

K2 Development TRO (Park Road)  
INFORMAL CONSULTATION

Initials	Date	Comments	Opinion	
			For	Against
DH	30/05/12	Questioned the need for a gap on the eastern side of the site.		
ML	30/05/12	Nothing about the scheme, but about his role afterwards.		
AH	06/06/12	Thinks the road is narrow enough to prevent parking, and it also would not stop people unloading anyway.		✓
WQ	06/06/12	Thinks the road is narrow enough to prevent parking, and it also would not stop people unloading anyway.		✓
RP	07/06/12	Thinks the road is narrow enough to prevent parking, and it also would not stop people unloading anyway.		✓
JH	07/06/12	Thinks the road is narrow enough to prevent parking, and it also would not stop people unloading anyway.		✓
AH	07/06/12	Thinks the road is narrow enough to prevent parking, and it also would not stop people unloading anyway.		✓
RE	07/06/12	Thinks the road is narrow enough to prevent parking, and it also would not stop people unloading anyway.		✓
ES	08/06/12	Thinks the road is narrow enough to prevent parking, and it also would not stop people unloading anyway.		✓
AH	08/06/12	Thinks that all the scheme is doing is adding to the hardship faced by locals due to the development. He also questioned how the restrictions will be enforced.		✓
NQ	09/06/12	It is not reasonable to expect the people who live in the cottages to not only have to live with an additional 500 cars going past their house every day but to deprive them of parking anywhere near their house is unacceptable.		✓
SA	10/06/12	Thinks the road is narrow enough to prevent parking, and it also would not stop people unloading anyway.		✓
GF	10/06/12	<p>He makes reference to the Traffic Survey of the area, which said that traffic generated by the site during construction or on completion will be no different than existed. It is unclear why Highways are now saying that restrictions are now required.</p> <p>He also makes the point that the residents currently do not experience any problems with the unrestricted parking, so wonders why the restriction has been proposed in the first place.</p>		✓

K2 Development TRO (Park Road)  
INFORMAL CONSULTATION

Initials	Date	Comments	Opinion	
			For	Against
KF	14/06/12	Doesn't believe the yellow lines are needed as the Highways justification for the route to K2 would not lead to any increase in traffic other than has been experienced from the existing trading estate. Yellow lines are not needed as per the traffic officers report and if it has been realised that there is a danger of congestion since the highways report then it is the route that should be changed.		✓
GS	18/06/12	This is totally unnecessary as the roads in the area are mostly single file, therefore I strongly object to this restriction. Also whilst writing HGV & Articulated lorries are still venturing along Park road thinking they can connect to the Wellsway side of Keynsham, in fact the road runs out to a track only !!!!! Therefore an official road sign positioned at the junction of Albert road & Park road showing & stating.		✓
GS	18/06/12	I seem to remember that when residents raised objections on the grounds of extra traffic at this point the developer assured us that there would be very little extra traffic compared to what we were used to from the farm, when there were businesses there. I see no need for our small road to be treated like a city street by the introduction of yellow lines. I see no reason why our road should be changed to suit the developer and therefore oppose the decision.		✓
JS	19/06/12	Thinks the road is narrow enough to prevent parking, and it also would not stop people unloading anyway.		✓
Cllr Alan Hale	17/07/12	The work will not change the usage of the road, and it worked ok before, so why change it.		✓
NN	05/08/12	Will cause disruption, and it isn't needed anyway.		✓
TC	13/08/12	Lives near to the site entrance, so welcomes anything which helps to keep it clear.	✓	