

Plan Ref Number	FeedbackCategory	OrderSupport	FeedbackText
Plan 1	Parking	WhollyObject	<p>Although I think the extension of the parking bay makes sense (seeing as the current proposed double yellow area is already being used as a de-facto parking bay!) I strongly oppose the proposal. Our garage, next to the double yellows, is very regularly blocked by parked cars/vans, and this is especially the case when people are parked on the double yellow lines, so I fear that our garage will become blocked even more regularly. This is a serious problem for us because A) the garage is in constant use, and I regularly leave for work around 5am, especially when driving to London, and the nature of my work is that everything depends on me being able to attend with dates booked far in advance. B) My wife is an NHS doctor working in the Hospital At Home team, which also means she needs to be able to get access to the car to see her patients across BANES &amp; Wiltshire. The lines on Pera Road are so faded they are almost existent. I have reported this three times over the past few years and no action has been taken and it is made clear that it's not a priority for the council, so this would need to be rectified at the same time as creating any new markings, with clear signage place to not block garages - perhaps stating that towing is in force + details given to residents with blocked garages on how this can be enforced. I look forward to the council reviewing this objection and letting residents know what will be improved so that cars do not block garages and impede access.</p>
Plan 13	Parking	PartlyObject	<p>The parking restriction to Toll Bridge Road seems to have no justification other than to prohibit parking. The traffic flow on the road is restricted by the bottle neck on the toll bridge and the round about at the top. Key positions are already guided by parking restrictions ensuring flow through the road is not further restricted by parking. To my knowledge the road has no recorded accidents. If the proposal were to introduce a pavement zone to allow walking from the bus stops on the main road to the Brewery office building, or perhaps restrict parking to time periods (say 4hrs) I could support the proposal. As it stand the proposal seems unnecessary and punitive to the valuable local businesses that contribute to the local economy.</p>
Plan 13	Parking	WhollyObject	<p>this will make no difference to traffic safety. the toll bridge and roundabout keep speeds down and cars parked here help further to keep speeds down. removing this parking will just push visitors to the brewery further away, denying the brewery and the many businesses a much needed parking facility.</p>

Plan 13	Parking	WhollyObject	It is unclear what this proposal intends to achieve, other than for the purpose of preventing parking in itself. Parking in this location is useful for those working and visiting the offices within Bath Brewery. Cars parking in these locations act as a passive traffic calming measure reducing speed of vehicles heading down hill towards the bridge. Removing the parking spaces will not improve traffic flow either up or down the hill. This is governed by the restriction to traffic flow caused by the mini roundabout at the top of the hill and toll bridge at the bottom. There is no record of any highways safety issues in this location.
Plan 13	Parking	WhollyObject	Re Yellow lines on Toll Bridge Road: It is unclear what this proposal intends to achieve, other than for the purpose of preventing parking in itself. Parking in this location is extremely useful for those working and visiting the offices within Bath Brewery, especially those that cannot walk long distances. Cars parking in these locations act as a passive traffic calming measure reducing speed of vehicles heading down hill towards the bridge. Removing the parking spaces will not improve traffic flow either up or down the hill. This is governed by the restriction to traffic flow caused by the mini roundabout at the top of the hill, the narrowing at the yellow box, and toll bridge at the bottom. There is no record of any highways safety issues in this location other than those caused by poor road maintenance. Parking on the main road at the top is already insufficient. Why make it even more difficult for those that need cars to carry out their work? we all walk or cycle when we can, but driving is a necessity when we have to visit remote sites and clients which is common in our line of work and this will make life even harder.
Plan 13	Parking	WhollyObject	I object the remove the parking space at Toll Bridge Road, Bath, BA1 7, United Kingdom as this is convenient for businesses, staff and visitors.

Plan 13	Parking,Traffic,Safety,Financial	PartlyObject	<p>We have been occupants of Bath Brewery for approximately 25 years and are not aware in this time of issues from the use of this unrestricted parking negatively impeding the movement of traffic or increasing the danger to pedestrians or traffic which we understand is the justification for this change. In fact our concern is that with reduced parking in the road that vehicles will drive at increased speed in an area of pedestrian movement to the offices and Toll Bridge beyond – the parking in effect provides a traffic calming effect on the road. The primary users of this parking are users of Bath Brewery offices and so when there is the highest levels of activity in the area the maximum calming affect is achieved. Our primary concern is the reduction in available parking which we rely on for our continuing use of the office space. There is inadequate quantity of parking for the offices in and around the Bath Brewery and there is no additional parking proposed to offset the reduction of this order. This will either push more parking to the London Road West which is fully occupied in the working week, and has no provision for crossing with faster moving traffic; or will make the Bath Brewery impractical for our continuing use as high quality office space. The loss of occupation in Bath Brewery will have a direct and indirect impact on BANES income and local economy. Either consequence of more high risk movements on London Road West or drop in occupation at Bath Brewery do not appear to have been considered in the proposed order nor we believe they are offset by the improvement to the road movement or assessed dangers which currently justify the order.</p>
Plan 13	Parking	WhollyObject	<p>I wholly object to the proposal of removing the parking spaces currently available outside our offices on Toll Bridge Road. These 10 or so parking spaces are essential for our business and other businesses in our building - for staff and visitors. This would make life very difficult for those who use these spaces every day. Having these spaces here currently does not affect the traffic either - the cars can still pass each other safely. I work here every day and my window looks out to the Toll Bridge Road - the traffic is not particularly bad here so i do not understand the reason for removing these spaces. It seems like you are gradually making all the residents of Bath's lives hell by removing every single free parking space available. HOWEVER, what we do need is a yellow box for the entrance to the Bath Brewery Car Park. If a car needs to turn into the car park (coming from the toll bridge), and the traffic is blocking the entrance, this means both lanes of traffic cannot move forward because of the bottle neck at the Toll. The only solution is to drive up to the Batheaston mini roundabout and turn back around, but sometimes people feel like they shouldn't need to do this so there ends up being a stand-off and a traffic jam until someone relents.</p>

Plan 13	Parking,Safety,Traffic	WhollyObject	If you remove the parking, it will Increase the speed of cars coming down the road, and it will also cause back to back Q of traffic during busy times, thus increasing the pollution on the road. Why don't you put a pavement in instead and stop the countless incedent's of cars hitting pedestrians and cyclists instead? Your proposal has no positive effect, only negative, removing a convenience with no benefit seems very odd when the real Issue is no public walkway!
Plan 13	Parking	WhollyObject	My response relates to the proposed parking restrictions on Tollbridge Road outside Bath Brewery. It is unclear what the objective of this proposal intends to achieve, other than for the purpose to prevent parking in itself. Parking in this location is useful for those working and visiting the offices within Bath Brewery. Cars parking in these locations act as a passive traffic calming measure reducing speed of vehicles heading down hill towards the bridge. There is a narrowing of the road further down the hill at the corner of the building where there is a yellow no stopping box. Removing the parking spaces will not improve traffic flow either up or down the hill. This is governed by the restriction to traffic flow caused by the mini roundabout at the top of the hill and tollbridge at the bottom. There is no record of any highways safety issues in this location. Parking spaces in the area are limited. I object to the removal of these spaces.
Plan 13	Parking,Disturbance	PartlySupport	The current proposed no parking zone is currently used by lots of workers from the brewery building. As the road will now not be allowed for parking this will inevitably mean that those workers will park outside of my house. It is already difficult enough to find spaces during the week and therefore I would propose that the road outside of the row of houses is made permit only. I know that this has been proposed before but as there is now going to be a parking attendant checking toll bridge road would it be possible to have this as well?

Plan 14	Parking,Disturbance,Safety,Traffic,Environmental,Financial,Access	PartlyObject	Imposing parking restrictions at the bottom of Gloucester Road will inevitably push more vehicles toward my house, leading to increased traffic, congestion, and noise. This raises safety concerns, with the increase in traffic in my area. The added congestion could also make it more difficult for residents to enter and exit their driveways safely, causing frustration and disputes. The lack of available parking will also force residents and visitors to park in more inconvenient or even unsafe locations. With the natural increase in idling and slow-moving traffic outside my home, this will lead to higher levels of noise pollution and car emissions, which is particularly concerning as I have asthma and am sensitive to the air quality, part of why we moved to a clean air zone. Beyond the immediate traffic concerns, these restrictions can also negatively impact property values and the overall quality of life for residents. A congested street with limited parking will likely make the area less desirable for potential buyers, reducing home values over time. It is really unfair that the burden of parking problems would be shifted onto certain residents rather than being managed through a more balanced and strategic solution. Instead of simply displacing the issue, the council should consider alternative measures that address parking concerns without unfairly impacting specific households. Please do not continue with the road restrictions on Gloucester Road.
Plan 14	Parking,Access	PartlySupport	With respect to - As for the subsection 122(2) matters: a) the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises. Please extend to double yellow lines across driveways on Gloucester Road (Map 5 of 9) to cover not only the dropped and dropping area, but also an extra 6 feet (2 kerb stones) on both sides to greatly improve sight lines and field of view when attempting to exit the driveways. I know this measure is supported by most, if not all, the residents affected. It is often impossible to see any distance along the road due to cars and vans (worse still) parked right up to the existing white lines and often overhanging them. Thank you.
Plan 3	Parking	WhollyObject	1) Cars never park opposite the chicanes in Belgrave Crescent. This proposal is a gross waste of resources at a time when cutbacks are being made in child services and care for the elderly. 2) If the double yellow lines were to encroach on the existing parking bays, it would exacerbate the already inadequate provision of residents parking in the road.
Plan 3	Safety,Traffic,Access	WhollyObject	BA-036 I wholly reject the proposal specifically for Belgrave Crescent which is seemingly designed to create a dangerous and life threatening escape road for other proposed road amendments by removing traffic calming bollards that are so important to slow cars not connected with this road. This will result in the potential for an already slim road without dual pavements to create the potential for road traffic accidents and loss of life.

Plan 3	Safety,Access,Other	WhollyObject	<p>This is a very very minor issue with occasional parcel drop; vans stopping for a minute or two. The most use of the area to change lines is by a disabled neighbour who has to get dropped by his house - the changes would mean this gentleman could not be dropped by his house any longer as taxi's might be unwilling to cause a traffic offence. This proposal adversely affects a disabled neighbour and member of the local community.</p>
Plan 3	Traffic,Parking,Safety	PartlyObject	<p>The proposed willow lines for Belgrave Crescent are, I believe to replace the eroded white lines opposite the chicanes, put in as a traffic calming measure to prevent rat running from Camden Road. They are reasonably successful,even though it resulted in the loss of 4 much needed parking spaces. The current white lines go from half way outside number 16 to half way outside number 18 and halfway outside no 34 to half way outside number 36. The proposals appear to show these no parking spaces opposite the chicanes being extended to end half way outside number 19 and halfway outside number 37, taking out 2 more parking spaces and making the chicanes totally ineffective . Any resident in Belgrave Crescent will tell you that, if cars are not parked up to the limit's either side of the chicanes, rat running cars will 'put their foot down ' and race along the crescent after coming off Camden road. This is why the chicanes were put in in the first place. There has never been a problem with emergency vehicles, bin lorries etc, so I cannot see any reason or benefits for extending the no parking spaces opposite the chicanes being extended, only disadvantages. I hope this is simply a mistake when drawing up the map, and that the yellow lines will simply replace the white lines as requested by the councillor.</p>

Plan 3	Parking,Traffic,Safety,Disturbance	PartlyObject	<p>Regarding the proposed no parking zone in the vicinity of the bollard chicane at the eastern end of Belgrave Crescent, I have no issue with marking the road as a no waiting/loading zone but oppose, on examination, the proposed extension (approx one vehicle space) to the no parking zone from the existing zone. The current zone (see attached diagram) runs from the border of 15/16 Belgrave Crescent to the middle of 18 Belgrave Crescent with the extension moving it to the border of 18/19 Belgrave Crescent (ie it gets longer). From personal evidence I can assure you that the current arrangement forces fast through traffic (often rat-running to avoid queues on Camden Road) to slow down, although some (regulars) manage to negotiate it travelling above 20 mph. The current space around the chicane allows cars and light goods lorries to negotiate it without issue and I have personal experience driving a van. That was the aim when the chicanes were installed. If there is one car not parked in front of 18/19 Belgrave Crescent (ie that mirrors the proposed no parking zone) then cars can easily negotiate the chicane without slowing down travelling 30-40 mph; I can hear the cars that are travelling at speed E-W (downhill) along Belgrave Crescent. The proposed increase to the no-parking zone is firstly unsafe as it will allow vehicles to negotiate it without slowing down; greater risk of a collision. This is in direct opposition to the councils promise to make neighbourhoods safer (ie LTNs) which I fully support. Secondly, it reduces parking which is in short supply (very few houses have off-road parking) which will just annoy residents. Lastly, it encourages drivers to travel faster which is anti-social and noisy. Drivers who travel fast on Belgrave Crescent, if asked to slow down, often respond aggressively and I have witnessed one resident being verbally abused and another threatened with physical violence which resulted in the police being called (see attachment). Marking the current no-parking zone accordingly is not a problem but extending the zone has no benefit whatsoever. I don't know where the requirement for this extension came from but it can only have been from a motorist who objects to having to slow down to negotiate the chicane, which is the whole point. Given that I witness vehicles negotiating the chicane regularly, I am more than happy to speak to a council representative.</p>
--------	------------------------------------	--------------	---

Plan 4	Parking	Neutral	<p>The parking of vehicles around the corners of the top of Croft Road can make it very difficult to pull out safely. The reason residents end up parking in this position is because there is insufficient parking outside houses due to: 1. Residents parking and time restricted parking on Eastbourne Ave, Camden and Tynning Lane forcing second and other vehicles into Fairfield Rd. Some of these vehicles stay stationary for weeks on end.</p> <p>2. Use of on street parking by visitors/staff of Fairfield Park Health Centre and Millies.</p> <p>3. Commuters parking and walking into town. As a resident of New Tynning Terrace I would support a Residents Parking Scheme in the area between the crossroads and the top of Croft. Most residents in this area only have one car and often have to park over 100 yards away. This is not acceptable, especially for those with young children or limited walking capacity. Please consider this option.</p>
Plan 4	Parking	PartlySupport	<p>The proposed changes to prohibit parking at the top of Croft Road are sensible. When people are parked on the junction, it does restrict visibility and makes pulling out more difficult. Since the introduction of the permitted zones on neighbouring streets, however, the availability of parking on Fairfield road has become increasingly limited, meaning these spaces are often the only ones available, and why residents are having to resort to parking in such areas. I am only supportive of these changes if the introduction of permit parking is introduced along Fairfield Road at the same time.</p>
Plan 4	Parking	WhollyObject	<p>I live on Fairfield Road and the parking situation is getting a lot worse for us residents. The situation has got worse since Eastbourne Avenue is resident parking has been granted there. Now there is more pressure on my road coming from the Fairfield Park Health Centre and the pub and shops. Of course I understand patients need to park but it should be limited to 2 hours. We get a lot of long term parking and day long parking and this needs to stop. It's not fair on us residents.</p>



Plan 4	Parking	PartlySupport	<p>Croft Road Double Yellow Lines. I am in favour of this scheme, however I am very concerned about the impact of parking for residents of Fairfield Road- currently the single white lines are occupied by cars 24/7. I have for years asked for residents parking and never had a response. There is increasing pressure on this road for casual parking which seriously inconveniences residents, we should be able to park near to our homes - I am frequently forced to park up on Marshfield Way or the bottom of Croft Road. Fairfield Road is used by commuters to park and walk/bus into town (this road will likely become a car park for commuters if the Camden Rd modal filter is implemented). People leave their cars here for weeks when they go on holiday and walk down to London Road to catch the airport bus. Vans and campers park here to avoid the CAZ. We can no longer park on Eastbourne Terrace. Since implementing a single yellow on Queenswood Ave, residents use Fairfield Rd. Fairfield Road is busy and a RPZ would help traffic flow by reducing the constant stream of people parking - which often blocks the road as cars manoeuvre in and out of spaces. It is an ageing population - many of my neighbours are either elderly 70+, with small children or with health and mobility needs. The current situation where Fairfield Rd is used as a short (and sometimes long term dumping ground for campers) will be exacerbated by reducing the ability to park (albeit dangerously) on the single yellow on Croft Road. My suggestions: I understand local residents may need to park given proximity to the doctor's surgery and Claremont Terrace shops. My suggestion would be to introduce a RPZ on Fairfield Road from 7am to 7pm with some of the spaces nearer to the surgery as 2 Hrs, no return within 1 hr. An additional measure could include: 2 Hour spaces at the top of Eastbourne RPZ to allow patients to attend medical appointments or use the shops,; or allowing residents of Fairfield Road to be part of the RPZ.</p>
--------	---------	---------------	--

Plan 4	Parking	PartlyObject	<p>I oppose “No parking at any time” order /suggestion by the council at Fairfield road and Croft road. As a resident, let me tell you that it’s impossible to find a parking space on Fairfield road or Croft road near my house when I return home from work late in the evening as all spaces have gone by that time. No parking at any time zone is the only area that I could find a space to park on Croft road. This end of Croft road is wide enough to allow smooth and unobstructed flow of traffic despite cars parked in this area on both sides. I have degenerative disc disease and my wife also has autoimmune condition affecting her mobility and joints. I have young children whom I have to drop to nursery regularly . It’s important for me to park car near my house so I can do my work and daily chores without damaging my health while living in a hilly area. My children and wife would struggle in the same way if we do not have car park near our house . Therefore I suggest council to please reconsider this order in relation to Croft road and Fairfield road. I think such order will be very harsh and unfair for residents like us who will suffer on daily basis as we would not be able to park car near our house. If council is still very keen to force this order on us then my request is to consider reducing the size of “no parking at any time zone” because currently as things stand , it’s wasting parking space for four cars ,two on each side of the top end of Croft road where it joins Fairfield road. We do not need this lengthy no parking at any time line/zone as both Croft road and Fairfield road are wide enough to allow smooth flow of traffic without any van or car getting stuck. This is a non issue for us and I do not understand why council has to bring this up when there are so many other more important issues that need tackling to improve traffic in Bath. I hope council will consider our views and remove this order completely abolishing No parking at any time on Croft road and Fairfield road. Many thanks for giving us opportunity to raise our concerns.</p>
Plan 4	Parking	PartlyObject	<p>I object the proposed amendments to Croft Road and surrounding roads because this remains one of the only roads in the area that does not have permit access and reducing the parking available to residents will have a major impact on our livelihoods by way of commuting, childcare access, deliveries.</p>

Plan 4	Parking	WhollyObject	<p>The issue you are trying to rectify, has only been caused by the poorly planned changes to parking zone 27, people only started parking at the top of Croft Road once the changes were made, when that happened people started parking on the single white lines due to lack of space. More over I would like to point to the email I received 05/09/23 stipulating that I should park on single white lines if I was unable to park anywhere near my home as no fines could be incurred and no action could be taken against me to trying to park near my home. I find the fact that two years ago you sent emails actively encouraging me to park on single white lines when I could not find a spot near my own home to 2 years later now putting a consultation out to remove the single white lines because people are parking there due to our street now being “free” Can somebody please take charge of the poorly thought out plan to change parking zone 27 and include Fairfield Rd, Croft Rd, queenwood Av &amp; Hampton View as well as midsummer buildings this would change the way people may parking as then you start to go up or down very steep hills which may act as a deterrent. I would like to strongly request you do not make Parking on Croft Rd any more difficult than it is since the change of parking zones, losing 4/6 more spaces will make life even harder for the people that live here. Not to mention the possibility of a 6 person HMO which may make parking even harder. Please extend parking zone 27 as soon as possible. If you can not do this I humbly ask that you do not make the change that will allow me to be fined for trying to park near my house, or allow dispensation for any resident who lives on Croft Rd to not be fined for doing so when all the people who park here for free and do not live on the street take up our valuable parking spaces.</p>
Plan 5	Parking	WhollyObject	<p>I have lived in Charcombe Way for many years. It is a leafy suburban on the edge of town which connects urban and rural living. It is a no through road so we only get traffic that is connected to residents. Parking has always been an issue as there is so little of it. As a community we have cooperated to minimise the problems caused by the shortage of places. We have a very active What's App group and we talk to each other. If there is an issue eg someone is expecting a large delivery or needs more space in the road they inform others and we help each other out. If four parking spaces are removed people will have no option but to park in Solsbury Way or Richmond Heights, roads not without their own issues. How can this benefit the residents of these roads. I can see no advantage to anyone in restricting the parking in the Way. Should neighbourhoods not have a sense of ownership of their own environment. We work well together up here and it is not always easy as it is but restricting parking further will only cause hardship and more problems. I would urge you please to reconsider this proposal and take into account the wishes of the residents and the detrimental effects which will be endured as a result of this change. What affects one has a knock on effect on others. Surely we all want to live harmoniously in our own neighbourhood.</p>

Plan 5	Parking	WhollyObject	<p>This is yet another bad proposal by the Traffic Department of Bath City Council. They do not seem to understand how we have to live in Charlcombe Way. The present parking spaces are used by the residents in this narrow no through road who have no where else to park or by visitors to our homes. To make things worse there are also proposals to reduce parking spaces along Solsbury Way and other roads in the area. Where do they expect us to park?!! It is time that the Lib Dem's stopped doing their worst to destroy our lovely City.</p>
Plan 5	Parking	WhollyObject	<p>Vitally need parking space for residents on Charlcombe way and rise as not enough private parking by houses. Double yellow lines are not required on this section of Charlcombe Way. This is a quiet residential street that does not need parking restrictions.</p>
Plan 5	Parking	WhollyObject	<p>Removal of four / five parking spaces essential to neighbours with limited / no parking, parking is already an issue why make it worse. The parked vehicles do slow traffic on Charlcombe Way which helps with pedestrian safety .</p>

Plan 5	Parking	PartlyObject	<p>...and finally, specifically to object to the proposed restriction along a section of Charlcombe Way and also to comment on this TRO in general.</p> <p>This proposal would remove at least 3 parking spaces along a stretch of road which already has had the number of spaces reduced. There are 25 households along Charlcombe Way and Charlcombe Rise, many of whom currently have no alternative but to park in Charlcombe Way or Solsbury Way. By removing 3 spaces will simply increase the number of vehicles needing to park in Solsbury Way or other nearby streets. The reasons for these proposals have been given as: a) for avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising, (c) for facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians) Also, the below paragraph indicates a reason to restrict the parking in narrow sections of the highway – Since the whole of Charlcombe Way is a ‘narrow section of highway’ it is illogical to apply a restriction to part of it with this argument and it would be untenable to restrict parking along the entire length of the road. As for the subsection 122(2) matters: c) the importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and of securing the safety and convenience of persons using or desiring to use such vehicles.</p> <p>Comment: A number of the proposals contained within this Order will restrict parking around junctions, along narrow sections of highway and around bends, which will improve the passage for public transport vehicles if required on these routes. The paragraph below suggests, ‘a local resident’ has requested the removal of 3 parking spaces along Charlcombe Way. I sincerely hope that the views of the other 24 households in the vicinity of this stretch of road, and who may have little choice but to park there, are taken into consideration as this would otherwise seem to be a very un-democratic decision. Plan 5 – Charlcombe Way, Bath – No Parking At Any Time restrictions were requested by the Traffic Management Team on behalf of a local resident to prevent obstruction of the highway. Finally, specifically regarding the Tynning Lane restriction, I would also point out that a 2 hour parking limit outside of the Doctor Surgery in Tynning Lane will not be sufficient for anyone visiting the Surgery as waiting times to be seen at the Surgery are frequently longer than 2 hrs. More pertinent for the overall proposal, most of the proposals shown in this</p>
Plan 5	Parking,Traffic,Financial,Safety	WhollySupport	<p>VYRNWY house has walling that directly fronts the CHARLCOMBE Way road Pavement. (approx 4 car parking places in length and approx 6 feet high. Made in Bath stone faced blocks. This part of the pavement is in constant use with virtually all vehicles (Vans,Cars) negotiating and parking well on the pavement itself.The pavement shows considerable signs of subsidence/wear &amp; tear. The walling shows similar signs, Cracking and movement. To repair or replace the wall will cost a huge sum of money which I will have fund.Safety is another issue. Pedestrians are forced to use th road. This road is used by many walkers. Surely this is an unacceptable situation to allow to continue. I have some photographs, just recently taken; showing the extent of the problem should you wish to see them. I can forward them by return. I've blanked the vehicle registration numbers.</p>

Plan 5	Parking	WhollySupport	<p>Charlcombe Way is a very narrow road , the visibility along the lane is poor due to the bends and inconsistent width , access to the pavement is therefore vital . As a pedestrian there is often little choice but to walk on the road . However due to the number of cars parked bumper to bumper on the narrower than usual pavement it is impossible to avoid oncoming cars and vans as they enter the road at some speed, this is obviously a dangerous situation . Two other situations have arisen from the constant pavement parking . The first concerns the inaccessible a mains water stop value that is situated on the pavement . The second concerns the foundations to both the pavement and perimeter wall , both showing signs of becoming unstable . I would there like to agree with the proposal to remove some of the parking along part of Charlcombe Way due to safety concerns .</p>
Plan 5	Parking,Traffic,Safety	WhollyObject	<p>I am writing to formally object to the proposed implementation of double yellow lines on Charlcombe Way outside my property. As a disabled resident, I rely on the support of my children, who do not live with me but visit regularly to provide essential assistance. My property does not have a driveway or garage, meaning the only available parking for them is along this road.The only alternative parking is on Solsbury way and that is already highly congested, with spaces frequently at full capacity. Removing further parking access will exacerbate this issue, forcing my visitors—and many other residents—to park streets away, making access significantly more difficult, particularly for those with mobility challenges.Additionally, the loss of parking may have a broader negative impact on the community, affecting other residents, visitors, and service providers who depend on this limited space. I urge the council to reconsider this proposal and explore alternative solutions that balance traffic management with the essential needs of local residents.</p>

Plan 5	Parking	WhollyObject	<p>Charlcombe Rise of the proposed yellow lines along Charlcombe Way over the length of the wall along the boundary of Vyrnwy House. This would mean the loss of about 4 parking spaces which are regularly needed by residents. I am also writing to raise concerns about a related issue which is safety for pedestrians along Charlcombe Way. Many of the houses along the two roads do not have reasonable parking space by their houses and so they regularly use the space that you will be taking away. We at Combe House only have one small parking place which is our garage. The garage is modern but built over the ground space of a 1930's original garage. It is therefore narrow and can only fit one small car. There is no parking immediately by our house, the nearest space is in the area you seek to remove. We need two cars, largely for work purposes, so we regularly need the parking space you wish to remove. Are you aware that it is not possible to park anywhere else along Charlcombe Way apart from along that strip at the end of the lane? This section at the end is therefore important to all residents. The roads which are nearest Charlcombe Way and Charlcombe Rise are difficult to park on as well as being a significant distance from many of the houses along the road. Removing parking spaces will have a significant impact residents. Also, I wonder where visitors to our houses will park. I would also like to point out that the parked cars slow down the traffic entering the road. This is important because the road is not suitable for traffic to be rushing along because there are no pavements and some very narrow pavements further along. There are a high number of people walking along the lane as it is a popular route for dog walkers who use the community fields. This raises a related safety concern, traffic leaving the lane is often going too fast as it exits up to the point it has to slow for the parked cars. This is dangerous for people walking in the road. I have had to alert cars to their speed at times when walking along the road past the turning to Charlcombe Rise. I have also felt unsafe at times leaving my property because of vans driving too fast there. The pavement is very narrow, the mirrors on vans are head high and there isn't much space. I have found two dead animals at the front of my property that seem to have been hit by vehicles.</p> <p>I would like to request that ways of reducing the speed of traffic along Charlcombe Way be</p>
Plan 5	Parking	PartlyObject	<p>I strongly object to the parking prohibition proposed for Charlcombe Way. There is already insufficient parking for the residents, their visitors and for tradespeople. To reduce the parking further is nonsensical and just makes life more difficult for the residents. Come and take a look and you'll see how limited parking already is. Moreover, there's no benefit to be gained by losing these parking spaces. It will not be more convenient and it will not be safer. Please let common sense prevail by not removing these parking spaces in Charlcombe Way.</p>

Plan 5	Parking	PartlyObject	<p>Charlcombe Way: The proposal may have been at the request of 'a resident' but will cause significant difficulty and disruption to the other residents of Charlcombe Way AND Charlcombe Rise, with whom no-one has discussed the issue prior to this. The residents who park in the proposed yellow line area have nowhere else to put their vehicles. Nor do visitors have anywhere else to park. Council vehicles are able to pass, as are ambulances, delivery vehicles and even some HGVs. We have even had a fire engine along that stretch of road. I have lived here for many years and have never known obstruction of the highway that is greater than on consultation. appyway.com any of the many hundreds of other narrow roads in Bath. One third of the residents of Charlcombe Rise (with no vehicle access to the houses) do not have a garage in the block below the houses so they, and their visitors, have to park on Charlcombe Way. The only alternative is to park on the footway on Charlcombe Rise itself, which is neither legal nor safe for pedestrians or other road users. This proposal appears to be unnecessary and would be the cause of many problems for the other residents.</p>
Plan 5	Parking,Traffic	PartlyObject	<p>I would like to object to the proposal to introduce additional parking restrictions mid-way along Charlcombe Way. This is a no through road which had provided much needed parking for local residents of Charlcombe Way and Charlcombe Rise for many years without any road safety incidents or unreasonable restriction to traffic. Although the road is narrow, there is very little traffic other than the movement of local residents and deliveries and this functions in a perfectly satisfactory way. Parking spaces are desperately needed for local residents and these restrictions will only add to the pressure on the much busier Solsbury Road and Richmond Heights. It could be argued that this narrow stretch of Charlcombe Way enhances road safety by slowing down any traffic without preventing access to lorries and delivery vans. If any thing, the most useful thing to do along this stretch of road would be to introduce 20mph speed limiters of which, strangely, there are none at the moment. All in all, I do not think this proposal is based on a balanced decision which takes into account the parking needs of local residents against the minor restriction to traffic flow including pedestrians. Instead, it will exacerbate the parking problem on adjoining roads which bear much greater volumes of through traffic. Please reconsider this proposal to restrict residents' parking along Charlcombe Way.</p>