

Plan	Road / Street	Object	Support	Support in part	Neither	Comments
1	Clarendon Road			X		Proposed disabled parking bay for Quaker Burial Ground. As this is being proposed for Clarendon Road which is on a slope and the burial ground is at the bottom of the road may I suggest that the parking space is put around the corner so on the level with the burial ground and it would be closer. Perhaps if you have time someone could check out what I've said.
1	Clarendon Road	X				I would like to make a representation / objection to the proposed disabled space opposite the Quaker Burial Ground in Clarendon Road. Whilst, I do not object to a disabled space in principle, I am surprised that a disabled parking space is feasible in this location. The road is narrow at this point measuring approximately 297 cm (or 9ft 9 in) excluding the pavement. If one puts in a standard parking bay similar to those on the rest of Clarendon Road of 138cm (or 4 ft 6in), the size of a modern Mini (wing mirrors in) that only leaves 161cm (5ft 4in) for traffic to pass barely the width of a medium-sized van with its wing mirrors in! The newly re-marked spaces on Widcombe are 11cm wider (4.5in) making it even more narrow if this size of space is installed. I am uncertain if disabled spaces require even wider spaces to allow for passenger exit. The proximity to the sharp corner and existing parking used outside Chapel Cottage (who incidentally park on the pavement) will make it difficult for larger vehicles to pass. The Crescent and Clarendon Rd are a hot spot for damage to parked vehicles. Hardly a day goes past without damage to vehicles or walls / boundaries this proposal further increases this likelihood in its current form. The only way I could see that this would be feasible would be if the space allowed parking on the pavement. However, this does not seem appropriate (or allowed) and I think the proximity of the wall would make it difficult for the disabled driver or passengers to exit. The only practical alternative would be to put in a disabled space just round the corner under the willow tree. However, this would result in a loss of a residents parking space in area where there is already significant competition for spaces. I would also query the extent of use planned for this disabled space, presumably intended for visitors / volunteers in the garden. The footfall to the garden is extremely modest so I am not sure this would justify the loss of a space for existing local residents paying for permits. I would urge that the Highways department check the feasibility of this proposal before proceeding.
1	Clarendon Road	X				We are writing to you to object to the proposed disabled bay outside Chapel Cottage on Clarendon Road (Various roads, south east outer area, Bath) (prohibition and restriction of parking and loading) (no stopping on entrance markings) (authorised and designated parking places) (variation No 2) (order 202). Reference = 23-022 Chapel Cottage is a student rental property owned by Peter Moore Lets, and as discussed with Peter himself, we do not feel that it is necessary to have a disabled bay right outside of the property. We have also only recently bought permits to park within walking distance to our house, and feel it would not be fair to have this taken away from us. Furthermore, ourselves and Peter do not feel that this bay would be used if it were put in place due to the severe gradient coming down from Widcombe Crescent and the uneven pavements. We would appreciate if these plans do not go ahead and a new location is proposed.
1	Clarendon Road			X		I'm writing as Clerk of Bath Quakers, which own and administer the Friends Burial Ground in Clarendon Road, Widcombe. We are naturally pleased that the Council has agreed that there is a need for a designated parking space for disabled drivers at that end of Clarendon Road. However, the site indicated by the arrow is not in the best place for a driver or passenger with mobility issues, as the steepness and narrowness of the road at that point - opposite Chapel Cottage - would make it quite difficult, if not dangerous, for such a person to leave their car and get down the slope to the Burial Ground. We suggest that a spot ten yards or so further back down the hill, opposite the door to the Burial Ground, would be a better spot, as it would be flatter, and broader.
3	Prospect Road		X			We are residents at Shunem Villa (formerly known as Beechwood House). We are already included within Zone 9. Access to our house is only from Prospect Road and we have ongoing serious concerns about parking in the turning head. Please see attached illustrative photos and an annotated street plan. We strongly support the TRO proposal to extend Zone 9 and make Prospect Road 'Permit Holders Only'. The turning head of Prospect Road outside our house is extremely restricted and we have recently suffered total demolition of our two substantial Grade 2 listed gate pillars as a consequence, the damage being caused by delivery drivers delivering to other properties in the road. (The bases of the pillars are visible in photo 3). The unauthorised parking makes it very difficult (and occasionally impossible) for us to turn out of our house and drive down Prospect Road. It also restricts the turning head so it is unusable. Please can you also ensure that an appropriate 'Permit Holders Only' sign is placed in a clearly visible location on the lamppost which illuminates the turning head. Please do contact me if you require further information/explanation.
3	Prospect Road		X			I am writing to support the following: Item 3 Extension of Zone 9 boundary and introduction of Zone 9 Permit only parking in lengths of Prospect Road, Widcombe, Bath. With regard to Item 4 I do have concerns that unless this is regularly monitored throughout the day the two hour limited parking is likely to be abused.
4	Beechen Cliff Road	X				I object to this proposal.
4	Beechen Cliff Road	X				We understand that a proposal has been submitted for more double yellow lines to be added on Beechen Cliff Road 'to improve property access' (23002). We wish to object to the proposal, on the grounds that as residents of one of the four houses down the alleyway opposite Croftside, we are dependent on these few remaining on-street spaces to park within a reasonable distance of our home. Placing yellow lines here would lead to the loss of much needed and greatly used parking spaces, potentially causing great inconvenience to the affected households on a regular basis. While we of course recognise the importance of safe access to all properties, it is important to balance this consideration with the needs of residents of Beechen Cliff Road who are reliant on on-street parking and who have no choice but to park on Beechen Cliff Road. This would be the sixth occasion in the past 9 years that the council have added new double yellow lines on Beechen Cliff Road where previously there were none. I do not feel that the needs of residents who need on-street parking have been taken into account. Should any more of the few remaining spaces on Beechen Cliff Road be lost, this could mean that the residents of houses down the alleyway would then need to walk at least 100 metres up the hill to Chaucer Road to get to their car. We do not feel this is fair or reasonable, as more than enough yellow lines have been added on the road already. Instead, we support the idea of identifying and creating permanent parking spaces on Beechen Cliff Road at suitable locations, so that those who need to park on the street can do so safely within a reasonable distance of their own homes. Thank you for taking our comments into consideration.
4	Beechen Cliff Road			X		Regrettably on 26/11/21 when the last changes were made to lining on BC road, for reasons that need not be dwelt on, the linesmen put lines in that had not been approved under the 2021 TRO on both sides of the Sunnymount driveway. The DYs to the city side of Sunnymount were subsequently blacked out, but the single line extension on the other side of Sunnymount was not. There was no TRO in 2022, so this year's TRO is the first opportunity to correct the lining. When I was councillor up until May 2023 I had extensive discussions with individual residents. There is inherent tension on what is an eighteenth century lane between those with garages and driveways, who want to be able to get in and out, and those without garages and driveways who want to park as near to their homes as possible for valid reasons that include child provision, medical needs and having for job purposes to transport regularly boxes/equipment in and out of their cars. There is no plan detail on the website that I can see, but if the detail is as I requested after those discussions then I support the proposal as a compromise acceptable to most on the road which takes account of those, less stark now since the RPZ, competing needs:- 1) the city side of Sunnymount's drive DYs to go no further than 2.1 metres from the end of the DY that was in situ until 26/11/21. IMAGE 1480 shows that the two car space is still maintained and a car parked in the Stanley House garage, with some manoeuvring, will be able to get out of the garage, provided these dimensions are kept to. 2) as shown in Image 1475 that the single yellow line extension that was wrongly lined on the other side of Sunnymount's drive is taken back to the end of the next slab, as shown where the tape measure is. If 1) is achieved then a car parked on the driveway of Sunnymount will have a considerably greater turning circle on the right hand side of their drive (street view). By extending the line on 26/11/21 regrettably a much needed parking space between Sunny mount and Tongaat has been removed for all but the smallest of cars, this loss of parking was never the intention of any discussion. 3) Clearly at the top of the road Stockland needs more room to get out of their drive on the city side. The parking space outside the length of road between Stockland and the DYs opposite Shirley cottage is not big enough for two cars but has ample room for one car/van. Image 1481 shows an extension of one slab's length and this would have no detrimental effect on parking on that part of the road, but would allow the users of the Stockland driveway more room to allow safe ingress/egress. AS on other roads in Bath, due to their historical origin, the exact dimensions make all the difference to something that will work and something that will cause problems with the competing needs.
4	Beechen Cliff Road	X				We are writing to object to the introduction of 'no parking at any time' on part of Beechen Cliff Rd, BA2, covered by the following TRO: (Various Roads, South East Outer Area, Bath) (Prohibition and Restriction of Parking and Loading) (No Stopping on Entrance Markings) (Authorised and Designated Parking Places) (Variation No.2) Order 202- reference 23-022 If implemented, this order would cause the loss of two or more zone 18 residents' parking places. I understand there has been a request for double yellow lines by the occupants of Stanley House, Beechen Cliff Rd, on the grounds that they are proposing to buy a car and might occasionally have difficulty getting it into their garage if cars are parked opposite. The parking places that would be lost are for the use of those residents who do not have their own off-street parking and consequently have paid for residents' parking permits. We object strongly to the proposal that parking places should be discontinued just because they might cause occasional inconvenience to people who do have their own off-street parking. Does the council propose to offer a discount on the residents' parking charges, if the number of parking places we compete for is to be reduced? Furthermore, residents' parking places in Beechen Cliff Rd are especially important for the occupants of St Kilda, Beechen Cliff Rd, Mr and Mrs Hughes. Mr Hughes has a serious medical condition and does not find it easy to walk to and from parking places further from his home. St Kilda does not have any off-street parking.

4	Beechen Cliff Road	X			<p>We welcome the proposal to add double yellow lines opposite the garage of Stanley House, Beechen Cliff Road BA2 4QT. We are the owners of Stanley House and have never been able to use our garage (which has been there for over 50 years) successfully as cars parked opposite block access to it. After several attempts in the past, we gave up and ended up parking on the road. The introduction of the residents parking zone did not improve the situation as cars could still be parked opposite the garage. We have tried using a "please do not park opposite the garage" sign which no one paid attention to. It is now really important to us to be able to access our garage as we would like to be able to buy a small electric car which will need to be charged/parked in the garage. We have not owned a petrol or diesel car for 14 years and now in line with Banes' Climate Policy, want to go electric. We feel that we need to be able to buy a car now for various reasons, including in case of any emergencies that may arise in the future. We are the only house on the whole of Beechen Cliff Road who have off street parking (garage) but who cannot use it because we do not have yellow lines to allow access. In 2020/2021 both of our direct neighbours either side of us applied for lines without sharing this information with us, knowing that we have the same problem. They consulted other neighbours, but not us, therefore we missed the opportunity to be considered along with their requests. There is no reason why our request is any less important than theirs. In fact, for approximately 15 years since the construction of their garage, we have seen the owners of Tresco Cottage access their garage successfully even with a car parked opposite them without lines. They had no need for the lines but applied for them anyway and were successful. In addition, the lines that have been painted opposite the Tresco Cottage garage are longer than agreed by the owners and the councillor. We witnessed the owner on the day, instructing the council employees to extend the line past the lamppost (which was the agreed position) by 12-18 inches. See attached photo showing the agreed length in white paint aligned with the lamppost, and the extended yellow lines. This has only made the available parking space shorter and more difficult for other drivers who do not have off-street parking. We would invite anyone to try to park in our garage with a car parked opposite - it is impossible. We have never been able to do it as it is the narrowest part of the road and our garage is angled uphill which makes it even more difficult. The lines are definitely needed opposite our garage to allow it to be used for electric vehicle charging.</p> <p>If the issue with our proposed lines is that people who do not have off-street parking have found it convenient (as it is near to their houses) to park opposite our garage blocking our access can no longer do this, then there is ample parking on Chaucer Road and the surrounding residents parking zone (which does not block anyone's access) which is very close. In reality, with the addition of our proposed lines, there would still be enough space to park two cars (as there is now), as the previous councillor, Winston Duguid, made sure of this, so it would make no difference to the number of spaces available anyway. Any objections about further reduced parking are incorrect and not valid. We are asking for the same consideration offered to our neighbours (the owners of Tresco Cottage and Shirley Cottage), who were both granted yellow lines opposite their garage/driveway, to be extended to us please. Thank you for reading this message and we hope that you are able to consider our request alongside other comments received.</p>
4	Beechen Cliff Road		X		<p>We have just been alerted to the suggestion that additional double yellow lines will be installed on parts of upper Beechen Cliff Road. We object to this for the following reasons: 1. The existing allocated yellow lines in the street and the parking spaces in the upper part of Beechen Cliff Road were installed after full discussion instigated by then Councillor Winston Duguid with all concerned parties in the Street on 26.11.21. 2. The existing parking and yellow line arrangements were a compromise allowing both access to all garages for those who have off street parking and also parking spaces near to their homes for those who are not fortunate enough to have a private garage space.3. The suggested new yellow line arrangements as shown on the map provided by the Council are unclear. They appear to indicate that parking spaces in the upper part of Beechen Cliff Road will be significantly reduced. This will mean that those without a garage will be negatively impacted and may not have access to a parking space near their homes. 4. This is particularly challenging for my husband and I. We do not have a garage and rely on street parking. My husband, Robert Hughes, has a malignant brain tumour. It is important that he and I can get to our car simply and quickly both for every day errands and in case of emergencies. Reduced parking spaces will mean that we may have to go further to find a space - difficult when you are in a hurry, don't feel well and your mobility is reduced. We hope that you will reject this application as it is currently shown on the map. However, we would not object if the map were amended so that it was clear that it referred only to the introduction of 2.1 metres of new double yellow lines opposite Stanley House, outside Sunnymount and measured from the end of Sunnymount's drive as shown in Mr Little's (the owner of Stanley House) scale drawing. We hope you will take all our comments into consideration. It would be appreciated if you could confirm that you have received this letter.</p>
5	Summer Lane	X			<p>I write in respect of the above consultation and pursuant to our instruction by Mr Coles of Mayflower, 2 Summer Lane, Combe Down: a property that would be directly affected by the proposed extension of on-street parking controls. The proposals are clearly shown within the 'Informal Consultation' report and whilst our client does not wish to comment on their entirety, only those relating to the proposed extension of 'No Parking At Any Time' markings on Summer Lane, Combe Down, Bath as shown graphically in Plan 5 of the consultation document and as extracted below. The justification for the proposed extension of parking controls is given within the title of the plan above which is to "prevent obstruction of the highway by parked vehicles". It is noted that the proposals have been prepared in response to the Ward Councillor and not in response to an otherwise understood or quantified highway efficiency problem. Summer Lane is a two-way single carriageway road with a typical width of circa 5.2-metres and accommodates a mix of informal on-street parking and formal parking bays occurring along its length in this vicinity. In this context, the road essentially operates with a series of informal give-take narrowings, just as occurs in the location where the extension of parking restrictions are proposed. Indeed, it is notable that formal on-street parking bays are provided alongside the Combe Down Primary School, some 150 metres east of the proposal scheme, where the kerb-to-kerb width is just 4.5-metres. However, within the immediate vicinity of our client's property (Mayflower), Summer Lane transitions from circa 4.2-metres to 5.5-metres opposite its junction with Byfield Place. The available width – and therefore the potential impact on the operational efficiency of the highway – alongside my client's property is therefore better than a nearby location where the Authority have implicitly accepted it appropriate to create formal parking areas which have the effect of permanently reducing road width. By comparison, most of the remainder of Summer Lane, including alongside my client's property, experience temporary and fluctuating parking (and the associated narrowing effect) along its length. Thus, in view that the Authority – and indeed the Ward Councillor – are not proposing restrictions elsewhere along Summer Lane, where the road conditions could arguably give rise to greater friction to the free-flow of traffic, we contend that parking restrictions in vicinity of Mayflower are unjustified and onerous. Indeed, the Authority must be cognisant that the effect of the proposed parking controls would be to displace existing parking demand in that location. This would have the effect of reducing gaps in on-street parking which currently serve to facilitate the informal give-take operation along the length of Summer Lane, particularly during busier school drop-off/collection times. Consequently, the proposals would therefore worsen the efficiency of the highway in this location. It is, however, accepted that some betterment could be provided to the operation of the highway around the junction of Summer Lane / Church Lane, but the extent of parking restrictions should be determined by the point on the highway where two opposing vehicles are adequately able to pass. In this regard, and by reference to Manual for Streets, this should be a point where the carriageway measures not more than 4.1-metres. This broadly occurs in line with the eastern edge of Number 70 Church Place, and which would therefore result in the extension of existing parking restrictions by just 3-metres. This is entirely nominal and would have no discernible bearing on the way in which drivers perceive or use the highway. For this reason, the changes would not be value for money and the Authority should, on this basis, cease their proposals in this location. For the avoidance of doubt, Summer Lane serves a discrete number of residential properties and the local primary school. As such, the composition of traffic is overwhelmingly comprised of car traffic, with ad-hoc and severely infrequent use by larger vehicles. As such, the Manual for Streets standard of 4.8-metres (suitable for a car and larger vehicle to pass) does not apply here. However, even if it did, that width occurs at the eastern edge of Number 1 Summer Lane and would therefore result in an extension of the existing parking controls by just 12-metres – approximately half the extent of the current arbitrary proposals. Conclusion. In view of our review as set out above, it is evident that the extent of the proposed parking controls has been arbitrarily determined and should, as an absolute minimum response, be reduced in line to a point where the carriageway width first achieves 4.1-metres. Notwithstanding, rather than solving an existing deficiency, the proposals would create disproportionate worsening in the efficiency of the highway due to a likely reduction in the availability of informal passing places required to facilitate the current give-take narrowings that exist by virtue of on-street parking along the length of the road. The proposals, as they stand, are therefore unwarranted, ineffective and poor value for money. Consequently, the proposals should be significantly amended or abandoned.</p>
5	Summer Lane	X			<p>I wish to formally object to the extension of the parking restrictions along Summer Lane. The reasons for my objection are as follows:1. I live on Summer Lane at Mayflower and currently park outside my property. I have a young family (including a 1 year old) and it is important that I can park close to my property for obvious family reasons.2. The provision of parking outside my house naturally calms traffic and I am worried that no parking will cause increased driving speeds outside my house.3. The path in front of my property is narrow (1.0 metre) and my front door opens directly onto the public footpath. Not having parking outside causes me concerns over safety to my family as there will no longer be a barrier from moving vehicles. I therefore consider the proposals increase the risk of an accident to my family and therefore the justification for the proposals needs to be supported with appropriate evidence that outweighs this risk.4. The width of Summer Lane is typically 5.2m with parking on one side. Outside my property the width is up to 5.8m. I accept that the top of Summer Lane (where the road narrows to 3.9m) could have restrictions but it only makes sense to me to increase the amount of parking restriction only to where the road becomes 5.2m wide. This change occurs halfway along the road in front of my property. I have attached a sketch that indicates the extent of the proposal I suggest. This strategy would mean there would still be parking in front of my front door. It would good if you could review my proposal and discuss or preferably amend.I have appointed a highways engineer who will be supporting my objection and I will forward this information accordingly.</p>
6	Greenway Lane	X			<p>I am the owner of #101 Greenway Lane and instigated the request of extending the parking bays in front of our property when the zones were first introduced. It went quiet for a long time and I assumed it wasn't being actioned. I would now like to retract the request if possible as it has proven manageable over time with the available spaces, and would create a pinch point in the road. If a retraction is not possible then please treat as an objection as the primary affected resident. My opposite neighbour also has concerns which she has emailed and again is directly affected. Thanks for looking into the initial request, and I do apologise if this has wasted time/effort, but the situation in this part of the Lane has evolved and the amount of trades requiring spaces has reduced.</p>

6	Greenway Lane	X				I should like to raise a concern about the proposed introduction of a further parking space in front of the garage of #101 Greenway Lane. My understanding is that the owners of #101 do not wish this to go ahead and I imagine they will state their reasons for this. My concern is that the current parking restrictions enable cars on our drive to be able to turn safely in and out of the drive on what can be a dangerous and blind corner in both directions (often with vehicles accelerating at high speed up or down the Lane). I suspect that the same is true of my neighbours at #92. Additionally, many larger vehicles such as lorries, delivery vans, ambulances and even larger cars (of which there are many passing in both directions to the Paragon School twice each day) struggle to round the corner/pass parked vehicles safely, frequently pulling onto our drive to park whilst making deliveries, or to ensure the flow of traffic. A further vehicle parked on this corner, especially a larger one, might make passing impossible. Thank you for considering this objection.
6	Greenway Lane	X				I wish to object to the proposal for the following reasons.1. Maneuvering in and out of my driveway is already difficult and would be made even more so especially at rush hours. 2. Given its close proximity to a blind bend to the west it would create a traffic hazard for drivers approaching from both sides. 3. At an already arrow point in the road it would create a pinch point between the walls at the end of my driveway and the proposed parking bay. Existing damage to the walls of my driveway is proof of the difficulty experienced by drivers at this point especially by those of goods vehicles.
7	Perrymead	X				Perrymead. This section of road is barely used for parking since the imposition of restrictions, presumably because the distance makes it impractical for city centre visitors and there are no immediately adjoining residents. I suggest removal of the permit holders designation. If it is necessary to restrict parking a 4 hour limit seems appropriate.
8	Clavertondown Road	X				No 8 Claverton Down Road I object to the introduction of the suggested no parking restrictions as I believe this will increase the speed of traffic along this section of road and make it more difficult to exit from Paddock Woods.
10	Church Street		X			As Church Wardens of St Thomas a Becket Church, Church Street, Widcombe we are writing to support the proposal to extend the operating hours of the 2 Hour Limited Waiting bays closest to the Church on Church Street, Widcombe, Bath to 7 days a week. Currently the 2 hour Limited Waiting is restricted to Monday to Saturday only. This means that on a Sunday the availability of on-street parking for people wishing to attend services at the Church can be severely reduced. The Church has no private parking and an ageing church population means that the availability of parking spaces is of prime importance.
13	Wellsway	X				Hi,good morning So I am a resident living at Wellsway,506 and I would like to object to the proposal,because is going to affect all the residents living on the area not just myself.It is already no spaces available to park at times because of the big number of residents which live here so these is going to make it worse.For example my landlord didnt put a gate on the path next to his house so the kids can be safe playing but he choose instead to make it easy for everyone to access so we all can be better persons and just think about others not just what suites a single person(please see photo attached and hope that make sense).
13	Wellsway	X				I live on wellsway and i would like to object the proposal with the double yellow because its goig to affect us.
13	Wellsway	X				Ref 23-022 Plan 13 – Wellsway, Odd Down Bath – Proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions at the entrance to 500-504 Wellsway. We object to the proposal to introduce “No Parking At Any Time” in front of 506 Wellsway. Parking is already very limited and reducing it further would clearly compound the problem. Although the proposal may marginally improve access and visibility for the few residents of the newly built houses at 500-504 it would worsen the parking difficulties for the many residents of the houses that front and park on the main road. For many, parking on the main road is the only option. It would be grossly unfair to penalise many residents who have lived in the area for many years in order to benefit the few residents of the new development. Rather than marginally improving access and visibility for residents of only 4 houses and creating problems for considerably more, a much better solution would be to introduce traffic calming in the area. Traffic calming would improve road safety for everyone over a bigger area and penalise nobody. It would also improve the safety of children walking to and from St Martin’s Garden Primary School and the adjacent playing fields. With slower moving traffic it would also improve air quality.
14	Perrymead					This is an objection to No.6 of the above (Plan 14 on the online version) regarding Perrymead having its limited waiting parking bay at the beginning of Perrymead extended to 4 hour limited waiting from 2 hours. The same objection was raised with the ward councillors in June in response to their leaflet discussing the change from 2 hour to 4 hour waiting times. The increase to 4 hours will simply mean that commuters, visitors et al will use the space as before the RPZ was introduced as there is little or no enforcement of the RPZ by Parking Services - and certainly of this limited waiting space along Perrymead. I do not see any other area increasing from 2 to 4 and wonder why Perrymead’s has been judged to be suitable? As with any restrictions, unless they are policed and enforced, they are ignored as with the 20 mph speed limit in Perrymead and the surrounding area, and also the existing 2 hour limited parking on Perrymead.
18	Wellsway	X				I wish to object to the proposal to create a dual zone 22 permit holder and 4 hour limited waiting in Wellsway Bath adjacent to numbers 237 to 241 on the following grounds: There are very few local amenities that people parking here will access. The four hour zone will become a short term car park for shoppers in the city centre or visitors to Bath rugby as it was before the RPZ was introduced. One of the reasons that the RPZ was put into place was to prevent this sort of parking. Local residents will be displaced and either park in other areas of zone 22 or on the unrestricted other side of the road to the inconvenience of local residents. Four hour parking zones are much harder to enforce than resident parking zones. (For example, if a car is parked at 8:00 a.m. and not seen by enforcement until 11:00 a.m. it my stay in place for seven hours before a fine is payable. This is a risk some drivers will take rather than risking a fine for a 10 minute stay in a resident parking area)
18	Wellsway			X		The Wellsway Bath Residents’ Association (WBRA) is broadly in favour of these proposals. Local community groups operating out of St Luke’s Church and businesses such as the guesthouse and pub require time-limited casual parking in order to continue to thrive. However, there is concern that a four-hour parking period in the area outlined in Plan 18 will enable people to park for free and walk into town. This would compromise attempts to encourage alternative forms of transport and use of the Park & Ride and creates a two-tier parking regime: residents paying for a permit, visitors parking for free. An alternative solution would be to limit the parking period to 2 hours or to restrict the number of four-hour parking spaces to four. This provides the flexibility and reassurance to residents and businesses in the immediate area without encouraging the detrimental effect of casual non-residential parking.
18	Wellsway	X				I object to the proposal,to implement No parking at any time,on Wellsway,Bath
18	Wellsway	X				Hi,good afternoon I am a resident of Wellsway and I reject to the proposal because is not faire that most of the residents of Wellsway dont have where to park in the favour of other 4 residents which live on the new built flats.
19	Upper Bloomfield Road	X				I would like to express concern and opposition to the proposal to create a no parking zone on Upper Bloomfield Road between Lodge Gardens and Oolite Road. The reason given for the proposal is to prevent obstruction of highway by parked vehicles. However, this is one of the few residential roads in Odd down where, in fact, the road is wide enough for cars to park and for two-way traffic to pass simultaneously. The bus stop is at the far end of this restricted area, and buses have no need to wait there for long periods of time, having just come straight from the park and ride stop where drivers are able to stop for breaks or get back to their correct timings. If there are concerns that a large vehicle parked opposite the bus stop could temporarily prevent the passage of traffic or emergency vehicles, then a small section opposite the bus stop could be made into a restricted parking zone, with plenty of space for parking 3 or 4 cars nearer Oolite road. The mobile library van also uses this place and many older people rely on it for library access. There are very few other safe places the van could stop nearby. I was informed by the local councillors that one reason for this proposal was due to complaints about noisy vehicles from the elderly residents of The Green. Leaving a parking zone near to Oolite Road would mean that any noisy vehicles would not be directly outside the residents’ houses (see figure 1). The map given in the proposal gives a misleading perspective and is not representative of how much space is actually available to pass parked buses. The aerial map view opposite makes it clear there is ample room for both a safe parking (marked in red) and a bus passing area along the stretch of road (marked in yellow). My reason for objecting the proposal is a concern that further restricting the parking in this area, next to a busy convenience store, will result in increased dangerous parking further up the road and on the corner of Oolite road, which is a daily occurrence. The current parking restrictions are not adhered to and there is no enforcement, so creating more restrictions is not going to solve the problem.

19	Upper Bloomfield Road	X				<p>I am writing to object to part of Item 1 in the above proposal. The issue of concern is shown on your Plan 19, Upper Bloomfield Road There are a few aspects to my objection but in summary there appears to be no particular problem that this part of the proposal seeks to solve yet it is likely to create a number of problems for local residents and visitors. Upper Bloomfield Road is fairly wide with good sight-lines and by my observation not particularly busy or fast and it would appear that prohibiting parking along much of that road will have a combination of 3 adverse unintended consequences:[1] displace parking onto less suitable residential streets. Lodge Gardens is bendy, narrow and unsuitable for parking. Oolite Road is very cluttered and residents already suffer from vehicles parked across their entrances or sometimes limiting the safe passage along Oolite Road and inconsiderate parking frequently prevents the delivery lorries to the Co-op getting into the loading area which results in lorries maneuvering on the carriageway more than otherwise necessary. Restrictions on Wellsway, at the other end of Oolite Road, are justifiable as Wellsway is faster, narrower and busier and any obstructions can cause both a safety risk and disruption to traffic. This doesn't happen much and the displacement onto Oolite Road or The Beeches will presumably be negligible. However, Upper Bloomfield Road (Plan 19) does not suffer from the same conditions as Wellsway and furthermore the south-east side of the road between Lodge Gardens and Oolite Road has no premises fronting the road, making it a safer section to allow parking. It is relatively uncluttered as there are residents' parking bays on the north-west side of the road. Wansdyke Road often has no spaces as the properties on the north-east side have to park on-street. Odins Road is narrow and also very little capacity but furthermore is used by many young children as a school-route to St Philips so displacement here would increase risk to children.[2] Increase unlawful parking. If people shopping at the Co-op, Chippy, etc. cannot park legally in a safer area they will be more inclined to park illegally closer to the shops, i.e. in less safe places than currently. This will happen partly because they think they are only 'just popping in' and if parked illegally want to keep an eye on the car and partly because there is less incentive to park safely if those areas are TRO'd. There is currently very little enforcement evident. I note that the police response was that the parking enforcement was carried out by Parking Services and that Parking Services made no comment. The nature of the short stops for shops makes it very difficult to enforce effectively and but I have never seen any enforcement in the vicinity. The net result of this would therefore be to make the area around the junction with Oolite Road and the Co-op less safe - many people cross both roads at or near this junction, primarily going to the Co-op and the inevitable displacement onto the corner would be dangerous and is easily mitigated by removing this part of the proposal, i.e. by continuing to allow parking on the section of Upper Bloomfield Road between Oolite Road and Lodge Gardens.[3] without an increase in resource for parking enforcement this element of the proposal will not have the desired effect. There is no indication, and I have not received an answer to my request for this information.[4] There is a likelihood that parking on the grass areas of (Upper Bloomfield Road, Odins Road and Wansdyke Road) will increase - it is rare now - which will degrade the valuable greenspace in the local area and increase the need for resources for enforcement. I have asked for copies of the evidence on which this proposal was based but have not received a reply; surely this proposal was based on evidence which would have been held with the proposal or referenced from it and very easy to provide. If the road safety assessment, traffic flow data, parking space occupancy, consideration of displacement effect and other basic records necessary for an informed decision to be made reasonably and on the basis of evidence was not readily available when requested by someone responding to the consultation it begs the question whether the decision-maker actually had that information available when making the decision or (and I doubt this but is the only other logical possibility) whether there was some reluctance to release the information within the time-frame of the consultation. For the above reasons I object to this element (parking restrictions on Upper Bloomfield Road) of the proposal, I believe that in the absence of evidence for this proposal it would be a perverse decision to include this in the final Order as it would reduce not increase safety, inconvenience residents, visitors and shoppers, require resources for enforcement and be to the detriment of the immediate greenspace.</p>
20	Clarks Way	X				<p>I am emailing to object to the proposed changes to parking regulations on Clark's Way, Bath. Myself and 4 housemates are residents on this road - we are University of Bath students and all of us have cars. When choosing a place to live, we settled on Clark's Way because it was further out from town and as such a cheaper option for us to rent. With it being further out, we have less reliable bus routes and as such all have cars now to transport to and from university. We have renewed the tenancy for the next academic year also, on the basis that we have accessible transport to and from university. With the proposed changes to parking regulations on Clark's Way, we will have nowhere to keep our cars and as such no way of getting to and from campus. In addition, I personally have a disability and a blue badge to prove this. It's for this reason even more so that I need to have somewhere to keep my car so that I can get around accessibly. My housemates have further need for their cars because they have to visit family back at home quite a lot, due to personal circumstances. Equally, we all have part-time jobs in order to support our studies which require us to drive to and from - if we have no place for our cars, we have to consider the financial impact of losing work. Had we known ahead of time, we would have sought a different property with enough available parking, however we are now contracted to live here for the next 2 years of our study. We urge you to reconsider your proposal - we know that many other households on our road are students who rely on street parking too, and this change will significantly impact not only the accessibility of travel for all but also the safety of the road we live on. If there is no possibility of reconsidering these changes, we request that we are personally allocated the street parking spaces outside the front door of our rented property (5 Clark's Way) - one of which to be a disabled bay - in order that we have secure parking.</p>
20	Clarks Way	X				<p>I wish to lodge my objection to this proposal. I do not agree that cars are parked adjacent to the houses on Clarks Way and should be parked adjacent to the care home</p>
20	Clarks Way	X				<p>I wish to place my objection to this proposal. The no parking should be adjacent to the houses on Clark's Way and not the nursing home. Also with cars parked all along Clark's Way adjacent to the houses turning onto Clark's Way from Orchard Drive will be unsafe with reduced visibility</p>
20	Clarks Way	X				<p>I am emailing you to object to the changes to parking regulations on Clark's Way, Bath. Myself and three other housemates are all University of Bath students and all own cars. When deciding on a place to reside, we chose Clark's Way due to the rent being cheaper as we could not afford to increase our budget. As our house is further away from University, we all have cars to transport to and from university as we have an unreliable bus route which often means taking two buses. We have renewed our tenancy for the next academic year (previous to this proposal) on the basis that we would have accessible parking for all cars, as is currently available. With these proposed changes, we will have nowhere to keep our cars, therefore, no accessible way to get to and from campus. Additionally, we all have part-time jobs which require us to travel via car in order to attend. If we are unable to park our cars, we will have to consider the financial loss also as it is likely we will lose work. If we had known previous to us renewing our tenancy, we would have searched for differing properties with available parking for all of us. However, we are now contracted to live here for the remaining 2 years of our study. I would urge you to reconsider your proposal as there are many students, as well as working residents, who rely on street parking. I would also like to make it aware that with a significant area of possible parking spaces being removed, this would create a safety hazard within our area as it would result in dangerous parking and a lack of space for cars to fit safely on the roads.</p>
20	Clarks Way	X				<p>I am emailing to object to the proposed changes to parking regulations on Clarks Way. My housemates and I chose this particular property due to the reduced price as it was out of town knowing that we could park on the road and drive to University. The public transport from Clarks Way to University is not up to scratch to fit in with a busy schedule as often we need to get home quickly after University to then work our jobs in the evenings. This is only possible with our cars and the on road parking. As well as this, my housemate has a disability and a blue badge meaning public transport is inaccessible for her and she relies even more on her car than the rest of us. We often see other students on our road, as well as families with small children, who are relying on cars to travel around Bath and so we urge you to reconsider the proposed changes.</p>
22	Bloomfield Drive					<p>Hello, I live on Bloomfield Drive in Bath and am objecting to the extension of double yellow lines from the bus stop towards Frome road. This would mean that we, at this end of the street, would lose 3 valuable spaces. It would be helpful to know why this has been proposed? If it's because of people parking on the double yellows during school pick up time then this proposal would not solve any issues here. Parents already park on the double yellows and will continue to do so if the double yellow lines were extended, it's not policed so there's no consequences to them doing so. People will continue to park on the double yellow lines or it will encourage parents to park in front of the various drive ways at this end of the street which will cause further frustration for the residents.</p>
23	Prior Park Road	X				<p>Further to the above proposal and specifically point 14 1.Extension of Zone 3 boundary and introduction of Zone 3 Permit Holder Only parking in lengths of Prior Park Road, Widcombe, Bath. I would ask that you consider the following. We live at Welton Lodge, currently we fall into zone 21 and your proposal is changing the boundary for us to move from Zone 21 into ZONE 3. Can I ask for this to be reviewed urgently as we do not want our house and therefore our parking options to be moved from zone 21 to zone 3. The reasons for this are as follows. 1. We have been in zone 21 for the last 18months and this has been very good for the security of my car 2. We have lived at Welton lodge and on regular occasions my car has been damaged either by Vandals or by cars coming down ralph allen drive and hitting my car when parked 3. The proposal to move our house to zone 3 would likely restrict our ability to park, we can rarely park in the area that is to be included into Zone 3 now, therefore if this area is full we would be required to park further down Prior park road, there is rarely empty spaces now and therefore the likely ability for me to park will be limited. 4.I have one permit in zone 21 and this has allowed me to park my car in Lyncombe vale for the last 18 months without vandalism or damage. Thank you for considering me objection to our house been moved into another parking zone.</p>
23	Prior Park Road	X				<p>I object to this proposal as being unnecessary. If there was a problem for residents parking it would be reflected in the use of spaces in Perrymead which is not apparent.</p>
Total:		27	4	5		