

Plan	ResponderType	FeedbackCategories	OrderSupport	FeedbackText
2	Resident	Parking	Object	My concern is when I bought this property the pull in areas on the deeds were for residents and visitors to this street we have more than 1 car . We struggle to park now as other people from other parts of estate park here also cars are left here sometimes for long periods of time . My husband is a blue badge holder . Can he apply for a disabled bay . Also there is a very lengthy bus stop bay outside which a small bus arrives a couple of times a week is this lengthy bus stop needed . There isn't enough parking g here now this is before restrictions are put in place . You must appreciate most properties have more than one car and visitors .
4	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety, Access	Support	As the disabled blue-badge owner on Clifford Drive, and a retired risk manager, I personally requested the proposed parking restrictions a year ago for two reasons (1) so as I and my neighbour could gain access to our drives and garages, without vehicles blocking the way (2) to allow emergency vehicles (especially fire engines) to access premises at the end of and beyond what is a cul-de-sac, respectively. As a director of the management company, I know that other residents feel similarly about (2). The only people to be "inconvenienced" by the proposal are those who insist on parking in the road near their property rather in their allocated off-road spaces. There is ample space nearby
4	Resident	Parking,Safety	PartlySupport	The parking on this estate is dangerous, we have large vans and cars parking on double yellow lines, by dropped pavements and corners making it dangerous for pedestrians and drivers. Given all the flats have 1 off-road space and the houses have 2 off road spaces, I think the parking restrictions could be extended to cover more of the estate.I've had near misses where cars come round the corner and neither driver can see the other until you've almost clouded.
4	Resident	Parking	PartlyObject	I object to the extension of no parking on Clifford Drive. The parking is already insufficient for the number of homes on the estate and will merely move to issue around the corner.
4	Resident	Parking	PartlyObject	I object to the No waiting at any time at Clifford Drive Paulton. I believe this will not be of any benefit to residents. It will reduce the parking for residents the area as there is already not enough resident parking and encourage people to park in more dangerous and inconvenient areas in the small area.It will lead to more accidents and vehicle damage as people will park and drive recklessly. Reducing the available parking spaces with this no waiting zone will also encourage residents to park in places that will block the road and could prevent emergency services getting to the residents at the bottom of Clifford Drive.
5	Resident	Parking	Support	I am all in favour of the proposal parking restrictions as I live on Gullock Tynning and the parking is getting worse in the evening you can't park anywhere as the people using the sports centre leave there cars every where and it's the same in the High street shop owners park outside their shops and complain about the parking but on a cautious note we need more wardens to enforce the rules as we never see them Yours sincerely Graham Gulliford
5	Resident	Parking,Disturbance	Object	Parking is already a tumultuous issue in the area. With many on my road being forced to park on the highstreet during the week as there's not enough space to go around. Restricted parking for longer hours isnt going to solve the issue. But simply move it to another area of town.
5	Resident	Parking,Access,Disturbance,Financial	Object	Parking is already a borderline impossible situation on South View Place. Implementing more restrictions on parking both on Midsomer Norton High Street and Gullock Tynning will mean that I, along with many others, will not be able to park my car on some days and cause a lot of unnecessary distress. This will also restrict the amount of visitors we can have to our home. I personally believe the consideration of permit holders should be considered prior to more restrictions and may help everyone come to a mutual agreement. If this does go ahead, where do you expect us to park?

5	Resident	Parking	PartlySupport	I live just off Gullock Tynning in Somer Court. I have no objections to the proposals. What does concern me is how these restrictions are going to be enforced. At present, mostly in the evenings, with the increased use of the Dragonfly Sports Centre the parking situation is horrendous cars parked on verges yellow lines in dangerous positions on junctions anywhere there is space. Yet I have never seen any enforcement of this dangerous situation as it is so bad at times that emergency vehicles cannot access the lower end of Gullock Tynning, St Chads surgery and the Somer Centre. This happens throughout Midsomer Norton as there seems to be little if any enforcement. What I would like to know are these new restrictions going to be enforced on a regular basis or just let go at a cost to local residents as it is at present and also is this email just going to be ignored like my contacts with the council have been in the past. A response would be nice on how the enforcement will be carried out.
6	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety	Support	Brilliant ideas!! In particular the extension of parking restrictions "Yellow Lines" on the Fieldways Estate in Paulton involving "Purnell Way". At the top of the estate we have already had two incidents involving vehicles entering the estate at some speed from the roundabout and colliding with vehicles parked at the very top of the estate where thankfully you propose to increase parking restrictions. In addition a number of the "yellow lines" put in place some time ago, have worn away or in my opinion were poorly applied in the first place. I would recommend using a different company and re-instating all the old markings! Difficult I know but I consider it necessary purely for safety.
6	Resident	Parking	Support	I support the parking/waiting restrictions on Purnell Way in Paulton. Is this double yellow lines? If so that's good. Also the others in Paulton, Timsbury and High Littleton, and on the A362 because they are needed as they cause visibility issues.
7	Resident	Parking,Financial	Object	This is a pointless restriction that will only affect residents who live here. People only ever park on one part of the proposed restriction; in two years I have never seen anyone park on the other corner ever or park in anyway that would cause a safety issue. No one parks on the pavement opposite for any length of time as the lane isn't wide enough. Although blocking the pavement when people park in one direction each side it leads to the lane with no pavement- this is more unsafe especially as cars don't stick to 20 limit and speed up here at 40-50mph. We won't be able to get deliveries as vans would need to park too far away from our houses, elderly neighbours get their shopping delivered but the van won't be able to stop outside, many of the terraces only have one parking space but more than one vehicle which is a necessity as public transport is so poor. When people visit them where are they supposed to park as scobells already has limited spaces due to driveways and dropped pavements. The terraces already struggle when trades need to do work as they can't get vans outside these houses (including curo) so how will that work? I assume this has been designed by someone who doesn't know the area and doesn't live here. Surely there are better things you could be spending your money on.
8	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety, Access	PartlySupport	I would like the proposal to consider extending the double yellow lines in front of Micela house too, as cars can also block visibility and access at that level. Cars parked there by give way island also blocks the visibility, also people speed to pull in front of our drive between the give way island and cars parked making it difficult to pull out of our drive safely. The cars parked around the drive makes it also impossible to see on coming traffic and the on coming traffic can't see us trying pull out so making it very unsafe. We had quite a few near misses.
8	Resident	Parking	Object	Parking already causes lots of problems in this part of Tunley, if you remove the parking from opposite Stoneage lane up to the existing chicane people will not be able to park at all, so more cars will be bunched together in the middle of Tunley, causing far more hazardous driving conditions
8	Resident	Parking,Safety	Object	There is limited parking in Tunley, this will cause additional difficulties in finding safe parking places given the number of residents that have cars. You will be aware there is very little practical public transport in Tunley so the use of a car is important to many residents including me. I believe preventing parking this area will add to parking elsewhere in the village and cause a greater risk to the public as people will be forced to park in areas not suitable that will in turn make it dangerous.

8	Resident	Parking	Object	I see no reason to disrupt the limited parking we have in this village even further. The proposal covers residents of 3 houses, I house has 4 cars, 1 has 2 and the other house is currently for sale, so this small village will need to accommodate circa 6+ cars in other areas which I believe will cause more issues as residents struggle to park.
8	Resident	Parking	Object	I object to the proposal for the no parking at any time in Tunley as it will cause significant hardship for the residence of the immediate area. There is already limited parking in Tunley and this will restrict even further causing residents to park in other areas of the village. I have not seen any evidence of accidents for the area and would be good to understand if this has been an accident 'hot spot' in the past.
9	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety, Access,Disturbance,Financial,Environmental	Object	I object passionately but as with all this pointless consultation you will just go ahead with what you want, roll on the next election where you will be wiped out
9	Resident	Parking	PartlyObject	The houses we live in are old cottages with some having parking for only one vehicle, meaning houses with 2 or more vehicles have nowhere to park other than the road. Whilst i agree the traffic does get bad along the road on the odd occasion it is generally not to bad. I think banning parking on chilcompton road/ laburnum road will only make the surrounding roads alot busier as people will need to park there cars somewhere.
9	Resident	Parking	PartlySupport	I am writing to raise a concern regarding parking on the section of council-owned land directly beside my property of 14 Chilcompton Road. Historically a tree had been planted in the centre of this space, which naturally limited how often vehicles could park there. Since the tree was removed a couple of years ago, parking has gradually increased again, and a neighbouring resident has recently resumed using the area regularly. With the possibility of further parking restrictions being introduced on Chilcompton and Laburnum Grove (TRO Review 26-050), I am concerned that this council-owned land may see even more frequent parking. This would have a direct impact on the immediate surroundings of my home and potentially create ongoing issues with access, noise, and general use of the space. In addition, when vehicles are parked on this land, it creates difficulties with visibility when exiting my driveway. The parked car(s) obstruct the line of sight, making it harder and less safe to pull out onto the road. I have attached a photo which shows Zone A & B as outlined by the council. This area runs parallel to double yellow lines, and I have previously been advised by the council that parking in Zone A is not permitted. I would like to suggest a simple and practical measure that could help prevent inappropriate parking, while still allowing maintenance access. Installing a few large boulders around the edges of the grassed area would stop cars and larger vehicles from using the space, while still leaving sufficient room for grass cutters and council maintenance teams to carry out their work. I would be grateful if the council could review the situation and advise whether any measures can be considered to prevent excessive parking on this land. I am happy to provide further photographs or details if helpful.

10	Councillor	Parking	Object	The cumulative effect of the Berkeley Avenue and Vivien Avenue proposals is likely to result in a significant increase in displaced parking on Clevedon Road and surrounding streets. I do not believe the combined impact of these proposals has been adequately assessed. Before any intervention is progressed, a full and detailed assessment should be undertaken to consider existing parking demand, displacement effects, road safety implications, and the impact on nearby residents. I also note that the report states that these proposals were brought forward at the request of a ward councillor. For the avoidance of doubt, I was not the ward councillor who made that request. I apologise for the late submission of this objection, but the contents of the report and the reference to ward councillor support only came to my attention within the past week. In summary, both proposals would have a negative impact on the area by creating additional and unnecessary parking pressures and reducing accessibility to Wellow Brook Walk for some residents. The displacement of vehicles onto less suitable positions within Vivien Avenue and Berkeley Avenue is likely to increase congestion and, in some locations, create visibility issues for residents accessing their driveways. There is also likely to be a detrimental impact on surrounding cul-de-sacs through additional displaced parking.
10 and 11	Resident	Parking,Access	Object	Wrt the the planned parking restrictions on Vivien Avenue and Berkley Avenue in Midsomer Norton. Firstly, please let me state my interest. I live on Clevedon Road, between the two suggested parking restrictions. The displaced cars will be parked around my house, probably blocking access to my driveway, difficult enough already with cars parked opposite it. My wife and I are pensioners, and would find this very difficult. On a wider scale, the cars parking on Vivien Avenue are used by those using the new Wellow Stream Park (probably a slightly different name but it's too hot to check it now), typically as dog walkers. They will now be forced to park outside houses. The parking of these cars forces a single traffic lane, which slows traffic on a 90 degree blind bend. They are a public utility parking there! On Berkeley Avenue, the parking is used by residents of "upper" Clevedon Road, many of whom do not have parking facilities, and by users of Welton Rovers football club at adjacent West Clewes. There is parking next to the field, but clearly not enough. Welton Rovers clubhouse is frequently used for funeral wakes and both Road areas are used for parking. Don't get me started on children's parties. In short, I am objecting because the proposed changes will make things considerably more difficult for local residents and visitors alike, while in my opinion reducing road safety. Please do not go ahead with them even if local councillors have recommended it. I would be grateful if you could give me their names so that I can make personal representations to them.
11	Councillor	Parking	Object	The area in question provides significant parking for both residents and visitors. This includes visitors to Wellow Brook, a council nature facility that actively encourages public use through the provision of seating and picnic areas. The parking available on Vivien Avenue is extensively used, including by residents with mobility issues. The proposed restrictions would have a significant detrimental impact on both Vivien Avenue and Clevedon Road by displacing vehicles into less suitable sections that are already congested and oversubscribed for parking. The proposal therefore risks worsening parking pressures for existing residents while reducing accessibility to Wellow Brook. In my view, the proposal does not appear to be supported by a sufficiently detailed assessment of local parking patterns and the likely displacement effects. I would therefore ask that the council reconsider these restrictions and undertake a fuller assessment of parking demand, accessibility impacts, and displacement before proceeding.
11	Resident	Parking,Traffic	PartlyObject	The proposed extension to parking restrictions along Vivien Avenue will only serve to make access to the Norton-Radstock Greenway harder for those who wish (or need) to arrive by car. They will be forced to park further along the road, where opportunities are limited by the number of driveways there. This has been a more pressing need in recent hot weather, where many motorists sought to park as close to the corner as possible to allow rapid access to shady pathways for the purpose of their own enjoyment of facilities, dog walking, etc. Please don't take away something that is beneficial to the community, for the sake of removing a few parking opportunities in what is a very lightly used road.

11	Resident	Parking	Object	i have lived at no 3 for 40 years and have and parked opposite with no issues .most cars parking are dog walkers some very elderly who live in the far end of the estate and cant walk the whole way .surely people should be encouraged to use the greenway and picnic benches. ther is no houses its a 20 limit so traffics moving slowly .why change something that has worked fine for years .at the risk of people parking in front of bungalows in vivien ave and st marks causing all sorts of issues .i spoke to several people today and some only stay for 20 minutes.
11	Resident	Traffic	Object	The proposed addition parking ban on the corner of Clevedon Road with Vivien Avenue is totally unnecessary. I have never encountered a problem at this location. I believe that the proposal will cause unnecessary parking problems and object to this proposal. At the most extending the parking ban by another car length by the electric sub station would be acceptable, it does not need extending any further. I am concerned that this proposal will move parking towards my and neighbouring properties restricting views on pulling out onto the road, Also if cars park opposite my drive it makes it very difficult to manouver back onto my drive. This a 20mph area so cars should be going slow enough to not require the parking restrictions.
11	Resident	Parking	Object	I am writing to object to the proposed permanent parking restriction outside the electricity sub station. I have lived in Beaufort Avenue for 39 years and walk this part of Vivian Avenue on my way to the High Street. I really can't understand the need for the parking restriction as I see it used by walkers accessing the Greenway and the Wellow Brook walk. Whoever has thought up this proposed parking restriction must be anti car which mode of transport is needed by the less mobile in our community. What I find particularly annoying is that parking in this part of Vivian Avenue isn't a traffic hazard when the BANES highway's deemed it unnecessary to implement parking restrictions at the top of Beaufort Avenue (BA3 2TG) when drivers entering our estate are blind to traffic coming up Beaufort Avenue because of cars parked on the bend. Last week I had to reverse twice to give way to upcoming traffic because of parking at the top of the avenue. But then I just don't understand the political thinking of BANES. Anyway I object to the totally unnecessary parking restriction in Vivian Avenue.
11	Resident	Parking	PartlyObject	There is no justification for preventing parking outside of the sub station at Vivien Avenue, this small strip of the road is used constantly by families and dog walkers making use of both the Greenway and nature walk. I vehemently object to this proposal.
11	Resident	Parking	Object	As a resident of vivien avenue. I've never experienced any type of distribution with the on street parking. Furthermore we have people come to visit our young family. Some of our visitors are disabled, or have young children. Taking parking away on our street will put unnecessary stress on them and our family.
11	Resident	Parking	PartlyObject	I object to the proposal to introduce 'no parking at any time' restrictions on Vivien Avenue (Midsomer Norton). I am a resident on this road and have never experienced any issues with parking. The majority of residents on this road use driveways to park their vehicles and bar the odd dog walker parking on the road the only other vehicles that would appear to ever park here are visitors to the residential addresses. I see no need for such restrictions to be put in place and cannot believe this is even being considered.
12	Resident	Parking,Safety	Neutral	I moved here just 3weeks ago and was totally unaware of this proposal, if I had known I would not have purchased the property. I suffer from aggro phobia brought on from being nearly killed by a speeding car outside my house in Southdown Bath. I choose this house because I can park directly outside my front door (I do not have a garage or driveway) and I can leave the safety of my car and be inside my house in seconds. Therefore any further restrictions to parking will severely impact on my life. Please also note that the pharmacy is open 7 days a week and is well used by many elderly/ infirm residents and they all need to park whilst attending consultations/picking up prescriptions

12	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety	Object	The restrictions proposed for the High Street, Timsbury are insignificant why are you allowing the sharp bend to be unrestricted when that is where the the worst of the parking takes place 24 hours a day when has it ever been ok to park on a bend? The only time the proposed parking restrictions is anyway an issue is when the chip shop is open and that's AFTER the restrictions are over! So therefore will have little effect except take away the only parking the 5 houses have all you are doing is penalising residents from parking outside their own house with no option to convert their front garden into driveways putting your head in the sand and pretending this will solve everything is naive and irresponsible. Public Transport is almost nonexistent and completely unreliable you are creating more problems and solving nothing and yet the council have approved a 2nd and 3rd housing development creating more traffic, more cars and less and less parking
12	Resident	Parking,Safety,Other	Support	Finally! This is a great idea - the pavement just opposite the "old chemist", like opposite side of the big post box is ALWAYS damaged from cars mounting the road to squeeze past, also have seen many cars scrape each other. I have also been DRIVEN INTO as a pedestrian, while walking down the pavement! I have also been driven at while walking on the pavement from cars mounting the pavement. This area is carnage at the moment, so yes FULLY SUPPORT this proposal, on safety grounds, and that it will save the BANES taxpayer money from not having to repair the pavement and drains every single year from car damage.
13	Resident	Parking	Support	The 'no parking on verge (presumably including pavements) at any time' is a very good proposal. There are nearly always vans and cars parked on the pavement outside our gate. Delivery drivers are often unable to use this gate and Valerie, who now uses a wheelchair is unable to use it at all. The situation is at its worst during evenings and weekends when the vehicles are not being used. However, this restriction will create another problem in that those currently parking as above will now move around the corner to positions outside our side gate, where we park our only car. We park here because of our disabilities and need to be as near to the car as possible. I have significant back and leg problems and Valerie is unable to walk more than a few steps (she is a 'Blue Badge' holder) We do have a short driveway but keeping on 'our' side of the drive means one of us is unable to get in or out of the car (depending on forward or reverse parking), as we both need our door fully open, which is impossible in the driveway. What we should like, and would be a considerable help, would be a dedicated 'D I S A B L E D' parking space outside our back gate, as they have in nearby Wesley Avenue (we would willingly be prepared to meet the cost of the required work, if reasonable).

16	Resident	Parking,Traffic	PartlyObject	Location: Catherine Way Batheaston. Grounds for opportunity missed of better ease of traffic and health services location change of dedicated disabled bays. Whilst recognizing the new proposal to remove of some yellow lines to help the residents of Catherine Way which we have a wide variety of occupations who seem to be the back bone of a lot of Baths needs. From Drs, shift nurses and carers to plumber's electricians, shop workers, Banes staff from SENCOs to social workers, which we know hardly any one works nine to five any more. This has been forward thinking from the Parish. I do have a couple of objections and a request for an amended proposal which I hope the committee will take into consideration. Attached are three photographs of the only slip ways on the odd numbers of this lower side of Catherine Way. (and scout hut). All the way to the emergency gate in the cul de sac. Picture 178: is by the slip way by no. 19. There is no pavement on opposite side. Picture 179: is by house 21. The occupant uses a mobility scooter. Is, and does, continue onto the path that leads down muddy lane past the Scout hut to Batheaston Primary School and our new village hall. Which if free in the future to allow people to attend events at the village hall, parents evenings or even to cast their vote. Our village hall only has a few parking spaces. Picture 180: (between houses 49 and 51 with a large green open space) is not as steep green bank with concrete steps. If we have any money could this not be a slip way too. I'm sure we could help fund raise, and our Parish Council request grants from various disability charities to build a gentle slope down and help with our medical services when transporting our poorly residents needing to go to hospital. Most middle houses in Catherine Way terraces are known to be bed blockers (shared stairs and two 90° angles before the front door). This will help ease of access for those disabled or not that sure on their feet, while still feeling part of our great community. I therefore propose that the dedicated disabled bays are put either side of these slopes. (Total two). The single track road is slightly larger on the curve by the slopes next to numbers 19 and 21. There is no pavement opposite. It has a wider area for the disabled to walk, use a wheel chair or walking frame and not a steep bank of steps with a hand rail to navigate around. If we could have the stairs (49-51) turned into a slope in the future that would be three in total. I'm looking at the demographic age range and future needs of this estate. A dedicated bay restricting road width outside number 39 I feel will continue to restrict deliveries and the general flow of the traffic. The bus often has to mount the pavement and drop off the curb which is not helping our road. My second proposal/request is to emphasize very clearly that a dedicated parking bay does not belong to a single person who is driving a disabled person or is disabled themselves. I feel this defeats the whole principal of a blue badge dedicated parking space open to anyone meeting the criteria for a blue badge and this should be strongly enforced. Having two by both current slopes will also help with visiting family members. I say this having witnessed quite frequently during school term time a highly emotive reaction to any one parking in the current courtesy bay. Even though the no. 8 BANES bus is used to transport the young man to school. I am currently under the care of Somerset, Wiltshire, Avon and Gloucestershire yearly Lung screening program. I have been since 2nd September 2022. First told in January 2023 I was entitled to a Blue Badge which I declined. However, I am realistic that I will need to apply in the future. I'm also aware that a couple of my neighbours have
16	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety, Access	Object	Please see appended letter - objection.

17	Resident	Parking	Object	I am writing to object to the Council's minimalist proposal to introduce 'No Parking At Any Time' restrictions on a very small length of New Road, Freshford adjacent to the junction with Dark Lane/Freshford Lane/High Street. The Council's proposal will have little impact on the increasing traffic congestion and associated road safety issues on New Road between the hours of 0830hrs and 0930hrs and between 1500hrs and 1600hrs on school days. The number of vehicles parked in New Road and other roads adjacent to Freshford School has increased substantially over the last five years as the school has had to recruit pupils from a wider and wider geographical area to maintain student numbers and the associated income – the substantial increase in the catchment area of the school has led to a much greater proportion of pupils travelling to and from Freshford School by private car. The traffic congestion in New Road, particularly on school day afternoons, has already led to the Council withdrawing the bus which provides 'home-to-school' transport between Freshford and Ralph Allen School from six stopping points in the village forcing students to have to walk to and from the A36 Warminster Road and to cross that very busy trunk road with a forty or sixty mile per hour speed limit once daily. The two minibuses which provide 'home-to-school' transport to and from Freshford School are frequently delayed in New Road due to the traffic congestion caused by parked vehicles. There are currently two separate 'white line' markings, separated by a 'gap', on the east side of New Road immediately north of the junction with Dark Lane/Freshford Lane/High Street. Parking is 'endemic' on the white lines, leading to congestion and road safety issues caused by the narrowness and curvature of the southern section of New Road; badly parked and over-sized vehicles parked in the 'gap' between the two 'white line' sections also cause similar issues of congestion and road safety concerns. I would propose that the Council extends the proposed 'No Parking At Any Time' restrictions for New Road to include both the existing 'white line' sections and the gap between the two sections – this would not cause inconvenience to the residents of Tynning View, who have vehicular access to their property from Dark Lane. The Council should additionally paint new 'white lines' across the entrances to both 'Trees' and to 'West House' to enable residents of these properties to have greater success in maintaining vehicular access to and from their properties and to provide 'passing places' on New Road. It has been common, during the last academic year, to have vehicles parked continuously on the east side of New Road between the junctions with Church Lane/Crowe Lane/Dark Lane and Dark Lane/Freshford Lane/High Street, thereby making the entire length of New Road a 'single lane road with no passing places'!
18	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety	Object	The double yellow lines proposal for Priston Lane and Hight Street in Priston does not tackle the problem. More signs detailing 20mph, or speed bumps may be more beneficial as the village suffers from speeding drivers. A better junction layout would be the best long term solution for visibility, by pushing the Hill Vw give way at the end of the Tunley road further down away from the difficult corner in question. This would give drivers better visibility looking left up the road as they arrive at the junction. I have attached a drawing for reference.
18	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety	Object	I am against yellow lines in Priston village.
18	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety	Object	I disagree with yellow lines in priston village.
18	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety	Object	I disagree with the implementation of yellow lines .I have lived in the village many years and i don't believe it to be an accident hotspot, other measures could be taken such as solid lines stopping traffic before pulling out, surrounding hedges cut back in line with actual road and the introduction of a "junction ahead" type sign on watery line so traffic speed is slowed.

18	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety	Object	I object to the proposal for the double yellow lines in Priston. I'd much rather see more concerted efforts to tackle the speeding through the centre of the village which feels like an increasing problem. While visibility is not ideal on that corner, it feels this could be addressed by other means such as a mirror, and wouldn't be an issue if the speed limits were adhered to. Parking is already difficult in the centre of the village and indeed elsewhere in the village. Many residents in the vicinity of the proposed double yellow lines do not have driveways and so need to park on the road, some are elderly or have small children, and therefore ideally need to be able to park as close to their homes as possible. Spaces in this area are also used by visitors to the pub, the Village Hall, the church, the local shoot, etc, and as far as I can see this is only set to increase. Thank you for taking my response into consideration.
18	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety	Object	I would prefer NOT to see yellow lines used in the streets/lanes around Priston. I can see that it might be useful and more safe if the current white lines around the corner linking Priston (watery) lane to the High Street were extended a little but leaving space for a car to be parked down the lane from the disabled space therefore allowing for one extra space. Parking is at a premium in Priston and has already been stated sensibly parked cars on the High Street encourage traffic to reduce speed. We have a 20MPH advisory through the village. If all traffic complied with this speed limit, including Cars and Bicycles, I think the streets would be safe. Extra reminders of the speed limit as traffic comes into the main part of the high street would be useful in my opinion.
18	Other	Parking,Traffic,Safety	Object	I am not a resident of Priston of course so I am not sure if I am entitled to a say on the matter of yellow lines in Priston, but I am responsible for a major piece of architecture and community asset in the village - the parish church. My concern is that an increase of yellow lines will make parking for weddings and funerals even more difficult than it currently is in the village and may cause some potential wedding couples to look elsewhere, which would be a great pity- not just for the church, but for the significant income such parties bring to the Ring O' Bells pub! May also affect use of the village hall for events and functions.

18	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety, Access,Disturbance,Other	Object	Regarding possible installation of double yellow lines-...Having been a resident of PRISTON for more than 30 years, I have seen the effects that an increase in the number of vehicles, and the size of vehicles, both private , farming and commercial has had upon the village and its roads.The roads are narrow -single track in many areas and we suffer with a great many pot holes, ruts and loose gravel, where flooding has damaged and lifted or washed away the road surface. Blind corners where visibility can be poor due to hedging or just because of the age of the road layout. We are, after all lucky enough to live in an area of rural natural beauty, that has been farmed and inhabited for hundreds of years. Motorists speed through our village, ignoring the speed advisory signs, in a bid to avoid traffic issues elsewhere. At times it is ONLY the parked cars at the side of the road that makes drivers slow down!! They seem to have no care for, or awareness of pedestrians, horse riders, cyclists, huge farm vehicles, flocks of sheep, herds of cows or children playing.On street parking is very limited and residents who don't have driveways, struggle to park their own cars, let alone cars for family, guests and, for example health caregivers. I feel that putting double yellow lines along the main(ish) road would push the problem out to other areas where there are no pavements, only grass verges, which are torn up and become unsightly, dangerous and unusable particularly in the winter. Forcing people to park on the surrounding lanes/roads, like around the corner at Hill view and Priston Lane , would make it practically impossible for the emergency services to get to those residents.. A lot of Priston's villagers are elderly or infirm. I myself have a blood cancer that can cause strokes- I need to know that I have 24/7 access to my home for an ambulance. People don't want to have to park their car then walk any distance to get home. We don't have- OR want street lighting but, as a woman it can be very scary walking home at night.. not to mention for anyone with children, shopping or luggage to carry at any time of the day.I am NOT in favour of double yellow lines for the above reasons. I feel more should perhaps be done to reduce the speed of vehicles passing through, not penalising the villagers who live , work in and love our village. Many thanks for reading this.
18	Resident	Parking,Traffic	PartlySupport	I'm in favour of double yellow lines in some areas of Priston village but feel the current proposal is too extensive.
18	Resident	Parking	Object	I object to the Yellow Lines proposal in Priston. The lines will be an eye sore and will also cause more safety issues with cars being able to travel to fast on the lower part of high street without vehicles parked there.
18	Resident	Parking	Object	Ref - the junction of the High Street and Priston Lane in Priston. I feel strongly that there is no need for a double yellow line in this location. The advisory white line is adhered to most of the time and could perhaps be extended by one more parking space length to improve safety. Some people think the yellow lines will improve safety due to increased visibility, others think that parked cars in that location will have a great effect on safety as they will slow the traffic down. I agree with the latter opinion and given that parking is limited in the village, and apparently set to worsen in coming years, I think the option of parking should be available in this location. The residents who live near to and use the parking available in this location (or who will be negatively impacted by displacement parking in event of double yellows) are all in agreement that there should not be a double yellows. It seems that those keen for double yellows are those residents who have their own off street parking and do not need to use that location for any of their parking needs. They unreasonably think that the residents that use the spaces should be content to walk up to 100-200m away from their residence to park their vehicle .

18	Resident	Parking	Object	Reference PRISTON 26-050. I do not have a parking problem as I have parking on my property but I am concerned with the speed on the High Street through Priston which I do not think will be rectified by double yellow lines on Priston Lane/High Street. I live just round the bend on the High Street and several times driving out of my driveway I have encounter cars and vans speeding round the corner of the High Street. Please find a solution to enforcing the 20 mph limit. I support a STOP sign and single white line at the junction of Priston Lane and most of all cut back the hedge on the corner which blocks the visibility when turning left into the High Street, and install a convex mirror opposite the triangle of grass. By removing parked vehicles it will only increase the speed of traffic through the village and safety of residents. As visibility is the complaint I have suggested the above and would like you to know I have lived here for 38 years, the roads cannot be increased in width, but we have not had any excessive problems that cannot be resolved by the village email giving us advanced notice of farm machinery etc passing through, and this successfully works. I would point out the pinch point is higher up Hill View, High Street and not where the cars are parked at present before the disabled bay as there is a passing place available.
18	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety, Disturbance	PartlyObject	I would like to respond on behalf of part of this consultation occurring in Priston as a resident of the village. I do not agree with the proposed double yellow lines, it will not be useful to any resident and will mean that cars will have to park in other areas of the village causing further congestion. In a rural village such as this, double yellow lines are pointless and people should use common sense when parking. I appreciate the consideration but believe that it will not be useful in any area of Priston. Thank you.
18	Resident	Parking	Object	There is a strong perception amongst local residents that the proposal has been driven, at least in part, by a personal dispute or vendetta involving certain members of the Parish Council, rather than by an objective assessment of road safety, traffic management and the wider interests of the village. The proposed restrictions may benefit a relatively small number of people at the particular location, but they will adversely affect a much larger number of residents who currently have no alternative but to park on the road. Residents should not be placed in a position where they are effectively required to find private parking when no reasonable alternative exists. The introduction of blanket restrictions in such circumstances risks disproportionately affecting elderly residents, families, visitors, carers, tradespeople and other people who depend upon being able to park close to their homes. I believe that the interests of the whole village must take precedence over the interests of a small number of individuals. The introduction of double yellow lines should only proceed where there is a clear, demonstrable and objectively assessed public benefit that outweighs the significant inconvenience and disadvantage imposed upon other residents. For these reasons, I strongly object to the proposed double yellow lines and request that the proposal is rejected, or at the very least reconsidered following a full and impartial assessment of its consequences for the wider village community.
18	Resident	Parking,Safety	Object	My objection relates to the double yellow lines proposed at the junction of High Street/Watery Lane Priston. There has not been a proper consultation with the residents affected - the decision has been made by the Parish Council and all other options have been dismissed and not actively investigated. I believe that there will be an increase in vehicle speeds through the High Street if the existing parking is changed. There has been one accident at this pinch point recently - not caused by poor visibility but excessive speed. There is no evidence to support that this is an accident hot spot. Furthermore there is a serious lack of on street parking available within the centre of the village and reducing parking spaces in other areas will only create more problem areas - especially around the pub and village hall which already sees an abundance of inconsiderate parking that creates access and safety issues for residents and more recently the very much needed local bus.

18	Resident	Safety	Support	The corner is very difficult to see around and vehicles parking too close to the corner or on the existing white line make it almost impossible to see around. Any parked vehicle too close to the corner or on the existing white lines also results in pedestrians having to walk around these vehicles, in the middle of the road, as there is no footpath. The pedestrians are often elderly and not able to move quickly if there are cars approaching. The addition of yellow lines should prevent vehicles parking too close to the corner and therefore increase visibility around the corner for approaching vehicles and provide space for pedestrians to walk around the corner in relative safety
18	Resident	Other	PartlyObject	I would like to see the proposal paused as the opinion amongst villagers is very divided. I feel further local consultations are required since the current proposal means reducing more parking places than had been previously discussed.
18	Resident	Safety	Object	Having double yellow lines will mean cars will speed up and it will mean traffic will drive faster through Priston . Outside our house further along cars slow down if we are parked on the road. There will not be enough space for all residents to park if that space is taken with lines.
18	Resident	Parking	Object	The double yellows will not make the road any safer and nor will it solve the parking issues in the village.
18	Resident	Parking	PartlyObject	26-050 PRISTON However, I support double yellow lines at the junction Priston Lane/High Street extending 10m from the corner towards the disabled bay, but leaving some space for parking before the disabled bay. Additional suggestions to deal with the complaint of 'lack of visibility at the corner': replace the broken white lines at the junction with a solid white line and add STOP signage. Cutting back the overgrown hedges etc on the corner (which extends over the verge to the white line) would instantly improve visibility. Another resident could install convex mirror to enhance visibility and safety.If the dbl extends to the disabled bay this will remove invaluable parking spaces which is significant because of the lack of parking in the High Street. I am not aware of any congestion or access issues, no problems with HGV traffic, public transport or waste management caused by the existing parking. However, I am very concerned parking will be displaced to other busy areas and unfortunately may increase speeds and reduce safety. Safety of all is a huge concern. I have lived in the village for 29 years. My home is two down from the junction. We have no pavements, no on street parking, no street lights. Although we have a 20 mph limit speeding is a big problem and I am worried removing the parking spaces will encourage people to pass faster through the village as vehicles will have a clear run (at certain times of the day we are used as a short cut). The parked vehicles definitely help slow traffic and protect pedestrians and children and I witness this daily.
18	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety	Support	Regarding the Highways Department recommendation for no waiting restrictions at the junction of Priston Lane and High Street, please record that as a Priston resident and pedestrian, cyclist and motorist, I am wholeheartedly in favour. There are no pavements around this junction so pedestrians, including very young children and elderly wheelchair users with their carers, are forced to use the road. Their safety must be prioritised over car parking, and the Highways Department has the most expertise on this subject. There have already been accidents here, I am grateful that the parish council has sought help to alleviate the problem.
18	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety	Support	I support parking restrictions proposed around the junction of Priston high street and watery Lane. I believe we should be prioritising the safety of pedestrians and other road users over car parking.

18	StakeholderGroup	Parking,Traffic,Safety	Support	Priston Parish Council Response to TRO-26-050: 1. The Priston Parish council support the creation of a double yellow line at the junction between Priston High St and Priston Lane as detailed in TRO 26-050. 2. The Parish Council considers that the proposal will • Increase pedestrian safety for pedestrians negotiating this section of the highway which has no footpath. • Increase safety for vehicles traversing this corner, particularly when proceeding west towards the village green • Increase the safety for emergency vehicles accessing this part of High St • Increase the safety for large and farm vehicles traversing this section of the highway. 3. The Parish Council has recently conducted a survey of parking spaces in the village and is aware that the proposal will reduce the number of spaces available which is detrimental to residents in the immediate area. Reducing the proposed length of the line to reduce the loss of parking to one space may still satisfy the safety issues outlined above. 4. The Parish Council acknowledges that there is a speed issue on this section of High St, particularly in the downhill easterly direction. We have requested 20mph signage on the roadway and roundels on the telegraph posts along all the village streets, but as yet none has been forthcoming from Banes. We have also requested speed cushions to be introduced on High St, Banes has responded stating that at the present time it would be unlikely to provide these without further justification work. 5. It is generally acknowledged that parked vehicles can be used to deter speeding by other road users. Several parishioners commented about poor visibility exiting Watery Lane/Priston Lane onto the High St on account of the number (and height) of vehicles that park at or near this junction. The Parish Council believe reducing the number of vehicles will outweigh the potential increase in speed as the increased visibility around this specific corner will allow both vehicles and pedestrians to have greater time to respond to any speeding vehicles, giving a significant advantage over the current 'blind' corner created by vehicles parking within 10m of the corner.
----	------------------	------------------------	---------	---

18	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety, Access	Object	I am writing to formally object to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) introducing double yellow lines/parking restrictions in Priston.As a parishioner and academic researcher specialising in data and research methodology, I am submitting this objection on the grounds that the local consultation and evidence base supporting this request are procedurally flawed, methodologically invalid, and contaminated by a clear conflict of interest. B&NES Council should not act on or implement a statutory order founded on a compromised process.Grounds for Objection1. Procedural Unfairness & Unmanaged Conflict of Interest• The local driver behind this TRO request, the "Priston Parking Survey 2026," was overseen and directed by Priston Parish Council's designated Roads and Highways Representative; who is a local commercial farmer. • Because the councillor's commercial operations stand to directly benefit from cleared village roads and restricted street parking for agricultural transit, allowing them to lead and influence the traffic consultation process introduces apparent bias and predetermination. • Under UK administrative law, public authority decisions or proposals contaminated by procedural bias or unmanaged conflicts of interest are legally vulnerable to challenge. B&NES Council should not adopt a TRO originating from a procedurally compromised parish process.2. Flawed and Unscientific Evidence Base. The Parish Council's supporting survey report falls far short of basic public sector consultation standards:• Confirmation & Framing Bias: The consultation materials used leading, inherently negative framing (e.g., "suffers from", "causing stress") rather than objective assessment criteria. • Non-Response & Sampling Bias: The survey suffered from a 28% non-response rate (24 of 84 households unreturned), yet the Parish Council drew definitive, unvalidated conclusions regarding village-wide consensus. • Selective Reporting & Outlier Focus: Qualitative feedback was selectively reported to support parking restrictions, and findings relied heavily on extreme traffic outliers (peak event days) rather than baseline conditions. • Absence of Raw Data Verification: Priston Parish Council has not released the anonymised raw dataset or qualitative coding criteria for independent verification. A formal Freedom of Information (FOI) request and complaint have been lodged regarding this data.3. Unintended Local Impact• The proposed restrictions do not resolve underlying access issues; rather, they displace parking onto narrower, secondary village lanes, creating secondary safety hazards for emergency services and residents.Requested Action B&NES Council has a legal duty to base statutory Traffic Regulation Orders on robust, fair, and objective public consultation. Given that the local parish process underpinning this request is subject to formal governance complaints, FOI requests, and clear procedural bias, I urge B&NES Highways to:1.Reject or pause this TRO proposal in its current form. 2.Refuse to rely on the Priston Parish Council 2026 Parking Survey as a valid representation of community mandate.3.Require an independent, objective assessment conducted directly by B&NES Highways Officers should highway restrictions be considered in the future.
18	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety	PartlyObject	TRO-26-050 Priston Lane/High Street, PristonI object to any yellow lines being painted on the village road. I would support other safety measures for slowing traffic, for instance, a STOP sign at the junction and 20mph signs on lamposts, reminding drivers as they come through the village. Longer yellow lines past where the white lines already exist will surely create more parking problems for residents and visitors.
18	Visitor	Parking,Traffic,Safety, Access,Disturbance	Object	I am against this proposal as a regular visitor to friends in the village, this will limit parking availability. I am also concerned about professionals visiting residents, such as nurses, doctors, carers etc, as this will have a huge impact on them, and their patients.

18	Resident	Parking	PartlyObject	I object to the area of restricted parking on the corner being extended because I don't believe that this will reduce the speed of vehicles on either road. I think keeping the extended area clear at all times will embolden drivers to continue at higher speeds because they believe that they can see far enough ahead & vehicles coming from Priston Lane will not stop at the junction. The cars that currently park in the areas you wish to extend no parking into actually act as a 'brake' on potential speeding as the road narrows to one lane in that stretch. If you wish to slow traffic down through Priston you need to consider other options such as more signs, speed pillows & LED speed reminder signs that actually measure a vehicle's speed. I am sure that most villagers would welcome consultation on these measures. Our village has more traffic travelling through it now than it ever has & limited footpaths so traffic calming & speed restrictions are key to retaining its character. Enforcing an extended area of no parking on this corner will not address these issues.
18	Resident	Parking,Traffic	Object	Double yellow line at the junction of Priston High Street and Priston Lane will remove much needed parking spaces. NO discussions with the a broad representation of residents have taken place. The real issue in this intersection and throughout the village is NOT one of safety but of SPEED. Cars, vans, taxis and bicycles are zooming past the village. Removing spaces is very likely to encourage increase speeds through the village. I am a witness of this as I live in the middle of the straight road (high street) before it reaches the junction. When just a few cars or no cars at all are parked on the road between Village Farm and the junction, cars, vans, motorbikes, taxis, and bicycles almost systematically speed. We must have a proper, realistic consultation and NOT a knee jerk reaction.
18	Resident	Safety	Object	I fully support increasing safety on Priston roads, but believe the current TRO does not achieve that. Parked vehicles help slow traffic and protect pedestrians, as GOV.UK/ Homes England guidance recognises. On street parking can be used to calm traffic, narrow streets, reduce speed and control vehicle forward visibility. The proposal means parking will be displaced to other parts of the village, meaning residents walking further to their cars on a potentially faster road. The proposal has the potential to make life more difficult for residents, visitors and carers. Any changes to current arrangements should be evidence- based and after proper consultation with residents. If the recent bicycle/ van collision in the subject area is relied on, I would point out that this was caused wholly by the excessive speed of the bicycle, who collided with the vehicle coming from Priston High Street and not from Priston Lane.; it had nothing to do with visibility.The Parish Council do an excellent job in Priston, but this proposal was formulated with minimal consultation with residents. I suggest that this TRO should be stopped, and a consultation with interested residents take place, to reflect better the local viewpoint.A practical alternative to the TRO would be to extend the current 7 metre white line to 10 metres, thereby complying with Highway Code Rule 243. This would have the effect of still retaining 2 parking spaces and preserving the traffic- calming effect at the narrowing point in the road. In addition 20 mph signage for cars AND bicycles should be improved in the village.

18	Resident	Safety	Object	As a resident of Priston I am concerned about the safety of our village roads. However I am very much against the proposal to put double yellow lines. Both cyclists and drivers travel down the village street too fast. We need to improve the 20 mph signage and if possible include signage for cyclists as well. Government guidance says - on-street parking can be used to calm traffic. If we reduce the parking to the extent suggested it will encourage greater speeds and also mean there is no parking available to residents who should be entitled to park safely near their homes. The current parking on the High Street and Priston Lane creates a narrowing point which requires traffic to drive slowly and with care. I also feel that double yellow lines in a village environment are totally inappropriate and tantamount to urbanising the village. I suggest the withdrawal of this proposal to enable better consultation with village residents. First and foremost we need to address the speed of vehicles through the village. All residents should be able to feel that their opinions are listened to.
18	Resident	Parking	PartlyObject	Consultation feedback - parking on junction of Priston Lane (Watery Lane) and High Street, Priston. The proposal to have double yellow line on the westerly side of this junction seems unnecessary, when the Highway Code does not allow parking within 10 metres of a junction anyway. The problem lies with high, 'solid-sided' vehicles parking where they obscure vision on the corner. You can see 'through' a car. It could surely be dealt with by a warning or advisory sign. Priston is urbanised enough already.
18	Resident	Parking	Object	This relates to parking on the junction of the High Street and Priston Lane in Priston. I suggest that there is no need for a double yellow line. The current white line works 99% of the time and this can be extended a little if needed. Those living closest seem to agree - who are those affected the most by the reduction in parking spaces - that the proposed double yellow line is unnecessary. Extending the white line by one car length would be sufficient.
18	Resident	Parking	PartlyObject	Please do not put double yellow lines at the junction of Priston High Street and Priston Lane. It is not a dangerous spot for pedestrians or traffic and the village needs those parking spaces. We would welcome a speed camera or speed bumps but we do not want double yellow lines.
18	Resident	Parking	Object	I object to the proposed double yellow lines on High Street and Priston Lane, Priston under TRO-26-050 on the grounds that it is an urbanisation of this rural village. We already have a municipal park around the sewage farm adorned with signs. That should be enough but these yellow signs will encourage more yellow signs around the village green and pub and other narrow roads. It will be a short step then to, horror of horrors, street lights and the urbanisation will be complete. Another solution to problems at this junction would be to remove the small grass triangle which, apart from providing 1 parking space, serves no useful purpose, mark the road on the west side of Pristol Lane to push traffic out to the right which will give a better view of High Street in both directions. These lines on the left could be marked to provide one or two parking spaces which will double the parking lost by removing the green. In general parking in the village could be improved by more use of the the Village Hall car park or even making a new car park. A seemingly trivial matter like this can cause didssension in a closely knit village like Priston so can I suggest a referendum conducted by an independent organisation like the Electoral Reform Society. This shouldn't be difficult or expensive in a village with only 70 or so dwellings

18	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety	Object	Double Yellow Lines Proposal near High Street Priston Lane TRO-26-050. I am writing to state my concerns on this and disprove of what has been suggested by the Priston Parish Council.. Removing car parking spaces will increase speeds through the village, its already used as a rat run this will get worse if double yellow lines are in place. Parked vehicles help slowdown traffic and protect pedestrians, there is a number of elderly and young children at that end of the village as well as animals. Parking will be pushed to other areas of the village and Summer lea already has to deal with the congestion of the Cricket club and Church. GOV.UK/Homes England Guidance recognises that narrow streets reduces speed and controls vehicle forward visibility. Priston needs Traffic Calming Measures, It needs to enforce the 20MPH Speed limit & keep natural pinch points to slow traffic.. The introduction of convex mirrors in said area would do the job. Also someone has planted a tree on the tiny triangle. As this get bigger that will cause further issue with visibility. The triangle could be removed which would widen said area that would be a win win. Highway Code Rule 243 advises not parking opposite or within 10m of a junction which we support. The current plans are nearly double this.
18	Resident	Parking	Support	Parking on this bend obscures the view of vehicles emerging from Watery Lane onto the Western Side of Priston Lane for both Vehicles and Pedestrians. It also restrictsview of Vehicles coming towards the Junction from the Western Side of Priston LaneThere is an automatic requirement to slow speed moving through the village between this Junction and Arum House as the road narrows. Whilst Residents can park along Priston lane adjacent to the Houses of Hill View without compromise to traffic safety, between Arum House and the retaining wall of the house opposite there also issues with the flow of Farm or Large vehicles (including Fire Tenders) through this short stretch when people ignore the single white line and park there.
18	Resident	Parking	Object	Regarding Priston Lane/High Street junction. As things stand parked cars slow down the traffic. There are many elderly residents which will be pushed out into the road when walking and young children. No accidents there attributed to the junction and parked cars there! At that junction a convex mirror on the opposite side of the road would aid visibility, along with cutting back the hedgerow going around the corner which over hangs the road. Also, a stop sign there with the appropriate road markings would increase safety. Taking away parking spaces at one part of the village will only push problems further up near the village green and by the church which already have their own problems. More 20mph road signs and other traffic calming measures are needed. Why not remove the triangle of grass that would create a larger safer junction. We don't want yellow lines in our village!

18	Resident	Parking,Safety,Environmental	Object	representation. It contains further detail on road safety, consultation, parking displacement, environmental impact and local process. I support measures that genuinely make Priston safer. As a parent of two young children, safety in the village is one of my main concerns. However, I am worried that this proposal may make the main safety issue worse, not better. The problem many residents see daily is excessive speed through High Street. This is a narrow village street used by pedestrians, children, older residents, cyclists, dog walkers, carers, visitors and pub and village hall users. I have personally had to ask drivers to slow down or stop when they have come through the village too quickly. On more than one occasion, drivers have told me they believed they were in, or entering, a 30mph zone. That suggests the existing 20mph zone is not clear enough, visible enough, properly maintained, or reinforced in any meaningful way. The parked cars at High Street and Priston Lane currently create a natural narrowing point. In practice, that makes drivers slow down, look ahead, give way where necessary, and proceed with more care. Removing those cars may make the road feel wider, clearer and faster. Before removing anything that currently helps slow traffic, the Council should assess whether the proposal risks increasing vehicle speeds through High Street. The Council's TRO papers state that the Priston restriction was requested by Priston Parish Council to prevent obstruction caused by parked vehicles. However, I cannot see Priston-specific evidence showing that this location is the main safety problem. I cannot see speed data for High Street, collision evidence at this junction, an assessment of what may happen to speeds if the parked cars are removed, or an assessment of where displaced vehicles will go. If any previous collision or incident is being relied upon, including the cyclist and car incident referred to locally, the formal accident report or other reliable evidence should be produced and considered. I fully accept that junction safety matters. Highway Code Rule 243 advises that drivers should not stop or park opposite or within 10 metres of a junction, except in an authorised parking space. If the concern is parking too close to the junction, the answer should be targeted and proportionate. There is already a practical way to do this. The current white line runs to approximately 7 metres from the junction. Extending this by a further 3 metres would bring the protected area in line with the 10 metre Highway Code guidance, while still retaining two parking spaces and preserving the traffic-calming effect of the existing narrowing point. This option has been suggested by me and, after my request, was minuted at a Parish Council meeting. It should be properly considered before any wider removal of parking is approved. A broader removal of parking is not justified if a targeted 3 metre extension would address the stated junction concern while avoiding the new risks created by increasing speed and displacing vehicles elsewhere. Priston is already under serious parking pressure. According to the Parish Council's recent parking survey, there are between 23 and 86 additional non-village vehicles in the village at busy times. The same survey projects an increase in village-owned vehicles of 33% over three years on the stretch between the pub and Hill View, and 17% village-wide. Removing another 2 or 3 spaces will not reduce the number of vehicles. It will simply move them into other parts of the village. That displacement matters. It will affect residents who have no off-street parking and no practical alternative but to park on the road. It will particularly affect older residents, disabled residents, families with young
18	Resident	Parking,Traffic	Object	Priston high street and Priston lane Yellow lines are unnecessary and will spoil this village. There are no other yellow lines in the village and very few white lines. I support speed bumps or similar.
18	Resident	Parking,Traffic	Object	Yellow lines are unnecessary and will spoil the street landscape in this pretty village - there are no other yellow lines and very few white lines. I support speed bumps or similar.
18	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety,Environmental	Object	It appears that this proposal has been escalated to this stage without a full understanding of local views. I object to this proposal in its entirety for a variety of reasons. The local community has not been properly consulted with. Many of us are hearing about it only now for the first time when it has reached this stage.

18	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety	Object	I am responding to the proposed double yellow lines on the junction between High Street and Priston Lane under TR)-26-050. My concerns are two-fold:1) The reduction of parking. I have no parking on or adjoining my property on the High Street. In the five years I have lived there, I have parked either beyond the white line after the junction, or next to the triangle at the junction, and juggle the spaces with my neighbours who also use them for their cars or visitors' cars. With a double yellow line stretching up to the disabled bay, this would remove spaces for 2/3 cars, meaning I would have to search elsewhere in the village for a space, potentially creating other issues, and meaning that in winter months, I would have to walk possibly a considerable distance to my house in the dark, in the road. I do not feel there has been adequate consideration of where displaced cars will park. If double yellow lines are necessary at the junction, better that they go only the required 10m past the junction - this would still allow spaces for cars to park before the disable parking bay.2) Speed of traffic through the village. The removal of spaces at a traffic pinch point will remove traffic calming measures at a traffic pinch point. Many cars do not obey the 20mph speed limit through the village. What other traffic calming measures have been considered? (E.g. repeated speed limit signs, flashing speeds reminders). No evidence has been presented that removing parked cars will increase visibility at the junction, and may have the effect of increasing speeds by the removal of parked cars that would otherwise act to calm speeds. Visibility at the junction is poor, whether or not cars are parked beyond it - even without parked cars, it is not possible to see out without creeping forward. A much better solution would be the positioning of convex mirror opposite the junction. In summary, the TRO creates additional problems in the village (removal of parking spaces, displacement of the cars that park there to other points in the village, removal of traffic calming measures) without solving the problem it seeks to solve (visibility).
18	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety	Object	TRO 26-050 - High Street/Priston Lane Priston. I object to the implementation of double yellow lines at the above location .As a small rural village local circumstances dictate that parking in the centre of the village is an issue and removal of any parking spaces will put pressure on other areas of village currently unaffected. There is no hard evidence to suggest that the introduction of a permanent restriction will improve safety - there have been no speed surveys or accident reports that suggest visibility as opposed to excessive speed are the problem - parked cars help slow traffic down. Safety of pedestrians at this location is already an issue as the pavement stops and it becomes necessary to walk in the road ,usually around the parked cars . Pedestrians would be at greater risk from speeding drivers. We need to explore alternatives that address the safety concerns and ensure proper consultation with local residents especially those most affected.
18	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety	PartlyObject	I do not support the proposal to put yellow lines on the road where suggested. It is a difficult juncton but the current arrangements are ok. People just need to park, and drive, with car. Traffic slowing signs might help.
18	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety, Environmental	Object	I wholly object to the proposal for yellow lines in Priston. They are unnecessary, will impact on safety and will be a visual blight to our village. At present, cars parked on the high street here slow the traffic passing through the village. No cars here will simply lead to faster traffic and increased danger. The issue of a van being parked on the corner and obstructing vision for those turning left from the adjoining lane has been resolved. He is no longer parking there. The problem has gone away. There is no longer any need for any action. The accident involving a cyclist had NOTHING to do with cars parked on this corner and he himself will vouch for this. In fact, removing these cars will make such incidents MORE likely. There is already a problem of parking in the village and losing two places will lead to parking displacement and further issues. And I object strongly to the rural nature of our village being gradually eroded by unnecessary signage. It is already too much. The last thing we want are horrible yellow lines. There is a lot of strong feeling in the village about this, of which the parish council was never fully aware. There is now a general feeling that this should be stopped and a wider consultation made about the issue of speeding in the village.Please, stop this!

18	Resident	Parking	Object	Taking away parking in a small village is unacceptable especially where there has been no issues of any accidents involving the junction of Priston Lane/High Street. Why not highlight the 20 mph speed limit and enforce it! Add more road signs! Put a STOP sign and markings at that junction. Add a convex mirror across the road to aid visibility and ensure hedges are cut back which hang over the road. Don't push parking to other parts of the village and cause more problems for other areas.
18	Resident	Parking	Object	The parked cars slow down the increasing number of 'rat runners' that race through the village particularly first thing in the morning and late afternoon. It has never been a problem and I have lived in the village since 1967. The only visual interference is when a van is occasionally parked on the high street.
18	Resident	Parking	Object	I am writing to formally object to the proposal to introduce double yellow lines at the corner of High Street and Priston Lane, Priston. Loss of parking will worsen an existing shortage. Parking towards the top of High Street is already extremely limited. This is precisely the area where displaced cars would end up looking for alternative spaces if the proposed restrictions go ahead. The street is already heavily congested, particularly in the evenings when the pub is open, to the point where it presents a genuine safety risk. Vehicles routinely park on both sides of our driveway and directly in front of our property, making it difficult and unsafe to exit safely. There have been several near misses of people trying to negotiate around the cars already parked there. There is currently no available parking for visitors to our homes. Removing further parking capacity from the village would only intensify these problems, not resolve them. The proposal would worsen the speeding problem, not improve it. Speeding through the village is a serious and ongoing danger. We regularly witness animals, including pets, being hit by vehicles, and children often play outside on this road, in particular around the pub where children are often on bikes and scooters etc, and I have witnessed near misses here. Parked cars along this stretch currently have a natural traffic-calming effect, narrowing the road and encouraging drivers to slow down. Introducing yellow lines would remove parked vehicles from the road and give speeding traffic a clearer, faster run through the village — making the road more dangerous, not less. Alternative approach. I do not believe there is a problem with the current arrangement at this location, and object to any change here. If the council wishes to address parking or safety concerns in the village, I would suggest yellow lines be considered in other, more appropriate locations, and would support the introduction of speed bumps as a more effective measure to address the genuine safety issue in the village, which is vehicle speed. For these reasons, I strongly object to the proposed double yellow lines at this location and would ask that the proposal be reconsidered.
18	Resident	Parking	PartlyObject	Double yellow line planned for Priston Lane into High Street is too long and risks residents on the High Street having nowhere to park. The line should be just on the corner and not extend onto the High Street. There should be better control of the speed limit through the village. No parking up from the corner will encourage higher speeds approaching the corner. Work vans should be discouraged from parking on the High Street as families with young children should have priority outside their own houses.
18	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety	Object	I feel strongly that safety is paramount and on the corner of Priston lane and High Street there should be a mirror rather than double yellow lines. Possibly slow or stop on road. If there are yellow lines there people passing through Priston ie non residents will go even faster at this junction. I am also extremely concerned that we as a village should not lose parking spaces. The pavements are not deep and children live in this area and the parked cars offer some protection. We need to retain the limited parking we have. There should be a formal meeting of residents to discuss these issues and choices and I strongly request a halt on the double yellow lines.

18	Resident	Safety	Support	I strongly support the introduction of double yellow lines at the corner of Priston Lane and the High St, Priston on the grounds of driver and pedestrian safety. For drivers, the junction is a blind junction. Drivers approaching the High St. from Priston Lane, have to creep across the Stop Line in order to check traffic coming from the left. Unfortunately, a windowless transit van parks most evenings and weekends in spaces leading up to the disabled space outside 3, Hill View. This means drivers cannot see any approaching traffic from the direction of the village pub, until it's upon them. Indeed, drivers have to pull out to pass the van into the path of potential oncoming traffic in order to proceed. This visibility issue doesn't happen when cars and other windowed vehicles are parked in this area as drivers can see much further up the road. Those of us who live in Priston learn to be cautious when passing through this junction but I and other have had near misses meeting cars coming the other way. A serious accident at the junction has heightened concern. For pedestrians, of whom there are many walking from Lower Priston and Priston Lane, the dangers of navigating this junction are considerable, particularly in summer and at twilight. There is no pavement at this junction and pedestrians have to navigate around vans parked between the current white line and disabled space, walking into the middle of the road. At least on winter evenings, pedestrians can see approaching car headlights. Residents of Priston Lane of whom 14 are over 70 years old regularly walk this route to access the Village Hall, Church, the village pub and the village bus stop. They need to be able to negotiate this junction safely. Local residents attempts to dissuade the van driver who regularly causes this problem to park elsewhere have failed, so something must be done to improve safety in this area. I therefore fully support the Parish Council's request for double yellow lines up to the disabled space in order to improve visibility and most importantly safety at this junction.
18	Resident	Parking,Safety	PartlyObject	I agree that the corner does not have the best visibility but I do disagree that the double yellow lines need to go as far up as the disabled parking bay marked on the road. At most it should only go to the legally required 10m from a corner of a junction. The parked cars there do slow traffic down and there are a lot of elderly people living around that local area, The cars will go faster around there if there were dble yellow lines. The hedgerow which overhangs the road could be taken back, probably a meter to aid visibility. If there was a mirror on the opposite wall that would help majorly. The triangle of grass could be removed, widening the whole junction, it would be muchsafer and no lines would be necessary at all. The village has limited parking and taking away valuable spaces would only push parked cars and the problem further up the village roads. There has recently been 2 accidents in that area and neither had anything to do with the junction.

18	Resident	Parking,Safety	PartlySupport	I am writing as a resident of Priston to submit feedback regarding the proposed parking and waiting restrictions under TRO scheme reference 26-050. I broadly support the Council's objective to improve road safety, prevent traffic bottlenecks, and maintain clear access for emergency and agricultural vehicles on Priston's narrow lanes. However, I believe a standard urban approach is unsuitable for our historic village. I strongly urge the Council to explore alternative, more sensitive options before implementing the current restrictions. I request that the Council evaluates the following alternative avenues:Conservation-Style Markings: Standard, bright double yellow lines severely compromise the rural aesthetic of our village. The Council should explore using narrow, pale-cream lines (often used in historic or rural conservation areas) or defining a "Restricted Parking Zone" at the village entry points to remove the need for excessive road markings altogether.Targeted Peak-Time Restrictions: Rather than blanket, permanent restrictions that penalise residents and local businesses like the Ring O'Bells pub, any new rules should target peak visitor congestion hours or specific event-driven blockages.Community-Led Parking & Infrastructure Solutions: Instead of relying entirely on restrictions to deter drivers, B&NES should work with the community to establish or better manage off-street parking options near high-traffic areas like the Priston Village Hall and Church.I support a safer village, but it requires a bespoke rural solution rather than a generic urban framework. I request that these alternatives are fully reviewed during this consultation phase.
18	Resident	Traffic	PartlySupport	Priston High Street and Priston Lane double yellow line proposal. I am in favour of the introduction of double yellow lines, but not in the form shown on the proposal for the following reasons:1 Parking. The proposed yellow lines will reduce the number of parking spaces unnecessarily, and inevitably force people to park in what could be even more dangerous locations. The loss of one parking space on the corner of the High Street would appear to be sufficient to improve visibility. The lost space could be recovered by reducing the length of the single white line further up the High Street. That could be converted to a shorter double yellow line, which would also ensure a passing space within what can be a long line of parked vehicles.2 Speeding . Many drivers disregard the 20mph limit, making both vehicular and pedestrian access onto the High Street and Priston Lane difficult and dangerous.Perhaps additional traffic calming road markings and even a 'Stop' sign could be considered.
18	Resident	Parking,Safety	Support	I support this proposal because when people park on the corner of Priston Lane and onto Priston High Street it is impossible to see whether cars are coming down the road without positioning your own car in the middle of the road. A cyclist collided with a car doing just this and spent three days in hospital, so this issue is not just theoretical, an accident has happened. I don't believe that allowing parking at the junction will slow traffic down (as has been argued by some) as the main danger is from cars speeding in the Bath direction. They already have the right of way due to how the parked cars are positioned in the road. I haven't measured the proposed length of the lines in situ, so can't comment on whether the length is excessive or not, but assume that the highways officers have applied the law and their experience in the matter.Stopping parking at this junction means that there would be a better line of sight up the road to see whether there is any oncoming traffic.I would argue that speeding issues should be dealt with by adding more 20 mph signs on telegraph poles and a digital sign indicating whether motorists are breaking the speed limit or not. I do not support 'speed pillows' or sleeping policemen in the road as the roads are already difficult enough to navigate in this area with potholes and overhanging hedges.
18	Resident	Parking	Object	The parked vehicles currently act as an effective speed restriction and make traffic slow. Applying yellow lines will allow 'rat-runners' to speed through the village. The narrow area 50m further up would benefit from clearer restrictions.
18	Resident	Parking	Support	People who park in this location in Priston are putting others needlessly at risk by blocking driver's sight lines. Parking at such a dangerous location should be prevented.
18	Resident	Parking	Support	People who park in this location in Priston are putting others needlessly at risk by blocking driver's sight lines. Parking at such a dangerous location should be prevented.

18	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety	Support	This proposal has arisen following a serious accident involving a cyclist coming down the High Street and colliding with a car edging out of Priston Lane. When exiting Priston Lane to turn left into the High Street, visibility to the left is always poor. When vehicles are parked within 10m of the junction, the turning can be completely blind into a single downhill lane, with a 20mph speed limit. The proposal bans parking for a further (beyond the present white line) 11-12m from the junction, losing 2 parking spaces. This seems to me to be both proportionate, and the only way I can see to reduce the risk of further accidents.
18	Resident	Traffic,Safety	Object	**Objection to the Proposed Double Yellow Lines at the Junction of Hill View and Priston High Street**I would like to formally object to the proposed installation of double yellow lines at the junction of Hill View and Priston High Street. My primary concern is that, although the proposal is intended to improve safety, I believe it is likely to have the opposite effect. Priston is a 20mph village, yet many vehicles regularly travel through the village at speeds significantly above this limit. The vehicles that currently park close to the junction create a natural pinch point, requiring drivers to slow down, assess visibility and give way where appropriate. In practice, this traffic-calming effect helps to moderate vehicle speeds through the centre of the village. When there are no cars parked on this corner, our experience is that drivers often take the bend much faster and continue through the village without slowing. Removing the opportunity for parking at this location would create a wider, more open junction, making it easier for vehicles to carry greater speed around the corner. I am concerned that this would increase the risk of collisions and make the village less safe for everyone. This concern is particularly important because many vulnerable road users regularly use this part of the village. I live immediately adjacent to the junction with my two young children, and we frequently walk this route. Several elderly neighbours also use this stretch of road, some with walking sticks or carers, and in places there is little or no pavement, meaning pedestrians must walk in the carriageway. Higher vehicle speeds would inevitably increase the level of risk for those who are least able to avoid danger. The proposal would also have a significant practical impact on local residents. There are four neighbouring properties in this immediate area that do not have off-street parking and therefore rely entirely on the existing on-street spaces. Over many years an informal arrangement has developed that allows residents to park considerately without causing obstruction. Removing these spaces would not remove the need for parking; it would simply displace it elsewhere in the village. This is likely to create new parking pressures in locations where parking is currently limited or uncommon, transferring inconvenience and potential conflict to other residents rather than resolving it. For families like ours, the impact would be considerable. Returning home with two young children, school bags, shopping or other belongings would often require parking some distance away and walking along roads that themselves have limited pedestrian infrastructure. Similarly, elderly residents, their visitors and carers would face greater difficulty accessing their homes safely. For these reasons, I do not believe the proposal represents the best balance between road safety and residents' needs. The existing parked vehicles perform an important traffic-calming function by encouraging lower speeds through the village, while also providing essential parking for households with no alternative provision. I would therefore respectfully ask that the proposal for double yellow lines at this location is reconsidered. If there are concerns about visibility or road safety, I would encourage the Council to explore measures that directly address vehicle speed—such as enhanced traffic calming or speed enforcement—rather than removing parking that currently helps to moderate driver behaviour.
18	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety	Object	As a village resident of 25yrs, the proposal to place double yellow lines in Priston is poorly thought out and likely to increase traffic speeds through the village. It will also cause a significant parking problem for some residents (not me) which will likely increase the number of vehicles parked outside the pub and village hall, a space that is already prone to congestion.

18	Resident	Parking	Support	I support the proposal TRO 26-050 with respect to the new parking restrictions in Priston. Ideally it will allow pedestrians to walk down the pavement from the pub to its end and remain on the RHS without having to walk into the road where vehicles are parked, when approaching the junction with Watery lane.
18	Other	Parking,Traffic,Safety, Access,Financial	Object	As a former resident of Priston, I had no private off street parking and no opportunity to park on the road outside my property. As a result the only on street parking was on and around the area where the proposed yellow lines are proposed to be. There is very little on street parking in the village as it stands and I can't imagine that there are fewer cars now than when I lived there. Myself and other residents who relied (and still rely) on this on street parking were aghast when the white advisory lines were put in. There is literally no reason to prohibit parking in this area. Cars and large vehicles can pass without issue when cars are parked there and unless there has been an accident in the time since I lived there, there were zero safety or collision incidents before. In fact in anything it is the case that cars parking in that area serves to slow cars on the approach to the junction from Priston Lane (from Cameron / Tunley direction). I can recall that when no cars were parked on the proposed area, traffic would approach at much faster speeds onto a blind corner where pedestrians and cyclists come from (there is no pavement from on that area. Removing the option for residents with little or no access to parking, in a remote village is unnecessarily punishing those residents and probably devaluing their property as a result. As above, this doesn't affect me any more but I very much feel for the existing residents who will lose access to any parking for what was and I suspect still is an unnecessary addition and one that will make the area less safe than safer.
18	Resident	Parking	Support	I wholeheartedly support the introduction of the 'No waiting at all times' restriction at High Street and Priston Lane, Priston. Recent increased parking of cars at this junction is causing a risk of future serious accidents. A cyclist has already been hospitalised after a collision here. And I am particularly concerned about children and elderly people walking along the lanes around this junction, where there are no pavements. I am a pedestrian, cyclist and motorist and my family and I will be safer at this junction following the work.
18	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety	Object	There is no need for double yellows in stated area. Convex Mirror would be adequate. You could also remove the very small tree to widen the road to increase the visibility. The village is becoming a rat run. Vehicles moving too fast through the village. Parked cars slow down traffic. Children and animals are all at risk. By allowing the installation of double yellows this would push parking further into the village which is all ready bottlenecked. We need traffic calming measures along with natural pinch points that slow traffic. The 20mph also needs enforcement with better bigger signage. Highway Code rule 243 should come into play no parking opposite or within 10m of a junction.
18	Resident	Traffic	Object	I wholly object to the proposed installation of double yellow lines in Priston. They are totally out of keeping with a rural village setting (as are other traffic calming measures such as speed cushions, digital speed signs and speed markings on the road surface) and there is no issue with regular traffic incidents on the proposed corner. As I understand it, in recent times one cyclist hit a car and conceded that they (the cyclist) had been going too fast. If anything, the tight corner with on road parking slows vehicles down because of the narrowing effect on the road. In fiscally straitened times, this is an unnecessary and wasteful use of public funds. Please just leave things as they are.
18	Resident	Parking	Support	I agree with the proposal
18	Resident	Parking	Object	We do not support the proposed double yellow lines near high street/priston lane

18	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety	PartlyObject	The parking on this corner makes a natural pinch point going through the village that currently is the only thing that slows traffic down. I worry that painting double yellow lines on this corner will have the effect of making the roads in the village less safe due to fast traffic. A live slightly down the hill from this location where the road is wider and straighter. Traffic regularly passes far in excess of the 20mph speed limit. I have young children and I worry about this. I would prefer to see resources being spent in the village to make the traffic slower and safer (e.g speed limit enforcement or traffic calming) than on painting lines that will reduce parking and potentially have the effect of making the village roads faster and less safe for residents. What is the purpose or intent of painting double yellow lines in this location? As far as I am aware there has been no concerns due to parking or reduced visibility on this corner and there has been no accidents. Priston is a lived in village with quiet county roads that should be considered a shared spaces for those on foot and children as well as cars. It appears none of this has been taken into account with the intent of the double yellow line being to improve the roads for passing traffic and not for the main users who are the residents of the village. These roads are not main roads and measures should be being taken to slow traffic and enforce speed limits.
18	Resident	Parking	Support	The main issue here does have to be safety and involves people not obstructing a blind bend. I totally understand the reduction of parking spaces will cause issues though...but consideration HAS to be given to farmers. After all, they are the original custodians of the countryside. It is them that work relentlessly under extremely difficult times to keep food on our tables. With growing numbers of residents and extensions on homes, there is an increase in vehicles. This all makes life so much more difficult for farm vehicles to navigate their way through the village. There are many times that they have to stop and find the drivers to get them to move. Parking has to be considered before buying your home, is this the ideal location if you have a number of vehicles? Putting traffic calming through Priston would quite frankly be an insult! Anyone who suggested this clearly hasn't thought about tractors, trailers, combines, foragers ! They'd be the first to complain if any of these farm vehicles scratched their cars whilst trying to navigate through a calming system .. as for speed bumps, well that would be ridiculous!!! Again, imagine the noise when tractors and trailers are bumping over them, causing more complaints no doubt. I hope an area is yellow lined to stop the corner being obstructed by large vans without stopping residents with normal cars parking in their normal spaces.
18	Resident	Traffic	PartlySupport	Large van parked on the corner most evenings and overnight causes visual hazard for cars and pedestrians.
19	Resident	Access	Object	I would like to enforce NO PARKING at any time restrictions which will enable traffic to flow freely, and therefore improving traffic, pedestrian and cyclist safety. Which opposite a v busy popular school is paramount!! I feel the only solution is to put double yellow lines from number 4 Kilmersdon road to number 1 and 3 Kilmersdon road on both sides of the road.
19	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety, Access,Disturbance	PartlyObject	I feel that this area is always congested with parked cars affecting difficulty for drivers leaving their house to access Kilmersdon road and I feel that both the no parking at the school keep should include the weekends plus yellow lines in this road should extend well beyond where they are at present

19	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety, Access	PartlyObject	26-050 at Kilmersdon Road Radstock I feel from both as a driver and resident at this location 1) that there should be - No Stopping on the school “ keep clear “ outside the school - should be at all times rather than allowing parking there on weekends as well as week days 2) I feel that double yellow lines should from number 4 and 3 - 2 - & 1 on both sides of the Road - in other words “ no parking at any time “ to ensure the safety of all those residents at these locations 3) finally as a local driver over the past 6 years I have regular observed almost all drivers driving both up and down Kilmersdon Road travelling at way in excess of the 20 mph and feel that coupled with the cars parked everywhere in the area - it is a very hazardous environment for residents.
19	Visitor	Parking	PartlySupport	Although I agree with the main of the proposed actions I feel it would be made even safer residents and regular users of Klmerston Road is to introduce double yellow lines on both sides of the carriageway from No 4 up to and including No 1 & 3. This would help traffic coming down the hill as there would be no obstructions and it would also aid at busy school times .
19	Resident	Parking,Safety,Access	PartlySupport	I reside on Kilmersdon Road and have experienced many dangerous/near misses on the road especially during school times and more recently commuters parking all day then walking down to board a bus. They also park on both sides of the road especially on the pavement by Meadow view. My neighbour has regular medical appointments and must navigate around blind spots caused by vans parking either side of her driveway.I have additionally been the recipient of verbal abuse from drivers who must wait while I park on my hard standing area.The parking restrictions (preferably double yellow lines) must be extended up to number three to allow the traffic to flow both directions especially the large goods vehicles who currently must mount the kerbs outside my house to avoid collisions.I assume that the chaotic activity during school hours has been witnessed by the TMT and local authorities.
19	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety	PartlySupport	I would like the double yellow lines to be extended to be in front of my house and up the side.This is because people park their vehicles in front of my driveway even if the car is parked on my drive. I would like the yellow lines extended up the hill because I have a back entrance to my property. People have parked there before who have damaged my slab which I had laid to get my husband in and out in his wheelchair.They have also chucked rubbish into my garden. This behaviour is unacceptable.
19	Resident	Parking,Safety,Access	PartlySupport	The parking restrictions on church lane and Kilmersdon Road in Radstock require further consideration as the current proposals are not going to help enhance the safety of this area. This is a busy road, particularly during school hours and is an accident waiting to happen. I have witnessed many near misses along her. There should be no parking allowed at all from number 4 kilmersdon road, upto and including numbers 1 and 3, on both sides of the road. It is so dangerous for people trying to cross the road due to the speed at which vehicles go up and down the road, including heavy plant vehicles going to the industrial estate. The houses along that road are unable to safely pull out of their houses as visibility is impaired due to all the parking. The post office vans and staff now have to park there due to the carpark behind the library now charging for parking, which has only added to the problems along this road. Double yellow lines should be in place all the way along by the residential areas. Perhaps consider allowing the post office to use the carpark for free and perhaps encourage parents to park in the carpark for school drop off instead of parking on the street. Something needs to be done and it needs proper measures in place. This road is dangerous!

19	Resident	Parking	Object	I am writing to OBJECT to the above proposal for New Traffic restrictions on Kilmersdon Road in Radstock. I frequently visit my vulnerable daughter to help and support her, each time witnessing the hazardous, inconsiderate and sometimes illegal parking all along Kilmersdon Road, but it is especially bad opposite St Nicholas school and on the blind bend leading up Haydon Hill. My Objection is on the basis that the proposed additional "No Stopping On School Keep Clear Markings" on Kilmersdon Road, are only enforceable Mon-Fri 8.00am - 8.00pm so parking will still happen on evenings and weekends. My Proposal. The SAFEST solution for residents & anyone using Kilmersdon Road would be to: Implement Double Yellow Lines from No 4 Kilmersdon Road up to & including No's 1 & 3 Kilmersdon Road, on BOTH sides of the carriageway. This will ENFORCE No Parking at Any Time restrictions- Enabling traffic to flow freely- Refuse & recycling vehicles not having to block the road when collecting - Street cleaning vehicles able to clean the whole carriageway, leading to drainage improvements- School crossing patrol person can see traffic approaching from Haydon Hill. All of the above will lead to improving Road Safety for Pedestrians, Cyclists & Motorists. The introduction of fees & removal of FREE parking in Church Street Car Park in March 2025, has pushed the problem further up Kilmersdon Road. The current hazardous parking situation is exacerbated by motorists NOT adhering to the 20mph Speed Limit
19	Resident	Parking	Support	In relation to Kilmersdon Road. The proposed changes state 'there should be added additional No stopping on School Keep Clear markings on Kilmersdon Road only enforceable Mon-Fri 8am-8pm'. However there is now almost permanent parking with vans and cars parked and left all over the weekend. This has happened since the restrictions introduced in the Church Street car park. It makes it very dangerous for motorists and pedestrians trying to negotiate around them and when safely crossing from the school side or from Meadow View, so that they can then walk on the pavement either towards the Town centre or up the road to Haydon. Cars travel at speed both ways on Kilmersdon Road, especially those coming down the hill from Haydon. They have to pull out on the wrong side of the road to pass the park cars, often a dozen or more at all times of the day. I have heard cars breaking suddenly when they come down the hill behind me and I am indicating to turn into Meadow View. They, presumably think I am indicating to pull out around the parked cars. Until I get almost to the entrance of Meadow View there is no line of vision down the road to see if it is safe to turn right into Meadow View. It would also help if the double yellow lines on the south side of Meadow View were extended a little further so that cars parked legally do not obstruct the view when entering and exiting the Road. During school terms, particularly, the situation is exceptionally difficult with a number of the parents/carers parking on the double yellow lines, close to the corner, and on the pavement at the road junction with Kilmersdon Road.
19	Resident	Parking	Object	I am writing to oppose the above proposal for new traffic restrictions in kilmersdon Rd Radstock. My objection. Is on the basis that the proposed additional "no stopping on keep clear markings " on kilmersdon Rd, are only enforceable Monday to Friday 0800 - 2000hrs so parking will still be a problem on evenings and weekends. My proposal. The safest solution for residents and anyone using kilmersdon Rd would be to :Implement double yellow lines from no 4 kilmersdon Rd up to and including no 1 and 3 kilmersdon Rd on both sides of the carriageway. Implement traffic calming system to slow down traffic to a safe speed. This will enforce no parking at any time restrictions and provide a safe environment for the elderly, young children and disabled people when walking on the pavements and crossings. It will enable traffic to flow freely and safely, Refuse and recycling vehicles will have easy access when collecting, Street cleaning vehicles will be able to clean the whole carriageway leading to improvements to drainage, School crossing patrol will be able to see on coming traffic and children will be safer with slower vehicles, All of the above will lead to improving road safety for pedestrians, cyclists, motorists and maintenance vehicles. We have seen these improvements made in many other local villages and communities in and around bath (Camerton, Stratton on the fosse and midsomer norton) Radstock is always left out because it is not an affluent area which is totally unfair.

19	Resident	Parking	Object	Following sight of BANES council proposals under the above TRO review I wanted to voice my concerns about same for the location at Kilmersdon Road. As a Haydon resident of over 60 years I've had vast experience of using the section of carriageway at the start of Kilmersdon Road, outside the location of St Nicholas school. The dramatic increase in vehicles parked at the bottom of Kilmersdon Road (whether this be workers, parents dropping children off or half the fleet of Royal Mail vans) has presented a constant obstacle when negotiating the climb up Kilmersdon Road/Haydon Hill and even more so when travelling down the road towards Radstock. Many times I've seen 'near misses' when it comes to potential collisions with parked cars or those trying to pass each other/or avoid t-boning residents trying to emerge from their driveways! BANES proposal to install suggested No Stopping Mon-Fri 8am-8pm with relevant white lines/zig zags will not solve the problem out of these hours as motorists can still park at these sites on evenings and weekends- and cars do still definitely use this road on evenings & weekends so the hazard will still persist! A safer solution for both pedestrians and vehicles using Kilmersdon Road would be for BANES to install double yellow lines from the house at no. 4 Kilmersdon Road up to and including no's. 1 & 3 Kilmersdon Road on BOTH sides of the carriageway to avoid the existing hazard being transferred to the opposite side of the road. Double yellow lines are a more visible confirmation over a longer segment of carriageway to enforce the 'no parking' and time restriction rules as opposed to a singular signpost more like to be overlooked. This would enable traffic to flow freely and improve safety for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists. It's only a matter of time before a head-on collision happens or a parent/child is knocked down or a resident's car is damaged trying to emerge from their residence onto the carriageway - mostly due to the 'bottleneck' created approaching a school which, by design, should be one of the more safe places off the highway !
19	Resident	Parking	Object	I am writing to OBJECT to the above proposal for New Traffic restrictions on Kilmersdon Road in Radstock. I frequently visit a vulnerable friend, each time witnessing the hazardous, inconsiderate and sometimes illegal parking all along Kilmersdon Road, but it is especially bad opposite St Nicholas school and on the blind bend leading up Haydon Hill. My Objection. Is on the basis that the proposed additional "No Stopping On School Keep Clear Markings" on Kilmersdon Road, are only enforceable Mon-Fri 8.00am - 8.00pm. so parking will still happen on evenings and weekends. My Proposal. The SAFEST solution for residents & anyone using Kilmersdon Road would be to: Implement Double Yellow Lines from No 4 Kilmersdon Road up to & including No's 1 & 3 Kilmersdon Road, on BOTH sides of the carriageway. This will ENFORCE No Parking at Any Time restrictions- Enabling traffic to flow freely- Refuse & recycling vehicles not having to block the road when collecting - Street cleaning vehicles able to clean the whole carriageway, leading to drainage improvements- School crossing patrol person can see traffic approaching from Haydon Hill . All of the above will lead to improving Road Safety for Pedestrians, Cyclists & Motorists. The introduction of fees & removal of FREE parking in Church Street Car Park in March 2025, has pushed the problem further up Kilmersdon Road. The current hazardous parking situation is exacerbated by motorists NOT adhering to the 20mph Speed Limit

19	Resident	Parking	Object	Parking Restrictions re. Church Street, Kilmersdon RadstockRe. the proposed increase in Parking Restrictions named above, part of the problem could be resolved by B.A.N.E.S. allowing the Post Office to park their vehicles overnight in Church St. Car Park either for free, or at a reduced collective fee! Most of their vans aren't parked in the road until about 4pm in the afternoon, and gone by 10.00am the next morning both periods within the FREE PARKING time slot any way.It might also be worth noting that few people complained when only 'ordinary' peoples' cars were parked their. Perhaps if we all bought red coloured cars, parking issues might be more seriously considered at earlier times for decisions to be made. It does seem to me, a somewhat stupid situation that Church St. is full over the weekend with 4 or 5 vans yet the car park is practically empty. I'm sure those attending Church on a Sunday would prefer to park closer, if they have difficulty with their mobility!Finally, I have mixed feelings contacting you re. this particular issue. I live in Meadow View, so any extension of yellow lines, or Parking Restrictions in general is almost certainly going to mean people trying to park in M.V.. At 84 yrs of age, I'm not keen to see the day coming when I have to park half way up Kilmersdon Rd. Thank God I have made it to 84, I guess.
19	Resident	Parking	Object	Does not give permission for their comments to be made public.
19	Resident	Parking	Object	I am writing to you as a local resident to submit my feedback and objections regarding the proposed parking restrictions under scheme reference 26-050 for Kilmersdon Road.As someone who regularly needs to cross this road with my dog, I have serious safety concerns about the current traffic flow. Cars frequently speed down the hill and around the corner, and visibility is so poor that you often do not see them until they are right on top of you.Because of these hazards, the current proposals for Kilmersdon Road do not go far enough. I specifically want to raise the following points:•The "Additional No Stopping On School Keep Clear Markings" are only enforceable Monday through Friday, from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.•This means that parking will still happen during the evenings and at weekends.•The safest solution for residents and anyone using Kilmersdon Road would be to implement Double Yellow Lines from No. 4 Kilmersdon Road up to and including Nos. 1 & 3 Kilmersdon Road, on both sides of the carriageway.•Implementing this will enforce "No Parking At Any Time" restrictions, enabling traffic to flow freely and improving road safety for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists.

19	Visitor	Parking	Object	I'm writing to voice my concerns following the proposals brought to my attention under the above TRO review. As a regular visitor to my parent in Haydon I've noticed the considerable decline in road safety when using Kilmersdon Road, starting at the bottom of this road, and travelling up the start of Haydon Hill. The increase in consistent parking opposite St Nicholas School and spreading upwards of Kilmersdon Road has presented several hazardous moments to me personally and many other motorists attempting to travel up and down the hill. This is wholly due to cars travelling down Kilmersdon Road presenting themselves in the centre of the road to avoid colliding into the back of the queue of traffic parked up for several hours, which often comes as an unexpected obstacle to the motorist. It also results in those vehicles climbing the foot of Haydon Hill/Kilmersdon Road having to either do an emergency stop or divert into the side of the kerb to avoid their car being hit by oncoming traffic which shouldn't be in the middle of the road! BANES proposal to install suggested No Stopping Mon-Fri 8am-8pm will not solve the problem out of these hours as motorists can still park at these sites on evenings and weekends- and cars do still definitely use this road on evenings & weekends so the hazard will still persist! A safer solution for both pedestrians and vehicles using Kilmersdon Road would be for BANES to install double yellow lines from the house at no. 4 Kilmersdon Road up to and including no's. 1 & 3 Kilmersdon Road on BOTH sides of the carriageway to avoid the existing hazard being transferred to the opposite side of the road. Double yellow lines are a more visible confirmation over a longer segment of carriageway to enforce the 'no parking' and time restriction rules as opposed to a singular signpost more likely to be overlooked. This would enable traffic to flow freely and improve safety for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists. Otherwise I'm of the view that it's only a matter of time before a head-on collision happens or a parent/child is knocked down or a resident's car is damaged trying to emerge from their residence onto the carriageway - and all this on the approach to a busy Junior School!
20	Resident	Parking, Safety, Access	Support	I whole heartedly agree there should be no waiting of parking along church street especially on the entrance to the car park where there are already white lines. It's a safety concern with ambulances not being able to access the drives opposite
20	Radstock Town Council	Parking, Safety, Access	Support	I am writing to support the proposed removal of the parking bays outside St Nicholas Church in Radstock because I have found that, corroborated by talking to residents, that they cause a problematic obstacle. There is such a length of parked cars here that when approaching from either end, you can't see if the way is clear and on more than one occasion, I've seen cars meet in the middle, requiring one of the cars to reverse. This causes particular problems at busy times and adds to the serious congestion in this part of the road network. It's also quite dangerous for cyclists to get past these parked cars safely when oncoming traffic hasn't seen cyclists before they start passing the cars. I think Radstock Town Council also supported the removal of the parking bays when consulted.
21	Other	Parking, Traffic, Safety, Access	Support	Happy to fully support the support for DYL to be installed, This will aid safety for visibility for those going into Faukland view, and the safety of access from the cul-de-sac on the left as you enter Faukland View.
21	Resident	Parking, Access, Disturbance, Environmental, Other	Object	This is absurd, the majority of young people can't afford to buy their own homes, so me and my sister both live on my house with my mum and step dad, all with our own cars, so now if this comes in to place we will have no where to park, we will have to start parking in other streets pushing more traffic and creating busier streets, and in winter when we finish work and it's raining we're going to have to walk up to two minutes minimum just to get home, rather than being able to park outside OUR OWN HOME. Extremely ridiculous and terrible idea.

22	Resident	Parking	Object	Under consultation 26-050 plan 22 on wellow lane, the proposal of no parking at any time is unreasonable. The residents of 118, 116 and 114 don't have car access to the front of their property under this new proposal. The residents of these addresses include an elderly person who needs access to walk to a car parked near the front of her address, and 116 have a young child who needs to be able to get into the car safely without unnecessary need of crossing a road. The alleged access blocking is on a very wide dropped kerb where a resident who rents and doesn't drive has come in to the street to verbally abuse people for parking legally in a way that she does not agree. There has never been a scenario where access to the end of wellow lane has been blocked. This proposal would be a total misuse of public funds
23	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety, Access	Support	As a resident living on Keats Road where parking have caused difficulties during school times with the local schools employees using Keats Road for their vehicles. The entrance of Keats Road is so narrow barely enough for two cars passing each other, every week the local recycling lorry have to drive over the grass bank to get through leaving a mess on the grass when cars are parked on that road (see photo attached). For emergency situation, the Ambulance or Fire engine won't be able to get through if cars are parked there, yes it would be ideal to have yellow lines on the entrance of Keats Road to allow larger vehicles and emergency services to get through safely without going on the grass bank. I do find it difficult to get out of my drive in my car due to narrow width of roads and cars parked on both sides of my drive, often have to do more than 3 point turn to get out. Regarding the blind corner of Longfellow Road where taxi drivers and parents cars during peak times in the morning drop off and pick up time in the afternoon which they parked on both sides of the road leaving a single lane on the blind corner, many times it has been blocked both directions when cars are using the single line which cars have to move on people's driveways to get the traffic moving, this corner of Longfellow Road must be kept clear all time for the safety reasons and ease the flow of traffic, yellow lines should be inserted that area.
23	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety, Access	Support	Parking in this area is incredibly dangerous and is causing an imminent pedestrian risk
23	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety, Access	Support	I have witnessed a couple of near misses when children are crossing the road near the proposed parking restriction corner on Longfellow Road where Taxis Minibuses and cars are parked waiting to drop off students at Fosseyway school due to vehicles not being able to see around the corner travelling in and out of the estate. Also taxis and mini buses block the road at school start and finish times waiting to get into Fosseyway School meaning residents cannot get in or out of their drives on Longfellow Road. The other issue is Emergency services will also find it difficult and frustrating to use the road and access residents properties during an emergency under the current parking chaos times. I understand teachers and students of Fosseyway school need to park somewhere on Longfellow Road and other side streets, the issue is the proposed corner on Longfellow Road that is causing the problem, therefore we agree to the double yellow lines parking restrictions proposed on Longfellow Road which will need to be monitored if it gets implemented.
23	Resident	Parking	Support	Fully agree with parking restrictions on Longfellow Road and Keats road

23	Resident	Parking	PartlySupport	The introduction of No Waiting and No Parking restrictions in Longfellow Road and Keats Road would be welcome, especially during school drop off and pick up times. But there are a couple of points I would like to raise: How would the restrictions be monitored and enforced? We already see some cars ignoring the restrictions outside Fossey School where there are time limits to parking. In fairness, parking officers do patrol occasionally but never during school drop off/pick up times, which is when the problem of parking is at its worst. Cars and minibuses queue with little regard to the current curtesy lines so how will any new restrictions be enforced? There are also cars who park, during school drop off/pick up, on the grass verge at the corner of the junction of Longfellow Road and Keats Road, spoiling the ground. Could consideration be given to putting a No Waiting on Verge restriction there? With no waiting restrictions on the road, there's obviously an increased chance that more cars will use the grass verge
23	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety, Access	Support	I have lived on Longfellow Road for over 50 years and in that time especially in the last five years the amount of stationary traffic on Keats Road and Longfellow Road as indicated on the proposed map is becoming a risk to people living, driving, walking and crossing the roads in that area. When leaving my home I always have to avoid times around 8am to 9.30am & 2.30pm to 4pm as it's impossible to drive down the road without the hassle of extra stationary traffic especially near the corner to Fossey School. I also have a friend who's always having problems with cars parking in Keats Road near her house & hampering the refuse collections & emergency services. I'm afraid a serious accident will take place injuring people and/or children as I have witnessed near misses in these areas in the past.
23	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety, Access	Support	Fully agree with no parking in this area. So dangerous at pick up and drop off times. Vehicles double parking in order to pick up their children. Parking all around the bend which makes it practically impossible to see around the corner when heading home. A seriously dangerous accident waiting to happen involving people's lives
23	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety, Access,Disturbance	Support	Good to see something is being done at last regarding daytime parking in Longfellow Road, although I would have thought the restrictions would carry on to Fossey School.As a resident of Longfellow Road it's a nightmare in school time to get out of drive with the indiscriminate parking that carries on. Whilst I applaud the parking restrictions on the bend of Longfellow Road I fear this will only push back the Taxis and Minibuses further back and cause congestion where the the school staff are parked both sides of the road. at the moment. I fear that one day because of all this congestion a child may come out from one of these parked vehicles and be hurt!! on BANES head be it.We in Longfellow Road have long campaign to get double yellow lines along all of Longfellow Road to no avail maybe this might be the first step??
23	Resident	Parking,Disturbance	Support	I have had several near accidents on the junction between Longfellow road and Keats road the new proposed parking restrictions.could save a head on collision, as two schools are on the road a child could be injured or killed.
23	Resident	Parking	Support	We fully support the proposal for no waiting at any time on Keats Road and Longfellow Road as during school term visibility and travelling down Longfellow Road is a nightmare and it's only a matter of time before there is an accident.
23	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety, Access	Support	I support the proposed parking restrictions in Longfellow Road and Keats Road. The corner on Longfellow Road at school drop off and pick-up times is turned into a single carriage way with no visibility because of vehicles parked on both sides of road and on the grass verge.. Keats Road. When vehicles are parked on the left hand side of the road it makes the refuse and recycling vehicles go across the grass verge on the right hand side. This leads to damage to the grass verge and in winter leaves a trail of mud over the corner on Longfellow Rd causing a skid hazard on this road. I have lived on Longfellow Road since 1986 and the residents on this estate are finding it more dangerous now to use the road access on this estate.

				My objection is primarily based on the existing limited capacity for informal on-street parking within the surrounding residential area. Removing the ability to park along Eckweek Lane is likely to displace existing parking demand onto neighbouring streets, where parking capacity is already constrained. Within postcodes BA2 8EF and BA2 8EB alone, there are approximately 54 residential properties. Based on an average vehicle ownership of approximately 1.4 vehicles per household, this represents an estimated 76 vehicles associated with these properties. However, the availability of kerbside parking within the area is substantially lower than this figure would suggest. Approximately 25 of the 54 properties have dropped kerbs providing access to private driveways, meaning that the available kerbside space is fragmented by vehicle accesses and cannot be considered as a continuous parking resource. Based on an assessment of the area, there are only approximately 11 locations that can reasonably accommodate informal on-street parking. This represents a significant imbalance between the potential residential parking demand and the available informal on-street parking provision. Consequently, the loss of any additional established parking opportunity is likely to place further pressure on the surrounding highway network. This concern is also consistent with Bath & North East Somerset Council's own description of parking conditions within the nearby Peasedown St John permit area, where the Council identifies a severe lack of available on-street parking space. The restrictions on visitor permits and the limitations placed on parking entitlements within that area further demonstrate the existing pressure on local kerbside capacity. The proposed restriction on Eckweek Lane therefore needs to be considered in the context of the wider local parking situation, rather than in isolation. Vehicles displaced from Eckweek Lane will not simply cease to require parking; they will need to find alternative locations within an already constrained area. Furthermore, residential parking demand is not limited to the vehicles owned by residents. The available kerbside capacity also needs to accommodate visitors, deliveries, tradespeople, carers and other legitimate short-term parking requirements. With an estimated average of 1.4 vehicles per household, even relatively small changes in parking demand can have a disproportionate effect where available kerbside space is already limited. I therefore consider that the proposed restriction has the potential to exacerbate existing parking pressures within the surrounding residential area, rather than resolving the underlying issue. Before introducing the restriction, I would ask the Council to demonstrate that adequate alternative parking capacity exists within the immediate locality to accommodate the parking demand that would be displaced from Eckweek Lane.
24	Resident	Parking	Object	I respectfully request that the Council reconsider the proposed restriction in light of the existing limited parking provision and the likely
24	Resident	Parking	Object	I object as I live on Ashgrove and don't have private parking so need to park on Eckweek, there are way too few spaces already on both roads for all residents. I need to have a car as my daughter isn't able to go on a school bus.

24	Resident	Parking	PartlyObject	I object to the proposal to take away 3 parking spaces on Echweek Lane in Peasedown St John. There is not enough parking provision for the houses on Ashgrove. There are many more houses that don't have driveways to park in than there are parking spaces on the street. Therefore we have to park around the corner on Echweek Lane. When those spaces are full we have to go further, into Echweek Road. None of the people on either Echweek Lane or Echweek Road want us to park there. Most of them don't want anyone to park outside their houses, and it has been known for us to be aggressively parked-in or to have our tyres let down. We are not doing anything wrong, we just have a legitimate need to park somewhere. What are we meant to do with our cars if there is nowhere to leave them? Does this mean that we should be disallowed from having them? The people who own the house with the driveway that is right by these parking spaces to be eliminated are complaining about their line of vision to exit their driveway, but really they have just as much vision as at most other turnings and exits. My sense is that they are a lot more concerned with just not letting anybody do what they don't want them to, and are using this as justification. I have lived here and parked in that area for 26 years, and there has never been a road incident problem due to parking there before or during when these people have lived there. I think that to grant this parking ban would favour too heavily the small-minder and un-community-spirited impositions of one particular residence, over the legitimate needs of the many. When returning home in the evening, especially when dark or wet, it feels like a long way to have to walk from Echweek Road carrying things. It's okay, in that walking is good for a person, and life involves compromises, but it seems that this judgement would fall unnecessarily strongly in favour of some people who really just don't want to share the public highway outside of their house, as compared to the many people who just need to leave their car somewhere. If you get rid of these parking spaces then we will just have to park further down Echweek Road, and the people there will object to us parking outside of their houses. It begins to seem as if the council's policy is that people who can't afford houses with driveways should not be allowed to have cars. Maybe this should be reserved only for more privileged people? I understand that we need to reduce traffic in order to protect the planet, but this isn't the way to do it., because it adversely penalises less well-off people. In this rural area, there isn't public transport to where I need to go, and I need to carry heavy, bulky things. Please do not give in to this poorly considered proposal, driven by the narrow-mindedness of two individuals over the reasonable life needs of the many. Thank you.
24	Resident	Parking	Object	As one of the many residents on Ashgrove who doesn't have a driveway, we rely heavily on Eckweek Lane for parking. Especially considering there's no parking directly outside our house. Being in a reasonably rural area, it's not feasible for me to function without a car. For example, getting to work would require me to take 3 buses. So, having somewhere to park my car is a must. Therefore, taking away these parking spaces could have a huge impact on me. This proposal seems to benefit very few and negatively affect many more. Please don't proceed with this proposal.

24	Resident	Parking,Safety,Access	Object	Ref: proposed no parking/loading/waiting on Eckweek Lane, Peasedown St John. I am writing to you to object strongly to the proposed introduction of a no stopping/waiting/parking area at the top of Eckweek Lane in Peasedown St John which has been 'requested by the local Ward members, Parish Councils or Council Officer'. The deadline for objections to this proposal is 20 August, so there is some urgency with this.I have filled out the online consultation form, but realise in retrospect that this form related to a whole tranche of measures across B&NES, and I am concerned that I didn't specify which part of the proposal I was objecting to. I would also like clarification from you whether you are able to block part of the proposal, or whether you have to either adopt all the measures proposed or none. I am a resident of the Northern end of Ashgrove in Peasedown St John, which is adjacent to Eckweek Lane. The proposed measures would remove 3 parking spaces – this takes into account existing white lines on the road which protect a narrow driveway. Currently, there are 10 on-street parking spaces on Ashgrove itself which serve at least 17 households with no private parking. Those households which do have private parking often require on-street parking for additional vehicles and visitors. Needless to say, there is already insufficient parking to meet the need.I have a small child and I have no private driveway and so rely on on-street parking. In addition, I live right next to the chicane introduced to ease traffic flow and protected by double yellow lines. There is a limited section with single yellow lines which is usually occupied because of the problems with parking/stopping outlined above. As a consequence, I rely on the Eckweek Lane spaces on most days.If the proposed measures are approved, I will find myself with nowhere to safely and legally stop to unload anywhere near my house, with even greater frequency. With a toddler, on a bus route, I'm sure you can appreciate that this presents a risk of collision. Furthermore, the next spaces to park are further down Eckweek Lane, approximately 5 minutes walk away, across pavement that is not gritted in icy conditions. The proposed changes would have a meaningful, negative and potential dangerous impact on my day-to-day life.There are a good number of neighbours in the same position as me – including other young families, a woman with a disability, and 2 elderly people. I would ask you to block the proposed changes or risk harm to the residents of my neighbourhood.
24	Resident	Parking	Object	I don't agree with the parking restrictions on ekweek road as there's no where else to park
24	Resident	Parking	Object	I am responding to ask that the “no waiting at anytime” proposal for Eckweek lane not go forward. I am a resident on Ashgrove, where there are only about 9 allocated parking spaces for what is I think about 20 houses that do not have dedicated driveways. Most of us need to park round on Eckweek at some point, and sometimes up to a couple of streets away. Taking local parking spaces available without providing suitable alternative space will just push the parking problem elsewhere. Buses are unreliable and Peasedown lacks sufficient walking amenities for most of us to not have a private car. Me neighbours on Ashgrove include people who are elderly, have very young children and my partner who lives with me has mobility issues - losing access to nearby parking options will severely impact their quality of life.
24	Resident	Parking	Object	Parking Suspension on Eckweek Lane, Peasedown St John.I object to this suspension because of the effect it will have on surrounding roads in the village.Ashgrove has insufficient parking spaces for homes without dedicated parking and Eckweek Lane is often used by those wishing to park when they arrive home from work to find no spaces available on Ashgrove.If the spaces are removed in Eckweek Lane this will just remove the parking to other roads in the area as residents have to park somewhere.Several residents of Eckweek Lane also park on the roadside, will they be given permits?This is the first I've heard regarding this proposal although it was issued in June, I also can see no consultation having taken place. You will exacerbate the traffic issues already experienced in Ashgrove if this proposal is granted.

24	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety	Object	IN RESPONSE TO PROPOSED PARKING/WAITING/LOADING RESTRICTIONS ON ECKWEEK LANE, PEASEDOWN We are residents of Ashgrove, adjacent to Eckweek Lane. We have no parking space of our own and rely entirely on on-street parking. On the stretch of Ashgrove between the junctions with Eckweek Lane and Eckweek Road, there are only 10 parking spaces available to serve 17 houses that have no private parking of their own. The proposed changes would remove a further 6 of these spaces. We have one small car and an 18-month-old child. The introduction of double yellow lines and the chicane on Ashgrove has already significantly reduced on-street parking on our road, meaning we rely on parking on Eckweek Lane most days. The proposed restrictions would force us to walk five minutes round the corner to the other part of Eckweek Lane to park (parking on Eckweek Road already being seriously limited). Doing this with a young child, shopping, and in poor weather represents a real hazard — particularly in icy conditions, as these roads and pavements are not gritted. We are not alone in this situation: there are elderly residents, people with mobility issues, and several other young families who would be similarly affected. By contrast, every house on Eckweek Lane has its own private driveway, and there is consistently ample parking available there. Eckweek Lane also has more than enough room for emergency vehicles (see attached photographs). Existing white lines already protect access to a narrower driveway, and the two houses directly opposite have wide, large driveways with plenty of space to manoeuvre and good sightlines (see attached photographs). We cannot see what benefit these proposed restrictions would offer beyond a purely aesthetic one, while they would have a serious and potentially harmful impact on a considerable number of people in the neighbourhood. We would also add that Ashgrove is a bus route, with double yellow lines already in place along many sections — including outside and opposite our house. Removing the possibility of stopping and loading on Eckweek Lane could put us at risk of serious harm from passing traffic.
24	Resident	Parking	Object	We are residents of Ashgrove, adjacent to Eckweek Lane. We have no parking space of our own and rely on on street parking. From the stretch of Ashgrove between the junction with Eckweek Lane and the junction with Eckweek Road, there are 10 parking spaces. In the same stretch of road, there are 17 houses with no private parking space of their own. The proposed changes would remove a further 6 parking spaces. We have one small car and an 18-month old child. The introduction of double yellow lines and the chicane on Ashgrove has meant there is even less on street parking for us on our road, and we therefore rely on parking on Eckweek lane most days. The proposed restrictions would mean that we would have to walk 5 minutes round the corner onto the other part of Eckweek Lane to park the car (parking on Eckweek Road already being seriously limited). With a child, with shopping, in poor weather conditions, this represents a hazard - especially in icy conditions as these roads and pavements are not gritted. There are elderly people in the same position as us, and people with mobility issues - as well as several other young families. Every house on Eckweek Lane has its own private driveway, and there is always ample parking on Eckweek Lane. Eckweek Lane has ample room for emergency vehicles (see attached photographs). There are already white lines in place to aid access to a narrower driveway (see photographs), and the two houses directly opposite have wide, large driveways, with plenty of space to exit and good sightlines (see attached photographs). I cannot see what possible benefits these proposed restrictions would have - aside from purely aesthetic ones - and at the same time would have a serious and potentially harmful impact on a comparatively large number of people living in the neighbourhood.

24	Resident	Parking	Object	I wish to formally object to Traffic Proposal 26-050, specifically the proposed introduction of additional "No Parking at Any Time" restrictions on Eckweek Lane and the surrounding area of Peasedown St John. As a local resident, I already experience significant difficulty finding parking close to home. Parking demand in this area regularly exceeds the available spaces, particularly during evenings and weekends. Introducing further parking restrictions will not remove the demand for parking; it will simply force vehicles onto neighbouring residential streets, creating even greater congestion and inconvenience. The proposal is likely to: Displace parking onto surrounding roads such as Firgrove Lane, Hillside View, Bath Road, Orchard Way and other nearby streets. Increase congestion and make it more difficult for residents, visitors and carers to park. Create additional problems for delivery drivers, tradespeople and emergency access where roads become more congested. Increase the distance many residents, including elderly and disabled people, have to walk from where they are able to park. I appreciate the need to maintain road safety where visibility is genuinely affected. However, I do not believe the current proposal strikes the right balance between safety and the practical parking needs of local residents. I would ask the Council to provide evidence that demonstrates why these additional restrictions are necessary, including accident data, traffic surveys and parking assessments. If there are only isolated problem locations, I believe those should be addressed individually rather than introducing widespread restrictions that will simply transfer the parking problem elsewhere. I respectfully ask the Council to reconsider the proposed restrictions and to work with local residents to identify a more balanced solution, such as targeted restrictions only where genuinely required, or a residents' parking scheme if parking pressures continue to increase.
30	Business	Parking	PartlyObject	Whilst these measures may be warranted or justified, they will only be effective if enforced adequately. Furthermore (and especially in the case of 3rd Avenue, Westfield, Radstock) they will only cause the problem to move elsewhere in the vicinity. The issue with this particular location (and probably many others under this TPO) is that many businesses here have insufficient parking space of their own to accommodate the the number of staff commuting by motor vehicle. The long-term effects of this TPO, if implemented, are more likely than not to be negative for local employment.
31	Resident	Parking, Access	Object	My house is on the footpath at the top of Plumptre Road so I cannot park directly outside my house. The 5 houses and 3 bungalows on this footpath - none of us with driveways or allocated parking (and no possibility of creating driveways). The implementation of no waiting at any time zones to this part of the street will significant decrease available parking to residents. I have two small children and it is already a struggle to carry my shopping etc in and this would make it significantly worse. I get home from work later than all of my neighbours 4 days a week so I would frequently be unable to get a parking space near my own house. If this were to be implemented, it would only be reasonable to do so if allocated parking spaces were created for residents at the top of Plumptre Road. For example, the raised area opposite the garages could be flattened and turned into allocated parking spots.
32	Resident	Parking	PartlyObject	I am writing to formally object to the proposed TRO 26-050 Plan 32. I am concerned that the current proposal doesn't place the parking bays at the widest points and therefore will limit access for emergency vehicles and refuse collection. I also think that where the footpath is currently placed will encourage traffic to drive faster and reduce safety outside our house and at the nearby school. I believe the parish council is considering redrawing the plans to address the above concerns but as they currently stand I am not able to support this proposal.

32	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety	PartlyObject	In respect of proposal K in Monkton Combe. I support the introduction of no parking on the south side of Church Lane, but with two further considerations. My support is based on safety of pedestrians and other road users, as parking on Church Lane forces traffic onto the other side of the road and along much of the road the bends reduce visibility increasing the volume of head to head meetings, requiring reversing back and interfering with the natural walking path on the south side of the lane. My first concern is that by formalising no parking on the south side of the lane, it will create a presumption that the north side of the lane is an acceptable place to park. Cars parked on the north side will create significant pinch points and reduced visibility given the bends in the road. For this reason I believe it would be best to make the north side of the lane a no parking area too. I.e. double yellow lines on both sides of the road from the school entrance westward to the top of Mill Lane.As currently proposed the no parking extends just around the corner into the top of Mill Lane. At this point the road appears wide enough to park on, but previous experience has been that emergency vehicles struggle to get down the lane when cars are parked here. I am concerned that ending the no parking a short distance down Mill Lane provides an invitation to park just where the yellow lines finish. I believe that the no parking should be extended down Mill Lane (on both sides) as far as the telephone box. This will have the additional benefit of maintaining good visibility for traffic entering/exiting the existing school car park. Below the telephone box, the lane becomes so narrow that it's less likely that people will assume they can park.On a more general point re this consultation I feel it is inappropriate to include a mandatory field for overall response. I appreciate that this provides simplistic numerical data for presentation, but the proposal covers such a wide area and range of issues that it's not possible to wrap up responses in one rating. I certainly don't have the knowledge of the other components of the proposal and so don't feel I can honestly say I support them
32	Resident	Parking,Safety	Object	I am writing to formally object to the proposed TPO 26-050 Plan 32. I am concerned that the current proposal doesn't take account of where the road is at its widest to place the parking bays and therefore will limit access for emergency vehicles and refuse collection. I am also concerned that the side the footpath is suggested will encourage traffic to drive faster and reduce safety outside our house and at the nearby school. The side that this is proposed also reduces the opportunity for residents electric charging which is clearly contrary to BANES current objective to increase electric vehicle usage. I understand that the parish council is considering redrawing the plans which hopefully will address the above concerns but as they currently stand I am not able to support this proposal.
32	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety	Support	I support the planned virtual pavement. I frequently walk through the village and I live in the parish. I believe there should be a total ban of parking in front of the school flats as it is impossible to get a n emergency vehicle through as has happened recently. There is a large car park for school staff a short distance away.
32	Resident	Parking	PartlySupport	Would it be possible to extend the yellow lines south east down Mill Lane to keep the Junction clear for the turning of Busses Lorries ETC
32	Resident	Parking	PartlySupport	I largely support the proposed changes as it would appear to help with safety & improved access through church lane. With the addition of virtual footpath, this will also assist pedestrians and cyclists travelling through the village.. There is however a risk of more speeding vehicles which could be mitigated by addition of a speed warning sign such as green/red illuminated speed monitor.

32	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety, Access	PartlySupport	I agree wholly to the proposal for Shaft Road in Monkton Combe.Regarding Church Lane in Monkton Combe, I wholly agree with the proposed parking restrictions, but I would like to see both sides of Church Lane (within the length of the road per the proposal) with no parking at any time. If there is no restriction on the north side of Church Lane, people will park there instead, giving no improvement to pedestrian safety or driver visibility. Emergency vehicles also need easy access to the village and will not be able to get through if cars are parked in the road, which was the case a year or so ago, when an ambulance had to park a distance from a house in which a resident had collapsed.I would also suggest an extension down the first 20 metres of Mill Lane to avoid a pinch point at that junction.
32	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety, Access	Support	Relating to changes along Church Lane in Monkton Combe:As a resident who cycles to and from work everyday I highly support the parking restrictions. I am also a driver who shares a car with my partner, so I understand that parking may be a concern for the residents who live by these restrictions. But having gone to the consultation for this proposal today I am assured that parking bays will be put in place to provide spaces for the residents.Church lane can become busy with traffic, especially in term time when Monkton school starts and ends. The oncoming cars can be unpredictable when walking or cycling along the lane. This makes it harder to cycle as views can become more restricted with parked cars on the lane, another side effect of the parked cars is the formation of bottlenecks. This can make driving, walking or cycling somewhat unpleasant at these times.Once the parking restrictions have been put in place I imagine that driving, walking and cycling along the lane will become more pleasurable. Looking forward into the future, a virtual pavement could be put running down the lane where there is no pavement, this would make drivers aware of pedestrians along the lane and encourage more mindful driving. In addition, I think that it would increase a sense of community in the village
32	Resident	Parking,Access	PartlySupport	I am permanently disabled, wheelchair bound. My left leg is fused from my thigh to my ankle and is elevated , I do not have a knee. I cannot drive a vehicle. My only option to enter and exit a vehicle, due to the space I need , is for a vehicle to be stationed outside the front of my home.. I am kindly requesting a Disabled Parking space outside the front of my property. My disability was caused through medical negligence 4 years ago.I do have medical records to support my application. Furthermore the curb outside my home is a dropped curb , however motorists ignore the Highway Code and my access is impaired .
32	Resident	Parking	PartlyObject	I would like the double yellow lines in Church Lane to remain, because they are in a part of the lane which is very narrow and ideally, as a driver, I would like there to be no parking at all along that particular stretch. The narrowness frequently leads to a fair bit of inconvenience. However, I realise that there are houses nearby whose owners no doubt feel very differently and that I live further away.

32	Resident	Parking	PartlySupport	Shaft Road contained within TRO 26-050. Why I support this proposal. Church Lane and Shaft Road have no footway and no separated cycle provision. Pedestrians and cyclists share the carriageway with motor traffic at all times. Parked and stopped vehicles on these narrow lanes, including cars stopping temporarily to drop off pupils at the private school, and delivery vans stopping to unload, regularly force people on foot, on bikes, and using mobility aids into the path of moving traffic to get around them. There is simply no room to pass safely when a vehicle is parked or stationary on either lane. I experience this risk personally and directly. I am a regular cycle commuter using these lanes, and I am also the parent of a child with complex disabilities. Every obstruction caused by an inappropriately parked or stopped vehicle is not an abstract inconvenience to us, it is a direct safety hazard, forcing a wheelchair/pushchair, a bike, or a child with additional needs out into live traffic on a lane with no pavement to retreat to. This is made worse by: • Inconsistent or absent enforcement of existing restrictions, which has allowed parking and "just a minute" stopping to become normalised; • A general decline in consideration shown by some drivers towards pedestrians, cyclists and other non-vehicle users, particularly around school drop-off and delivery times. A clear, unambiguous, enforceable "No Parking At Any Time" restriction along the full length of Church Lane and Shaft Road would materially reduce this daily risk to residents, schoolchildren, cyclists and disabled users of the lane. Request for clarification on the Church Lane wording! note the notice also lists a separate item: "Removal of No Parking At Any Time (Double Yellow Line) restrictions on Church Lane, Monkton Combe," I would be grateful for clarification of how this interacts with the new restriction being introduced on Church Lane, so that residents can be confident the net effect is an increase in protection along the full lane, and not an unintended net loss of double-yellow-line coverage at any point. I would welcome sight of the plan/map referenced in the Statement of Reasons to confirm the exact extents on Church Lane. I raise this only for clarity, my support for a comprehensive, enforceable no-parking restriction along Church Lane and Shaft Road is unconditional. Enforcement! I would ask the Council to confirm what enforcement regime will accompany the new restrictions, particularly at school drop-off/pick-up times and around delivery hours, as signage and lining alone have not proven sufficient to prevent obstructive parking on these lanes in the past. Restrictions without visible, consistent enforcement risk simply repeating the current situation. Wider support for the Council's approach More broadly, I support the Council's efforts to address the climate emergency and to encourage the shift from private car use towards sustainable and active travel, including improved bus services, walking and cycling. Protecting the limited carriageway width on lanes such as Church Lane and Shaft Road for safe pedestrian and cycle passage is an important, practical part of that transition. At the same time, I recognise that some residents and visitors depend on car use out of necessity, including Blue Badge holders and those with mobility needs, and I support the Council continuing to ensure that appropriate, clearly signed provision is retained for them elsewhere in the scheme (as reflected, for example, in the proposed Blue Badge Holders Only parking). This is not in conflict with restricting parking on lanes such as Church Lane and Shaft Road, which have no safe capacity to accommodate any stopped vehicle without endangering
32	Resident	Parking	Object	I am writing to formally object to the above proposal. I believe it would limit access for emergency vehicles and refuse collection due to the placement of parking bays, as they are not shown where the road is widest. I also have concerns about the position of the suggested footpath. On that side of the road it takes away the opportunity for us, and other residents to charge electric cars, which is clearly contrary to BANES current objective to increase electric vehicle usage. I understand that the parish council is considering redrawing the plans which hopefully will address the above concerns. However, I cannot support this proposal as it currently stands. Thank you for taking these concerns into consideration.
34	Other	Safety, Access	Support	Happy to support the need for no waiting/ no parking, due to this area can cause a safety issue for emergency vehicles leaving the bottom rank of Hillside view.

				Re: Objection to Proposed Traffic Regulation Order 26-505 – Hillside View, Peasedown St John. I am writing to formally object to the proposed “No Parking At Any Time” restriction on Hillside View, Peasedown St John, under the above referenced order. My household has no off-street parking and we rely entirely on being able to park on Hillside View. My work requires me to leave home extremely early in the morning and return late in the evening, often in darkness, particularly during the winter months. If this restriction is introduced, residents like myself will have no realistic parking option nearby and will be forced to park a considerable distance from home. Walking that distance alone, at unsociable hours and in the dark, raises genuine personal safety concerns. I would ask the Council to reconsider this proposal, or at minimum to explore alternatives that would preserve some residential parking provision on Hillside View, for example, permit-based or time-limited restrictions rather than a full-time ban, so that residents without off-street parking are not left without any viable option. I would be grateful if this objection could be formally logged as part of the consultation process, and I would welcome confirmation that it has been received.
34	Resident	Parking	PartlyObject	
34	Resident	Parking	PartlyObject	Confused as to why I won't be allowed to park outside my house.
35	Resident	Parking,Safety,Access	PartlySupport	I am responding to the proposal of double yellow lines being placed on the junction of Farrington Way and Main Street towards the 'no through road' in Farrington Gurney. Whilst I recognise and potentially support why this is felt necessary I don't think full consideration has been given to the consequences of double yellow lines at this point. Currently residents living on the 'no through road' section of Main Street have little or no off road parking resulting in them parking where they can find any space. This is exacerbated by non-residents using the area as a park and ride whilst using the bus stop. The no parking restriction should improve safety at this point but will, in my opinion, make a bad situation worse by moving the problem to the other side of the junction of Farrington Way and Main Street. This part of the road has more traffic (it not having no through access), two additional junctions Meadow Close and School Lane within a few metres and the pedestrian route to the local primary school. Unfortunately accidents at the junction with School Lane have already occurred due to vehicle parking issues and the fact that School Lane has poor visibility when exiting onto Main Street. Of additional note there are several properties at this location who currently need to be extra vigilant when exiting their properties as approaching traffic is often partially unsighted due to parked vehicles. It also makes navigating this stretch difficult for larger vehicles such as lorries and delivery vans. Therefore the risk of accident due to poor visibility would be significantly increased under the current proposal unless the double yellow lines, no parking at any time restrictions are increased to include all junctions along Main Street. Consideration should then be given to residents only parking along the 'no through road' area of Main Street.

36	Resident	Parking	PartlyObject	I am writing to object to the parking restriction proposal for the junction of Main Street and Farrington Way in Farrington Gurney. Whilst I accept that where a vehicle is parked on the corner of this junction it would create visibility issues for another vehicle turning from that junction, to place restrictions up to the boundary of Chestnut Cottage will be counter productive and is just going to move the problem to the area on the corner of Meadow Close as there will be nowhere else for cars to park. Not all residents on this part of Main Street, myself included, have access to a driveway so we are solely reliant on on-street parking and should the restrictions in their current form be put into place, this will result in three less on-street parking spaces in an area where parking is already in high demand. This not only applies to residents without driveways, but also to visitors who struggle to find parking. The concern is that the only other available parking will be near the junction of Meadow Close so just pushes the problem to another stretch of Main Street. If you are insistent on introducing parking restrictions, then why not limit this to, say, the area from the junction of Farrington Way to the cul-de-sac sign which would still improve visibility but would mean that on-street parking would remain for two vehicles (instead of three) up to the boundary of Chestnut Cottage. Another alternative is to introduce residents' parking for those properties that don't have a driveway i.e. Chestnut Cottage and Jessamine Cottage who will be most affected by this proposal if we end up losing on-street parking availability. For the reasons outlined above, I would strongly urge you to either scrap this proposal in its entirety or to limit the restriction to just the area directly on the junction of Farrington Way and not extending all the way to Chestnut Cottage. As mentioned, by introducing these restrictions in their current form, this will cause further issues for residents and visitors who already struggle to find on-street parking and will just result in the problem being moved elsewhere as people will need to find alternative parking in an area where parking is already limited. Thank you for considering this objection. If you want to discuss further then I am happy to do so.
36	Resident	Parking	PartlySupport	My comments are in relation to the proposal to put double yellow lines around the corner of farrington way/main street in Farrington Gurney. In the past we have had an issue with parked cars right on the junction parking on the white lines of the junction and obstructing the view so double yellows around the corner will make a positive difference to ease congestion and visibility, but the suggested area as it curves round onto main street is quite long. I feel the area curving onto main street could be a little shorter so that it does not reduce parking spaces too much for residents. I believe an area up to the edge of the tokaido/south view properties opposite would be more than sufficient. Please consider my suggestion. Thank you
36	Resident	Parking	PartlyObject	I am writing in response to the proposed "No Waiting" area on Main Street in Farrington Gurney, at the corner of Farrington Way. I acknowledge that, at times, vehicles do park over the corner, and this does create a hazard. However, having reviewed the diagram, I note that the yellow lines are proposed to extend up to Chestnut Cottage. My preference is that the restriction extends only up to the cul de sac sign post before Chestnut Cottage. This adjustment would allow the few houses in this section to retain essential on-street parking, as we do not have access to any off-road parking.

36	Resident	Parking,Safety,Access	PartlySupport	only have on street parking but some 30 years ago, parking of their cars was not generally a problem and the vehicles seldom encroached the junction. Also, they were never parked on the section between Farrington Way and Meadow Close. This section has driveway entrances opposite, which includes mine. In recent years though, as the number of drivers, and therefore cars, in the families of closed off Main Street have increased, the parking has spread along so now we frequently see cars parked on the section between Farrington Way and Meadow Close. The most serious issue here is that the view for drivers approaching the junction when travelling down Farrington Way is severely restricted to both the left and right, and in the case of the latter, when these drivers pull out, they are often confronted by an unsighted oncoming vehicle on the wrong side of the road as it passes the parked cars. Similarly, the drivers coming along Main Street are unable to see vehicles emerging from Farrington Way due to the obstructing parked cars that they are passing. From our location we have witnessed many near misses. On a personal note, this can make exit and entry from our driveways difficult, and recently when a car was parked directly opposite my driveway, I had to manoeuvre so tightly that I clipped my wall, resulting in a £1200 repair bill for damage to my car. In more recent times, we have seen the spread of parking worsen to the extent where vehicles actually park on the curve of the junction, in fact the area where yellow lines are proposed, a proposal which I endorse provisionally. However, this proposal in isolation will only serve to make matters worse. Because of my historical knowledge I can say with complete confidence that faced with the yellow lines, those people will simply park on the opposite side of the junction, around the curve and all along the section to Meadow Close. As described above, this will serve to make the observation difficulties even worse and will most likely lead to a serious injury collision through either a vehicle on vehicle contact, or vehicle on pedestrian, because this part of the junction forms the pedestrian route to the village school. On that topic, just along from Meadow Close, is the junction with School Lane which has poor visibility in its own right. There have been some nasty collisions at this junction. The spread of parking further along Main Street towards School Lane has obvious implications. I strongly request that you do not go ahead with the double yellow lines as proposed without also installing lines around the opposite corner, and all the way along to, and around the corner of Meadow Close. Also around the opposite corner of Meadow Close. There is some parking room in Meadow Close itself which does not impede other peoples' property. My attached photos show a white VW car parked partly opposite my driveway, and then a lorry delivering to the farm shop having to negotiate the VW. It was a tight turn for the lorry driver, and had the VW been closer to the junction, it would have been impossible. Another photo shows, through the windscreen of the truck on my driveway, a red car which had just parked fully opposite my driveway even though there was room elsewhere. My wife can be seen pointing out to the lady driver, who when asked, had stated that it was her intention to leave her car there all night, that the truck would not be able to leave our driveway with her car where it was. Unfortunately this demonstrates peoples' lack of awareness of the effect of their actions and why, unfortunately again, there is a need for enforceable restrictions.
----	----------	-----------------------	---------------	--

36	Resident	Parking	PartlyObject	I am writing to formally lodge my objection to the proposed "No Parking at Any Time" (double yellow lines) restrictions on the corner of Main Street, Farrington Gurney. While I understand the council's duty to maintain road safety, I believe this specific proposal is unnecessary and will cause significant unintended harm to the local community. I request that the council considers the following points: Existing Road Width: The physical layout of Main Street at this location is wide enough to allow vehicles to pass safely when cars are parked legally. Routine traffic flow is not inherently obstructed by the presence of parked vehicles. Lack of Alternative Parking for Historical Housing: Many of the traditional cottages along this stretch of Main Street are multi-generational households. These historic properties were built without driveways or dedicated off-street parking spaces. Removing on-street parking will leave residents with nowhere to park their vehicles near their homes. Displacement of Traffic and Increased Congestion: Forcing vehicles off this corner will not reduce car ownership; it will simply displace the problem. Vehicles will be pushed onto Farrington Way and further up Main Street. Crucially, this will worsen the existing heavy congestion near the post box, where cars already park on both sides of the road, creating a genuine highway bottleneck. Disproportionate Response to Isolated Incidents: It appears this sweeping restriction may be a reaction to isolated incidents of inconsiderate or illegal parking by specific individuals. Introducing a permanent, blanket ban punishes the entire community for the actions of a few. Alternative Suggestion: Instead of implementing a total parking ban that penalises law-abiding residents, I urge the council to increase targeted enforcement. Issuing penalty charge notices (tickets) to motorists who park illegally or dangerously would resolve the obstruction issues without stripping residents of vital parking. Thank you for considering this objection. I look forward to your response and hope a more balanced solution can be found
36	Resident	Parking	PartlyObject	I think the corner of Main Street and Farrington Way has extended too far along Main Street beyond the legal minimum. I also think it should be considered where the displaced cars will now park. Most of the surrounding area is even less suitable, for example the opposite corner of Farrington way and Main Street. Or the opposite side of Main Street.
36	Resident	Parking	PartlyObject	I wish to respond to the section of Main Street Farrington Gurney marked 'C' on the map. I am in favour of restricting parking right on the corner of Main Street and Farrington Way, however I believe the area marked extends too far towards my property and should only include the legal limit of 10 meters from the junction. Most of the houses in this part of Main Street were built before cars were in use and therefore have no off road parking available. The cars which currently park in the highlighted area will be displaced and there is very little availability for parking elsewhere on this road or the surrounding streets.
37	Resident	Parking	PartlySupport	I see that the no parking in Bathampton Lane is on the north side of the lane as approaching Kennet Park. I agree with that. However, I see a lot of parking on the road where Bathampton lane becomes the High Street, at the bottom of Down Lane, which causes congestion. I strongly recommend that the no parking zone is extended to this area, so that vehicles do not park opposite the bottom of down lane. When they do park there it provides problems for the buses seeking to turn up Down Lane from Bathampton Lane and larger vehicles that come our way, such as bin lorries! The length of road on the north side between Kennet Park and Harbutts should be double yellow

40	Resident	Parking	PartlyObject	Doc 26-050 Catherine way no stopping adjustments. There seems to be a discrepancy between the map shown here and the maps shown in the document 26-050 item map 40. It clearly shows existing yellow lines back to number 54 Cathrine way (G no this map) if this is the case then we would lose a disabled bay and two car parking spaces.. At the moment the bus stop outside number 58 Cathrine Way extends into the carriage way it is able to stop with no obstruction . the yellow lines start from the end of the disabled bay outside No 60 Catherine Way with the yellow lines to the right in front of the bus stop towards the junction .As a disabled driver I would object to to losing a disabled paring and other parking spaces I hope this is an error. Also the map No 40 in the document as I understand it is all about keeping the steps outside No 73 Catherine Way clear. There seems to be quite a lot of misunderstanding regarding this section of Catherine Way . First off all the steps downs form the road on Catherine Way had Single No waiting white line painted across them when the road re-surfaced all those white lines were replaced on all except outside No 73 where yellow were placed across the steps and continued towards the bus stop removing two car parking spaces as well. The mistake was rectified by the lines being blacked out to allow parking once again leaving the yellow lines across the steps. After a while the black wore and to correct that this time the lines were burnt off including across the steps . So somebody assuming the yellow across the steps pre-existed which was an error when before the road relaid all that was there was a white no waiting line . It seems to me that somebody is asking for unnecessary change without the full facts the road outside number 73 is back to what it was before the road was resurfaced the only thing missing now is a white line across the steps. One moe thing surely extending the parking outside number 64 Cathrine Way towards the junction would inpead the rotation of the BUS going around that corner it does need the all the the space it has now.
42	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety, Access	PartlyObject	I attach to this feedback form two letters I have written in regards to road safety on Wellow Lane. The first letter was written to the Council on the 10th April 2023 and my second on the 14th August 2026. Should these attached letters not be accesible please contact me so that they can be posted to you. I also attach photographs that clearly demonstrate the reduced visibility on exiting the driveway at No 59 Wellow Lane. The vehicle photographed and obscured from view by a parked vehicle is a Sainsbury's delivery van - NOT a small car or cyclist. This was photographed on a bright sunny day with excellent visibility. In reduced visibility and dark nights pedestrian safety is also at risk when reversing onto private driveways.
42	Resident	Parking	Object	I object to the proposal for a double yellow line. I have lived near this junction for 50 years and there has only been one incident. When there are no cars parked there, cars drive far too fast and cut the corner, which is more dangerous.
42	Resident	Parking	Object	I see no reason for double yellow lines or parking bays on Wellow Mead where I have lived for 14 years. I have never seen the road full of parked cars, there is always space to park. The only times there may be a lot is when the GP surgery does flu clinics and they don't last all day. Every house on Wellow Mead has drives with at least 1 parking space and every house has a garage of which a few have been converted but there is still always spaces on the drives. There is an occasional problem with speeding but parking bays and double yellow lines aren't going to stop that. I consider it would be a total waste of money. The houses on Wellow Lane from the end of Wellow Mead to Braysdown Lane also all have at least 1 parking space and there are never enough cars parked on the road to cause problems. Also on these proposals there is a parking bay planned right opposite my drive entrance which would make it very difficult for me to manoeuvre my car in and out of my drive.

42	Resident	Parking,Safety	PartlyObject	I have been planning on putting in a proposal to BANES on Wellow Mead, due to significant safety concerns I have. Despite being 20mph zone, cars regularly exceed this speed. In addition, regularly there are cars and bikes that travel at closer to 60mph. This is at all times of the day, but particularly in the morning when I walk my dog, or in the early evening. Obviously this is hugely dangerous, and I have concerns for the safety of my children and pets, as well as others in the street. This is a residential street with many families and young children. In the past couple of years I've had a knocked over cat crawl onto my drive, as well as a hedgehog. Having to find the cat owner on Facebook and then watch as she collected the cat was not something I'd like to do again. As such, I would've assumed the measures planned would include traffic calming, as has been done in the main road through Camerton and also Timsbury . I'm very disappointed that this has not been included. As such. I'd like to request these type of measures are included. It is not realistic to assume that the parking bays alone will improve safety. With no cars parked (often during the day or early evening) the road will continue to be a race track. As such, I don't think it is credible to introduce these measures without traffic calming. If budget can be found for the far safer roads through Timsbury and Camerton, then it can be found here. If the worst happens to a child then it will clearly be horrendous and entirely preventable. To be clear I support parking bays, but only in conjunction with proper traffic calming measures. Thanks for your consideration.
42	Resident	Parking,Safety	PartlySupport	I think the scheme is poorly designed, it has a large majority of parking on one side of the road, if you look at a similar road, old fosse road in Bath it creates constant conflicts as people on the side cars are parked try to force their way through. I think where possible to alternate the side of the parking creates more of an even share of priority causing a slower flow of traffic. Speed bumps could also be added to slow the persistent offenders who will ignore the priority rules.
42	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety, Access,Disturbance	PartlyObject	Whilst I support the parking restriction around entrances to cul de sacs along Wellow Mead . I do not support parking restrictions on one side of the road along the length as this will encourage people to speed even more so to get around parked cars . At present this system is being done by people parking outside of their homes between Wellow Lane and Frederick/Albert Avenue and this has not reduced the speed in any way . We have several motorbikes and cars that use Wellow Meadows as a race track and go at least 50+mph. It is only a matter of time before a life threatening incident will occur and there have been several near misses already. The only thing we feel will help is that speed tables are installed so that vehicles have no option but to reduce their speed . Trying to stagger parking to make a natural chicane will encourage some individuals to move faster to beat oncoming vehicles.
42	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety	PartlyObject	We think the proposed parking bays at the Braysdown Lane end of Wellow Lane should be positioned on the opposite side of the road. One has been suggested next to the bus stop near the junction to Braysdown Lane which will cause obstruction. The other has been suggested opposite the entrance to Jubilee Road, which will result in reduced vision for vehicles exiting this road safely, especially given that this end of Wellow Lane is noticeably narrower than the rest of Wellow Lane towards the Bath Road. Double yellow lines would be more sensibly placed on the side of the road where there are residents' driveways. We appreciate the need to slow traffic to the legal 20mph speed limit, which unfortunately isn't being adhered to by numerous vehicles.
42	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety, Access	Support	I fully support speed reduction as it is necessary, as I have seen vehicles travelling in excess of 50mph including very fast speed of motor cycles.
42	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety, Access	Support	I support the proposed scheme, speeding of vehicles has been a major concern for many years. Some Vehicle travel in excess of 40mph plus, causing safety issues and noise disturbances. As a ward councillor, I have received many complaints about the situation, Thankfully the issues will be addressed, and hopefully any further improvements to the scheme can be updated once implemented.

42	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety	PartlyObject	I responded to a previous consultation regarding the introduction of double yellow lines in Wellow Lane to highlight that this would simply lead to vehicles parking further down the road towards Wellow Mead. This is exactly what happened, with cars starting to park close to the entrance to the cul de sac leading to numbers 10 - 20 Wellow Lane having not done so previously. Initially, drivers parked fairly sensibly here but over the last six months, the number of vehicles parking in this area has increased and now includes large work vans as well as cars. The vehicles are also parking very close to the entrance/exit to the cul de sac. Wellow Lane curves in this location and it means that there is very limited visibility when trying to exit the cul de sac. I have had several near misses as have my neighbours. Turning into it can be difficult as well. I very much welcome the introduction of double yellow lines at the exits/entrances of the various roads leading on to Wellow Lane as people are certainly parking too close to them. They are also parking opposite the junction from the doctors' surgery, so double yellow lines are needed here too. I also welcome the creation of 'chicanes' by marking out parking bays on both sides of the road to slow traffic. The speed of traffic in Wellow Lane is unacceptable most of the time. However, I would strongly urge someone to visit Wellow Lane and consider the visibility for themselves rather than mark out bays via a desk top exercise. At present, I think that the parking bay you are proposing adjacent to 10 - 20 Wellow Lane is too long and when fully occupied will compromise the visibility of those trying to exit the cul de sac here. I have attached a couple of photographs to illustrate my point about lack of visibility but have many more taken at different times. Also attached is a screen shot from google maps showing the curve on the road in this location.
42	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety, Access,Disturbance	Support	This is much needed good news.Sometimes I find it difficult to pull out of my cul de sac as vehicles are blocking my view on both sides, making it dangerous!They also park on entrance into cul de sac, would be good to increase double yellow lines to prevent pavement parking.Lack of common sense and poor parking needs to be addressed, bravo!!Also the speed at which some drivers do along Wellow Mead is quite unbelievable with their nosey exhaust pipes and boy racer attitude.
42	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety, Access,Disturbance	Support	This is much needed good news.Sometimes I find it difficult to pull out of my cul de sac as vehicles are blocking my view on both sides, making it dangerous!They also park on entrance into cul de sac, would be good to increase double yellow lines to prevent pavement parking.Lack of common sense and poor parking needs to be addressed, bravo!!Also the speed at which some drivers do along Wellow Mead is quite unbelievable with their nosey exhaust pipes and boy racer attitude.
42	Resident	Access	PartlyObject	I wish to note my objections to certain changes proposed for Wellow Mead, Peasedown St John detailed within TRO 26-050, which is currently under public consultation.The information provided in Plan 24 of the TRO indicates proposed changes along Wellow Mead directly opposite the entrance to the cul-de-sac from which numbers 23, 25 and 27 gain access.Having spoken to a member of the BANES Parking Services Department I have confirmed that the dotted lines shown in the drawing mark areas where parking will be allowed between road sections designated for yellow lines. I attach an amended drawing detailing my particular area of concern.I strongly object to the one section of non-restriction indicated within the circle shown on my amended drawing. My reason for contesting this plan is that any parked cars in this proposed section will cause a constriction in the busy road, which could lead to possible collisions with any cars leaving our cul-de-sac and traffic travelling along Wellow Mead. The visibility along Wellow Mead when exiting our cul-de-sac is limited by adjacent hedges of our neighbour and Hillcrest Surgery - please see attached photo. The Surgery hedge is particularly problematic, as it is poorly maintained - a recurring matter I have raised on several occasions with those concerned at Hillcrest. Consequently, the proposed change will introduce a hazard to traffic flow at that point.I trust that my comments will be included by the Council as part of the consultation process, and I shall be grateful if you will notify me of the outcome of this consultation.

42	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety	PartlyObject	Im concerned about the parking along Wellow Lane where I have put a cross on the picture of the road as how the parking is proposed to be allowed it's on a curve in the road it's blind curve when vans and cars are parked there especially as there is a parking bay on opposite side of the road where there is always a big van parked there so when I come out of my drive at number 33 you can't see cars coming from Wellow mead unless you come out to the middle of the road.I don't think there should be parking on a bend it's dangerous, I know traffic needs calming but it should be safe not dangerous.
42	Resident	Parking,Safety	PartlySupport	Firstly, putting double yellow lines down both sides of wellow lane will create an even better race track for speeding cars, which is already unsafe but they do need to slow down if cars parked on the street. Staggered parking bays would be much safer,especially with cars pulling out of culdisacs. Cars will be forced to park on side roads including jubilee rd which is a private road that residents pay to maintain. I don't think this has been thought through properly.
42	Resident	Parking,Safety,Access	PartlyObject	I noticed on the new parking proposal for Wellow Mead Road that there will be a parking zone opposite our exit road, when the new yellow double lines are laid, that parking zone opposite Home Farm Close will cause a safety issue for us leaving our cul-de-sac. Also, when the recycling lorries enter Home Farm Close, they usually always reverse so they need the space opposite to be able to reverse there lorry safely into the cul-de-sac for collection of bin waste.In the past when cars have been parked opposite our entrance it;s very difficult to exit safely. I have also noticed on your plan parking that we are the only cul-de-sac blocked by cars parked opposite.I strongly object to cars parked opposite Home Farm Close on Safety issues.

42	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety	Object	off street parking space allowance for these houses are a joke. Many people have multiple cars per household, our semi rural area and poor public transport does not support the needs for most who work anywhere other than bath. My wife and I could never use public transport for work as there is no network for our work locations or times of shift patterns and I strongly believe that's the case for many other people who live in Peasedown St John. Coupled with the housing crisis and children staying home longer, like it or not we need space for cars. The proposals are suggesting REMOVING space, surely that actually makes parking inadequate? The older houses will be gleefully unaffected as they have driveways for multiple cars and don't need the road. I also have a works van. My covenant states I'm not allowed to park on the estate, by limiting the space available I'm much more likely to have to park further and further away with the competition for space in less visible roads, causing further parking issues for residents and risk my vehicle being broken into. The cynic in me thinks this is another sly approach to push cars out and claim a success for public transport, but as we had the bus route on wellow lane removed years ago I struggle to see how. It's claimed this proposal will calm traffic, if I could point out the obvious that people already freely park in the manor the application shows and our local councillors are contacted over the years about it still being an issue. Surely that would give sense enough to anyone that this is not an adequate solution but a pointless waste of money? the issue of speeding needs to be simply addressed with speed bumps, an example of which can be proven to work not far from us in Camerton on camerton hill, the resulting speed bumps were simple, effective and I'm sure the residents would agree, reduced speed. The added bonus of leaving people to free park along the street with speed bumps, would be natural and irregular chicanes. without need of money spent on yellow and white paint, it would only help to wind up the local boy racers and motorbikes who excessively speed. I cannot understand why this approach has not been suggested all along. I would also like to submit a photo I've taken this morning further showing my reasons to object, taken down the street showing at mid morning the road near empty. We're all at work so there is no traffic calming to be gained by bay parking during the day, no natural restrictions. By night there will be cars but also most of us will be at home so no traffic and that's when we get the idiotic drivers gunning down the road at 60 with no reason to slow as they have a clear sight down the road and no oncoming cars to slow them. Finally if I could also add a historic change example similar to these proposals that was made on the junction of braysdown and wellow lane and I think proves my point perfectly, we had double yellow lines put down to improve traffic, on a road with no traffic issue that I had or have ever experienced. despite us all protesting we were ignored and the lines were painted. Practically a day after we lost the offstreet parking, people were gunning it and power sliding cars round the junction up and down braysdown and wellow lane as there was suddenly no natural (And at no cost the the tax payer) barrier to stop them going wide on the corner and screaming down the road. I have simply had enough of people's poor decision making that does nothing but cause further inconvenience, wastes money at a time I think we will agree can be ill afforded but primarily will make the situation only worse and not cure the issue, there are projects that could benefit far greater from the money that would be wasted on this like for
42	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety	Object	The inclusion of double yellow lines and parking bays along Wellow Mead and Wellow Lane in Peasedown will do nothing to towards it's aims of helping slow traffic and increasing parking availability. The entire road is currently available for parking, allowing cars to park on multiple sides, creating natural chicanes - and even these do not serve to slow traffic down, as the road is wide enough for parked cars and 2 vehicles to pass each other. Wellow mead and Wellow Lane needs speed bumps to reduce the traffic speed, as currently people fly down the road at 30-40mph, very rarely following the signposted limit of 20mph. The proposals of parking areas will just serve to increase people's speed, as if there is someone waiting at the other end of the parking area (unlikely, as people will still be able to pass 2 abreast), people will speed up to not inconvenience other drivers, rather than proceeding at the limit. Only speed bumps will materially slow down traffic on this road.

42	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety, Access	PartlyObject	On Wellow Lane we have already problem not only with speed but also with parking spaces. Cars are parked on the both sides but it doesn't limit the speed. We don't have enough parking spaces on our street. Many young people are still living with parents which means there is more cars in many houses and they are all needed(different jobs, different work time etc).In that case we need more parking spaces. If there is big problem with that why we cannot have parking for more cars(opposite our house and house nr 28 is green area which might be used for that)People who are working in the Sulis hospital are parking their cars on our street .We really need more parking spaces , but your proposal is limiting them more.Recently introduced double yellow lines across from our house has limited parking spaces but has not improved safety, it has made the road more unsafe as more people using that junction speed across it without stopping.
42	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety	PartlyObject	On Wellow Lane we have already problem not only with speed but also with parking spaces. Cars are parked on the both sides but it doesn't limit the speed. We don't have enough parking spaces on our street. Many young people are still living with parents which means there is more cars in many houses and they are all needed(different jobs, different work time etc).In that case we need more parking spaces. If there is big problem with that why we cannot have parking for more cars(opposite our house and house nr 28 is green area which might be used for that)People who are working in the Sulis hospital are parking their cars on our street .We really need more parking spaces , but your proposal is limiting them more.Recently introduced double yellow lines across from our house has limited parking spaces but has not improved safety, it has made the road more unsafe as more people using that junction speed across it without stopping.
42	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety, Access,Disturbance	PartlyObject	- similar initiatives in the area did not succeed in slowing traffic so this may be ineffective - parking is already difficult and heated with issues and disputes among residents as people struggle to park near their homes, so taking away spaces would make this issue worse - cars already park in a similar pattern on this road and traffic is still going over the speed limit further proving this approach alone may not slow traffic down - since double yellows were added opposite 28 Wellow lane, cars coming down from Frederic Avenue have been speeding more/not stopping at the junction to check road is clear/causing near accidents on a weekly basis - this double yellow could be removed as cars parking there did seem to be effective at reducing the speed of cars going across this junction - Sulis hospital staff use this road as parking which means controlling and reducing parking spaces as per this proposal would further reduce spaces for residents - I would support this proposal if it offered more parking spaces than it currently does - could speed bumps be considered instead or as well as a more appropriate/effective measure? - could the green space across from 28 Wellow lane be utilised as parking spaces instead/as well as, this seems to work well over across Frederick Avenue area

42	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety	Support	I fully support the proposal to introduce double yellow lines and designated parking bays on Wellow Lane and Wellow Mead. The current parking situation is often inadequate, leading to congestion, poor visibility at junctions, and difficulties for residents, visitors, and emergency vehicles. I am particularly supportive of the proposed measures in the area between the Doctors Surgery and Frederick Avenue. This section of road experiences ongoing parking issues, with vehicles often parked in an unstructured manner that can obstruct sightlines and create hazards for both motorists and pedestrians. In addition to addressing parking concerns, I believe the proposal would help tackle the issue of excessive vehicle speeds along this stretch of road. Clearly marked parking bays would help organise the available road space and act as a natural traffic-calming measure. The presence of parked vehicles within designated bays can visually narrow the carriageway, encouraging drivers to reduce their speed and pay greater attention to their surroundings. This is particularly important in an area regularly used by patients visiting the doctors surgery, local residents, children, and other pedestrians. The introduction of double yellow lines would also prevent unsafe parking in key locations, improving visibility and making it easier for drivers to safely navigate the road. Together, the double yellow lines and marked parking bays would create a safer, more orderly environment while helping to discourage speeding and improve road safety for everyone. Should this proposal be accepted and implemented, it would be beneficial to have some form of Speed monitoring for this area post the implementation to assess the impact on the speeding challenges being experienced currently. Overall, I strongly support this proposal and believe it would deliver significant benefits to the local community by improving parking provision, reducing congestion, enhancing pedestrian safety, and creating a more effective traffic-calming environment along the entire road.
42	Resident	Parking	Object	I am writing to formally object to the proposed installation of double yellow lines on Wellow Lane. One of my main concerns is that removing parked vehicles from the roadside is likely to increase vehicle speeds. The presence of parked cars naturally encourages drivers to slow down and take greater care. If the road is left completely clear, there is a real risk that motorists will travel faster, making the road less safe for residents, pedestrians and children. In addition, when purchasing our home, the availability of on-street parking was an important factor for our family. We are a household of seven, and while we understand the need to balance the needs of all residents, these restrictions would have a significant impact on our daily lives. It would become extremely difficult to accommodate visitors, family members or carers, as there would be little or no nearby parking available. I would also like to point out that the newer housing estate on Wellow Lane was designed with designated parking spaces and garages located to the rear of the properties. These facilities were provided specifically to meet the parking needs of those homes and should be used where possible, rather than introducing restrictions that negatively affect existing residents who rely on the available on-street parking. If the purpose of the proposal is to improve access and prevent obstruction, I believe there are more proportionate alternatives. Rather than introducing continuous double yellow lines along the street, the council could consider installing them only in front of driveways where access is regularly blocked and on bends where parked vehicles may create visibility or safety concerns. This would address the specific problem areas while still allowing residents to make reasonable use of the available on-street parking. I appreciate that parking and road safety concerns must be carefully considered, but I do not believe that double yellow lines are the most appropriate solution. I would ask that alternative options are explored, such as restricting the length of the proposed yellow lines, introducing limited waiting restrictions where genuinely necessary, or carrying out further consultation with residents to identify a solution that balances safety with the practical parking needs of those who live on Wellow Lane. I respectfully ask that my objection is taken into account before any final decision is made.

42	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety	Support	I fully support the proposal to introduce double yellow lines and designated parking bays on Wellow Lane and Wellow Mead. The current parking situation is often inadequate, leading to congestion, poor visibility at junctions, and difficulties for residents, visitors, and emergency vehicles. I am particularly supportive of the proposed measures in the area between the Doctors Surgery and Frederick Avenue. This section of road experiences ongoing parking issues, with vehicles often parked in an unstructured manner that can obstruct sightlines and create hazards for both motorists and pedestrians. In addition to addressing parking concerns, I believe the proposal would help tackle the issue of excessive vehicle speeds along this stretch of road. Clearly marked parking bays would help organise the available road space and act as a natural traffic-calming measure. The presence of parked vehicles within designated bays can visually narrow the carriageway, encouraging drivers to reduce their speed and pay greater attention to their surroundings. This is particularly important in an area regularly used by patients visiting the doctors surgery, local residents, children, and other pedestrians. The introduction of double yellow lines would also prevent unsafe parking in key locations, improving visibility and making it easier for drivers to safely navigate the road. Together, the double yellow lines and marked parking bays would create a safer, more orderly environment while helping to discourage speeding and improve road safety for everyone. Overall, I strongly support this proposal and believe it would deliver significant benefits to the local community by improving parking provision, reducing congestion, enhancing pedestrian safety, and creating a more effective traffic-calming environment along the entire road.
42	Resident	Parking,Traffic	Object	I consider the proposal to restrict parking in Wellow Mead PSJ totally unnecessary and ineffective in preventing speeding in this street. All it is going to do is annoy residents who need to park and as the restrictions are nearly all on the same side of the road for most of Wellow Mead will mean a nice clear run for speeding vehicles, especially motor bikes. I am referring to Wellow Mead not Wellow Lane. Wellow Mead merges into Wellow Lane at the turning for Hilcrest surgery. The notice posted all over Wellow Mead doesn't actually cite Wellow Mead and the printed proposal delivered via a local councillor only refers to Wellow Mead and not Wellow Lane even though it includes both. What a mess! The proposal has not been properly researched and local people are not being properly informed. I had to really search around your website to find this consultation and the notices on the lamp posts in Wellow Mead don't even mention Wellow Mead, so most residents will not realise it affects them.
42	Resident	Parking	PartlyObject	In response to proposal 26-050 I would like to strongly object to the proposed restrictions specifically on Eckweek Lane. There are a large number of residents on neighbouring Ashgrove who do not have private parking, and who rely on the use of street parking on Eckweek Lane. These proposed restrictions would severely impact these residents, including myself, my husband, and my neighbours who have a one year old child. Please reconsider the restrictions on Eckweek Lane.
42	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Access, Disturbance	PartlyObject	Junctions should have yellow lines , don't agree with the rest .
42	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety, Access	PartlyObject	With the double yellow lines going out down Wellow Lane, I am concerned that more vehicles will park down Braysdown Lane. With the garden/side exit of my house going onto this road, I already worry when leaving the house with my toddler with how busy it gets as is. Cars already dodge one another up and down the road when cars are parked on each side and with this new proposal people will be looking elsewhere to park, with Braysdown being opposite Wellow lane more people will feel the need to park there which isn't helpful for not only myself but others who live down the lane. Having gate going directly onto this road it would not be helpful to have people needing to park on the road, we already have had people park directly in front of our gate which would not be good in circumstances of emergency, we don't need the congestion!

42	Resident	Parking,Traffic	PartlyObject	I don't understand the reasoning for the implementation of on street parking restrictions in Wellow Mead or Wellow Lane, Peasedown St John. Parking is not an issue on either street and, to my knowledge and observation, does cause any access or traffic restriction issues for residents or traffic passing through. In fact, the current unrestricted parking along Wellow Mead does go some way to slowing traffic speeds (which is a bigger issue and does warrant further consultation). The application of parking restrictions in this area is unnecessary, both in terms of tangible benefit and cost to the council.
42	Resident	Parking,Safety	Object	I wholly object to this order on the basis that wellow lane is not problematic when cars are parked, its problematic when cars go speeding down the road at over the 20mph limit. And this is when no other cars are on the roads. Buses and emergency vehicles have enough space to get past when vehicles are parked. It is stated the new development has adequate off-street parking. 1 space is not adequate parking when the garages are not wide enough for a standard car nowadays. As for the older properties on the street. They are able to park on the council owned grass verges (if it isn't council owned verges then why are banes cutting the area) so does that mean others will be able to park there without their vehicles being damaged by residents that think they own a whole street? The residents detesting this use the street themselves for moving their 4 vehicles around so holiday homes can be moved and have made their moans public knowledge when slating the residents and the family members to people working outside. I know this as I have personally witnessed all the pointing and heard the slating. There are narrower roads around the village that do not have double yellows and also not on any plans . If this isn't a problem then again I don't know why wellow lane is. Households dependants are living at home more nowadays as it is near impossible to get their own properties which means more drivers. People drive to be able to work. It's okay for the Households with driveways big enough for many vehicles to want this. But take a good look around the area and realise that other places have problems nowhere near this double width road
42	Resident	Parking,Safety	PartlyObject	I see no reason for the yellow lines on Wellow Lane. I understand the ones they have done on the junctions for better vision. The road is a 20mph, very wide residential road and parked cars are not a problem. They help with slowing the cars that do use the road. This has all come from a select few that have been moaning prior to the houses being built, who did not get their way to prevent the houses being built. There is talk that it is hard to pull out of their driveways, the road is wide enough and does not cause a problem. All this will cause is more parking issues with the roads that are connected to Wellow Lane. Maybe we can park on the large verge the council owns and the bungalow owners already use. There are many roads around with worse parking problems and much more traffic flow without yellow lines. What a waste of our money to keep a handful of moaners happy. All it will do is bring more problems than solutions. I bought this house due to the on road parking and now there wont be enough parking for residents and visitors.
42	Resident	Parking,Safety	Object	The parking along this stretch of road is not causing any safety issues, except when there are no cars parked and cars feel they can drive way over the 20mph limit that is in force. I recommend speed bumps would be a better and safer option. If this is implemented, then ask where will residents park vehicles? This would cause problems on the surrounding roads
42	Resident	Parking	Object	Where is it the local residents should park? I live on Ashgrove where I cannot park so I have no choice but to park on Ecweek Lane. Is the council going to provide residents parking somewhere else? Just stopping parking does not make the problem go away and is a complete misunderstanding of local issues. This is not a solution to congestion and will encourage even more obstruction in other areas. Perhaps a representative from the council needs to come and see the problem for themselves to understand how out of touch this proposal actually is. This is not a solution based proposal but appears to be purely punitive. Not what we expect from our local representatives.

42	Resident	Parking,Access,Disturbance	Object	It would further restrict people/people with accessibility issues in an already car filled street. Making it so they would have to travel further from their home to park. I think this proposal is selfish considering some people don't have access to drives and garages in this area.
42	Resident	Parking	Object	There is limited parking already and so we feel we would not be able to park at all.
42	Resident	Parking	Object	Without parking on Eekweek, residents will be forced to park on the already busy Ashgrove.
42	Resident	Parking	Object	Given the limited parking throughout Peasedown St John, particularly on Ashgrove, if you removed further available parking spots those of us with accessibility needs would have unnecessarily increased difficulties finding parking that was acceptably close to home
42	Resident	Parking	PartlyObject	We have very limited parking as it is. If you put double yellows the whole way down Wellow lane people with more than one car wil have nowhere to park.
42	Resident	Parking,Traffic	Object	I truly believe this is ridiculous, as a family of 5 who 4 out of 5 have vehicles we have no where in our col de sac to park apart from the road!! It does not cause any harm parking along the side of the road near the col de sacs!!! I know many of my neighbours and other residents of wellow mead road who also have this issue with parking and the road is the simple and safest solution!! The road is already used as a race track let alone with no cars on it will be like the by pass! A resolution is needed! Where do family's with more than 2 cars parks? Where do visitors park? With limited spaces along the road for family's with older children! This is utterly ridiculous
42	Resident	Parking	Object	Wellow Mead - Ridiculous parking restrictions on a road that is already used as a racing track, removing parked cars (which slow the traffic down), will make this problem worse! Over flow for the quiet cul de sacs .. where do houses with more than two cars and visitors park!!!! There is no problem in this stretch of road so why change it!!!
42	Resident	Parking	Object	I have enclosed a petition to protest against parking opposite the entrance of Home Farm Close by the residents. We feel that it would restrict our exiting , and entering into our culture-de-sac, and it would become a safety hazard for us.Recycling lorries who reverse into the cup-de-sac for collection would not have the room to position their lorry to swing in, if there are cars parked opposite. There should be consultation to begin with, for what you intend to do in our area, there hasn't been any? And the residents are very unhappy.
42	Resident	Parking	Object	I wish to note my objections to certain changes proposed for Wellow Mead, Peasedown St John detailed within TRO 26-050, which is currently under public consultation.The information provided in Plan 24 of the TRO indicates proposed changes along Wellow Mead directly opposite the entrance to the cul-de-sac from which numbers 23, 25 and 27 gain access.Having spoken to a member of the BANES Parking Services Department I have confirmed that the dotted lines shown in the drawing mark areas where parking will be allowed between road sections designated for yellow lines. I attach an amended drawing detailing my particular area of concern.I strongly object to the one section of non-restriction indicated within the circle shown on my amended drawing. My reason for contesting this plan is that any parked cars in this proposed section will cause a constriction in the busy road, which could lead to possible collisions with any cars leaving our cul-de-sac and traffic travelling along Wellow Mead.The visibility along Wellow Mead when exiting our cul-de-sac is limited by adjacent hedges of our neighbour and Hillcrest Surgery - please see attached photo. The Surgery hedge is particularly problematic, as it is poorly maintained - a recurring matter I have raised on several occasions with those concerned at Hillcrest. Consequently, the proposed change will introduce a hazard to traffic flow at that point.I trust that my comments will be included by the Council as part of the consultation process, and I shall be grateful if you will notify me of the outcome of this consultation.