

Number	Plan	Name	Object	Support	Support In part	Neither	Comments
1	Royal Victoria Park	Wickham	1				As a paid up member of Victoria Park Golf Club feels they should be able to park for free near the course.
2	Royal Victoria Park	Woodford	1				As a paid up member of Victoria Park Golf Club feels they should be able to park for free near the course with some kind of permit system or create a new parking area next to the golf course.
3	Royal Victoria Park	Memory	1				Feels the new parking charges and time restrictions around the park will effect his Hot Air Balloon business.
4	Royal Victoria Park	Rowe	1				The proposals will unfairly disadvantage less-well off residents and people with young children.
5	Royal Victoria Park	Digby		1			Thinks it is a good idea.
6	Royal Victoria Park	Kennedy		1			Allow for a turn around of vehicles meaning more people can use the park.
7	Royal Victoria Park	Bebbington	1				Penalising those on lower incomes.
8	Royal Victoria Park	Boulton	1				Proposals will mean there will be no spaces for the residents visitors to park for longer than 4 hours near property.
9	Royal Victoria Park	Curry	1				The removal of free limited parking in the park will have an impact on local buisnesses and their staff who currently park there.
10	Royal Victoria Park	Cottle			1		Agrees with the proposals but feels the knock on effects due to the loss of free parking within the park will mean the surrounding streets will take the brunt of all the extra vehicles. Therefore feels a resident parking zone should be created for these roads.
11	Royal Victoria Park	Wilkinson	1				Needs access to vehicle in close proximity to their office due to the nature of their work. The new proposed Limited Waiting times would prevent this.
12	Royal Victoria Park	Stone	1				New proposals would prevent residents visitors from parking when staying for longer periods than 4 hours. No other alternative available parking in close proximity.

13	Royal Victoria Park	Haile			1	There would be a knock on effect caused by the proposals on Zone 7, with more residents wishing to buy permits. This needs to be taken into consideration. Either, restrict the number of Zone 7 permits available, Allow Zone 7 permit holders to also park in Zone 0 outside the Royal Crescent, Include some new Zone 7 permit spaces in Royal Victoria Park.
14	Royal Victoria Park	Bolden	1			New machines and signs around the park will create a visual intrusion for park users. Best option would be to eliminate cars from the park altogether.
15	Royal Victoria Park	Winter	1			Believes charging people to park will discourage people from using the park.
16	Royal Victoria Park	Crossley	1			Creating new parking charges will effect the cost conscious commuters and those on low wages and will ultimately make Bath a less attractive place to work.
17	Royal Victoria Park	Watkins	1			Worried that the new parking charges and restrictions will effect the trade and buisness of the Ice Cream, refreshment and amusement buisness in the childrens play area. Lower income and disadvantaged families will suffer and not be able to use the park facilities.
18	Royal Victoria Park	Reed	1			Why are the council not introducing more limited waiting parking in the park rather than pay & display. This would prevent all day commuter parking without penalising park users. 2 hours in not a long enough time limit for park users including those who use the tennis courts, golf course, bowls green etc. The loss of free available parking in Royal Victoria Park will have a knock on effect on the surrounding streets and put pressure on local residents being able to park near their homes.
19	Royal Victoria Park	Bubb	1			Parking in Zone 12 will become more difficult for residents after 6pm Mon - Sat as displaced park users look for free available parking in close proximity to the park facilities.
20	Royal Victoria Park	Hywood	1			Worried about displaced parking from the park making it more difficult for Sion Hill residents to park near their homes.
21	Royal Victoria Park	Davies			1	Worried about displaced parking from the park making it more difficult for Weston Road residents to park near their homes.
22	Royal Victoria Park	Lowe			1	Agrees with trying to limit the parking in the park for all day commuters but feels charging residents is not the way forward. Feels by paying council tax they are already paying for the park facilities and shouldn't be charged again to use them.

23	Royal Victoria Park	Taylor				1	A request from BANES for the existing disabled parking bays in the south of Royal Victoria Park to be moved towards the childrens play area where the ground is more level as per the DDA Park designs scheme. The Disabled bays can be made wider in this location.
24	Royal Victoria Park	Parker	1				Worried about displaced parking from the park making it more difficult for Sion Hill residents to park near their homes.
25	Sion Hill / Summerhill Road	Parker		1			Believes the new double yellow lines are needed but would need to be enforced as the existing double yellow lines along Sion Hill are not. Believes a resident parking zone is required to prevent commuters and university students from parking all day and that the existing double yellow line should be extended.
26	Sion Hill / Summerhill Road	Henshaw				1	Believes the proposals do not go far enough to tackle the issue of poor parking in the area.
27	Sion Hill / Summerhill Road	Madden	1				Believes the current proposals will displace vehicles and cause more poor parking. Feels a Resident Parking scheme is required.
28	Sion Hill / Summerhill Road	Atherton				1	Believes the current proposals will displace vehicles and cause more poor parking near property. Believes the double yellow line proposals should be extended down and running through the Sion Hill loop to allow residents to exit their driveways onto the narrow road. Also extend the proposals along the northern side of Summerhill Road joining up the two proposed double yellow line stretches.
29	Sion Hill / Summerhill Road	Cutter	1				Believes the current proposals will displace vehicles and cause more poor parking. Feels a Resident Parking scheme is required.
30	Sion Hill / Summerhill Road	Burton	1				believes the proposals in Royal Victoria Park and Sion Road will cause a displacement of parking which will have a disastrous effect on the already limited parking around Summerhill Road. Believes a resident parking zone is required.
31	Sion Hill / Summerhill Road	Hughes		1			New proposals will improve the junctions for local residents.
32	Sion Hill / Summerhill Road	Ahlberg				1	Supports the proposed double yellow lines in replacing the existing white keep clear markings but not any further extensions.

33	Sion Hill / Summerhill Road	Moth		1		Agrees with the proposals but feels the knock on effects due to the loss of free parking within the park will mean the surrounding streets will take the brunt of all the extra vehicles. Therefore feels a resident parking zone should be created. The Double yellow lines would also need to be enforced as the existing ones dont seem to be.
34	Sion Hill / Summerhill Road	Griffiths		1		Doesn't feel these proposals tackle the issues of insufficient resident parking and feels the proposals to introduce pay and display parking in Royal Victoria Park and new double yellow lines along Sion Road will have a knock on effect and push even more displaced parking around Sion Hill. A Residents Parking scheme is needed.
35	Sion Hill / Summerhill Road	Donnithorne		1		Feels the proposed double yellow lines will take away valuable parking spaces in an area where parking is already limited. Believes a Resident Parking scheme is required.
36	Sion Hill / Summerhill Road	Hill		1		Believes the proposed double yellow lines will help around the junctions but should extend further down the Sion Hill loop to prevent poor parking. Believes the new proposals around Royal Victoria Park and Sion Road will make the parking worse around the Sion Hill loop.
37	Richmond Road	Abrahams		1		Agrees with the proposals along Richmond Road to prevent irresponsible parking. Feels that it is not right to introduce charges or time limits in Royal Victoria Park.
38	Richmond Road	Wilson		1		Agrees with the proposals along Richmond Road to prevent irresponsible parking allowing better access for emergency vehicles. Wants resident parking in Richmond Hill.
39	Richmond Road			1		Agrees with the proposals along Richmond Road to prevent irresponsible parking.
40	Richmond Road	Darch		1		Agrees with the proposals but worries that traffic will speed up along this stretch of road without the parked cars creating a traffic calming measure.
41	Sion Road, Lansdown Road, Northfields	Branfoot		1		Believes the new double yellow lines will help to improve visibility and lower speeds along Sion Road. Improving overall safety.
42	Sion Road, Lansdown Road, Northfields	Baker		1		Believes the new double yellow lines will help to improve visibility and lower speeds along Sion Road. Improving overall safety. Believes the double yellow lines should be extended along the western corner of the junction with Waldegrave Road and Sion Road

43	Sion Road, Lansdown Road, Northfields	Baxter	1				Wants a resident only parking scheme in Northfields. Doesn't feel the proposals take into account the needs of residents allowing them to park near their homes.
44	Sion Road, Lansdown Road, Northfields	Newman		1			Agrees with the proposals but believes the double yellow lines should be extended along the western corner of the junction with Waldegrave Road and Sion Road.
45	Sion Road, Lansdown Road, Northfields	Meharg		1			Believes the new double yellow lines will help to improve visibility and lower speeds along Sion Road. Improving overall safety.
46	Sion Road, Lansdown Road, Northfields	Sandy				1	Have attached a plan of new suggested restrictions along the western end of Sion Road.
47	Sion Road, Lansdown Road, Northfields	Ockwell		1			Believes the new double yellow lines will help to improve visibility and lower speeds along Sion Road. Improving overall safety.
48	Sion Road, Lansdown Road, Northfields	Balfar		1			Believes the new double yellow lines are required along Sion Road.
49	Sion Road, Lansdown Road, Northfields	Howard		1			Believes the new proposed double yellow line markings will help improve visibility for residents.
50	Sion Road, Lansdown Road, Northfields	Key				1	Believes the proposals shouldn't allow parking on both sides of Northfields as this will still create a single lane and create safety problems when turning into Northfields from Lansdown. Believes it would be best to restrict parking along the whole of the southern side of Northfields or if bays are to be introduced on both sides make one 2 hours and one 4 hours parking.

51	Sion Road, Lansdown Road, Northfields	Hewitt	1				Believes that Winifreds Lane should be closed to through traffic. Believes that the double yellow lines should be extended to the left of the shared driveway to no.9 and no.11.
52	Sion Road, Lansdown Road, Northfields	Hughes		1			Are very pleased with the proposals.
53	Sion Road, Lansdown Road, Northfields	Shearn		1			Are very pleased with the proposals and exactly what the residents proposed.
54	Sion Road, Lansdown Road, Northfields	Duffy	1				Believes the proposals will have a knock on effect of parking being displaced into the the Sion Hill area and that if this is the case a Resident Parking Scheme should be adopted.
55	Sion Road, Lansdown Road, Northfields	Cutter	1				Believes the removal of the parking in Sion Road will create an increase in traffic speeds as the existing parked vehicles act as a traffic calming measure.
56	Sion Road, Lansdown Road, Northfields	Madden	1				Believes the removal of the parking in Sion Road will create an increase in traffic speeds as the existing parked vehicles act as a traffic calming measure.
57	Sion Road, Lansdown Road, Northfields	Parker	1				Believes that the proposed double yellow lines on Sion Road and Lansdown Road will improve safety and visibilty. The new double yellow lines on Sion Road will allow for more passing places. The displaced vehicles however may look for alternative parking in the surrounding streets. Believes the proposed double yellow lines should be extended on the north side of Sion Road at Kelso House up to Waldegrave Road.
58	Claremont Road	Greenaway	1				Feels a full survey of traffic and parking should be carried out in the area.

59	Claremont Road	Badder	1				Objects to proposals
60	Claremont Road	Wratten	1				Believes the loss of parking in Claremont Road due to the proposed double yellow lines will add to the pressure on available parking in Belgrave Road. If parking restrictions on the west side of Claremont Road cause cars to park on the east side it will become even more difficult to turn left out of Belgrave Road onto Claremont Road.
61	Claremont Road	Patrick	1				The proposed markings would take away more valuable parking spaces from an area that is already under intense competition. The government inspector in March 2010 granted permission on the appeal for the development that this TRO is for he stated that there were ample parking spaces in the area according to information supplied by the vendor, all there statistics were taken during the daytime. The time to check availability is in the evening when people are home from work. It is often necessary to drive round and round to try and find a parking spot.
62	Claremont Road	Glen	1				The proposal to limit parking on the west side of Claremont Road will simply serve to increase parking on the east side. The proposals will render access to Eastville dangerous due to the lack of clear visibility.
63	Claremont Road	Garlington	1				The plan of the proposals omits the build-outs, which were deemed necessary by the inspector and agreed upon by the appellants at the inquiry, and therefore a scheme without build-outs would be contrary to the planning permission, thus rendering it invalid. The loss of available parking on the west side of Claremont Road would force people to start parking on the un-restricted east side causing greater congestion. The existing double yellow lines shown on the plan are not on site.
64	Claremont Road	Snowdon	1				It would appear that some of the conditions deemed necessary by the planning inspector and agreed by the developers are being ignored, thereby rendering the scheme invalid. The build-outs into claremont Road to improve visibility were never introduced and are omitted in the plan. The double yellow lines are being extended further than was approved reducing parking even further. Parking in this area is difficult especially since the introduction of the resident parking zones 15 & 16.

65	Claremont Road	Wiltshire	1				The loss of parking on Claremont Road caused by the proposed double yellow lines would displace parking into the surrounding streets which are already at full capacity. It would appear that some of the conditions deemed necessary by the planning inspector and agreed by the developers are being ignored, thereby rendering the scheme invalid.
66	Claremont Road	Ryan	1				The plan of proposals is incorrect. It erroneously indicates existing no waiting at any time markings which in fact do not exist. The plan does not conform with the conditions set in 07/01598/FUL. The reduction of parking will have a detrimental effect in an already congested area.
67	Claremont Road	Powell & Hall	1				The proposed double yellow line markings on the west of Claremont Road will only increase parking on the east side which will cause an obstruction and visibility issues. The displaced parking will be pushed into surrounding streets which are already at full capacity. The double yellow lines described as existing on the plan are not on site.
68	Claremont Road	Willis	1				The proposed markings would take away more valuable parking spaces from an area that is already under intense competition. The proposal to limit parking on the west side of Claremont Road will simply serve to increase parking on the east side.
69	Claremont Road	Delglyn	1				The proposed markings would take away more valuable parking spaces from an area that is already under intense competition.
70	Claremont Road	Ingham	1				It would appear that some of the conditions deemed necessary by the planning inspector and agreed by the developers are being ignored, thereby rendering the scheme invalid. The proposal to limit parking on the west side of Claremont Road would force vehicles onto the east side causing obstruction and visibility issues. Parents and children cross the junctions on the east side of Claremont Road and decreasing visibility here would effect their safety.
71	Claremont Road	Bobrowski & Cherry	1				Believes the loss of parking in Claremont Road due to the proposed double yellow lines will add to the pressure on available parking in Belgrave Road. The proposals don't seem to be inline with those made by the government inspector who granted permission for the Southbourne Gardens scheme. The new proposals seem to be reducing the parking further than was agreed.



72	Claremont Road	Redden	1				The proposal to limit parking on the west side of Claremont Road will simply serve to increase parking on the east side. There is a danger when entering Dowding Road. The short double yellow line needs to be on Claremont Road and the longer double yellow line needs to run into Dowding Road.
73	Claremont Road	Watts	1				It would appear that some of the conditions deemed necessary by the planning inspector and agreed by the developers are being ignored, thereby rendering the scheme invalid. The build-outs into claremont Road to improve visibility were never introduced and are omitted in the plan. The double yellow lines are being extended further than was approved reducing parking even further.
74	Claremont Road	Longstreth	1				The proposal to limit parking on the west side of Claremont Road will simply serve to increase parking on the east side. The proposals will render access to Eastville dangerous due to the lack of clear visibility. The displaced parking from Claremont Road will be pushed into the already full surrounding streets including Eastville.
75	Claremont Road	Vickery	1				The plan of the proposals omits the build-outs, which were deemed necessary by the inspector and agreed upon by the appellants at the inquiry, and therefore a scheme without build-outs would be contrary to the planning permission, thus rendering it invalid. The existing double yellow lines shown on the plan are not on site.
76	Claremont Road	Hadley	1				It would appear that some of the conditions deemed necessary by the planning inspector and agreed by the developers are being ignored, thereby rendering the scheme invalid. The build-outs into claremont Road to improve visibility were never introduced and are omitted in the plan. The double yellow lines are being extended further than was approved reducing parking even further. Placing double yellow lines on the west side of Claremont will just force vehicles onto the east side and cause an obstruction.

77	Claremont Road	Harriss	1				It would appear that some of the conditions deemed necessary by the planning inspector and agreed by the developers are being ignored, thereby rendering the scheme invalid. The build-outs into claremont Road to improve visibility were never introduced and are omitted in the plan. The double yellow lines are being extended further than was approved reducing parking even further. Placing double yellow lines on the west side of Claremont will just force vehicles onto the east side and cause an obstruction. The double yellow lines shown on the plan at the entrance to Dowding Road and Beaufort Villas do not exist. If the council is going to remove more parking spaces then a Resident Parking scheme should be considered.
78	Claremont Road	Case	1				The proposal to limit parking on the west side of Claremont Road will simply serve to increase parking on the east side which will cause an obstruction. The existing Resident Parking Zones 15 & 16 have put pressure on the parking around Claremont Road and Beaufort Villas.
79	Claremont Road	Pyke	1				It would appear that some of the conditions deemed necessary by the planning inspector and agreed by the developers are being ignored, thereby rendering the scheme invalid. The build-outs into claremont Road to improve visibility were never introduced and are omitted in the plan. The double yellow lines are being extended further than was approved reducing parking even further. Placing double yellow lines on the west side of Claremont will just force vehicles onto the east side and cause an obstruction. The proposals will render access to Eastville dangerous due to the lack of clear visibility.
80	Claremont Road	Armstrong	1				It would appear that some of the conditions deemed necessary by the planning inspector and agreed by the developers are being ignored, thereby rendering the scheme invalid. The build-outs into claremont Road to improve visibility were never introduced and are omitted in the plan. The double yellow lines are being extended further than was approved reducing parking even further. Placing double yellow lines on the west side of Claremont will just force vehicles onto the east side and cause an obstruction.

81	Claremont Road	Indoe	1				It would appear that some of the conditions deemed necessary by the planning inspector and agreed by the developers are being ignored, thereby rendering the scheme invalid. The build-outs into claremont Road to improve visibility were never introduced and are omitted in the plan. The double yellow lines are being extended further than was approved reducing parking even further. Placing double yellow lines on the west side of Claremont will just force vehicles onto the east side and cause an obstruction. The Double yellow lines at the entrance to Dowding Road and Beaufort Villas/Southbourne Gardens described as existing on the plan do not exist.
82	Claremont Road	Jones	1				The loss of parking on Claremont Road caused by the proposed double yellow lines would displace parking into the surrounding streets which are already at full capacity. It would appear that some of the conditions deemed necessary by the planning inspector and agreed by the developers are being ignored, thereby rendering the scheme invalid. The proposals will render access to Eastville dangerous due to the lack of clear visibility.
83	Claremont Road	Turner	1				It would appear that some of the conditions deemed necessary by the planning inspector and agreed by the developers are being ignored, thereby rendering the scheme invalid. The proposals will render access to Eastville dangerous due to the lack of clear visibility.
84	Claremont Road	McKeown	1				It would appear that some of the conditions deemed necessary by the planning inspector and agreed by the developers are being ignored, thereby rendering the scheme invalid. The build-outs into claremont Road to improve visibility were never introduced and are omitted in the plan. The double yellow lines are being extended further than was approved reducing parking even further. Placing double yellow lines on the west side of Claremont will just force vehicles onto the east side and cause an obstruction. The Double yellow lines at the entrance to Dowding Road and Beaufort Villas/Southbourne Gardens described as existing on the plan do not exist.
85	Claremont Road	Hazelwood	1				It would appear that some of the conditions deemed necessary by the planning inspector and agreed by the developers are being ignored, thereby rendering the scheme invalid.
86	Claremont Road	Howell	1				The loss of parking on Claremont Road caused by the proposed double yellow lines would displace parking into the surrounding streets which are already at full capacity.

87	Claremont Road	Reeve	1			By removing the parked vehicles on Claremont Road you would be creating a rat run and allow vehicles to travel at greater speeds. The loss of parking on Claremont Road caused by the proposed double yellow lines would be detrimental to local residents. The Double yellow lines at the entrance to Dowding Road and Beaufort Villas/Southbourne Gardens described as existing on the plan do not exist.
88	Claremont Road	Easdon	1			Approval for this development with access was granted on appeal. In March 2012 the access junction arrangement of Southbourne Gardens with Claremont Road was marginally amended from that originally agreed with the planning inspector, with the small nib of wall now being retained. However the approved access plan granted in March 2012 by BANES showed the originally agreed TRO requirements recommended by the planning inspector. For some reason the council officers had amended the TRO requirements first time around which as said above did not accord with that originally recommended by the planning inspector. However the current approved plan does accord with the TRO requirements agreed with the planning inspector. BANES committee approved this in March 2012.
89	West Avenue, South Avenue, & Triangle North	Claridge	1			Restricting parking in this area is likely to increase traffic speeds and cause a danger to children and parents. The parked cars also create a safety barrier between pedestrians and moving vehicles. The new restrictions may encourage further dangerous and inconsiderate dropping-off. There is a restricted view of traffic coming across the bridge. The proposals fail to address this problem and will make it worse because drivers will have improved vision and traffic will be able to emerge more easily into West Avenue without stopping. Crossing West Avenue where it meets Lyndhurst Avenue is also currently difficult for children and parents travelling to and from the infants and junior schools, and will be more so if the pinch point for vehicles is removed.

90	West Avenue, South Avenue, & Triangle North	Williams	1			Restricting parking in this area is likely to increase traffic speeds and cause a danger to children and parents. The parked cars also create a safety barrier between pedestrians and moving vehicles. The new restrictions may encourage further dangerous and inconsiderate dropping-off. There is a restricted view of traffic coming across the bridge. The proposals fail to address this problem and will make it worse because drivers will have improved vision and traffic will be able to emerge more easily into West Avenue without stopping. The proposals do not support and address local peoples concerns about speed and proximity of traffic around corners and emerging from Brook Road.
91	West Avenue, South Avenue, & Triangle North	Foreman		1		Everyday I see motorists having to negotiate an almost blind bend, stopping suddenly and then having to reverse back to let traffic through at either end of this short stretch of road. We also get a lot of lorries and a regular bus service using this stretch of West Avenue. It would be much safer to have vehicles parked on one side only.
92	West Avenue, South Avenue, & Triangle North	Singh	1			The new proposals will displace parked vehicles into surrounding streets which are already full.
93	West Avenue, South Avenue, & Triangle North	Milner		1		The new proposals at the bottom of West Avenue by the railway bridge would be a welcome improvement both from a traffic and pedestrian point of view. Parking on corners is a problem for traffic and pedestrians as it reduces visibility. I'am less convinced of the need for restrictions around the corner of Triangle West but agree this does sometimes cause similar traffic congestion and also difficulties for pedestrians (particularly given the school children crossing around here).
94	West Avenue, South Avenue, & Triangle North	Harding		1		These yellow lines are desperately needed before there is an accident, particularly on the corner opposite the Oldfield Park Station. Buses use this route which it makes it more important than ever.

95	West Avenue, South Avenue, & Triangle North	Morgan		1		West Avenue has always been a bad road for traffic due to the amount of cars parked both sides of the road, but now it has become a nightmare for cars and buses alike, I am a pedestrian, car driver and bus passenger and realise this area of road is an accident waiting to happen. I feel very sorry for the bus drivers as everyday of the week they have a near impossible task manouvring their vehicles around this 's' bend.
96	West Avenue, South Avenue, & Triangle North	Edwards		1		I would like to support the proposals before someone is injured in this area. The parking on both sides of the road is a real hazard, especially at the junction of Brook Road, and West Avenue where 3 streams of traffic converge onto a blind bend. I am a regular traveller in this area and absolutely dread this section of road, and it is a nightmare for the bus drivers.
97	West Avenue, South Avenue, & Triangle North	Jeanette		1		I support the new proposals. There is a bus route to Whiteway that uses this road and struggles to get round the corner due to parked cars and the cars waiting to get down the hill.
98	West Avenue, South Avenue, & Triangle North	Blackburn		1		Would like to express support for the proposals. As a local resident we see daily the problems created by the inconsiderate parking on and around the corner of West and South Avenues. It is this type of parking we have never experienced anywhere before. We understand the local pressures on spaces but leaving corners blind is dangerous and allows road users to think this is acceptable and normal parking behaviour, it's not and the law is being stretched, at best, in these instances.
99	West Avenue, South Avenue, & Triangle North	Fraser		1		Writing to support proposals. This area at the top corner where single lane traffic emerges from Brook Road (and numerous commuters from the train station) is currently a hazard due to existing parking. This is a route used by numerous children going to and from Oldfield Park Infants School. The commuters park inconsiderately and it is currently a death trap. The proposed lines may potentially increase drivers speed, however at least then the cars could be seen coming. The lines are needed and very long overdue.

100	West Avenue, South Avenue, & Triangle North	Breckman		1		Driving and negotiating the roads is getting increasingly difficult in some parts of Oldfield Park. The bend at West Avenue is a nightmare and one day I think there is going to be an accident. Sometimes the bus cannot get through because the cars are backed up along West Avenue and it causes tension for some drivers (road rage). Lorries are unable to turn at the Triangle also because of inconsiderate parking. In general it is dangerous that cars are parking on both sides of the road.
101	West Avenue, South Avenue, & Triangle North	Denning			1	Parking is very difficult for residents due to the number of commuters who use the area as a free car park. A number of houses in Oldfield Park are also multiple occupancy which means there are a number of cars on the road for these properties. The only sensible solution would be to introduce a Residents Parking scheme.
102	West Avenue, South Avenue, & Triangle North	Barretto		1		I would like to see the double yellow lines in these places. I live on Triangle West and it is very dangerous on the corner.
103	West Avenue, South Avenue, & Triangle North	Gyori		1		We think it is an excellent idea to put double yellow lines in West Avenue. The road is chaos during the daytimes with cars parked both sides of West Avenue. Vehicles coming up the road go too fast and do not seem to like giving way to other vehicles and this causes commotion. Vehicles coming along from Moorland Road end of West Avenue also go too fast coming round the slight bend at the top by the railway. There was recently an accident here where a car was parked on a corner and a bus hit it when it came round the bend into West Avenue. There have been plenty of near misses and a constant blowing of horns and road rage.
104	West Avenue, South Avenue, & Triangle North	Wilkey			1	I support the addition of the No Waiting restrictions in front of 111 West Avenue up to the railway bridge. However in the interest of public safety I object to the proposed restrictions on the former methodist church side of the road and the corners of the junction of South Avenue with West Avenue. Such lines will only encourage speed and reduce the need for caution to be applied when negotiating these two situations.

105	West Avenue, South Avenue, & Triangle North	Wilkey			1	I support the addition of the No Waiting restrictions in front of 111 West Avenue up to the rialway bridge. However in the interest of public safety I object to the proposed restrictions on the former methodist church side of the road and the corners of the junction of South Avenue with West Avenue. Such lines will only encourage speed and reduce the need for caution to be applied when negotiating these two situations.
Comments received after consultation period						
106	Claremont Road	Mason	1			The proposed markings will not solve the problems around this area, they will only force vehicles onto the opposite side of the road which will cause even more distrupction and chaos. It defies the imagination what this stretch of road is going to be like if there is a building site.
107	Sion Hill / Summerhill Road	Clayton			1	The residents of Sion Hill, Summerhill Road and neighbouring streets are right to be concerned about the effect of the council's proposals for parking in Royal Victoria Park and the area of Sion Hill and Sion Road on their ability to park within a reasonable distance to their homes. My wider question is whether the council has a policy for providing affordable car parking specifically for commuters. Such a policy is necessary becuase Bath's economy is largely service based and there is a need to attract and keep numbers of employees from outside the city.
108	Sion Hill / Summerhill Road	Enstock	1			We are concerned that there will be a knock on effect of displaced vehicles looking for free parking around Sion Hill due to the new proposals around Royal Victoria Park and Sion Road.