

# OFFICER DECISION REPORT - TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

3

## OUTCOME OF TRO PROCESS

PREPARED BY: Traffic Management Team, Highways and Traffic Group

**TITLE OF REPORT:** North East Somerset Area  
**PROPOSAL:** Various Waiting Restrictions  
**SCHEME REF No:** 22 – 001  
**REPORT AUTHOR:** Kris Gardom

### 1. DELEGATION

The delegation to be exercised in this report is contained within **Section 4** of the Constitution under the **Delegation of Functions to Officers**, as follows:

<b>Section A</b>	The Chief Executive, Strategic Directors, Divisional Directors and Heads of Service have delegated power to take any decision falling within their area of responsibility....”
<b>Section B</b>	Without prejudice to the generality of this, Officers are authorised to: serve any notices and make, amend or revoke any orders falling within his/her area of responsibility.
<b>Section D9</b>	An Officer to whom a power, duty or function is delegated may nominate or authorise another Officer to exercise that power, duty or function, provided that Officer reports to or is responsible to the delegator.

*For the purpose of this report, the Director of Place Management holds the delegated power to make, amend or revoke any Orders.*

### 2. LEGAL AUTHORITY

This proposal is made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, which under Section 1 provides, generally, for Orders to be made for the following reasons, and in the case of this report specifically for the reason(s) shown below:

(a)	for avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising, or	X
(b)	for preventing damage to the road or to any building on or near the road, or	
(c)	for facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians), or	X
(d)	for preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which, is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property,	
(e)	(without prejudice to the generality of paragraph (d) above) for preserving the character of the road in a case where it is specially suitable for use by persons on horseback or on foot, or	

(f)	for preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs, or	
(g)	for any of the purposes specified in paragraphs (a) to (c) of subsection (1) of section 87 of the Environment Act 1995 (air quality)	

**3. PROPOSAL**

To implement various parking / waiting restrictions around the North East Somerset area.

**4. BACKGROUND**

A number of proposals for: No Parking At Any Time markings, Reduction of existing No Parking At Any Time markings, Disabled Parking, Restricted Parking Zone and No Parking / No Loading At Any Time at various locations around the North East Somerset area were submitted to the Council by local residents, Ward Members and the Bath & North East Somerset Councils Traffic Management and Transport Planning Engineers. The reason behind these requests was to improve visibility and access for emergency and refuse vehicles, to allow for the safe passage and re-passage of vehicles and to provide limited on-street parking provision. These proposals have all been considered by the area Senior Safety Engineer.

**5. SOURCE OF FINANCE**

This proposal is being funded by the capital Parking budget, project code TC8302.

**6. INFORMAL CONSULTATION REQUIREMENT**

Informal consultation was carried out with the Chief Constable, Ward Members and the Cabinet Members for Transport.

The responses to the informal consultation can be found in TRO reports number 1/2.

**7. OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS RECEIVED (following the public advertisement of the proposal(s))**

The objection / comments received have been summarised below with the technical responses in italics underneath each one. **Appendix 1** attached to this report includes the full responses received during the 21-day public consultation.

**Plan 1 – A39, High Littleton (No Parking At Any Time)**

**Objections – 1**

**Objection main points raised:**

- Curb mounting doesn't occur on the corner opposite Timsbury Lane where you are proposing a no parking zone. Curb mounting does occasionally occur further up opposite Church Farm, but this has nothing to do with the lack of visibility from parked cars opposite Timsbury Lane.
- This parking that you are proposing to remove opposite Timsbury Lane is needed by parents to get their children to school. If it is removed further congestion will occur with more parents using Aumery Gardens as the school car park.
- Aumery Gardens is a quiet cul-de-sac that is getting increasingly congested as it is becoming the school car park.
- For me the real danger is the lack of safe crossing between High Littleton Church & High Littleton School. We have been without our lolly pop lady for at least 12 months and my daughter has nearly been knocked down here. It is particularly dangerous when we leave school at 3.30 and cross the A39 by the church. There is often a traffic jam into the village from west to east. So, to the children it appears the cars in the traffic jam nearest to us (on the school side) have given way, so they think it is safe to cross, not seeing the fast traffic leaving the village on the other side of the road because the traffic jam hides them and hides the children!!! It is only a matter of time before there is a serious accident here. We need a pelican crossing with traffic lights to make our children safe.

*Response:*

*The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions were requested by the Parish Council and local Councillor to improve visibility along the A39 in High Littleton. As we only received one objection to these proposed restrictions it is the recommendation of this report that they are sealed within this Order and implemented on-site as advertised. The request for a Pelican Crossing sits outside the scope and remit of this TRO consultation; however, this request has been noted. This request would need to be reviewed by the Traffic Management Team for possible funding and inclusion within a future Transport Improvement Program.*

**Plan 2 – Ashgrove, Peasedown St John (No Parking At Any Time)**

**Objections – 6 (Including a petition with a further 26 signatures)**

**Objection main points raised:**

- Lack of available on-street parking on Ashgrove.
- If the proposed double yellow lines go ahead then we won't even be allowed to pull up to load and unload, which seems somewhat over-severe. We would then need to pull-up in the bus-stop, which would cause disruption, whereas parking on the chicane does not.

- Petition from the local residents in the area of the proposed changes to parking on Ashgrove, Peasedown St John as many properties don't have off-street parking available.
- No visibility issue with parking in this location.
- Parking here does not block any pavements.
- Of far greater concern is the number of cars who speed along this stretch of road at well over 20 mph: could a speed monitor perhaps be placed at the entrance to the village?
- The issues are with people speeding, so instead I think we need more speed bumps.
- Reducing the available parking without providing meaningful alternatives will not solve the problem, but simply push it into the side streets such as Eckweek lane.

*Response:*

*The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions around the buildout on Ashgrove, Peasedown St John as seen below were requested by the local Councillors and our Enforcement Team as we cannot permit vehicles to park in this location obstructing visibility along Ashgrove.*



*The Buildout was placed on-site to act as a chicane and slow vehicle speeds down. Regarding dropping off deliveries, this can be done on existing No parking At Any Time restrictions in sensible locations where the highway will not be obstructed for 5 minutes grace as long as you are seen to be coming to and from your vehicle. It is therefore the recommendation of this report that despite the objections raised these restrictions are approved and sealed within this Order.*

## **Plan 6 – Cappards Road, Bishop Sutton (No Parking At Any Time)**

**Support in Part – 1**

### **Support in Part main points raised:**

- I had asked if double yellow lines could be painted as to exit our driveway is extremely dangerous, we have no view of the road because of the parked cars. The plan open for consultation ref 22001 wants double yellow lines around the cappards road junction but NOT including our driveway. As this will force even more people especially school staff to park as close to our driveway and parents dropping children off to actually block our driveway, they think they won't be long so it doesn't matter We should not have to risk our lives or that of others pulling out on to a main road just of parked cars. If you won't paint double yellow all along up to and including our driveway is there a time limit to us paying for the white lines.

### *Response:*

*The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions were requested by the area Senior Traffic Management Engineer to improve safety around the junction of Cappards Road and the A368 near to the play area. As the request above is not considered to be a substantial change to the Order and no objections were raised during the consultation, it is the recommendation of this report that proposed restrictions are sealed within the Order but extended further north eastwards along the A368 by a distance of 9 metres to run up to and extend in front of the property entrance as requested above.*

### **Plan 9 – Village Road / Dunkerton Hill, Dunkerton (No Parking At Any Time)**

#### **Support in Part – 2, Support - 1**

### **Support in Part main points raised:**

- Dunkerton and Tunley Parish Council strongly support the installation of double yellows as designed but are aware that a parishioner has objected and therefore the parish council would be content for the design to be amended as the parishioner proposes as long as the change does not delay the installation or make it prohibitively expensive.
- Request: Can the yellow lines be extended as they are not going down far enough to opposite my property and this will cause people to park opposite which will block his access.

### *Response:*

*The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions were requested by the Traffic Management Team on behalf of the Parish Council and local residents to prevent obstruction at the junction where there is also a bus stop located and consequently people walking across the highway at this point. The request above to extend the proposed restrictions further down Village Road (Church Lane) to prevent obstruction of their entrance is not considered to be a substantial change to the Order and therefore it is the recommendation of this report and with the Parish*

*Councils support that the proposed restrictions are implemented and sealed within this Order at the extended length of 53 metres from the junction with Dunkerton Hill.*

### **Plan 10 – Durcott Lane / Weekesley Lane, Camerton (No Parking At Any Time)**

#### **Objections – 4**

##### **Objection main points raised:**

- This restriction will particularly affect the 5 houses situated in Brewery Yard opposite the junction. Because of the lack of parking in the Yard visitors park in Durcott Lane. The Lane is wide there and they do not restrict visibility or the passage of other vehicles in any way.
- Traffic down Durcott Lane is light.
- Radford is quite an isolated hamlet and visitors have to arrive by car. Cars have parked there for at least 30 years to our knowledge without causing any safety or traffic problems.
- This location is, in our view, the only safe place for our visitors and delivery drivers to park.
- A Police Officer visited stated that he could see no reason why parking could be seen as an issue at the junction after a PCN issued was retracted.
- This is also a spot where nurses park to care for other elderly residents.

##### *Response:*

*The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions were requested by the Parish Council, however due to objections raised above and the concern over lack of available safe on-street visitor parking within the area it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are reduced and implement at the junction only and extend down Durcott Lane by a distance of 8 metres instead of 30 metres. This will prevent vehicles parking too close to the junction but retain valuable on-street parking provision for local residents.*

### **Plan 12 – Farrington Road / Abbotts Farm Close, Paulton (No Parking At Any Time)**

#### **Objections – 3, Support in Part – 2**

##### **Objection main points raised:**

- As a homeowner on Farrington Road within the proposed no stopping area, we rely on deliveries such as grocery deliveries. With young children and lift sharing arrangements with friends we rely on them being dropped off outside our property following after school clubs outside of the village. Introducing no

stopping here would present a safety issue as they would have to be dropped off further away from our property down the road and walk by themselves out of sight.

- I am a resident of Farrington Road and I object to proposal plan 12 Farrington Road / Abbot's Road. I agree to the original proposal of yellow lines North of the bus stop but to bring them down past the bus stop in front of the houses will cause a plethora of problems.
- Double yellow lines would mean the residents will park further down the road and there will be one long line of cars parked so there will be no gaps to enable traffic to pass safely, what this road needs are traffic calming, living on this road at times it's like a racetrack.
- The parked cars act as a traffic calming measure. So, it's not nor never has been double yellow lines that are the solution it's a speed camera or ideally speed humps.

#### **Support in Part main points raised:**

- Whilst I have no objection to the proposal. As I think the current situation is an accident waiting to happen, my concern is that with the proposal the likelihood is that people will start to park on Abbott's Farm Close, mainly outside my house, which has happened before. This situation is not only dangerous for me but for other resident living in the close. If people decide to park there so close to the junction it means I have to pull out around the parked vehicle right on the junction. If these plans go ahead, I am requesting the yellow parking lines be extended and end at the dropped curb to my house.
- I 'am a resident of Farrington Road. I agree yellow lines should be put in place on the corner by abbot's farm Close but not down past the houses on Farrington Road. I drive past these cars every day and never had an issue, the only issue on this road is the speed of some traffic using it. Something to keep the speed down would be a lot better than putting yellow lines that will just move cars further down the road leaving no gaps for traffic to give way and pass safely.

#### *Response:*

*The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions were requested by the Parish Council and local Councillor as cars parking in this location on the brow of the hill make visibility extremely poor for vehicles traveling from Farrington. The purpose of the highway is for the safe passage of vehicles. Parking is an obstruction of that purpose and can therefore only be condoned where it is safe to do so. It is therefore the recommendation of this report that despite the objections raised that the proposed restrictions are implemented on-site and sealed within this Order with the slight amendment of extending by a distance of 5 metres the No Parking At Any Time restrictions into Abbots Farm Close as requested above to prevent obstruction near to the junction. A vehicle is permitted to stop on a No Parking At Any Time restriction for the purpose of loading and unloading (which includes boarding and*

*alighting of passengers) as long as the activity that is being undertaken is continuous.*

### **Plan 13 – Ferry Lane, Claverton (No Parking At Any Time and a Restricted Parking Zone)**

#### **Objections – 7, Support in Part – 1, Support - 1**

##### **Objection main points raised:**

- The needs of liveaboard boaters without a home mooring have not been considered.
- The Canal and River Trust manage the waterways and refuse to renew boat licences if boaters don't move long distances - this means that many liveaboard boaters now need to use cars to enable them to get to work.
- Liveaboard boaters do not have anywhere to park as they don't own a house or a driveway to park on, but they are still part of the community and must be catered for.
- We have to work and it is essential that we can park vehicles close to the boat for safety.
- We are already subject to very strict rules and regulations on the canal and mooring is often very difficult, especially towards Bath. I can appreciate the issues with parking down this lane in the summer months but those that park for swimming and leisure purposes visiting Warleigh Weir also cause problems along the A36. They park on verges and pavements with no care for other road users. If restrictions are imposed, and I object strongly to these, maybe there is a way of issuing temporary parking permits to boaters who are already struggling with livelihoods.
- Live aboard boaters are required to move regularly by the Canal and River Trust under threat of refusal to renew their licence and loss if their home. Under these circumstances a car parked within a reasonable distance of a mooring place is even more essential for daily access to school and work. These proposals do not allow for adequate provision for these citizens and should be rejected.
- The majority of parking problems experienced by the residents and agricultural users of Ferry Lane are the result of good weather. People park in Ferry Lane so that they can have access to Warleigh Weir, a popular swimming place. Most visits take place in the warmer months of the year, in fine weather, when the river is not in flood. This pattern of fair-weather use does not support the need for further restrictions on parking and would disadvantage the community of boat dwellers and anglers who use the parking space in Ferry Lane all year.



- Fishing on Canal & River Trust waterways is a hobby that is enjoyed chiefly by older, retired working-class men. The May 2014 Canal & River Trust survey of angling clubs found that 98% of respondents were men; around half were aged over 65, and only about 3% were aged under 45. Many respondents to this survey stated that car parking was important. Most anglers carry equipment that is fairly cumbersome and therefore good road access and parking is important. Night fishing is popular amongst anglers. Ferry Lane is one of the places where anglers can park vehicles close to the canal. To impose further parking restrictions at would disadvantage older and retired working-class men, especially those with disabilities, who come to Ferry Lane to fish and who may not have many other opportunities for recreation and relaxation.
- The proposed parking restrictions will have a disproportionate adverse impact on boat dwellers without home moorings. Ferry Lane is one of the few mooring places that is within easy reach of Bathampton Primary School, where many boat dwelling children attend.
- Parking vehicles in Ferry Lane is needed all year round by Bargee Travellers (itinerant boat dwellers) on the Kennet and Avon Canal.
- The proposals amount to indirect sex, age and disability discrimination contrary to Section 19 and Schedule 2 of the Equality Act 2010. Those using the moorings who need to own and use a vehicle would need to park elsewhere in Claverton village or on the A36. This will have the unintended consequence of deterring use of the mooring space. This will have a greater impact on women, who are less likely to walk through unlit areas at night. It will also cause road safety issues due to Bargee Travellers (and other canal users such as anglers) having to cross and/or walk along the busy and fast A36 to get from the vicinity of Claverton village to the canal, and they will often be carrying children or heavy, bulky items such as fishing gear, shopping, sacks of coal in wheelbarrows, etc

#### **Support in Part main points raised:**

- Whilst I have no objection to the proposal insofar as extending the 'No Parking At Any Time' zones (on the basis that those areas as outlined in the proposal appear to be consistent with the current restrictions) I do object to the proposal to implement a 'Controlled Parking Zone' (i.e. resident only parking), to the extent that the proposal will be restricted to resident parking only as illustrated on the proposed map, for the following reasons: a. Residents rely on the current available parking zone at the bottom end of Ferry Lane: b. non-residents equally rely on the current available parking zone at the bottom end of Ferry Lane: c. Banes Policy ST7 further strengthens the case against a blanket Controlled Parking Zone for residents only. d. I understand the need to control the parking to a degree. However, I consider the proposed restriction to residents parking only is contrary to Government Policy ST7, unfair and dangerous to pedestrians going forward for the reasons set out above. Rather, I would recommend restricted parking on Ferry Lane which provides a restriction to parking to say one hour parking

slots, for the wellbeing of the local community and so the highway safety is not prejudiced, and that pedestrian's safety come first in line with Government policy.

### **Support main points raised:**

- I am writing on behalf of the Claverton Pumping Station Group. We maintain the Grade I listed waterwheel at the bottom of Ferry Lane. The Claverton Pumping Station Group wholeheartedly support the proposals for a restricted parking zone on Ferry Lane in the permanent traffic order notice 22-001. Far too often has the lane become blocked in such a way that emergency services would not be able to reach the Grade I listed building in the event of a fire or injury. We ask the council to consider also adding signage specifically reminding drivers that there can be no parking in the passing place. Almost every day for the last few years there have been cars and vans parked in the passing place making the road treacherous to residents and our volunteers.

### *Response:*

*The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions and Controlled Parking Zone was requested by the Senior Traffic Management Engineer on behalf of the police to prevent obstruction of Ferry Lane by parked vehicles. The proposed Controlled Parking Zone is not a Residents Parking Zone, and local residents would not be issued permits. The proposed restrictions are to allow parking in dedicated marked bays only for all drivers. Due to the number of objections raised above from the local boating community, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are not implemented at this time and further consultation and investigation be carried out in how to tackle the parking issues along Ferry Lane in the best way for all involved. It is recommended that this request be added to the next available Transport Improvement Program and funding be allocated to look into this issue further.*

### **Plan 15 – Ham Lane, Paulton (No Parking At Any Time)**

#### **Objections – 3**

#### **Objection main points raised:**

- We often get large vehicles temporarily using that space to deliver broken down vehicles or large deliveries of equipment or stock where the vehicle is too large to get into our yard and off the road.
- My view is this would impede customers using this as a waiting area to enter Central Garage, a thriving repair business offering a service to local people.
- At present, yellow lines now stretch most of the way down Ham Lane, this is leaving nowhere for delivery companies to deliver and park legally.
- The small strip to the side of our entrance is currently used by parts delivery companies that cannot fit into our yard especially recovery trucks offloading

vehicles, as our yard isn't big enough for them to turn around in. The small strip is the only small area that is legal for them to do so, take this away and they will have to reverse out of our yard into the highway, into oncoming traffic.

- Every day the post van pulls up on that area to do its delivery rounds along Ham Lane. If you take away that small area, then there will be nowhere legal to park or pull up anywhere. This will have an effect on the operations of the business.
- There is no reason why this area requires double yellows. It currently has a single white line with no prohibitions. So, no need to change anything.

*Response:*

*The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions were requested by the local Councillor on behalf of local residents as the houses that live opposite the Central Garage are unable to exit their drives without having to make at least two goes and to improve visibility at the junction with Brookside. The purpose of the highway is for the safe passage of vehicles. Parking is an obstruction of that right and can therefore only be condoned where it is safe to do so. A vehicle is permitted to stop on a No Parking At Any Time restriction for the purpose of loading and unloading (which includes boarding and alighting of passengers) as long as the activity that is being undertaken is continuous. It is therefore the recommendation of this report that these restrictions are sealed within the Order as advertised and implemented on-site as they have the support of the local Councillor.*

**Plan 16 – Harford Square, Chew Magna (No Parking At Any Time)**

**Objections – 2**

**Objection main points raised:**

- We have concerns about what this new enforcement means for deliveries to the coop and the butcher's where we already have problems with HGV lorries stopping outside of our house to unload on a regular basis. We are worried that this parking enforcement will mean more delivery lorries now blocking the road outside of our house because they won't be able to stop in the zones that are marked, and which are currently used for unloading. I would also note the proposal for a parking restriction at the top of silver street would mean the removal of a valuable parking space in Harford Square for those in the village that don't have a driveway. Please can you advise what considerations have been made to the implication of these new enforcements with the many deliveries to the butcher's or coop. Is your view that it will improve the situation? We are a little concerned it will make the situation worse and will result in more road blockages on Harford square. It also seems a little pointless because it appears to be not enforceable, there is already double yellow lines in Harford square that are ignored due to the deliveries at the coop and butchers.

*Parish Councils Response: The Parish Council is concerned that the pressure on available parking spaces in the village is growing - not least due to the increase in food and drink outlets and the future conversion of the NatWest bank to flats. It has to find mitigations and compromises that work, at least in part, for the sometimes-differing needs of residents, businesses, farmers and visitors, with the overarching aim of maintaining the sustainability of the village. The shortage of available parking spaces during the day leads to bad or inconsiderate parking, causing blockages for through traffic, delivery and farm vehicles. The Parish Council's proposals for more yellow lines seek to address the bad parking issues. The Parish Council requested the extension of double yellow lines at Harford Square to prevent parked vehicles blocking traffic to and from South Parade and the High Street. These blockages frequently cause congestion in the village centre and problems for agricultural vehicles. Our understanding is that the lines will allow delivery vehicles to unload/load so there should be no change except to prevent nuisance parking. The parking restriction at the top of Silver Street is aimed at improving visibility for traffic emerging from or entering Silver Street.*

*Response:*

*The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions were requested by the Parish Council as stated above to prevent obstruction of the highway but allow for delivery and drop off access for local businesses. It is therefore the recommendation of this report that despite the objections raised above that the proposed restrictions are sealed within this Order and implemented on-site as advertised.*

### **Plan 18 – Holcombe Lane, Bathampton (No Parking At Any Time)**

#### **Objections – 1**

##### **Objection main points raised:**

- Whilst of course I appreciate that I live close to the corner of Down Lane, no-one has ever made a complaint or even politely requested that we don't park directly outside our property. Neither have I ever been aware of any car parking outside our property causing an obstacle to any traffic, whether that be cars or larger vehicles such as refuse collection or emergency vehicles, beyond the restrictions imposed by the road being narrow by nature. Put simply, having had the option to be able to park directly outside my own house since we moved in, I'd really appreciate someone taking the time to explain to me why we may not be able to go forward.

*Parish Councils response: Bathampton Parish Council have requested three junctions on Holcombe Lane to be consulted on due to the receipt of complaints regarding parking violations of the highway code. Regarding the Bathampton Lane / Down Lane junction which you refer to within your email, this junction has received numerous complaints from members of the community. The key concerns are as follows: 1) Due to the car being parked in close proximity to the junction it makes visibility difficult for drivers turning from Down Lane into Holcombe Lane. Frequently, this results in vehicles having to back up onto Down lane as vehicles are forced to enter Holcombe Lane directly into oncoming traffic. 2) Complaints from parents who*

*struggle to get children with buggies along the pavement due to the car frequently being parked up on the pavement. 3) Complaints that the parked car obstructs pedestrians being able to safely cross an already dangerous junction. Whilst many complaints have been received, both verbally and in writing from members of the community, rule 243 of the Highway Code prohibits parking within 10 metres of a junction, except when it's in an authorised parking space. It is also essential that residential parking on a single white line doesn't hinder the flow of traffic which in this instance it does.*

*Response:*

*The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions were requested by the Bathampton Parish Council on behalf of local residents as outlined above to prevent obstruction of the highway. It is therefore the recommendation of this report that despite the objection raised that the proposed restrictions are sealed within this Order as advertised and implemented on-site.*

### **Plan 20 – Northend, Batheaston (No Parking At Any Time)**

#### **Objections – 1, Support in Part – 2**

##### **Objection main points raised:**

- Northend is a residential area, with many families who have more than one car and no parking spaces attached to their properties. Many of these families have working age employees of industries requiring trade vans or other vehicles so the parking balance in the village can be tense and has to be extremely finely balanced.
- Because of the rural nature of the community, the village thoroughfare is also used daily by tractors with large trailers and is also used by vehicles associated with the Mealings builder's yard. The road through the village can become extremely busy during the day. It is not unusual, especially around the time that the school begins or ends for the village to become completely 'logjammed' because somebody has parked inappropriately and then at certain 'pinch points', the thoroughfare becomes unpassable. My concern over this application is that by removing what currently represents five parking spaces, you will be pushing five cars into situations where they are more likely to park 'inappropriately' with potential for blockages in the village.
- I am also concerned that the approval of this measure would set a precedent that would only serve to encourage similar requests. I would also reiterate that this approach relates to dwellings that are lucky enough to have off road parking and that both of these residences were purchased in the full knowledge that parking existed on the road.

##### **Support in part main points raised:**

- I support the order to prohibit but suggest one minor change. This is to limit the extent of the yellow lines so that they run alongside the full length of the

houses but stop short at the shed at the southern end - where the property is shown to narrow on the map, as shown on the Notice. This would allow one parking space to remain rather than losing them all.

- Parking in this part of Northend is frequently difficult and limited, especially in the evening once most people are home from work. The area proposed for the new parking restriction has space for 6 parking places. Thus, if these were removed it would cause further pressure on what is already limited parking for local residents. I understand that the front door for No. 50/50a opens directly onto the pavement and therefore if a car is parked immediately outside the door this would no doubt be inconvenient/unpleasant for the occupiers. I would therefore propose that parking restrictions are put in place to cover this area out of due consideration and for the convenience of the occupants of No 50/50a. However, there is no practical reason to impose restrictions on the whole length of road as per the proposal and this would have a significant negative affect for the majority of local residents.

*Response:*

*The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions were requested by the local Councillor on behalf of local residents. It is the recommendation of this report however that due to the objection and observations raised above due to the limited on-street parking in this area for local residents that the proposed restrictions be reduced by a distance of 8 metres at the southern end retaining 2 valuable on-street car parking spaces for local residents. It is recommended however that the remaining 14 metres of Double Yellow Lines (3 cars length) running in front of properties 50/50A Northend be included within this Order and implemented on-site as requested by the local Councillor to prevent obstruction to the property entrance and impact on natural light entering the building.*

**Plan 23 – Waterloo Road, Radstock (No Parking At Any Time)**

**Support in Part – 5**

**Support in part main points raised:**

- I live in Pines Way and have had a few near misses pulling out of Pines Way onto Waterloo Road due to the hazardous parking. I think that yellow lines on the corners is a great idea, but I think that this will make the parking along Pines Way even more ridiculous than it is. I think if there are only yellow lines on the corners this will make people park back along in Pines Way and cause further congestion. I think we need either double yellow lines the whole length of Pines Way (all houses here have drive ways or private numbered parking around the back) or make Pines Way a resident only parking area, for people who actually live on Pines Way.
- I 'am glad to see that finally something is being done. The only concern I have, is that with just putting the yellow lines right on the very corners, this will just push the cars back along Pines Way, I am already struggling with access to my driveway due to cars hanging over the first 1/4 of it when pavement

parking along Pines Way. I request that the yellow lines be put from the corners of Waterloo Road right along to the first driveway on both sides of the road in Pines Way.

- I do feel that with the doctor's surgery being built along the other end of Waterloo Road, and the current parking congestion along the whole length of Waterloo Road from where the hair salon/florist is right up to Pines Way, it is dangerous, cars park both sides of the road and this makes it very difficult to get through, especially if you meet another car. Therefore perhaps yellow lines should be considered for the entire length of Waterloo Road. Bearing in mind there are two cycle paths very close to hear, it is just an accident waiting to happen.
- There is a car park at the end of Waterloo Road, which for the most part is empty, just because residents want to park immediately outside their house. It would make it better for everyone if they parked here as they would not be blocking up the road.
- I am happy to see restrictions are coming in to prevent the parking on the corners of the road. However, I was hoping the no parking lines would be extended further along the road.
- There are white lines prohibiting parking at the entrance to Pines Way, could the lines be extended further towards Tynning Hill to the entrance of the drive opposite? Previous tenants of Waterloo Road complained to the council and had lines painted, as the parking was obstructing their view when trying to exit their drive. Cars Park directly opposite us, creating a pinch point just before Pines Way, cars and particularly lorries, have to constantly squeeze through and I have had my mirror clipped several times. I appreciate people need somewhere to park, but houses opposite have drives, yet choose to park in the road and create a hazard.

*Response:*

*The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions were requested by the Traffic Management Team on behalf of local residents to upgrade the existing advisory white Keep Clear markings to enforceable yellow No Parking At Any Time restrictions. Extending the proposed restrictions along the length of Pines Way or along Waterloo Road is outside the scope of this TRO consultation. It is therefore the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are sealed within this Order and implemented on-site as advertised.*

**Plan 28 – Southstoke Lane, South Stoke (No Parking At Any Time)**

**Objections – 1, Support in Part – 2**

**Objection main points raised:**

- My objection is based on road safety and the effect it will have on the character of the Southstoke Conservation Area. Currently, the cars parking in

this area act as traffic calming, if they're removed, vehicles will enter the village at far greater speeds.

- I also object to the proposal on heritage grounds. In the BANES South Stoke Conservation Area Appraisal of 2014, the village was praised for its "Absence of street lighting and traffic signage" and 60 years before this, Nikolas Pevsner celebrated the 'The happy sight of a village still entirely unsuburbanized, though only two miles from the main station of a city'. Over the last year, a number of signs have appeared in the village which would appear to go against what the BANES conservation area appraisal set out to protect, I fear the addition of double yellow lines will add to the suburbanization of the village.

#### **Support in part main points raised:**

- I should like comment that the proposed restrictions need to be extended around each corner (Brewery House and Upper Cottages). This is because parking on the corners of this narrow road is both obstructive and dangerous.
- I am very concerned to discover that the proposed parking prohibition orders proposed for South Stoke do not continue down to the end of my property. When there is traffic parked below the disabled bay it means that traffic approaching from the village of South Stoke sets off blind into South Stoke Lane and we have already noted several near misses when cars have narrowly missed hitting traffic coming down the hill. It also makes access to my neighbour's disabled parking space difficult, when there are cars parked above it.

#### *Response:*

*The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions were requested by the local Councillor and supported by the Parish Council to prevent obstruction of this narrow section of highway by parked vehicles. The Parish Council have considered these proposals and support the double yellow lines but requested that as the lines are on a narrow lane in the South Stoke Conservation Area that they would prefer the thinner line option if possible. It is therefore the recommendation of this report that despite the objection raised above, as the proposed restrictions have the support of both the local Councillor and Parish Council that they are sealed within this Order and implemented on-site using the thinner reduced 50mm width lines to reduce the visual impact within this conservation area and as requested above are extended slightly further down to the junction with Pack Horse Lane (retaining the existing Disabled Parking Bay).*

#### **Plan 29 – Oldbridge Road / Staunton Fields, Whitchurch (No Parking At Any Time)**

#### **Objections – 17, Support in Part – 2**

#### **Objection main points raised:**



- There are many families living in this road with multiple cars but only a space for one or 2 cars on the driveway. Where are they meant to park?
- When we have visitors round, family get together or deliveries. Where are they going to park?
- We are a dead-end estate no cut through is possible. So, what is the reason for the lines it's only residents and visitors who park here.
- Speaking with neighbours no one wants them out in our road. We live here and pay taxes and you want to use this money to annoy and make everyone who lives in this estate's life difficult.
- It's all about the money. we are a quiet estate people are quite happy living here just leave us alone our estate is fine the way it is.
- You tried it once already and went too far and had them blacked out as it was no good.
- I believe putting double yellows lines in will de-value our house. Who wants to buy a house with no parking if you have more than 1 car?
- I have no problem with the cars on the road the road is clear to drive down very easily we have lorries for deliveries who don't struggle getting down the road whatsoever. Emergency vehicles can very easily get down the road. I live here and don't have a problem so why do you?
- Removing cars parked on the road can increase people speeding through the estate. And there are always kids playing cars parked will slow people down. If someone was to run someone over after these lines are put in, I would see it as your fault.
- Please stop wasting our money and using it against us if you got some money left over, please fix the potholes you take forever to sort out around the local area which is damaging our cars and if someone gets a puncture and needs to park they'll get a fine.
- The road parking is getting extremely bad due the many drop kerbs that BANES council have allowed to happen. This will cause even more problems with people who have just one-off road parking. These houses were sold as family homes and families have more than one car.
- The proposed parking restrictions are unlikely to be enforced which negates their placement. If there are vehicles causing an obstruction, then the police or neighbourhood policing team need to be informed at the time to deal with offenders not yellow lines that the council wardens may enforce once in a while.
- We have lived here for over 30 years and have never had any issues with parking problems.

- We are writing to object to the proposed double yellow lines in the Staunton Fields area. We understand the reason for needing emergency vehicle access, (which we agree does need to be addressed), but we believe that stopping people parking completely on Oldbridge Road will only push people to park where there are no lines and therefore moving the problem to other areas not restricted. We already have difficulties when additional people park here, and they often block our exit without even realising it. We do not have any pavements in Bridge Close so the access to Staunton Lane, via the public footpath is by road. Increased parking will make it more hazardous.
- What we need is signs that state Resident Parking Only this would hopefully help us. Please do not put double yellow lines down it would make our living here an absolute nightmare. I work 12 hour shifts and to come home finding you cannot park makes you very angry, please think again.

**Support in part main points raised:**

- I am writing to politely request some additional double yellow lines to be implemented in Staunton Way. I have access to a private driveway, however pulling on/off this driveway is difficult due to neighbours/visitors parking directly across the road / bumped up onto the pavement. This impacts us daily and I would like double yellow lines to be added to the opposite side of the road to prevent people from parking there. If an ambulance or fire engine needed to enter the cul-de-sac, they would find it very difficult to pass. I think it would also be a good idea to add them to the bend of the road, like you have proposed to the other roads in the estate as sometimes vehicles will park on the corner making the turn into the cul-de-sac a blind turn with limited visibility. We recently had 7 houses added to the existing development, when you approved the planning application you allocated each house 2 parking spaces (3 on the largest house) however, the residents do not use both spaces allocated to them and instead park on the road. Adding these double yellow lines will prevent these restrictions that we currently face. People have ample parking available on their own driveway for their own vehicles / visitors. In addition, we have a stretch of road leading up to the cul-de-sac which can be used for parking, this stretch of road does not impact anyone's parking at their own address and should be used, rather than parking outside my own property.
- We live on Lines Way and would like to request additional road markings in relation to access to our property. People regularly park at the entrance to our drive meaning that we are not able to gain access to our homes in our vehicle. Please can you kindly include some sort of parking restriction immediately outside of this access to ensure access is always possible. Also, please consider the if you do install parking restriction that you ensure parking is not possible on both sides of the road at the same point as again when reversing into our access with multiple vehicles parked outside on both sides of the road it can be very difficult / impossible.

*Response:*

*The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions were requested by the Whitchurch Parish Council, however due to the amount of objections raised above by local residents it is the recommendation of this report and the Traffic Management Team that the proposed restrictions are not implemented and are not sealed within this Order.*

**Plan 30 – Temple Inn Lane, Temple Cloud (Removal of existing No Parking At Any Time)**

**Objections – 9, Support in Part – 1**

**Objection main points raised:**

- These spaces are exactly where the bus stops are in Temple Inn Lane for the 754 buses to Midsomer Norton. This would mean that the bus would have to stop in the middle of the road to pick up passengers, which could cause a back log of traffic.
- This will also cause a chicane for the large 40-foot Artic lorries which use this road. We have lived here for fifteen years and have watched the lorries getting much larger to service the depots in Marsh Lane, Clutton.
- We did write to our Parish Council to advise them of the bus stops but they have totally ignored us.
- We have experienced first-hand of almost being knocked down by a left-hand drive lorry which mounted the pavement to negotiate parked cars and however he missed us – pure luck, as he could not see us. The yellow lines stopped all this mounting of pavements over the last few years and things have been much safer. There is lots of parking in Brandown Close so cannot see why you want to put parking back on Temple Inn Lane.
- I oppose to the removal of No Parking At Any Time in lengths in Temple Inn Lane, Temple Cloud. Temple Inn Lane is used by lorries and commercial vehicles to access Marsh Lane as Hart's Lane is not suitable for these vehicles. I believe that the removal of the No Parking at Any Time will cause undue traffic and possibly accident.
- I oppose the removal of No Parking At Any Time in lengths of Temple Cloud. For the safety of the neighbourhood, the No Parking at Any Time must remain
- I object to the removal of the No Parking restrictions as it's right outside my house. It's going to block our sunlight when people park. Use opposite side of the road for parking space please instead.
- Whilst acknowledging that vehicles already exceed the 20mph speed limit, I have concerns around the proposals. At the moment vehicles already parked beyond the Meadway junction, blocking the visibility as you exit Meadway.

Vans regularly park here so you have to pull out to see if anything is coming. The proposals now propose parking adjacent to No2 Meadway which could potentially block the view when exiting Meadway in both directions.

- Parking bays are proposed outside the new Brandown development, not quite opposite each other close to the pub. We already have delivery vehicles to the pub stopping on the yellow lines, so this will only add to the chicane effect the spaces will create. This will make it difficult for larger vehicles exiting Meadway (the school regularly use coaches and people have caravans) to turn left or right due to the further restricted visibility.
- All the houses in Meadway and Brandown have car parking spaces, so I don't see the requirement. As happens in other villages, people will use the spaces to catch the bus to Bristol.
- Temple Inn Lane is the road that leads to Cameley Primary School. Cars, or larger vehicles, will block the view of the children when crossing the road. There is no zebra crossing on the road, could thus be possible and would also calm traffic speeds.
- What about chicanes as in other villages? With spaces you are encouraging more car use.
- The pub has its own car park and there is a car park for villagers at the village hall with easy access to the A37 via Brandown Close. I foresee these proposals adding to the risks on Temple Inn Lane and entering / exiting Meadway and Brandown.
- Traffic calming measures such as chicanes as in High Littleton would be a much better solution and not endanger the lives of the children walking to school.
- We think the planners have a lot to answer for they allowed building at the Temple Inn/10 letting rooms without enough parking. Also, for the number of houses on Brandown Close without enough parking spaces. We now have to suffer for their very bad planning.
- I am writing to object to the proposed removal of double yellow lines on Temple Inn Lane, Temple Cloud. I live in Temple Inn Lane. In order to park my car, I have to pull over to the far side of the road, and reverse in. If you remove the double yellow lines, it will be impossible for me to do this.
- We are residents of temple inn lane. We strongly disagree on the removal of the double yellow lines for safety reasons such as pulling out from Meadway as this is the only exit to and from Cameley primary school and the playing field / village hall it will massively reduce vision of oncoming vehicles. Also, it will restrict the access to our driveway with cars parking opposite, we have knowledge that one of the proposed reasons to remove the lines is to slow vehicles down but limiting the vision of approaching vehicles makes risks much higher. The other proposed reason to our knowledge is to allow parking

for Brandon close and the temple inn pub which seems ridiculous as both have been built in the last 5 years with no thought of any parking, we would be interested to know who would let this happen.

- I think this is possibly the worst thing you could do for residents of Temple Cloud who live off that road. There was a fight to have the double yellow lines put there in the first place and had they not been deemed needed then they wouldn't have been allowed!! If you look at coming out of Meadway first thing on a morning when people are leaving to go to work early, vision is so difficult especially to the right where cars are parked after the double yellow lines, and the same on an evening and weekends once people are home and parked, you actually have to pull out slowly to look around the parked cars, as you don't get a clear view. If you decrease the double yellow lines to the left as well this is going to become even more dangerous as the view is obstructed both sides!

#### **Support in part main points raised:**

- I welcome the removal of some of the parking restrictions on Temple Inn Lane but not all indicated on the plan. I believe that the restrictions should be maintained at the corner of Temple Inn Lane and Brandown Close, and the corner of Temple Inn Lane and Meadway to ensure visibility when crossing these roads. I also think that the removal of the restrictions should be limited to the north side of the road, as I believe that it is likely that motorists will park half on the kerb in this area partially blocking the pavement. If parking is allowed on both sides, both pavements may end up being blocked. The south side tends to get more foot traffic than the north side as all the side roads connecting to Temple Inn Lane connect onto the south side.

#### *Response:*

*The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions were requested by the Parish Council and local Councillor to provide some additional on-street parking for local residents in the area. Due to the number of objections raised however by local residents regarding the removal of the existing No Parking At Any Time restrictions on safety grounds, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposal is removed from the Order at this time.*

#### **Additional Proposal Request – Charlton Park, MSN (No Parking At Any Time)**

#### **Objections – 1**

#### **Objection main points raised:**

- Where you want to put the yellow lines would be absolutely useless they need to be put on the other side of the road of which I sent an attachment indicates where they really do need to go because at the moment most days of the week we cannot see what is coming in off the main road and it makes it difficult for us to pull out.

*Response:*

*The proposed extension of the existing No Parking At Any Time restrictions were requested by the local Councillors to prevent double parking creating a pinch point and obstructing the highway. The main purpose of the highway is for the safe un-obstructed passage of vehicles. It is therefore the recommendation of this report that despite the objection raised that the proposed restrictions are sealed within this Order and implemented on-site as advertised.*

### **Additional Proposal Request – Downside Close, Bathampton (No Parking At Any Time)**

#### **Objections – 3, Support in Part - 1**

##### **Objection main points raised:**

- These potential parking places are regularly used by local residents and in particular visitors to the surrounding area for leisure purposes. For those wanting to enjoy the many footpaths including the canal tow paths the proximity of these parking space makes them particularly valuable. These parking places are also vital for holidaying and cruising boaters, allowing them to re supply their boats with basic essentials such as food and fuel. Some members of the canal community are not able-bodied and are elderly. Even more essential for this latter group that they can park in these valuable parking places which are closest to their homes.
- Street parking is extremely limited in Bath in general and in these streets are no exception. To remove these places will further increase parking stress for locals and visitors.
- There is room for approximately 4 vehicles on the proposed areas. I would suggest that when accommodated by vehicles there is minimal restriction or compromise for pedestrians or other road users. In short there is plenty of space for all on the wide sweeping bends leading to Downside Close.
- I have personally watched trucks such as the recycling truck easily navigate around these bends when vehicles are parked there.
- There is an oversized pavement on one bend which comfortably allows for legal part-pavement parking giving enough room for wheelchair access and the opposite neighbour to access their driveway.
- Restricting parking at the lower end of Downside Close will simply force motorists who currently park in Downside Close for access to the Canal, to park their vehicles further up the Close. As the Close is considerably narrower further up, the nuisance, inconvenience and restriction to the Close will impact adversely on those residents who live in the Close.
- Due to the narrowing of the Close, motorists often park their cars half on the pavement and half on the road thereby restricting pedestrian access as well

as vehicular access. In short, your Proposal will exacerbate the parking problem we have in Downside Close and further inconvenience pedestrians.

- The solution would be to make parking in Downside Close available only to Residents, perhaps one space per dwelling. This is similar in practice to the permit system currently in place for Areas 01-07 in Bath. You could introduce this scheme for the hours of 8am to 6pm and even, possibly, make small charge which, in addition to guest fees, could benefit the Council elsewhere.

#### **Support in part main points raised:**

- Firstly, I support the principle of keeping the corners of this junction clear. There have been various instances of inappropriate parking, which has caused the road to be blocked to larger vehicles including service lorries. I do however have a concern about the unintended consequence of making this change. Many of the instances cited above are not caused by residents of either Holcombe Lane or Downside Close. They are instead by non-residents looking to park their cars before using the nearby footpath to get to the canal and boats. As a result, these vehicles can be left for days / weeks at a time with no ability to identify whose vehicle is causing the issue. This pattern is unlikely to change with parking restrictions in place. My concern relates to where these vehicles will therefore be left and I am fairly certain these drivers will use Downside Close as an alternative. The difficulty with this is that the cul-de-sac roadway is only 4.75m wide. There are eleven driveways accessing Downside Close and in the event of cars parking on the road, access to these driveways is hindered. Some drivers do not recognise the difficulty this creates and it can be several days before the vehicle moves. Others may realise, but get over it by parking on the pavement and blocking pedestrian routes instead. This already happens to some extent and there have been occasions where I cannot get my car off the driveway without driving over either my garden or mounting both pavements. I do not think this is a safe situation. The issue would be less problematic if cars were driven by residents; any blockage could be resolved by request. With the vast majority of current issues relating to non-residents, overcoming the problem is not possible. This could be overcome by designating the space as residents only parking. Is this a possibility?

#### *Response:*

*The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions were requested by the Parish Council as there was an incident last year where cars and vans were parked around the junction of Holcombe Lane and Downside Close and as a result of this, they were blocking access to larger vehicles which couldn't get through. This would include emergency access. As the Highway Code states that vehicles should not be parked around a junction, it is the recommendation of this report that despite the objections raised above that the proposed restrictions are sealed within this Order and implemented on-site as advertised on safety grounds. Introducing a Residents Only Parking Scheme is outside the scope and remit of this TRO consultation.*

**Additional Proposal Request – High Street, Batheaston (No Parking / Loading At Any Time / Loading Only Bay Monday – Saturday, 8am – 6pm)**

**Objections – 1**

**Objection main points raised:**

- There is already a severe lack of parking spaces on the left-hand side of the road, since there are no parking spaces on the right-hand side or on the many residences at The Batch. At present, the unsuitable location of a Spar convenience store with no legal parking spaces for deliveries or potential customers has resulted in illegal parking whilst people just 'pop in' to make their purchases. This has resulted in obstructions to traffic coming down from the Northend turning, particularly with a left-hand turn. I would like you to prove to me that your plans for extension of parking restrictions will result in any alleviation of the present problems. Will it stop delivery vans and 'convenience' customers from parking illegally right outside the shop? Will you be able to police any infringement of these restrictions since at present there seems no such control? Furthermore, the lack of available parking spaces for local residents will be severely impaired, let alone local workers and Airbnb visitors. Basically, you are prioritising commercial concerns above local community, without any firm conviction that these measures are going to work. I hope you take these serious objections from someone who has the interests of our community at heart before you contemplate imposing these alienating restrictions that will in no way solve the problems you are trying to address.

*Response:*

*The proposed No Parking / No Loading At Any Time restrictions were requested by the local Councillor to improve access for larger vehicles when turning into Northend by preventing vehicles parking opposite this junction. A dedicated Loading Only Bay operating Monday to Saturday, between 8am – 6pm was also proposed southwest of the junction for use by the Spar convenience store for their delivery vehicles. There is no legal right to park on the highway. The purpose of the highway is for the safe passage of vehicles; therefore, parking can only be condoned where it is safe to do so. It is therefore the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are sealed within this Order and implemented on-site as advertised.*

**Additional Proposal Request – Orchard Avenue, MSN (No Parking At Any Time)**

**Objections – 1**

**Objection main points raised:**

- No other parking options on Paulton Road mainly due to Curo rejecting residents to put in driveways onto the front of their properties.



- These restrictions would have no benefit to any of the above properties in Paulton Road or that of the residents of Orchard Avenue.
- This would cause huge problems for all properties on Paulton Road and Orchard Avenue.
- Elderly neighbours who rely on visitors will no longer visit as they are unable to walk far, one of these needs a walker and help to get from his property into a car.
- Putting in this restriction will force the cars that park here to park on the main road and some of these families have young children which will also be a safety issue.
- If these plans are to go ahead, we as residents will need permission to have driveways put onto the front of our houses for parking and the safety of our families.

*Response:*

*The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions were requested by the local Councillors to replace the existing advisory white Keep Clear markings with enforceable restrictions at the junction of Orchard Avenue to prevent obstruction and improve visibility. It is therefore the recommendation of this report that despite the objection raised above that the proposed restrictions are sealed within this Order and implemented on-site as advertised.*

### **Additional Proposal Request – The Dymbro, MSN (No Parking At Any Time)**

#### **Objections – 1**

##### **Objection main points raised:**

- We would like to object to permanent no parking on The Dymbro Midsomer Norton. We park our cars on this road, which if not available we would need to park our cars on the main road, North Road, which will cause traffic jams and chaos.

*Response:*

*The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions were requested by the local Councillors to prevent obstruction of the highway caused by double parking creating pinch points. Parking can only be condoned where it is safe to do so. There is no legal right to park on the highway. As only 1 objection to these proposals was received during the consultation it is the recommendation of this report that despite this objection the proposed restrictions are sealed within this Order and implemented on-site as advertised.*

### **Additional Proposal Request – Turnbridge Road, Chew Magna (2 Hour Limited Waiting Bay operating Mon – Fri between 9am – 5pm)**

## **Objections – 2, Support in Part - 1**

### **Objection main points raised:**

- The problem is for the residents of people living on The Chalks this 2-hour parking bay is actually going to make our day to day lives harder. This intervention will force us to have to park further away from our homes and doesn't resolve the situation at the weekends (and evenings) when it is just as bad if not worse. I and other residents have children and consequential large amounts of belongings that need to be transported from car to home frequently and safely. We already have to navigate a busy road with no pavement, but a more complicated parking arrangement seems very unfair. With the new arrangement I may be able to park in a convenient place on a Sunday night but then be forced to move it by Monday 11am. I am asking that residents be given permits and visitors permits so we may park in the 2-hour bays without issue.
- I appreciate that there are various viewpoints and priorities regarding parking in Chew Magna, but I would like to object to the current proposals. I do not believe the current proposals take into account the numerous residents that live in the centre of the village and by reducing parking will force parking pressures further out into the village. The main argument by the parish council is that there is a lack of available spaces in the centre, but these proposals are actually reducing the number of available spaces. There are many residents who live on the Chalks, Tunbridge Road and South Parade who are either disabled or have small children and being able to park and leave their car close to their home is vitally important. The current proposals do not take this into account and there are many examples around Bristol and Bath where resident permits alleviate this problem, which I feel would be a better solution here. Having the ability to load and unload does not help residents with children or are disabled as they cannot then move the car later. It is my view that it was short-sighted to continue to allow business and residential expansion in the centre of the village without proper plans for parking and these parking proposals continue to disadvantage those living in the centre of the village.

### **Support in part main points raised:**

- We live in the village and have never had concerns that parking in the outlined area at the top of Tunbridge Road causes an obstruction. Even if it did, Mon-Fri 9am-5pm 2-hour parking bays will not prevent that stated risk either during the operational hours or outside of these times. It will therefore not achieve its stated purpose. There are several residents who do not have off-street parking but live in the centre of the village and therefore park on Tunbridge Road or the Triangle. We would like to request that residents are exempt from the 2-hour parking limit if it goes ahead. I assume this would require some sort of resident permits, and there may be a cost associated with this.

*Response:*

*The proposed 2 Hour Limited Waiting Bay operating Mon – Fri, between 9am – 5pm at the top end of Tunbridge Road was requested by the Parish Council to provide available short term on-street parking for users of the High Street. Residents Parking Permits sit outside the scope and remit of this TRO consultation. As these restrictions were requested by the Parish Council for the benefit of the village as a whole, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed Limited Waiting Bay be sealed within this Order and implemented on-site as advertised.*

**Additional Proposal Request – The Triangle, Chew Magna (No Parking Between 9am – 5pm, Mon – Sat)**

**Objections – 1, Support in Part - 2**

**Objection main points raised:**

- By reducing parking will force parking pressures further out into the village. The main argument by the parish council is that there is a lack of available spaces in the centre, but these proposals are actually reducing the number of available spaces, especially on the triangle. I agree that there are access issues to the top of the old school rooms, but this is due to a small number of individuals who choose to park blocking the north side of the triangle, beside the high wall. The side beside Natwest and Debbie Fortune has been used for parking for many years with no issues so I do not believe this should also have restricted parking.

**Support in part main points raised:**

- The no parking at any time area around the triangle in Chew Magna does not extend fully enough along the South parade to prevent someone parking there and preventing cars from exiting there (one of the main issues currently).
- We have reviewed the proposed parking restrictions in Chew Magna, as outlined in the proposals. The documentation states that both are to prevent obstruction to traffic. This is certainly a real problem on the Triangle, where parking prevents any traffic and the 'no parking' will mean that the road can be used. However, the application does not cover after 5pm or the weekends, during which time obstruction is likely to continue. We request that this is a 24/7 change, particularly in anticipation of the Bank's conversion to flats.

*Response:*

*The proposed No Parking, Mon – Sat, between 9am – 5pm around The Triangle, Chew Magna was requested by the Parish Council to prevent obstruction by parked vehicles during peak periods. The purpose of the highway is for the safe un-obstructed passage of vehicles. It is therefore the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are sealed within this Order and implemented on-site as advertised despite the 1 objection raised above. Upgrading this proposed restriction*

*to 24/7 (No Parking At Any Time) would require a new TRO consultation as would constitute a substantial change to what was advertised and proposed.*

**No Objections received to:**

- Plan 3 – Ashgrove, Peasedown St John
- Plan 4 – Cameley Road, Temple Cloud
- Plan 5 – Cameley Road, Temple Cloud
- Plan 7 – Catherine Way, Batheaston
- Plan 8 – Clapton Road / Hillside Avenue, Midsomer Norton
- Plan 11 – Old English Way, Peasedown St John
- Plan 14 – Goldney Way, Temple Cloud
- Plan 17 – High Street, Midsomer Norton
- Plan 19 – Knightstone Close / Camvale, Peasedown St John
- Plan 21 – Norton Lane, Whitchurch
- Plan 22 – Perrin Close, Temple Cloud
- Plan 24 – Publow Lane, Pensford
- Plan 25 – Publow Lane, Pensford
- Plan 26 – South Road, Timsbury
- Plan 27 – South Road, Timsbury
- Plan 32 – Trollopes Hill, Monkton Combe
- Plan 33 – Mill Road, Radstock
- Additional Proposal – Silver Street, Chew Magna
- Additional Proposal request – Lansdown Close / A39, High Littleton
- Additional Proposal – Chilcompton Road, Midsomer Norton
- Additional Proposal – Back of Charlton Park, Midsomer Norton
- Additional request to amend proposal Plan 31 – The Island, Midsomer Norton

*Response:*

*As there were no objections received to these proposals it is recommended that these restrictions be approved and sealed within the Order.*

**Chief Constable**

No comment.

**Parking Services**

No comment.

**Ward Members**

**Bathavon North:**

Cllr Kevin Guy – Your proposals are just fine and they should go ahead as per the approved TRO.

Cllr Sarah Warren – I support the alteration you have made at 50 Northend in response to feedback, and the decision to continue as planned at Holcombe Lane and on Batheaston High Street.

Bathampton Parish Council – No comment.

Batheaston Parish Council – I am very concerned about the length of the double yellow lines across the full length of at this property - so too are other residents, as I have already had residents tell me that if the double yellows go the full length of 50/50A that they will just park on the opposite side of the road! This particular property has massive adequate off-street parking just immediately around the back of their property which was how it was designed to be as parking was always a problem in front of it. The owners will never use their front door with prams nor shopping because of the huge expanse of rear, immediate access.

These double yellow will then cause a chicane effect and reduce viability for the heavy lorries/farm tractors and recycling vehicles that go by that (at the moment) straight route. By also including the Mealings Yard into any extra double yellows you will be reducing the parking at an already difficult local area by at least 10 cars.

You will also be adding to the congestion by cars then parking on the opposite side of the road. This clearly needs careful consideration and as a councillor here on the ground we (ie all of us) need to be mindful of the extra parking restrictions this will place on Northend. I also have to say and fully believe that we just cannot have Ward Councillors having meetings locally with residents and not informing the Parish Council to discuss such severe restrictions - as already has happened on this and other occasions when (deciding) where double yellow lines should go in. This is very unfair on parish Councillors who are trying to help all residents and not just arbitrarily announcing that double yellows will go in because one household has complained - thus reducing 5 car parking spaces. A thorough insight is integral to that process surely.

*Response:*

*The Parish Council were provided with an opportunity to comment on these restrictions during the informal consultation stage prior to moving onto the 21 day public consultation as seen within Report 2, where no comment was made. The objections raised during public consultation by local residents have been noted and as a result the proposed restrictions reduced in length by a distance of 8 metres at the southern end retaining 2 valuable on-street car parking spaces for local residents. The recommendation of this report is that the remaining 14 metres of Double Yellow Lines (3 cars length) running in front of properties 50/50A Northend should be included within this Order and implemented on-site as requested by and supported by the local Ward Councillors to prevent obstruction to the property entrance and impact on natural light entering the building. As with all new restrictions, there will be an embedding period where residents parking practices change. We will continue*

*to monitor the situation and if required amend or introduce measures on-site to tackle any issues that arise.*

**Bathavon South:**

Cllr Neil Butters – No comment.

Cllr Matt McCabe – I would like a meeting to discuss the Ferry Lane situation. Could we include Claverton Parish Council, please.

*Response:*

*A meeting will be arranged between the area Senior Traffic Management Engineer, Ward Members and Parish Council to discuss possible solutions to the issues faced on Ferry Lane in the future.*

Southstoke Parish Council - On behalf of South Stoke Parish Council and in respect of Plan 28 Southstoke Lane:- South Stoke Parish Council considers the small extension to the proposed lines as entirely sensible and acceptable, and wholly agree that the scheme is implemented on-site using the thinner reduced 50mm width lines to reduce the visual impact within this conservation area and extended slightly further down to the junction with Pack Horse Lane (retaining the existing Disabled Parking Bay).

Separate Parish Councillor email - As a resident of South Stoke for 32 years and a Parish Councillor for 10 years, I have observed the increase in volume and speed of traffic here. I agree wholeheartedly with the original plan for narrow double yellow lines at the narrow lower end of Southstoke Lane to ensure the clear passage of emergency vehicles. This is essential. I do NOT, however, agree with extending the DYL Lines further southwards around the corners. Cars parked there have an important role - they slow down the traffic through the village centre. DYL Lines would speed up traffic and make the junction far more dangerous than it is now.

*Response:*

*The Highway code states that a vehicle should not be parked close to a junction, providing safe unobstructed access to drivers. It is therefore the recommendation of this report with the support of the Parish as stated above that these restrictions are implemented on-site at the extended length as described above running up to the junction.*

**Chew Valley:**

Cllr Vic Pritchard – No comment.

Cllr Karren Warrington – No comment.

Chew Magna Parish Council - No comment.

**Combe Down:**

Cllr Gerry Curran – No comment.

Cllr Bharat Ramji Nathoo Pankhania – No comment.

**High Littleton:**

Cllr Ryan Wills – No comment.

High Littleton Parish Council - No comment.

**Mendip:**

Cllr David Wood – I know there has been objection to the bay next to Meadway in Temple Cloud. But we're there objections to the other two bays specifically? If not, can those go ahead? There doesn't seem to be a conflict with the operation of bus services on the northern side of Temple Inn Lane so can these restrictions be removed?

*Response:*

*Amended report recommendation at Cllr David Wood's request: Due to the number of objections raised by local residents regarding the removal of the existing No Parking At Any Time restrictions on safety grounds, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed removal of the existing restrictions on the southern side of Temple Inn Lane are not included within this Order, however at the request of Cllr Wood the proposed removal of the existing restrictions on the northern side are included within this Order as this removal will not cause a conflict with the operation of bus services or larger vehicles and will provide more on-street parking for local residents.*

Temple Cloud with Cameley Parish Council – No comment.

**Midsomer Norton North:**

Cllr Michael Evans – No comment.

Cllr Shaun Hughes– No comment.

**Midsomer Norton Redfield:**

Cllr Paul Myers – No comment.

Cllr Christopher Watt – No comment.

Midsomer Norton Town Council – No comment.

**Paulton:**

Cllr Liz Hardman – Same as below.

Cllr Grant Johnson – I would like to thank you for your time in putting this report together. As local Councillor's, Liz and I receive numerous complaints regarding the proposed sites and are happy to see this progressing. I would also support the decisions outlined for Paulton in this report.

Paulton Parish Council – No comment.

### **Peasedown St John:**

Cllr Sarah Bevan – Many thanks for sending us the outcome of the public consultation and your team's responses to the objections, particularly on plan 3 for Ashgrove.

Cllr Karen Walker – I have read the comments from the Parish council regarding the proposed TRO's

Plan 19 - Knightstone close and Camvale are concerns with visibility when leaving this cul-de-sac. More so Knightstone as there is a house for children's day care. Carers and parents park on the junction blocking visibility, with causes safety issues.

Plan 2- DYL around the pull out at Ashgrove, I have read both the PC comments and those objecting. Parking is an issue on this stretch of road, and concerns have been raised about cars/vehicles parking on the pull out. If there is a way to address the safety issue and keep parking spaces, I would agree with removing the pull out and replacing with at least 2 parking spaces. This would help reduce speed, when vehicles are parked there, which is nearly all the time.

### *Response:*

*Removing the buildout is outside the scope and remit of this TRO consultation. The buildout was placed on site to create a pinch point that would slow vehicle speeds when traveling down Ashgrove.*

Plan 11- Happy to support as it helps residents living at 65 & 67 exit their properties without cars blocking their drives.

Peasedown St John Parish Council – The report was discussed at the Full Council meeting on 12<sup>th</sup> April 2022. At the meeting there was also public representation from several residents of Ashgrove.

Councillors agreed the following as their formal comments:

Plan 2 – Ashgrove, Peasedown St John (No Parking at Any Time) - It was agreed to **strongly object** to this proposal.

The reasons raised in the course of discussion were:



- Ashgrove is a really difficult area to park in. As the current arrangement doesn't cause any issues to anyone it is ridiculous to put in double yellow lines. The road is perfectly navigable and there is not an issue with visibility. There is no reason whatsoever to make residents' lives more difficult.
- Currently the parking in Ashgrove acts as a speed deterrent. It almost acts as a traffic calming in itself, with drivers having to slow down to give way to oncoming vehicles.
- Consideration should be given to getting rid of the speed humps/build outs to create more parking in this area for residents which would naturally slow the traffic down, rather than spending money on doing unnecessary superficial work.
- Parking should be looked at as a holistic thing rather than just individual areas, which means the problem just ends up being moved from one place to another.
- Councillors were also aware of comments from local residents regarding parking in the area. Parking is already wholly inadequate, and the changes will make it worse. Concerns were also raised regarding the fact that the speed bump in this location is so shallow that it no longer slows traffic down. Many local residents are concerned about speeding, including the associated noise of cars slowing down because the speed limit goes from 50mph straight to 20mph just before the chicane.

*Response:*

*Removing the buildout is outside the scope and remit of this TRO consultation. The buildout was placed on site to create a pinch point that would slow vehicle speeds when traveling down Ashgrove. These parking restrictions were requested by our Parking Services Team as vehicles should not be parked on the pavement or a buildout area obstructing visibility.*

Plan 3 – Ashgrove, Peasedown St John – It was agreed to **object** to this proposal. It was considered that this proposal is putting parking restrictions on a section of road in front of a property that has converted their garden into a driveway, although the conversion has not been actioned officially as there is not any dropped kerb installed at this location.

*Response:*

*The proposed Double Yellow Lines are replacing an existing advisory White Keep Clear marking which currently advises drivers where not to park. This proposal is an upgrading to enforceable restrictions of this guidance which is supported by the local Ward Members of Peasedown St John.*

Plan 11 – Old England Way – It was agreed to **support** this proposal.

Plan 19 - Knightstone Close/Church Road - It was agreed to **object** to this proposal. From consultation with local residents, it was thought that the majority felt the change was not necessary, as there are no parking issues at this location. This section of Church Road is single carriageway anyway, so it

was thought that it was not possible to park there without blocking the entire road.

*Response:*

*As no objections were received to these proposals as part of the 21 day public consultation and the restrictions were requested by the local Ward Members of Peasedown St John, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are sealed within this Order.*

**Publow with Whitchurch:**

Cllr Paul May – No comment.

Publow and Pensford Parish Council – No comment.

**Radstock:**

Cllr Christopher Dando – No comment.

Cllr Bruce Shearn – No comment.

**Southdown:**

Cllr Paul Crossley – No comment.

Cllr Dine Romero – No comment.

**Timsbury:**

Cllr Douglas Deacon – No comment.

**Westfield:**

Cllr Dr Eleanor Jackson - No comment.

Cllr Robin Moss – No comment.

Westfield Parish Council – No comment.

Monkton Combe Parish Council – No comment.

**Cabinet Members**

Cllr Manda Rigby – No comment.

**8. RECOMMENDATION**

That the Traffic Regulation Order is sealed as described below.

Signature:

Date: 20<sup>th</sup> April 2022

Paul Garrod  
Traffic Management & Network Manager

## 9. DECISION

As the Officer holding the above delegation, I have decided that the objections / comments be:

a)	not acceded to and the Order as advertised be sealed.	
b)	acceded to in full and the proposal(s) withdrawn.	
c)	<p>acceded to in part and the following adjustments, being of minor significance; be included in the Order to be sealed.</p> <p><i>specify minor amendment to Order here:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b><u>Plan 6 – Cappards Road, Bishop Sutton (No Parking At Any Time)</u></b> <i>it is the recommendation of this report that proposed restrictions are sealed within the Order but extended further north eastwards along the A368 by a distance of 9 metres to run up to and extend in front of the property entrance as requested.</i></li><li>• <b><u>Plan 9 – Village Road / Dunkerton Hill, Dunkerton (No Parking At Any Time)</u></b> <i>the recommendation of this report and with the Parish Councils support that the proposed restrictions are implemented and sealed within this Order at the extended length of 53 metres from the junction with Dunkerton Hill.</i></li><li>• <b><u>Plan 10 – Durcott Lane / Weekeslay Lane, Camerton (No Parking At Any Time)</u></b> <i>The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions were requested by the Parish Council, however due to objections raised above and the concern over lack of available safe on-street visitor parking within the area it</i></li></ul>	<b>X</b>

*is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are reduced and implement at the junction only and extend down Durcott Lane by a distance of 8 metres instead of 30 metres. This will prevent vehicles parking too close to the junction but retain valuable on-street parking provision for local residents.*

- **Plan 12 – Farrington Road / Abbots Farm Close, Paulton (No Parking At Any Time)**

*It is therefore the recommendation of this report that despite the objections raised that the proposed restrictions are implemented on-site and sealed within this Order with the slight amendment of extending by a distance of 5 metres the No Parking At Any Time restrictions into Abbots Farm Close as requested above to prevent obstruction near to the junction.*

- **Plan 13 – Ferry Lane, Claverton (No Parking At Any Time and a Restricted Parking Zone)**

*Due to the number of objections raised above from the local boating community, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are not implemented at this time and further consultation and investigation be carried out in how to tackle the parking issues along Ferry Lane in the best way for all involved. It is recommended that this request be added to the next available Transport Improvement Program and funding be allocated to look into this issue further.*

- **Plan 20 – Northend, Batheaston (No Parking At Any Time)**

*It is the recommendation of this report however that due to the objection and observations raised above due to the limited on-street parking in this area for local residents that the proposed restrictions be reduced by a distance of 8 metres at the southern end retaining 2 valuable on-street car parking spaces for local residents. It is recommended however that the remaining 14 metres of Double Yellow Lines (3 cars length) running in front of properties 50/50A Northend be included within this Order and implemented on-site as requested by the local Councillor to prevent obstruction to the property entrance and impact on natural light entering the building.*

- **Plan 28 – Southstoke Lane, South Stoke (No Parking At Any Time)**

*It is therefore the recommendation of this report that despite the objection raised above, as the proposed restrictions have the support of both the local*

	<p><i>Councillor and Parish Council that they are sealed within this Order and implemented on-site using the thinner reduced 50mm width lines to reduce the visual impact within this conservation area and as requested above are extended slightly further down to the junction with Pack Horse Lane (retaining the existing Disabled Parking Bay.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Plan 29 – Oldbridge Road / Staunton Fields, Whitchurch (No Parking At Any Time)</u></b> <i>The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions were requested by the Whitchurch Parish Council, however due to the amount of objections raised above by local residents it is the recommendation of this report and the Traffic Management Team that the proposed restrictions are not implemented and are not sealed within this Order.</i></li> <li>• <b><u>Plan 30 – Temple Inn Lane, Temple Cloud (Removal of existing No Parking At Any Time)</u></b> <i>Due to the number of objections raised by local residents regarding the removal of the existing No Parking At Any Time restrictions on safety grounds, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed removal of the existing restrictions on the southern side of Temple Inn Lane are not included within this Order, however at the request of Cllr Wood the proposed removal of the existing restrictions on the northern side are included within this Order as this removal will not cause a conflict with the operation of bus services or larger vehicles and will provide more on-street parking for local residents.</i></li> </ul>	
--	--	--

In taking this decision, I confirm that due regard has been given to the Council's public sector equality duty, which requires it to consider and think about how its policies or decisions may affect people who are protected under the Equality Act.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Chris Major', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Signature:

Date: 20/04/22

Chris Major  
Director of Place Management