

Plan	Road / Street	Object	Support	Support In part	Neither	Comments
Plan 19	A37 Bristol Road	X				I am writing to object to the plans to restrict parking in the layby out side my house - , Hursley Hill. These restrictions would impact greatly and reduce parking options for all the residents and any visitors or tradespeople who need to work on these houses. There are no parking options nearby for alternative options. Please can you keep me updated.
Plan 3	Beaufort Ave	X				With ref to the above there are a number of points that I feel have not been taken into account, these are:- 1.Estate/ Roads in being for 35 years+, no knowledge of any accidents caused by vehicles parking on the road in the area of the proposed double yellow lines. 2. Vehicles parked act as a natural restriction thus preventing speeding up and down this part of Beaufort Avenue. 3. No consideration of where vehicles displaced by the proposed double yellow lines will park. Whilst accepting that residents have no right to park outside their own property this proposal will inevitably force the vehicles that park there at present to most probably park in Grace Drive, where the additional building of No 5 has already caused the loss of 50% of the turning/parking ability. 4. The visibility problem could just as easily be decreased by installation of the double yellow lines on just the corner of the entry side of the road for just a short distance down to 2 kerbstone lengths past the 1st drain cover. 5. Vehicles in all probability will also park on the bend outside the front of No1 Grace Drive which is actually on Beaufort Avenue thus causing a potential additional hazard.
Plan 3	Beaufort Ave	X				I wish to object in the strongest terms to the proposed restrictions to parking in Beaufort Ave. I have lived at Grace drive for over 30 years and have never seen any issues with the current arrangements. The cars parked at the upper end of Beaufort ave have the effect of slowing traffic entering the road and forcing the traffic exiting to West road to be controlled both in speed and volume. The effect of removing the parking availability in Beaufort ave will result in cars moving further down the road and parking in Grace drive so removing the ability of residents in Grace drive to have access to parking. If the parking is removed in Beaufort ave the result will be an increase in speed further down the road which would then need to be controlled. This scheme is been proposed with a direct effect on our property but there has been no direct consultation with myself. I would appreciate a face to face conversation with whoever has thought up this harebrained scheme and understand the reason for yet another waste of scarce resources from this council.
Plan 3	Beaufort Ave	X				I strongly and rigorously oppose the plans. The sole reason stipulated for these restrictions is labled as: Proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions were requested by the area Senior Traffic Management Engineer to prevent obstruction of the highway due to parked vehicles creating pinch points preventing larger vehicles from accessing the road. I'm intrigued as to how many "larger vehicles" this "Area Senior T.M.E" thinks need to venture down our quiet avenue, at a frequency that made this preposterous request necessary? What facts have been concluded to make this request plausible, please? The only "large vehicle" that frequents this stretch of road are refuse collectors - once a week. They are in the vicinity during quieter times for a matter of minutes. During the 9 years I have been a resident, I have never witnessed any obstructions preventing the safe manoeuvre of vehicles. A red route is unnecessary given there are 4 dropped pavements leading onto private driveways, that cover 3/4 of the proposed route. Whilst there are mixed reports on the legality of parking on dropped pavements, it is nonetheless an offence. These dropped pavements (like most others) have served as a suitable deterrent for at least the past 9 years. Red paint across the proposed route would seriously devalue those properties having devastating consequences to future property sales. It would spoil the aesthetics and attraction of a notoriously quiet and safe avenue and it's synonymous environment. No consideration has been given to the disabled or those challenged with mobility restrictions. My mother in law is registered disabled with this exact crippling disability. She relies on being able to park along the proposed route in order to access our property. The basis of the request by the "Area Senior T.M.E" therefore looks to be extremely discriminate and ill considered. There is already a 20 MPH speed restriction along the length of Beaufort Avenue which ensures traffic moves at a safe speed. I can not find any records of any road accidents along Beaufort Avenue since it's inception, that makes these additional safety proposals necessary. At least two of the properties affected by the proposal are "home" to a wider, extended family unit. A red route would mean them having to park further down the road, promoting unwanted confrontations with inhabitants having more vehicles prevalent in their living space. In conclusion: Adding further, unsightly safety measures is therefore unnecessary, ill considered, discriminatory, offensive, inappropriate and disproportionate. During a "cost of living crisis" when it's public knowledge that council budgets are already stretched, I struggle to accept that this is an appropriate use of public funds. I therefore implore you to see reason and exercise decorum in rejecting the proposal along Beaufort Avenue in it's entirety.
Plan 30	Chilcompton Road		X			As a person who lives on Chilcompton Road & sees daily the trouble that all the parking around this junction does, I am fully in favour of this proposal. owever if this proposal was to go through, my concern is that the bit of grassland that lies alongside my house & garden fence (marked on the attached photograph) will be used for parking. Even now with the parking restrictions not in place, one of my neighbours regularly uses this land to unnecessarily park his vehicle, & it has an impact on the grass, the light into my home, & generally looks unsightly. Has the council considered the possibility of setting some large boulders or planting more small trees in the area to stop this from happening?
Plan 28	Church Hill	X				I would like to object to the introduction of a no parking at any time restriction outside the Church at Church Hill, Freshford. I believe there may be a case for the introduction of a disabled bay here to allow disabled drivers access to the Church through the new disabled ramp. The bay could be sited so that it does not restrict the ramp or the fire hydrant. But a double yellow line is inappropriate and unnecessary.
Plan 16	Gregorys Tyning				X	I have received the notice for proposed no parking lines around my property in Gregory's Tyning. I have no objection to the lines being on the corners and what looks like on the map down to my drive on the side of the road next to my property. It looks like the line proposed on the opposite side (around the grass verge) stops slightly shorter than the one around my house however I just wanted to check it does not come all the way down to the start of my drive. This would leave one space of kerb directly opposite my drive which would cause significant anxiety as people would no doubt take advantage of this one space. Lack of parking in this area sees people parking on the corners particularly at the weekends which I agree needs to stop. However as an Emergency Nurse I have already had to speak to neighbours who have parked opposite my drive making it difficult for me to get out. I may be worrying unnecessarily but would like clarity as to exactly where the lines will finish. The current drawing does not show this clearly enough for me to object or agree.
Plan 16	Gregorys Tyning	X				We have received a letter from yourselves proposing no parking at any time. We strongly object to this happening as it will not solve the problem it will just move the problem a long the road which will then cause problem with the neighbours... we ourselves have four grown up children that drive and need to be able to park outside their own home. Unfortunately every house hold now has more than two cars and there's more children that will be driving in the future . With this in mind this can cause more trouble having lines as everyone has no trouble in parking . It's unfortunate that only one or two people have complained about the parking causing all this unnecessary upset in the community
Plan 16	Gregorys Tyning	X				we understand there is attention to restrict parking at the back of Gregory's tyning opposite number 61. Our concerns of this are : The piece of road oppositewill result in a lot of residents bringing vehicles down from the rear side of the close and parking opposite. This will cause severe obstruction from traffic coming into the close as well as our drive!! This needs to be reviewed because we will be effected considerably by the restriction of parking outside our property. We totally concur with the decision that vehicles should not be parking on immediate access to junctions and corners but our concern if this goes ahead we will be affected more than anyone.

Plan 16	Gregorys Tyning	X			Our reasons to object is that there is a current problem with parking in the cul- de- sac. Proceeding with no parking markings on the road will only encourage the vehicles to park elsewhere. This potentially being further around the corner of the grassed area, w. Which has no proposed no parking markings by the council. If the proposed markings go ahead, and vehicles park elsewhere in the cul- de- sac how will an ambulance be able to access properties. Therefore, I ask you to reconsider the proposal or make additional changes so that the vehicles can park safely and to pass safely to gain access to properties and to ensure that our concerns are taken into consideration when highlighting to you that there are a number of residences that are clearly vulnerable that need access to they're properties and certain services such as adapted taxi's, and emergency services.
Plan 16	Gregorys Tyning	X			We have received a letter from yourselves proposing no parking at anytime in are cal-de-sac. We declined this as there are a lot of families that live here where the children are now old enough to drive and need places to park their vehicles. We have all moved are vehicles around so that the parking now works for everyone even to the point if this does go ahead it is only going to move the problem along the road as people still need to park somewhere when as it stands everyone knows where to park and not upset anyone. We strongly disagree with this proposal.
Plan 16	Gregorys Tyning			X	I have received the notice for proposed no parking lines around my property in Gregory's Tyning. I have no objection to the lines being on the corners and what looks like on the map down to my drive on the side of the road next to my property. It looks like the line proposed on the opposite side (around the grass verge) stops slightly shorter than the one around my house however I just wanted to check it does not come all the way down to the start of my drive. This would leave one space of kerb directly opposite my drive which would cause significant anxiety as people would no doubt take advantage of this one space. Lack of parking in this area sees people parking on the corners particularly at the weekends which I agree needs to stop. I may be worrying unnecessarily but would like clarity as to exactly where the lines will finish. The current drawing does not show this clearly enough for me to object or agree. The map provided shows the line finishing just around the curve but at the same time just level with my drive, two very different points on the road. As discussed this will cause me significant problems as the 5 meters will enable someone to park directly opposite and this will be the only space available. The lines will not need to come down the road that far to enable visibility at the junction.
Plan 16	Gregorys Tyning		X		We strongly support the introduction of No Parking At Any Time at the junction of Gregory's Tyning and Britten's Hill, Paulton. We live on Gregory's Tyning and the introduction of these highway restrictions will enhance visibility for both drivers and pedestrians. We hope that the proposed restrictions will continue to the same point as the current single white line. There are dropped pavements on both sides of the road and it is important that these sections of the road are not obscured or blocked by parked vehicles as this would make it hazardous to cross from one side of Gregory's Tyning to the other.
Plan 16	Gregorys Tyning		X		Thank you for deciding to put Double Yellow Lines down on Gregorys Tyning. At least now ambulances can get through to house. You omitted the corner as you come up the hill shown in photos. Can you please consider here too please.
Plan 31	Ham Lane		X		I would like to express my support for the proposed introduction of "No Parking At Any Time" on the stretch of Ham Lane from Simons Close to Paulto Hill. I would like to state that this stretch of pavement is in constant use by myself at least 4 times a day, and others. Although some that park there are considerate of pedestrians that use that footpath, and allow space to walk past their cars, others park so far onto the pavement that it's impossible to get past and forces us into the road, which is very dangerous due to the bend in the road that is in close proximity to the parked cars. In addition, parked cars do make it very difficult to turn onto Ham Lane from Simons Close, causing many near misses. I would also recommend that you include the stretch of pavement the other side of Simons Close, between Simons Close and the entrance to Ham Farm, as the problem will simply be moved to that area instead. I would also ask whether there is no proposal to do the same on the other side of Ham Lane on the stretch from the top of Brookside to the entrance of Little Orchard. This stretch is constantly full of parked cars that make it dangerous to pull out of Brookside onto Ham Lane. There have been many close calls at that junction due entirely to these parked cars.
Plan 31	Ham Lane		X		We would welcome the proposal for double yellow lines, as parked vehicles forces drivers to drive on the wrong side of the road, sometimes at speed. This is a hazard when trying to pull out of a driveway or Simons Close. The parked vehicles have also made the pavement inaccessible.
Plan 18	Lansdown Crescent	X			I am writing as I oppose the proposition of Plan 18 – Lansdown Crescent, Tisbury – Proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions were requested by the Traffic Management Team on behalf of a local resident to improve access and prevent obstruction. For the following reasons:- 1. The bend is never used for parking. 2. If the side is not available to park the front of house number 34 needs to be used to charge an electric vehicle. 3. Emergency vehicles can still easily pass through if need be, no obstruction is caused. 3. no 30 park their vehicle quite often on the other side, however this doesn't seem to be a problem with the complainant, I have drawn this out on the map and posted a picture as evidence. Proving that an emergency vehicle can still pass through. 4. We have had regular complaints to the police and Curo in regards to this. The police have reiterated that there should be no reason why we can not park at the front of our house, Curo have also said the same. 5. The complaint is a territorial issue, This is not a reason to inhibit use of highway parking, we all share the same issue up and down the entire street and a common scenario on many roads. 6. If this is to go ahead on the false premise of obstruction then the line I have also drawn, which is used daily will also need to have the yellow lines. I propose the following 1. the double yellows to only be used on the corner. And not 10ft in front of the house. As I have mentioned there is no obstruction to other vehicles getting passed. Vans and delivery trucks have managed quite fine.

						parking and Loading no stopping on entrance markings authorised and designated parking spaces variation No 1 order 2023 Reference 23-011. With respect to the proposed parking restriction on Loves Hill Timsbury I have serious reservations as to the supposed safety improvements it will bring. Firstly Greenhill House is currently a Leonard Cheshire home and is closing within a few weeks. This means that until the new owners and their proposals are put through the planning system, which could take many months or years then any changes to the highways are premature to say the least. Secondly we have lived close to Greenhill House for the last 17 years and have never seen or heard of an accident or incident relating to the parked cars. Finally and most importantly by placing a parking restriction at its proposed position the cars that are parked will be forced to park to the west down Loves Hill (a blind brow and bend) where the road narrows considerably, or worse east onto South Road where they will be parking also on a blind bend which will be extremely hazardous to all traffic using Loves Hill / South Road, not just a few cars that use Greenhill House. Immediately adjacent to the blind bend and a few years ago a car left the road and struck our house, it did so much damage that it was possible to see through a stone wall 3 feet thick into our living room. We are extremely concerned that forcing cars to park on the bend does could cause a repeat of that accident or any other type of accident. This proposal has come from a traffic engineer who has completely missed the wider dangers of the parking restriction. Interesting that there have been no requests from the surrounding residents for a parking restriction. The parked cars are not the hazard that is suggested and when they are there serve to slow down the traffic into the village without the need for any further traffic calming measures.
Plan 10	Loves Lane	X				
Plan 10	Loves Hill	X				With respect to the proposed parking restriction on Loves Hill Timsbury I have serious reservations as to the supposed safety improvements it will bring. Firstly Greenhill House was a Leonard Cheshire home and is now closed this means that the staff that used to park on the road have now left. So until the new owners and their proposals are put through the planning system, which could take many months or years then any changes to the highways are premature to say the least. Secondly we have lived extremely close to Greenhill House (approx 50 meters) for the last 17 years and have never seen or heard of an accident or incident relating to the parked cars. Finally and most importantly by placing a parking restriction at its proposed position the cars that are parked will be forced to park to the west down Loves Hill (a blind brow and bend) where the road narrows considerably, or worse east onto South Road where they will be parking also on a blind bend. This would force traffic entering the village to drive on the wrong side of the road around a left hand corner will be extremely hazardous to all traffic using Loves Hill / South Road, not just a few cars that use Greenhill House. We are immediately adjacent to the blind bend and a few years ago a car left the road and struck our house, it did so much damage that it was possible to see through a stone wall 3 feet thick into our living room. We are extremely concerned that forcing cars to park on the bend could cause a repeat of that accident or any other type of accident. This proposal has come from a traffic engineer who has completely missed the wider dangers of the parking restriction. Interesting that there have been no requests from the surrounding residents for a parking restriction. Therefore the hazard that seemed to be identified but in reality never existed has been completely removed by the closure of the Leonard Cheshire Home.
Plan 24	Northend	X				I would like to object to the outlined proposal. It would take away at least 8 parking spaces opposite 50 through to 52a on a stretch of Northend that already has limited parking. Some has already been removed by the new double yellow lines outside numbers 50/50a, this would make it even worse. I could understand some restriction directly opposite the 2 driveways on the map (adjacent to 50a and 50) to help access but not for the whole stretch
Plan 21	Northend	X				Firstly, as a local resident I know lorries, fire engines and tractors etc regularly drive through the village with no access/ obstruction issues at all. My particular concern is that making the space outside no 26 clear where the pavement runs out will just allow cars to travel way too fast through a space that is regularly used by pedestrians and in particular children. The fact there is a car regularly parked in this space acts as a speed reduction much more than the speed bumps as people don't want to damage their wing mirrors There has never been an accident there up until now but on your head be it if you allow this proposal through and someone gets knocked down by a car. I do hope you consider my strong views on this and reject this proposal
Plan 21	Northend	X				I wish to object to the removal of this parking space. Firstly, thank you for resurfacing the village earlier this year – however at that time spaces were removed with out consultation with the village, these included a space in front of chapel house which had been causing the pinch point. So, I am unclear as to why we need to lose another space? Since this has been done there have been no incidents with larger vehicles getting stuck and all emergency vehicles have been able to pass safely. This road is a 7.5t weight limit road and yet vehicles over this weight pass unchecked and these are the ones that have been getting stuck historically. I object on multiple fronts to this being removed. 1.Parking in the village is at a premium for all the residents many of whom have young children. We have already had an incident in the last 20 years where a child was the victim of an RTA outside what is now Chapel House and was at the time a nursery. Every day during term time we have children, 4-18 years of age, walking along these roads and the parking has acted as a traffic calming measure to stop people speeding through the village. When cars are not parked here the speed limit is never adhered to by people driving in and out of the village. Removing that last space will again encourage speeding and if you have removed the space BANES will be liable for any injuries. 2.Since the increase in prices of parking in Bath we are finding non-residents parking to catch the bus into town for work and thus halving their costs for the day. This has become more and more popular as we have a cost-of-living crisis. The reason this is important is that the majority of the cars that have ended up blocking this road are by people not local to the area. If you feel you must remove this space – at least consider making that space (and that space only) a single yellow line – with no parking between 8-6/ or 8-6 and residents only. All the residents of the village are aware of what has happened historically with markedly over 7.5 t vehicles getting stuck outside Chapel House– issues are on the whole caused by non-residents parking inconsiderately in the village – I would also suggest that you make the first km of parking in the village resident only – the increase in people seeing this as free parking has increased to the point during the day we can at times not park in our own village due to people catching the bus into town – or make it residents and two hours max for non-residents as we do have the church hall and church which function during the day.

Plan 21	Northend	X			<p>I am writing with specific reference to the removal of a parking space outside number 26 Northend. I have lived in the village since 2005 and during that time we have had parking outside number 26 Northend. Northend is a thriving village with constant cars , lorries, delivery vans etc...with public amenities such as the village hall and mikes meadow bringing in visitors from outside and an active primary school creating traffic during school drop off and pick up. The only issue during the last 17 years of living here was a pinch point that was beyond number 26 which did on rare occasions cause concern for the very large building supply trucks that visited developing houses building sites. That pinch point was removed recently when the road was resurfaced and the parking bay made shorter. Since that time there have been no issues with vehicles passing through at all. In fact a fire engine passed by only last week. As a mother of a child that attended batheaston primary I know the benefit that the parking outside number 18 - 26 brought. The cars passing by this area naturally slow down as they do so - forced to slow down their speed - this is critical at number 26 as shortly around there children have to cross the road to get to the pavement on the other side as it only runs along one side. I am extremely concerned that removing the space outside number 26 will create a false sense of space and drivers approaching the village with no local knowledge of the children crossing will 'put their foot down ' at just the wrong time. In 17 years there have been no instances of children having accidents at this point and I largely believe this to be down to cars naturally having to drive with caution - any change made to this point must be done so with absolute understanding of the local geography as to remove this natural traffic calming measure would in my opinion be very serious. By year 6 the children like to walk themselves to school or scoot or cycle and this is even more of an Inverness-shire as no adult is supervising. When the school was developed 7 years ago we had a village meeting with the councillor from bath and the developers and they agreed the parking should remain throughout the development for this very reason - what has changed?! would like to say drivers head the speed notices and would be aware but sadly that isn't the case when strangers are in a hurry racing around at rush hour. Please tread very carefully with this decision as 17 years with no accidents is a fantastic record and As my mum would say 'if it's not broken don't fix it'. I can only assume the suggestion of removing this space has come from someone who hasn't been a parent of a child attending batheaston school.</p>
Plan 21	Northend	X			<p>safety issue which is further detailed here, also is the importance of this space as an essential village resource. We have lived at the property near parking space 26 northend for over 15 years and in that time traffic through the village has got faster and faster and more frequent. I've firsthand witnessed the excessive speed the visiting vans, cars and even tractors suddenly get up to once outside of the single carriageway section along the stretch by number 26. Why is everybody in such a rush these days I wonder?? It is apparent the frequency of smaller faster vehicles has increased and I believe it would be fair to asses that these are commonly smaller delivery vehicles (ie like Amazon etc). The five spaces have always acted as a very simple low cost traffic calming measure due to the drivers travelling along a single carriage section driving with relative caution as there is a steep wall to one side. We have a local school very near here, and the only way to reach it from this side is to cross the road further down - literally metres from the parking space that is under review here . The space outside number 26 acts as a deterrent to speeding drivers and given the fact that this village has elderly members, children and out of town walkers visiting salisbury hill etc. crossing along from this stretch on a regular basis, it is arguable the risks of removing this space given the traffic calming elements outweighs the benefits of removal. Personally as a parent who has had to negotiate this stretch with a pushchairs over the years I have experienced the crossing of this road further down firsthand, and the council needs to think long and hard whether opening this section into a small two lane section may encourage chancy drivers to speed in both directions, we've been accident free along here for over 15 years . I ask the council / highways to consider why take a risk by removing a useful, practical parking space that provides a low cost, efficient traffic calming measure that further supports the speed bump in the locality? Elderly / disabled persons visiting. The limited spaces along by properties 18-26 that we have currently are an essential resource for elderly / disabled visitors who visit these properties (numbers 20-26) and who can park close to the property or be dropped off to the property by use of these spaces. We for example at number 24 regularly have our elderly mother to visit and the parking space makes all the considerable difference to the ease of her visits. Village amenities and local dwellings. The village of northend has numerous amenities, a church, school, village hall and mikes meadow etc. The parking space at number 26 is a valuable resource to the village thats allows the ebb and flow of both residents and visitors to be able to park within walking distance of properties as well as offering convenient and helpful parking options for those visiting the church, school, hall and mikes meadow for example. It is notable that none of those amenities have any large scale provision of viable parking, hence for the village - the highway itself is one of the only options for parking. Unannounced removal of 1 whole space without consultation in early 2023. It must also be noted that when the recent resurfacing of the road in Northend was undertaken, an apparent mistake was made with regards to the repainting of the parking bays, where there was originally five bays, this was reduced to four without consultation of the local residents. In fairness with regards to the changes - Double yellow lines were added beyond number 26 that previously people had in the past illegally parked along, when it was a white line. This solved any original 'pinch point' issues that may have ever existed, only last week I witnessed a fire engine came past with relative ease along this stretch making it clear that there was appropriate room for that vehicle. There was no consultation with the local residents, and no letter posted through doors or notice applied to lampost to indicate the removal of a whole space outside number 18. Therefore with no notification and opportunity for response it would appear the local council had removed a whole parking space already. Therefore in the space of 12 months the local council will have implemented the removal of two whole spaces from a small stretch of 5 spaces. Please can you notify me of the receipt of this letter from myself. I hope you take mine and hopefully other local residents views on board and consider this decision taking into account the key points outlined above. I would just like to add one further comment. MJ Church waste management have recently been carrying out Bin Collections at the School Further down in the village. I have noticed they send out their very largest waste collection vehicle (bigger than the council ones it would seem). And this passes the end space regularly, albeit with care and reduced speed - but with no problems whatsoever. So again - in terms of the request for removal of this parking space due to it being a liability - it still seems contrary to actual day to day reality, I do believe if you/team are to come and visit and see with your own eyes, I think then you will have a much better</p>
Plan 4	Publow Lane	X			<p>Reference No Parking at all times 23-011 Publow Lane, Pensford. Our parish council were going to object to this on behalf of some local resident's and the Village Hall Committee. On a Busy day at the tropical pool by Publow church we already struggle to stop people parking in the hall car park. we have increased signage which everybody ignores and we end up with a car park full of visitor vehicles. If you put the amount of Double Yellow Lines down as per your proposal it will force more vehicles into the hall car park making it even more difficult for weekend lettings . Can the amount be reviewed please. I understand you need to do this from the village hall onwards towards the church, but some parking on the lane between the village green and the hall is fine and actually slows the traffic down from the usual grand prix circuit that is supposed to be a 20mph limit, it just needs another short section to allow for passing without people having to reverse too far. Mid distance between the existing lines outside the hall entrance and the small parking area in front of the Curo properties 6 to 11 on Publow Lane. This is what has been discussed at our previous parish council meetings. I am a resident of Publow Lane and can assure you this would be better than your current proposal of all the way through on both sides.</p>
Plan 4	Publow Lane		X		<p>We TOTALLY AGREE to NON PARKING all way down Publow Lane, Publow Pensford as purposed in your plans. Perhaps even double red lines all along Publow Lane.As the name suggests we live in a lane, the area is totally agricultural and farm machinery, horse boxes and all the emergency vehicles need to be able to freely access Publow Lane. We find that people have no respect parking in Publow Lane and do not care about any farming and rural issues etc and we have longed for and asked for something to be done. Could we also please point out that the bottom of Publow Lane before the church only has 2 houses so we can easily imagine you will have far more respondents objecting to a non parking zone than those in favour, however most if not all of these we think will not live in Pensford or Publow.</p>
Plan 5	Ridge Lane/Crescent		X		<p>Yes an impossible situation. I spoke to the farmer's tractor driver to see if he could use my drive to proceed backwards. It is a common occurrence for him he said. The truck driver had left his lights on and a neighbour in the Close thought she knew who the owner was to no avail. What a cost to the farmer and overall economy!</p>

Plan 5	Ridge Lane/Crescent	X			X	I am writing to make representations in response to the Proposal; which seeks to restrict parking at any time at the junction of Ridge Lane and Ridge Crescent, West Harptree. I live at Ridgeway which is in Ridge Lane, immediately adjacent to and on the south side of Ridge Crescent. Firstly, I have no objection to the Proposal. However, I would like the Council to consider imposing a similar restriction to the short section of Ridge Lane shown coloured orange on the attached plan (the "Orange Area"). During the flood alleviation works carried out in Ridge Lane a few years ago a new drain and backing kerb was installed in the Orange Area, which seems to be acting as an invitation for people to park vehicles in this location. On the attached plan I have shown my driveway hatched in green. As you might expect, it is quite difficult to access my driveway when vehicles are parked in the Orange Area. You will also note the proximity of the Orange Area to Ridgeway Close; which is a narrow lane, without the benefit of the visibility and maneuvering splays enjoyed by Ridge Crescent. When vehicles are parked in the Orange Area it is very difficult for large vehicles to turn into Ridgeway Close and I suspect it would be impossible for a fire engine. I will provide 5 photos showing different vehicles parked in the Orange Area on recent days. Unfortunately, I will have to send them by 3 different emails as I am unable to compress them. If any go missing in transit, please let me know and I will re-send them.
Plan 27	Springhill Close	X				I object to the proposed plans above as a resident of Springhill Close, this would reduce our already limited parking in the street. I feel that it is unnecessary to add these parking restrictions in such a quiet road.
Plan 26	St Julians Road	X			X	With regards to the proposals on St Julian's Road in Shoscombe I feel I must point out that the majority of the proposed changes were implemented on the road several months ago without any consultation. As such a taxi bay and disabled bay, along with a School Keep Clear Zone are already marked and painted on the road. The only variation with the 23-011 proposals now live are that the disabled and taxi bays have been marked the other way around. The only new element of the proposal is the no waiting zone. Whilst I have no real problem with the changes proposed or already implemented, I feel that it would make sense to align the proposed taxi and disabled bays with the way they are already marked on the road to avoid rework and cost. I'd also raise that in practice over the months they bays have already been marked that the restrictions are widely ignored by parents using the school and without proper enforcement there is little point in the changes. To date no enforcement of the restrictions has happened on the road, which needs to be focused at school drop off times in the morning and afternoon, the only times of day any restrictions are even necessary in this area.
Plan 26	St Julians Road	X				As a resident of St Julians Road further restricting the parking outside of Shoscombe primary school will only exacerbate already acute issues at school drop off times. The existing zig zags are already ignored by parents and the school has never seriously sought to police the area by its entrance. To add additional restrictions is not only futile, but it would also go way beyond the drop off times and cause local residents real inconvenience, simply moving the worst issues along St Julian's Road where it is arguably even more dangerous (as it is narrower). I object to this proposal and hope that common sense will prevail
Plan 26	St Julians Road	X				The disabled parking bay, taxi bay and School Keep Clear markings are already in situ, the latter of which for several years, so this part is a retrospective proposal which has already been implemented. As there is no policing of the road all of these areas regularly have cars parked on them; there is no actual deterrent not to. The school lunch van parks on the yellow lines for at least an hour every day with no consequence. The school have no powers to have vehicles removed. The only new proposal is a no waiting at any time line on the opposite side of the road to the school. This is directly outside our property. Despite a request for the Council Statement regarding this matter we have not been sent one, so the rationale of placing a "no stopping at any time" line directly outside our property is unclear. Please provide the rationale. The current proposal discriminates against those living in St Julian's road, specifically us. There also appears to be a conflict of interest at the source of this proposal. We accept that living in a property opposite a school inevitably comes with a small amount of inconvenience. The inconvenience stretches to approximately two 40 minute periods at the beginning and end of the school day. Banning parking opposite the school at any time seems a wholly disproportionate response designed and targeted to inconvenience the people living opposite the school. The proposal will prevent stopping 365 days a year for the sake of 1 hour and 10 minutes on approximately 60 days of the year. It will make all deliveries for school and residents close to impossible and it will worsen the congestion when delivery lorries have to park for longer further along the road as they are unable to "stop and drop". Given that the current parking restrictions are currently ignored by a small number of school parents, we fail to see how additional lines are going to improve the problem. Additionally has the school identified an alternative area for its refuse collection as under this proposal the refuse lorry which collects at 5.30am every Tuesday will no longer be able to do so? The village as a whole largely respects the informal one way system in operation along St Julian's road to ease congestion and improve safety around drop off and pick up time. It is a big ask to expect many not connected to the school to regularly alter their journey, never the less this is supported by the local community. I would support measures that are proven to improve traffic flow and pedestrian safety, but this really does seem like a sledgehammer to crack a nut proposal designed to maximally inconvenience the residents of St Julian's road.
Plan 26	St Julians Road	X				I wish to raise my objections to the two above consultations. My main issue is the no parking as this will have a detrimental and significant impact on the running of the school. As a parent of children at the school it is a necessity for parents to park up drop off and pick up. This is unavoidable and short sighted. I would not let my 3 yr old walk any distance which I would need to if parking further away. Make more provisions for drop offs not less. Secondly, the taxi bay as well as the disabled bay have already been implemented despite this consultation deadline - how is this legally possible? Shouldn't locals have been consulted on Thurs 'before' work was done?! I am happy to allow the disabled bay but whole heartedly object to the taxi bay which removes yet more spaces for parents to be able to safely pick up children. Even if the bay was allocated to a taxi for a 10min window that would help rather than being out of bounds for what is 23hrs and 40mins each day - this is not a great use of road when space is at a premium. Where is the support from BANES in keeping schools open and accessible. Why are parents always penalised for keeping their children safe at drop offs and pick ups!
Plan 26	St Julians Road	X				With reference to St Julian's Road, Shoscombe. I note that the school keep clear, taxi and disabled bay on the above proposal have already been done, so this is a retrospective proposal asking for the residents comments? Of note these road marking are continuously ignored and not enforced in any way and deliveries to the school often leave their vehicle parked in the no stopping area for over an hour most days. Can I please ask if the parish council were asked to comment on this as they also represent the residents? As a resident of St Julian's Road I have not requested any no waiting at any time lines be painted outside our neighbours property and I cannot see any benefit of this at all. I live in the close opposite the school and our road is clearly marked as private, we already have significant issues with parents parking in the close, blocking our drives, sitting in their cars with engines running etc. Further restricting parking in the prosed way would only increase this problem. There is also a risk created by parents parking on the corner directly behind the disabled parking bay. This causes limited vision to drivers coming out of the school car park and pedestrians. No parking lines here would be more beneficial than in the proposed area. I have seen many near misses due to poor parking and have even had my front wall knocked down by a parents car. I am in favour of any measure that improves safety for road users, pedestrians, horse riders and drivers, but I can see no benefit to the proposed no waiting lines other than to push the problem elsewhere, also the rationale/benefit of this has not been made clear? I appreciate that I live opposite a village school and accept that, but I am not clear how a permanent measure such as this that is in theory in force 24/7 365 days a year is a suitable solution to a manage a term time drop of and collection issue? If all parents acted in considerate and respectful way parking would not be the issue that it is, most do, but a few do not seem to consider the safety of the residents and other road users or the children. As above I support anything that improves road safety, I do my utmost to adhere to the voluntary one way system even though this does at times cause me inconvenience. I cannot see how these no waiting at anytime lines will have any benefit to traffic flow or safety, they will just inconvenience residents with no gain. Changing lives mean that deliveries are a necessity for many of us now and this will also cause an issue as drivers will have to park a distance from some houses and cant just do a quick drop. Future planned development on St Julian's Road such as the houses proposed opposite St Julian's Farm will again increase traffic and add to the issue. To summarise I would not support the installation of these lines as I see no rationale or benefit, I would support better policing of the road at school peak times and more environmentally appropriate, safer ways of children getting to the school.

Plan 26	St Julians Road	X			<p>I have children that attend this school and have concerns about the proposal and the impact this is going to have on safety along the road, and access. I am aware that earlier in 2023 a single disabled bay and single taxi bay were added along St Julians road, outside of Shoscombe Primary school. I would like to know if the bays mentioned within this proposal relates to these or if there are plans to introduce any further bays in addition to these? If the proposal relates to additional bays to those already marked outside of the school, could you please let me know the proposed location and if this would impact upon parking along St Julians road outside of the school premises. In which case I would like to raise an objection to the bays which have already been added or the adding of more. The existing bays already take up valuable parking space within the village and are only occupied for a small percentage of the day, often for less than 30minutes a day, Monday – Friday are not used on the weekends. Instead, they use up space for cars visiting those within the village on weekends and those using the road for school pick up and drop off during the week. I would also like further information about the proposed school keep clear markings along St Julians road. There are already school markings visible on outside the entrance to the school. Does this relate to these lines and what is the change being proposed? Or is there proposal to add further exclusion waiting zone? The timings listed would impact upon School drop off an pick up. As I am sure you are aware there is limited parking available to parents and villagers in this stretch of the road (referring to the stretch along to School boundary) Parents successfully use the road in the mornings to drop their children off at the entrance to the school. This may involve them waiting for a minute or two whilst the child/children exit the vehicle safely, this method prevents parents from having to park their vehicles along the road which causes extra demand on those living by the school. The worry would be that any introduction of restrictions preventing this would further clog up the village and cause extra traffic for longer around this busy period. Equally at the end of the day parents often park their cars to collect their children safely from the school. Parking, as with all schools, is valuable and proposals to introduce further restrictions to this will have a direct impact on the safety of children exiting the school onto a busy road. Equally struggles for those living within the village on car parking which may be taken up by parents collecting from the school. The introduction of the Disabled and taxi bay earlier in the year already took away 4 car parking spaces, which as mentioned earlier mean villagers can not use these neither parents to collect children from school. Concern is that further restrictions will cause an increase chaos at school pick up and drop off. It will impact upon the safety of children having to walk further along congested narrow roads to reach vehicles. Vehicles are likely to start parking in more precarious locations which will also impact upon the local foliage, natural embankments, and access routes for emergency vehicles. I look forward to hearing your reply to the above and the next course of action with this proposal. With regards to the final TRO report I would like to raise my objection to the taxi bay being made permanent due to its inefficient use of valuable parking space for residents and those using/accessing the school. The bay is not utilised for more than 30/60minutes (this is being generous) a day during school opening. And it unused during school holidays, weekends and public holidays. Equally to the addition of the no waiting zone proposal. Restricted parking in this area is already covered by the zig zags and the fact of the school entrance prohibits parking in this vicinity as already covered by the Highway Code. The zone would only hinder access for residents outside of school hours and cause inconvenience for those in the area.</p>
Plan 26	St Julians Road	X			<p>I am a resident of Shoscombe, and I also have children at the school. I have fully supported the school in their communications to parents and residents regarding the unofficial one-way system to ease congestion. I fully support the school and council in ensuring safety for our children and adults in the village. I suggested a parking bay to put a stop to the minibus parking on the Keep Clear hatching outside the school gates. I fully support measures to stop parents and delivery drivers stopping outside the school gates where safety of children and others accessing the school is paramount. Additional parking bays for a Taxi and Disabled parking have already been painted. The School Keep clear markings have been in place for some time. I understand following a conversation, this part of the proposal is make 'School Keep Clear' Zone and parking bays enforceable. It was also confirmed to me that the 'No Parking' or 'No Waiting At Any Time' proposal is double yellow lines, and it is my understanding that parking along this stretch of road will not therefore be authorised at any time and anyone parking here would be liable for a fine. It was explained that the proposal had been advised by the traffic officer (or department responsible for road markings), although the proposal suggests that this has been requested by a resident. She also confirmed councillor's M involvement. I called Matt McCabe this morning and explained my concerns regarding a no parking at any time restriction. He was unaware that people do not currently park along this stretch of road. I would like to make it clear that generally parents and visitors to the school only park on the school side of the road or in the private layby outside Vale House. Allowing space for delivery and emergency vehicles to pass. I am writing to register my objection to any additional road markings and specifically to the proposed 'No Waiting At Any Time' area opposite the school for the following reasons: - The reason given for the proposal is "requested by residents" for the proposal, however I have spoken with neighbours, and understand that other properties featured in the map have not requested so would like to better understand from where the request came. - The reason given for the proposal to "provide available short term on-street parking" conflicts with the proposal. You cannot provide on street parking by introducing a no parking zone. - The reason given for the proposal to "prevent obstruction to the highway" is covered by parking rule 243 which states "do not park near a school entrance" and "do not park in front of an entrance to a property". - A no parking/no waiting length adjacent to The Old Post Office will only inconvenience the residents of this property outside school hours and during school holidays. - If safety is the concern, the 'at any time' time frame is grossly exaggerated and the restrictions if needed at all should be limited to school pick up and drop off times only. - Additional hours required to enforce the restrictions would be a waste of precious resources. - The safety of our school children, teachers, parents and residents will not be improved by these measures. - If safety is the concern our efforts should be put into slowing traffic ie with the introduction of speed bumps (traffic calming measures) and or flashing lights warning road users at school pick up and drop off times. - I fully support the 20 MPH speed limit but in a village location we have seen enough painting on the roads - 20 painted on the road (in addition to the 20MPH signs on lamp posts); Taxi bay; Disabled parking bay - Residents in the immediate vicinity have not requested the zone. - The school has not requested the zone. - The parish council has not requested the zone, nor was it informed. Parking for residents outside their own properties will be hindered. Parking for local traders, refuse collectors and delivery drivers will be hindered.</p>
Plan 6	St Peters Road	X		X	<p>I have seen your proposals on the lamp post at the end of our road - I cannot stress enough how this will cause even more bedlam than at present Your map shows all of the St Peter's cul de sac will have parking restrictions EXCEPT one road, first turning left as you enter, which is the road (a dead end) outside of my house - hence you will have more people trying to squeeze into this very small area. We already have a parking situation outside of our house - our neighbour has resorted to putting out cones as he cannot get his work vans onto his drive, recently I had to write a note on a windscreen kindly asking the driver not to block access to our drive - this proposal is going to make the current problem even worse !! I totally agree with the proposed restrictions but they need to be applied to the ENTIRE cul de sac - it's not just the school drop off/pick up times anymore (I have lived here for 10 years and it has definitely got worse) - school staff are parked here all day long - feel free to take a look during any school day and you'll probably see a long line of cars using our road for long stay parking. Look forward to hearing from you - please consider my comments before implementing your proposals - some adjustments definitely should be made</p>

Plan 6	St Peters Road	X			<p>I would like to submit my concerns in general at St Peters close. I totally agree that something needs to be done but I'm not sure if the proposed changes are the right changes that I needed. Like many areas, parking residential, business or drop-offs are extremely busy at different times of the day. Parking here at St Peter's has been a problem for many years. Now it seems that residents and members of the public can't respect or work together to resolve the issues. Residents park every car they have on the roads all day to stop anyone from parking, leaving rude notes of people cars, confronting parents on the way back from collection with their children and stopping them from getting in the car. One resident threatening to fight another parent behind the fence so the CCTV can't record. Objects being placed on the road to stop anyone coming through part of the estate. Also on the other side of things some parents from both schools are not always very pleasant and exchange words with the residents. Sadly it's just not the best situation for anyone. Myself I have to drop off in the morning and go to work and then I finish work at 2 and then I make my way to school, I just want to get my child home after a long day. Collection is very stressful and I absolutely hate it. I could never understand why two schools were built next to each other and limited parking for staff let alone parents. With the population getting bigger and school intakes getting bigger, the issue is only going to get worse. Maybe could we look at Fosse Way school finishing around 2:30 reducing some for the traffic and getting them to open the gates at the back for the turning circle earlier to get the mini buses out of the estate. I don't know what the answer is but taking parking away is only pushing the problem on to other roads. I know funding is extremely tight but long term could we not move one school? Then that site to be used as parking and affordable housing. I agree something needs to be done but strongly feel that the proposal isn't what we need. The children from both schools need to be able to access their education safely. Parking is a major problem but we all need to think of a solution not just moving the issues to another road. I hope you can understand how concerned I am on how we are going to drop off and collect our children from their schools. I'm sure there must be a alternative option that we can look at. This is the residents blocking the parking all day forcing parents to park unsafely. If you call highway they will confirm the large number of calls regarding the four bungalows placing items in the road to block it off</p>
Plan 6	St Peters Road			X	<p>As a resident of St Peter's Road Westfield I am writing to express my concern and frustration on the decision to only introduce parking restrictions in half the road. Don't you think the whole road has the same problem! All you will do is force all the traffic into a small narrow cul-de-sac with a small turning area. There have been instances that I have not been able to reverse my car out of my drive due to inconsiderate parking. I wish to object that this proposal does not go far enough. It increases the risk of accidents on such a narrow road and will cause difficulty in residents getting in and out of their driveways. There will be a risk of damage to cars / pavements and an increase in air pollution. Safety should be a number one concern and if an emergency vehicle needed access the road at school times it would not get through. I would also like to ask why the whole road was not contacted / consulted with details of this proposal? Further who is going to police this parking restriction and follow up on issues it will cause? Please can the proposal be extended to the whole part of St Peter's Road?</p>
Plan 6	St Peters Road	X			<p>This road provides a limited yet essential amount of parking space for residents and the local primary school. Westfield Primary School currently has no provided parking for parents and students. There is only street parking on the road adjacent to the school (thirty spaces often taken by staff) and a very small amount at the local recreational field (10-12 spaces). The school has approximately 430 students. The parking that is currently available on St Peters Road has already been reduced via double yellow lines, which proved to be a huge mistake as the parking only became more hectic with residents and parents from the school parking on those lines and sometimes mounting the curb in order to make space for other cars. The constant police presents has had zero impact. Creating an 'absolute' no loading area will only add fuel to the fire in my opinion. I personally have never had a conflict over parking on St Peter road, and only seen conflict due to some parking only double yellow, which your proposal will absolutely not stop, it will only cause inconvenience to those who abide by the law and are courteous to others like myself. (I have parked on the road for the last 10 years) The houses on St Peters Road boast large driveways, great neighbours and a well kept local area. But most of all, the road residents have the luxury of fantastic access to a fantastic school. I believe they must in turn accept that ours would like to use that luxury. Parking rush hours must be expected and accepted when moving directly opposite two schools.</p>
Plan 6	St Peters Road	X			<p>Firstly, I would like to register genuine concerns relating to the timing of the notice of intent. It was posted on the very last day of the school year with a deadline within the school summer holidays. This can only be described as an underhand tactic to ensure that the level of opposition is minimised. I would urge you to push back the notice of intent until September. I note in section 8 there was an informal consultation. When did this take place and how was it shared with people? Certainly, the parents of the Fosseway children were not invited! I would have expected at the very least that a communication would have been shared with the school. We have tried the drop off and pick up solution Fosse Way school offer, but this adds a considerable time to our journey. When we park in St. Peters Road, we do so responsibly and walk to collect her at 3pm. This way we can be home by 3:40pm. This is a significant difference in time. It is also a short distance to walk as her disability (recognised by DWP as limited mobility, hence the blue badge) makes her tire easily and she is a danger to herself and others when attempting to walk distances. We have tried to walk down Longfellow Road, cross at the traffic light crossing, walk along the main road to the carpark by the playing fields. This caused considerable distress with the volume of heavy vehicles passing extremely close by. I therefore strongly object to Plan 6 stopping my child having a safe route to and from her transport. There appears to be no comment from Cllr Robin Moss or Cllr Eleanor Jackson for the plan and that it was proposed by the local ward member on behalf of residents. I am aware that there is strong feelings from the residents regarding the parking in the street, and indeed there have been some occasions when the residents have taken to parking their own cars on the street (often taking up 2 spaces with one car) to prevent parents from parking there. In my experience, the majority of parents from Westfield primary and Fosse Way park considerably. However, there is a small minority who converge at the end of the cul-de-sac by the footpath to Longfellow Road. They stand outside, smoking/vaping and I can understand the residents' concerns about a small minority. With that in mind, is it fair to penalise the majority of parents from both schools with this parking order due to such a small minority? Fosse Way school do put communications about parental behaviour and parking in St. Peters Road. It's not like they ignore or overlook this behaviour. The issue with St. Peters Road is the residents parking on the road in such a way to try to make it difficult for parents from Westfield and Fosse Way using it to drop off and collect their children. There are a couple of households who park one car on St. Peter's Road to take up 2 spaces – some even foregoing the use of their driveways to force parents to park elsewhere. This forces people who have a blue badge to park on the double yellow lines. If the road had more spaces to park without using the yellow lines, then cars would park there. I enclose photos of one said car as an example. I get why they are doing it; they've had enough of the minority who demonstrate anti-social behaviour. A resident has taken to parking in front of his other gate taking up 2 spaces. You cannot park in front of him as the double yellow lines have a white line there too. There is another household on the straight part of St. Peters as you enter it that does the same thing with a black car. Another house with a double driveway but no drop kerb on one side I have seen have a go at someone for parking on the road but there are no lines and there is a kerb, so they are legal to park there. I enclose another photo showing residents parking their cars on St. Peters Road all day to stop parents parking on St. Peters Road. I therefore strongly object to Plan 6 stopping my child having a safe route to and from her transport. There appears to be no comment from Cllr Robin Moss or Cllr Eleanor Jackson for the plan and that it was proposed by the local ward member on behalf of residents. I am aware that there is strong feelings from the residents regarding the parking in the street, and indeed there have been some occasions when the residents have taken to parking their own cars on the street (often taking up 2 spaces with one car) to prevent parents from parking there. In my experience, the majority of parents from Westfield primary and Fosse Way park considerably. However, there is a small minority who converge at the end of the cul-de-sac by the footpath to Longfellow Road. They stand outside, smoking/vaping and I can understand the residents' concerns about a small minority. With that in mind, is it fair to penalise the majority of parents from both schools with this parking order due to such a small minority? Fosse Way school do put communications about parental behaviour and parking in St. Peters Road. It's not like they ignore or overlook this behaviour. The issue with St. Peters Road is the residents parking on the road in such a way to try to make it difficult for parents from Westfield and Fosse Way using it to drop off and collect their</p>

Plan 6	St Peters Road	X			<p>children attending Fosse Way to 18, the knock-on effect is the situation we currently find ourselves in with regards to the parking. We pointed this out at the time of the construction of the 16-18 provision, but no additional parking was provided for the additional staff to cover the extra hours. Parents park on the double yellow lines regardless, also on kerbs, block driveways and park on the pavement and obstruct corners. They argue that they are only there for a few minutes, however this is not true and the build-up of this begins at 2pm and continues until after the staggered ending of the school day for both the schools. Fosse Way has a café frequented by the parents, and so they can be there for a good while before the end of the school day. When challenged they are argumentative and aggressive and we totally support that something has to be done about this. Photos taken 20/7/23 at 14.45. Several of the parents are collecting from Fosse way School and have disabled parking badges, so unless there is to be clear signage that no loading or waiting is allowed, then this will just continue. We are disappointed that we have not been included in any meetings or discussions regarding residents opinions and the effect that restrictions will have on everyone. If there have been meetings, we have not been informed and there appears to be no obvious consultation on the BANES website, so this is clearly not considered part of the "liveable neighbourhood" programme. Some residents on the street seem to have formed a committee which has not been totally inclusive of everyone's opinions. We are not sure why we have not been included. There was a time during Covid when they would have street parties, and we were invited once to join in, but declined as we were shielding our son and staff members from the terrible impact of Covid, particularly in the early days before vaccination. It seems we have been excluded ever since. It also seems to be that the majority of neighbours complaining are the newcomers, who knew they were buying properties near a school and the problems that this often brings, like living near a pub and complaining about the noise! Carers attending in the family home, were challenged about parking on the pavement, and were told that they could not do it and the community police officers attended a couple of times. However, since the introduction of this, the school bus and bin lorries etc. now have to drive on the pavement as the road is not big enough to get by. The residents challenging our staff were rude and aggressive in their manner, and our staff are quite prepared to write letters of support and confirmation if requested. Several other neighbours still park on the pavement and are not challenged by the same neighbours that instigated this whole process, photos below, and so one can only surmise that it is ok for some to since the recent yellow line painting, people who normally park on their drive are now parking on the road/pavement, to take up more spaces, and this could be seen as potentially confrontational and unnecessary. park in this manner and not others, namely if you are disabled and require carers then you should not live here. We have suggested that a parking permit zone would help alleviate the pressure from staff and assistants at the school using the road as a car park, however, the yellow lines that are in place at the moment just don't work and have actually made the situation worse. They switch from one side of the road to the other, which might be interpreted as a speed limit restrictor, however it just causes a major headache for the recycling wagons, Bin Lorries, delivery people and the school bus for the disabled children needing transport for school. There have been occasions when bins/recycling are not collected due to parking issues. Therefore at pick up time for schools, some parents park legally on the road, but by doing so make it impassable for larger emergency vehicles or anything larger than a small car. If the lines had been painted on one side of the road only and consistently, there would be room for parking and passing without the dangers that we have at the moment. The issue of not parking on the pavement has made the road situation much worse. The pavements are wide enough to straddle with a car and leave enough room for wheelchairs and buggies, making the road safer and passable without the need for driving on the pavement, which happens now. There is a more worrying aspect to all this, in that no-one is interested in policing the yellow lines that are there at the moment. They have been there for a couple of years and the situation is as bad as ever with no control of the parking, the parents simply do not care and park anywhere as they know that nothing will be done. Recently on a Sunday morning, a police car was seen parked outside one of the neighbours for a couple of hours on the yellow lines in the turning corner. There was ample parking available and also the drive way of the house it was visiting, but the police chose to park on the yellow lines in the turning corner. If the police can't even obey the rules of road, we cannot</p>
Plan 32	Waterloo Road	X		X	<p>With reference to the above traffic proposal, more specifically the changes proposed for Waterloo Road, Radstock, please consider the following: Whilst I do not object in principle to the proposed introduction of 'No parking at any time' in the areas indicated on the illustration provided, I would ask again that you consider better parking provision for people working all day in Radstock. There are only a small number of all-day parking spaces in the Waterloo Road car park, with the rest of the parking in Radstock limited to 4 or 5 hours. Whilst I understand the rationale for this (to increase turnover of spaces to help the traders and to deter the use for those that park there all day and then travel onwards to Bath/Bristol by bus), it does not help those that work and provide services in Radstock. All our staff shifts are over 5 hours, with many staff working 8am – 6 pm (or longer) to provide a healthcare service to our residents. We have previously suggested converting half of the parking spaces in Church Street car park to 'all day' and making all of Waterloo Road car park 'time limited', or providing parking permits to staff that work all day in Radstock to allow them to park in designated spaces. We were issued parking permits from the council during Covid and therefore a trial for this has already been successfully conducted. If the proposal goes ahead without consideration to the knock-on effect this will have for parking within the town, which will affect staff retention and therefore delivery of essential services; then I object. However, if there is a strategy to address the bigger issue of parking within the town, I would appreciate being sent a copy and would consider supporting this proposal.</p>
Plan 32	Waterloo Road	X			<p>I have seen your proposal to prohibit parking in a number of areas across the BANES region, and I'm particularly concerned about your plans for Waterloo Road, Radstock. I would appreciate it if you could explain to me how you came to this informed decision. For now, I have to say I do not entirely understand your proposal, especially since it is a well-known area for sheltered accommodation with the presence of Pine Court and Chichester Place. As one might expect a number of residents in this area struggle with their mobility and utilize the services of carers. Enforcing such restrictions will only hinder the residents' ability to access their vehicles, which they rely heavily on to commute. By increasing the distance between their homes and their/their visitors' vehicles, you would be creating an additional barrier for those who struggle to walk short distances, while simultaneously increasing the risk of falls. I would be grateful if you could explain to me what your justification is for impeding on their ability to commute. On top of that, this will simultaneously make it even more difficult for carers to park nearby and provide the full service they seek to give. Since the recent development of the new Doctor's Surgery, Hope House, there has been a notable increase of traffic in the area which has made it progressively harder for residents and their visitors to park close to their homes. Even if the parking restrictions only spanned a short distance, it is crucial that you account for the fact that Waterloo Road is now typically a busy road for parking thus residents and their visitors will have to park even further away. Could you please provide an explanation as to how these restrictions will not worsen this problem? I understand the need for traffic control, but in areas like Waterloo Road which is home to a high number of people in need of care/support, safety and accessibility should always be a priority, so I'd like to know how your proposed parking restrictions will positively impact that.</p>
Plan 32	Waterloo Road	X			<p>Objections to introduce No Parking At Any Time in lengths on Waterloo Road, have you considered Where can people who work in Radstock park all day? If we park in a 4 hour car park at Waterloo road or 5 hour at Church Street space, the car then needs to move, what do we do if we can't find an alternative space in the other car park? If we park in a 4 or 5 hour space, we don't always have the time available to move cars after that time is up. Our work requires us to attend groups and meetings which we would be unable to leave to "sort" our vehicles. Local residents impacted by yellow lines are likely to use all the all-day spaces in Waterloo Road, therefore leaving no spaces for worker or visitors. Have you considered the impact this will have on small business? With no parking, no one will use the businesses in the local area. This could have damaging effects on people's lives, mental health and the local area. As a member of staff at the Children centre team based in Radstock, our car is essential for the job role and the service to provide for BANES residents and therefore we have no other option but to attend work via car. We undertake home visits, carrying lots of equipment and therefore need car parking available within reasonable proximity and for a long period of time.</p>
Plan 32	Waterloo Road	X			<p>I understand there is to be more parking restrictions in the Radstock area, particular Waterloo road. I am a children centre worker currently based in Hope House. Can I please ask; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Where can people who work in Radstock park all day? •If we park in a 5 hour space and then need to move, what do we do if we can't find an alternative space in the other car park? •if we park in a 5 hour space, we don't always have the time available to move cars after that time is up •We undertake home visits, carrying lots of equipment. We have loading spaces in the building car park, but would take time to walk to get vehicle, bring to the centre, load the car, and then do it all in reverse. •Local residents impacted by yellow lines are likely to use all the all day spaces in Waterloo Road. </p>

