

**CALNE AND CALNE WITHOUT: PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS****COMMENTS OF OBJECTION AND SUPPORT****Castle Street** (18 letters - 10 objecting, 8 supporting)

<b>Principle of Objection</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>
<p><b>Residents of Castle Street and Chaveywell Court</b> Consider that the proposals will make life more difficult for residents, in an area that already has a shortage of parking, will also increase vehicle speeds if parking removed and cause congestion as people hunt for parking in the surrounding roads.</p> <p><i>(Similar comments were made by 2 other residents)</i></p>	<p>Wiltshire Council has no duty to provide parking for individuals; its statutory duty is to maintain the right of passage along the highway.</p> <p>Vehicles should not be parking within 10 metres of junction and the proposed restrictions are there to prevent this.</p> <p>It is the responsibility of the owner/keeper of the vehicle to find somewhere safe to park the vehicle and it is something for which the Council cannot take responsibility.</p>
<p><b>Residents of Castlefields</b> The proposals will only push parking further into Castlefields and will result in drives being blocked or not able to turn out of their drives as the road is so narrow. Therefore, requests that the proposals be extended to include all of Castlefields to ensure access for residents and emergency vehicles is maintained.</p> <p><i>(Similar comments were made by 2 other residents)</i></p>	<p>At this stage of the process we cannot increase the proposals without re-advertising the proposals for Calne as a whole at great expense and would further delay the implementation of the restrictions for the rest of the town. This is because the Traffic Regulation Order covers the whole of the town, and whilst this may seem a request for a small addition, it will require an amendment to the whole Order.</p> <p>However, white advisory markings can be installed to protect drives from obstruction.</p>
<p><b>Residents of Castle Street</b> There is insufficient parking in the area already for the number of properties. Parking on Castlefields does not restrict access for residents. If considered to do so, then suggests removing the pavement to increase the width and not restrict parking.</p> <p><i>(Similar comments were made by 1 other resident)</i></p>	<p>Wiltshire Council has no duty to provide parking for individuals; its statutory duty is to maintain the right of passage along the highway.</p> <p>Vehicles should not be parking within 10 metres of junction and the proposed restrictions are there to prevent this.</p> <p>It is the responsibility of the owner/keeper of the vehicle to find somewhere safe to park the vehicle and it is something for which the Council cannot take responsibility.</p> <p>Also access for larger vehicles, such as the emergency services and refuse collection vehicles, needs to be maintained.</p> <p>The pavement is required for pedestrian access and will therefore not be converted into additional parking. However, it is considered that a section of parking could be retained on Castlefields for approximately three vehicles, but maintaining restrictions at the bends, thus keeping access clear for emergency and larger vehicles.</p>
<p><b>Residents of Castle Street</b> Consider that many properties in the area have no private parking and this is already a shortage in provision with residents in competition for the available spaces with workers in the town as well as customers of local shops, etc. Proposals for other surrounding roads will mean that the parking left in Castle Street will be under increased demand.</p> <p>No consideration has been given for properties without private parking and requests the introduction of a residents parking scheme.</p> <p><i>(Similar comments were made by 1 other resident)</i></p>	<p>See comment reference paragraphs 1-3 above.</p> <p>Any Residents Parking Scheme should be requested via the Calne Area Board in the first instance.</p>

**Castle Street** cont...

<b>Comments of Support</b>	
<b>Residents of Castlefields</b> Support the proposals, however, requests they extend further to include the whole of the Castlefields cul-de-sac to avoid the problem being shifted further along the road.	
<b>Residents of Castle Street</b> Support the proposals as the parking causes hazards for large vehicles, such as emergency services, courier and delivery vehicles, and vehicles should not park on junctions anyway.	
<b>Residents of Castlefields</b> Support the proposals in Castlefields as have been denied access to their properties on a number of occasions due to inconsiderate parking and lives with the consequent fears regarding emergency vehicle access.	

**Curzon Street** (8 letters – 6 objecting, 2 supporting)

<b>Principle of Objection</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>
<p><b>Residents of Curzon Street</b> The parking on Curzon Street currently slows the passing traffic, by removing the parking, speeds will only increase. Also concerned that if parking is removed outside the properties then property prices will be affected and asks where they and their neighbours are meant to park.</p> <p><i>(Similar comments were made by 2 other residents)</i></p>	<p>Wiltshire Council has no duty to provide parking for individuals; its statutory duty is to maintain the right of passage along the highway. It is the responsibility of the owner/keeper of the vehicle to find somewhere safe to park the vehicle and it is something for which the Council cannot take responsibility.</p> <p>However, it is considered that a section of double yellow lines could be reduced to a day-time restriction to allow residents to park in the evening and at weekends, but would still allow maximum traffic flow during the peak hours and the working day, when the A4 is at its busiest.</p>
<p><b>A resident of Springfield Drive</b> considers that parking on Curzon Street has only been a problem since the Council permitted the development of houses fronting the main road with inadequate parking. Cars then blocked the school entrance until the school took action which then moved parking onto neighbouring streets.</p>	<p>See comment reference above.</p>
<p><b>Residents of Curzon Street</b> consider that the proposal does not meet its objectives to avoid danger and reduce congestion, and has been made without reasonable thought or remedy to the problems its implementation creates for the residents of the areas affected.</p> <p><i>(Similar comments were made by 1 other resident)</i></p>	<p>See comment reference above.</p>

<b>Comments of Support</b>	
<b>A resident of Meadowsweet Drive</b> is in support of the proposals as is concerned with the safety of pedestrians and drivers particularly outside the school and hopes that they will be vigorously enforced.	
<b>Wiltshire Councillor – Cllr Ansell</b> Appreciates the need for parking restrictions; however, is concerned about the knock on effects with increasing number of residents trying to find parking in surrounding streets. Also since parking for residents was lost at the school site, vehicles have suffered criminal damage as a result of displacing to neighbouring streets.	

**Duncan Street** (1 letter – 1 in support but requests further restrictions)

<b>Comment of support</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>
<p><b>Resident of Duncan Street</b>                      Whilst not opposed to the proposals in principle, particularly during school term times but asks why the restriction includes evenings and weekends. But also asks for more restrictions across the access to properties no.20-54 as parents have previously blocked residents in by parking inconsiderately.</p>	<p>At this stage of the process we cannot increase the proposals without re-advertising the proposals for Calne as a whole at great expense and would further delay the implementation of the restrictions for the rest of the town.</p> <p>It is considered that a length of proposed double yellow lines could be reduced to a single yellow, day-time restriction, thus providing some extra evening and weekend parking for residents.</p> <p>Also an advisory access protection marking shall be put across the entrance to no. 20-54, which does not require an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order.</p>

**Isis Close** (1 letter – 1 in support but requests further restrictions)

<b>Comment of support</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>
<p><b>Resident of Isis Close</b>                      Agrees that there is a problem with parents parking but this is only during the morning and afternoon drop off/pick up and feels that the proposed no waiting and any time will penalise residents and is concerned that as parents will still come to the school, the parking will just be pushed further into the residential area.</p>	<p>After further consideration, a section of proposed double yellow line on Isis Close on the approach to the school gates could be reduced to a single yellow line day-time restriction, thus providing some extra evening and weekend parking for residents, but not affecting the clear access required for the school during school hours.</p>

**Linden Close** (2 letters – 2 objecting)

<b>Principle of Objection</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>
<p><b>Residents of Calne</b>                      Are concerned that the proposals will restrict parents ability to drop off/pick up their children attending Girl Guides at the Guide Hut on Silver Street or Linden Close.</p> <p><i>(Similar comments were made by 1 other resident)</i></p>	<p>The proposed restrictions are intended to protect visibility from the Linden Close and Wenhill Lane junctions onto Silver Street and to prevent vehicles parking too close to those junctions. Parking will remain unrestricted on the rest of these roads allowing for parents to park in a safe area when dropping off/picking up from activities at the Guide Hall.</p>

**London Road** (2 letters – 2 objecting)

<b>Principle of Objection</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>
<p><b>A resident of London Road</b>                      The resident is a full time carer for their elderly mother and requires constant access to their vehicle which also needs to be parked close to their property. They are concerned that the removal of parking will only increase the speed of passing vehicles and prevent them and their neighbours unloading shopping or receiving deliveries.</p>	<p>Persons are permitted to board or alight from vehicles stopping on the proposed restrictions and deliveries to properties are permitted on the restrictions under loading/unloading exceptions.</p> <p>However, it is considered that this section of double yellow lines could be reduced to a day-time restriction to allow residents to park in the evenings, but would still allow maximum traffic flow during the peak hours and the working day, when the A4 is at its busiest.</p>
<p><b>A resident of London Road</b> is firstly disappointed that they did not receive direct communication regarding the proposals and also objects to the proposals because it will place unnecessary restrictions on residents. Also concerned that the speed of vehicles on London Road will increase if the parking is removed.</p>	<p>Wiltshire Council ensures that all processes regarding TRO's are carried out following the statutory regulations as set out in legislation under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. In terms of consulting with the public, our statutory obligation is to only publish a public notice within a newspaper circulating within the area.</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. We cannot letter drop every single household.</p>

**North Street** (19 letters – 19 objecting)

<b>Principle of Objection</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>
<p><b>Residents of North Street</b> are concerned that as the proposals will reduce the parking available on North Street, parking will be move to neighbouring streets which already have problems and that the speed of vehicles will increase if the parking is removed making it difficult to cross this busy road to access the town centre.</p> <p><i>(Similar comments were made by 7 other residents)</i></p>	<p>The restrictions were developed following requests by residents, via the Town Council, concerned about congestion and also the forward visibility when travelling along the road. The day-time restriction will still permit deliveries to take place.</p> <p>Given the level of objections for the limited waiting, these proposals will be removed from the scheme.</p>
<p><b>Residents of North Street</b> consider that the proposals will cause an increase in the speed of traffic and also cause inconvenience for residents. They are also concerned that by removing parking for residents this will have a negative effect on possible re-sell values of their properties</p> <p><i>(Similar comments were made by 6 other residents)</i></p>	<p>See comment ref above.</p>
<p><b>Residents of North Street</b> believe that no consideration has been given to residents who work irregular hours and are at home during the day, nor for those who for work after 8am and arrive back before 6pm. They are also concerned that local traders may be effected should the parking be removed.</p> <p><i>(Similar comments were made by 3 other residents)</i></p>	<p>See comment ref above.</p>

**Patford Street** (3 letters – 3 objecting, 0 supporting)

<b>Principle of Objection</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>
<p><b>Several patients of Patford House Doctors Surgery</b> consider the proposals to be counter-productive. As a cul-de-sac only those who are visiting the businesses drive in and reducing the space to park would just inconvenience those parking in the road.</p> <p>Whilst accepting there have been complaints about parking on the pavements, this happens infrequently and most people park in the road anyway, only taking refuge when a vehicle approaches.</p> <p><i>(Similar comments were made by 1 other resident)</i></p>	<p>Even if Patford Street is a cul-de-sac Wiltshire Council has no duty to provide parking for individuals; its statutory duty is to maintain the right of passage along the highway.</p> <p>As there is a doctor surgery and residential care home accessed from Patford Street, it is paramount that access for emergency vehicles is maintained.</p>
<p><b>Several patients of Patford House Doctors Surgery</b> consider that the proposals will prevent patients of the Doctors surgery to be dropped off/picked up close to the door of the surgery. The addition of yellow lines will do nothing to ease the situation and consider it an ill thought through proposal.</p>	<p>The restrictions were developed following requests by residents via the Town Council concerned about congestion and also the forward visibility when travelling along the road. The day-time restriction will still permit deliveries to take place.</p> <p>Given the level of objections for the limited waiting, these proposals will be removed from the scheme.</p> <p>Also persons are permitted to board or alight from vehicles stopping on the proposed restrictions.</p>

**Quemerford** (7 letters – 6 objecting including 1 petition, 1 supporting)

<b>Principle of Objection</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>
<p><b>Residents of Quemerford</b> concerned that the planned proposals will make an existing problem bigger. Very few residents have the bonus of off road parking.</p> <p>Residents who work shifts or who are on call need to access their vehicle in the early hours or late into the night and will have to walk some distance from their property which for lone females would not be ideal.</p> <p>By removing parking in this area it will result in displacing the problems onto the nearby streets like Lakeview and Ebor Paddock. The parking also acts as traffic calming reducing the speed of passing traffic too.</p> <p><i>(Similar comments were made by 4 other residents)</i></p>	<p>Objectors appear to have misunderstood the proposals, believing that they are to cover the whole length through the village, both sides of the road.</p> <p>However, the proposals only protect access and visibility on the southern side of the A4 and the parking currently on the north side outside the residential properties will remain.</p>
<p><b>Petition from residents of Quemerford – 247 signatures</b> The petition was raised highlighting similar concern to those raised above.</p>	See comment ref above.

<b>Comment of support</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>
<p><b>Resident of Lake View</b> supports the proposals but requests that they extend further round the bend into the estate as concerned that an emergency vehicle would have trouble getting through.</p>	At this stage of the process we cannot increase the proposals without re-advertising the proposals for Calne as a whole at great expense and would further delay the implementation of the restrictions for the rest of the town.

**Salmons Leap / Stickleback Road** (3 letters – 3 in support but requesting more)

<b>Principle of Objection</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>
<p><b>Residents of Stickleback Road</b> were disappointed that the proposals do not go further and cover issues at other junctions in the area.</p> <p>Requests the proposals go further to protect driveways further into Salmons Leap.</p> <p><i>(Similar comments were made by 1 other resident)</i></p>	<p>The proposals are to deal with an existing parking issue where parking opposite a parking court access is causing difficulties from vehicle trying to exit.</p> <p>It is difficult to justify proposing restrictions in areas where there is no actual issues.</p>
<p><b>Resident of Salmons Leap</b> Believes the planning department failed to ensure that the developer made Salmons Leap as wide as Stickleback Road to allow for adequate road side parking. The proposal will just result in vehicles shifting from one side of the road to the other, and not solving the issues at all and problems with the refuse collection will continue.</p>	<p>The restrictions were developed following requests by residents via the Town Council concerned about congestion and also the forward visibility when travelling along the road.</p> <p>At this stage of the process we cannot increase the proposals without re-advertising the proposals for Calne as a whole. Requests for further restriction need to be sent to the Town Council in the first instance.</p>

**Stockley Lane** (8 letters – 6 objecting, 2 supporting)

<b>Principle of Objection</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>
<p><b>Residents of residential roads off Stockley Lane</b> Cannot see the justification for these proposals. Has never seen any problems caused by parking between Ebor Gardens and the A4 junction, in fact local appear to respect an unwritten convention and only park on one side.</p> <p>By removing parking in this area it will result in displacing the problems onto the nearby streets.</p> <p><i>(Similar comments were made by 5 other residents)</i></p>	<p>The proposals are to prevent vehicles parking within 10 metres of a junction that in turn cause obstructions to visibility for drivers exiting the residential side roads.</p>

**Stockley Lane** cont...

<b>Comment of support</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>
<b>Resident of Riverside</b> Supports the proposals, however, does not think they need to extend quite as far along Stockley Lane or Riverway so that some parking for neighbours and visitors can still take place.	After further consideration, a section of proposed double yellow line could be reduced in length, but still protect the junctions and mini-roundabout.
<b>Resident of Riverway</b> Fully supports the proposals for Stockley Lane and the roads off it, as has encountered restricted visibility due to parked vehicles up from the A4 junction.	

**Wessington Park** (3 letters – 1 objecting, 2 supporting)

<b>Principle of Objection</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>
<b>A resident of Quemerford</b> Cannot see the reasons for lines outside their house, as if anyone parks there it is for short periods only, primarily for loading/unloading or for deliveries or taxis. The property does not have the luxury of a driveway therefore uses Wessington Park to park where parking never causes traffic or delays.	The proposals are to prevent vehicles parking within 10 metres of a junction that in turn cause obstructions to visibility for drivers exiting onto the A4.

<b>Comment of support</b>	
<b>Resident of Wessington Park</b> is very pleased with proposals as is a continual nightmare trying to pull out onto the A4 to see clearly in both directions when vehicles are parking on or close to the junction. However, requests that the restrictions go further both into Wessington Park and continue along Quemerford to the end of the terrace housing.  <i>(Similar comments were made by 1 other resident)</i>	

**Various / General comments**

<b>Principle of Objection</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>
<b>A resident of Calne</b> Considers it staggering that in these times of financial hardship that the Council should be wasting time and money on proposals for 18 separate sites around the town. Is convinced that what is proposed could actually make things worse and should trust people to park sensibly.	We have a duty to ensure that the public highway is maintained for the passage and re-passage of persons and goods and that any parking on the highway is considered an obstruction.
<b>A resident of Calne</b> As a disabled person living in the Calne area they ask why the time-limit on Blue Badge spaces have been cut from 3 hours to 2 hours.	No alterations have been made to the time limits of the disabled parking bays within the town. However, the wording has been altered with the aim for greater understanding of the restriction signage. So that the disabled bay is a permanent disabled bay, however is limited to 1 hour during busy periods to allow for turnover.
<b>A resident of Calne</b> Asks why two high priority areas (Wessington Avenue outside the primary school and Oxford Road between Porte Marsh Road and Woodhill Rise) have been ignored and believes the proposals are therefore a waste of money.	We have investigated areas that were brought to our attention by Wiltshire Councillors, Town Councillors and members of the public.