the necessary improvements to traffic flow/visibility while also giving the necessary parking spaces for residents who need them most. I support this alternative proposal as a good way forward.</p>	<p>The comments within this response are noted however highway law states the public highway is for the passage and repassage of persons and goods. There is no legal right for motorists to park on the public highway, nor obligation upon Wiltshire Council (as the local highway authority) to provide parking. Parking within the confines of the public highway is tolerated so long as it does not impede the right of passage along it.</p> <p>In terms of Blue Badge parking an approved parking place can be marked out on the road outside the applicant's property. Where a property does not have direct access to the road, consideration will be given to a bay within 50m of the property.</p> <p>Design guidance advises that junctions which result in vehicles have to change their direction of travel by more than 70 degrees to be a traffic calming feature that controls the speed of vehicles, as such vehicles there is no reason to believe that cars will be traveling at greater speed when entering into Deweys Lane as result of the Council's proposals.</p>

	Thank you for your time and consideration. I should have put that it is my partner Mr ?? that is the blue badge holder	
15	<p>My name is ??, I reside at ? Castle Street, Ludgershall, ?.</p> <p>I am writing to voice my objection, to the proposed 22 metre extension, of the double yellow lines on Deweys Lane. The length of this extension is really inappropriate, this extension would cover the front of existing cottages, that have been there for hundreds of years and really do not have anywhere else to park. Parking in our area is very limited as it is, I myself have had to obtain planning to put a drive way into my rear garden. I am aware that there is a car park in the centre of the village, but this does not help the elderly, their carers, or families with young children. There certainly is an issue with people parking, on the corner of Castle Street to Deweys Lane, most of which are people using the hairdressers on the opposite side of the High Street, this could be addressed by extending the lines in by 10 metres from the corner. This would still allow the residence positions to park and solve the corner parking problem.</p> <p>Kind regards</p>	<p>The comments within this response are noted however highway law states the public highway is for the passage and repassage of persons and goods. There is no legal right for motorists to park on the public highway, nor obligation upon Wiltshire Council (as the local highway authority) to provide parking. Parking within the confines of the public highway is tolerated so long as it does not impede the right of passage along it.</p> <p>Without waiting restrictions, only the police are able to enforce speeding and dangerous parking at locations where members of the public are driving.</p>
16	<p>I would like to object to the proposal to place 22 metres of Double Yellow Lines at the corner of Dewey's Lane Ludgershall. Whilst I appreciate the reason why this is proposed I do feel that the length of the lines (22 Metres) is too excessive as this will impact on all the residents within in the vicinity especially as adequate parking spaces for at least 5 households are at a premium, and their daily routine i.e. dropping off shopping and goods, having deliveries and indeed friends and family visits etc will be severely affected. This will be exacerbated because of your proposal to make the parking spaces outside of Erskine House on the High Street disabled parking, I am sure your friends and family would not want to walk half a mile (from the town car park) to visit.</p> <p>Once motorists realise that there is a clear run around the corner they will take the corner (from the North) at speed causing more danger as now. I feel that a small change to the length of the parking restriction lines will alleviate the problems mentioned above.</p> <p>I think that if the lines are extended for 10 metres instead of 22 the residents immediately affected would be able to park safely and motorists would still be aware that cars may be parked around the corner so would not race around it.. This would also not affect the traffic flow or visibility.</p> <p>I hope that you will take my concerns into account when voting on the proposal as safety should be fair for every one.</p> <p>Your sincerely,</p>	<p>The comments within this response are noted however highway law states the public highway is for the passage and repassage of persons and goods. There is no legal right for motorists to park on the public highway, nor obligation upon Wiltshire Council (as the local highway authority) to provide parking. Parking within the confines of the public highway is tolerated so long as it does not impede the right of passage along it.</p> <p>There are already 10m of restrictions present at the junction; however, this does not prevent the width of the road being reduced to one car width. Ludgershall Parish Council have requested that the restrictions within Deweys Lane are removed following the consultation.</p>

**Notes**

- <sup>1</sup> – Information removed so as to not identify the correspondent in line with the Council's procedure for reports considering comments on proposed TROs*
- <sup>2</sup> – Photos removed so as to not identify the correspondent in line with the Council's procedure for reports considering comments on proposed TROs*