

Number	Plan	Road	Object	Support	Support In part	Neither	Comments
1	47	St Peters Road		1			Wants to express support for the proposal in its entirety
2	38	Belle Vue Close		1			We are wholeheartedly in favour of the double yellow lines leading into Belle Vue Close as any vehicles parked on either side of the narrow stretch of road up to the traffic calming pinch causes problems for any vehicles entering or exiting.
3	7, 8, 9, 38, 43	Roads in Peasedown St John		1			I was very pleased to see that there is to be a review of restricted parking in Peasedown and welcome the proposals although I do not think they go far enough.
4	43	Wellow Lane			1		Would like the markings to extend further into Braysdown Lane and along Wellow Lane.
5	43	Wellow Lane			1		Would like the markings to extend further.
6	43	Wellow Lane			1		Would like the markings to extend further.
7	23	Welton Road			1		Wants the markings to be extended by another 7 to 8 metres on the north side of Welton Road in a westerly direction to help improve the Manoeuvrability for the three properties opposite when exiting their driveway.
8	43	Wellow Lane			1		We agree with the lines as proposed by the council on our side of the road, but give more thought to double yellow lines opposite us. If, because of the junction there is a necessity for some kind of restriction, then apply single yellow lines to allow for loading and off loading.
9	6	Redfield Grove	1				Objects to further parking restrictions in Redfield Grove. A narrow road with 10 properties which have 3 available parking spaces due to the present restrictions already in place. I urge you to take a physical look at this road where you will see for yourselves the lack of parking that already exists. In my view any further restrictions will be unworkable. The only problem we get here is parents of pupils at St Johns School and Somervale School picking up and dropping off their kids here using the Grove as a carpark.
10	40	Rock Road	1				Parking at Rock Road is hard enough as it is with out extending the yellow lines. By extending the yellow lines will only make parking even harder. I strongly disagree with this proposal.

							<p>1, local residents use the wider part of this road outside of the college for parking. This is extremely handy for our visitors. Cars and vans can park and this still allows 2way traffic to pass safely.</p> <p>2, If this happens surely people will park on the opposite side of the road which will obstruct the view for vehicles pulling out of the Welton Road junction and heading East.</p> <p>3, I live at postcode BA33SD and at times people park opposite on the more narrow part of Wells Road opposite Dringside. If this happens at peak traffic times the traffic on several occasions has been queued to the traffic lights by Cobblers Way. Has nobody from the Highways department never seen this situation as this would be a regular occurrence. Obviously with these tailbacks comes the pollution issues.</p> <p>4, Where would people park who use the Railway pub. This could lead to another business going closing down.</p> <p>5, The most dangerous part of this road where accidents often happen is where cars park at the top of Welton Road close to the junction and cannot be seen by cars heading west down Wells Road and turning into Welton Road only to face a parked car. I don't see any plans to put lines in this area. Is this a desktop exercise or do the Highways department actually look at these situations.</p> <p>6, Eight weeks ago I reported a bollard had been damaged which left a hole in the ground outside Dringside. On reporting this a road cone was placed over the hole but this regularly gets moved by children. I have contacted Banes on 3 occasions stating my concerns as a blind gentleman often uses this footpath and could lead to a fatality if this caused a trip hazard. My point is you can't maintain what you already have without wasting more tax payers money. I would like to state I am totally against this parking restriction going ahead at Wells Road.</p>
11	24	Wells Road	1				
12	10	Church Street		1			In my view it is a really good idea to get parking around here.

13	4	Gullock Tynning	1				I would like to place my objection to the above at Gullock Tynning, Midsomer Norton as I am a local resident (Hope Terrace) and we have VERY restricted parking in the area, as we have none designated to our homes. We usually park along Somer Court but occasionally use Gullock Tynning when we can't. If you impose further parking restrictions here, you will push users of the park and doctors surgery and visitors to the area down this side road, more than they do already, thus making our parking even more restricted. You will also make it even more difficult to sell our homes as we will not be able to offer even nearby parking when trying to sell. I have lived here for 15 years, but recently with the parking restrictions imposed by the Council and local residents make it nigh on impossible to park. I am a single mum with an autistic daughter and although I don't use my car all the time, I do need one.
14	24	Wells Road	1				It appears that the consultation over these has passed without a number of us realising the potential impact on a local business, in this case the Railway Inn. It appears that this will impact severely on the pub, at a time when business is difficult enough as it is. Recent government proposals on a range of subjects have identified the importance of pubs within the local community.
15	43	Wellow Lane				1	Wants double yellow lines to extend much further along Wellow Lane as parking is causing both access and visibility concerns for local residents.
16	23	Welton Road	1				Wish to object to the small stretch of Double Yellow Lines outside 54 and 55 Welton Road. We do not believe the width of the road with parked cars outside houses 54 and 55 causes an issue for residents opposite to turn up the road in an easterly direction. The width of the road is sufficient to allow the properties Greenwood, Melvaig and Endersley to turn their cars down the road. The current width of the road is perfectly safe with good visibility in both directions. Therefore the only issue is a tighter turning circle to turn down the road in a westerly direction. Placing double yellow lines outside number 55 will have absolutely zero effect on the turning circle of any vehicle. The 20 metres of double yellow lines will create a guaranteed lay by for traffic meaning properties 54 and 55 will be subject to the constant noise of cars pulling up outside the house, the increased chance of damage to the stone walls and the increased danger when exiting the properties. These markings will also result in reduced access to properties 54 and 55 Welton Road.
17	23	Welton Road				1	Want the proposed markings outside properties 54 and 55 on Welton Road to extend for at least another 2 car lengths down Welton Road to improve Manoeuvrability for the residents opposite.

18	53	Northend	1			I appreciate that the road through Northend is not the widest and large vehicles do have to proceed with care through the village - however it is for exactly this reason that I feel very strongly that the existing parking should be retained. We have quite a steady flow of traffic through the village at all times of the day made very busy at school times. We also have a number of companies operating deep into the village that require drop offs of very large items on huge trucks. The parked cars mean that traffic of all types proceeds with care and caution and at a 'reduced' speed. This creates a very natural traffic calming measure that all drivers have to abide by. Thus the many children walking to school, mums with buggies going to and from nursery and church goers of an elderly age have some protection from traffic. It is my belief that Northend will be made a more dangerous place to walk our children to school if this proposal goes ahead
19	4	Gullock Tynning	1			If the new proposed restrictions go down on Gullock Tynning it will make it impossible to park to visit relatives who live in Hope Terrace.
20	4	Gullock Tynning	1			I have friends that live on Hope Terrace in Midsomer Norton and i am unable to visit on occasions due to the increased parking problems created after numerous houses and flats were built around Gullock tynning. Parking has been a problem for a while, the skate park was built and then to add to that the council then added double yellow lines. The residents in this area already have a problem parking, let alone relations and guests coming to visit. There are already double yellow lines, and by making the parking bays by the kids play area into a max 30 minute stay it means that the current amount of spaces will be cut by half. When the double yellow lines were installed in the first place, local residents were assured that spaces wouldnt be lost and that the new bays would be available to them, now you want to go back on that and take them away again. My friends are strongly having to reconsider there jobs, houses and there general way of living. By reducing spaces you are effectively reducing their lifestyle choices by making them reduce the vehicles they can own and how they get about and to and from work.
21	8	Blenheim Close			1	Parked vehicles in the turning head prevent individuals from using it for purpose and generally they will turn on the area in front of the block of five garages which is private property. I'am totally in favour of this proposal.
22	2	High Street, High Littleton	1			The parking on the High Street in High Littleton considerably reduces the speed of through traffic and acts as a traffic calming measure. The Traffic through High Littleton has increased over the years and the parked vehicles in this location are now more necessary and welcome than ever before.

23	53	Northend	1			<p>1 - SAFETY OF CHILDREN / OLD PEOPLE: This area of the 4/5 car parking spaces in question sits in an area with two key village amenities, just by the Jack and Jills Day nursery and the Methodist church. Neither of these places have parking facilities - hence those using them are required to street park in the limited parking spaces available. It is worth bearing in mind with the two facilities you have both old people and very young people crossing this road at this point. The current 4/5 five parking spaces which you proposed to remove act as an excellent TRAFFIC CALMING measure and actually serve to slow the overly fast traffic on occasion coming from deeper Northend.</p> <p>2 - LOCAL COMMUNITY PROVISION OF PARKING: The parking for the local community is limited, there are very few properties / amenities with their own parking in the village, therefore these spaces help to serve the village and all its amenities with some degree of parking.</p> <p>3 - LISTED PROPERTIES :The majority of homes in this area are all listed properties, therefore for the families living in them they have no choice but to park on the road as they invariably have will never be granted the opportunity to ever create 'parking' within their own property.</p> <p>Final note: I understand that the Safety department has deemed this area of the road too narrow for the size of a fire engine. However - I note that a huge number of much larger vehicles pass through this area of the village on a daily basis. MJ Church trucks are regularly passing along this road on way to building developments within the village. Also medium and large sized trucks also flow through the village on route to Hawkers yard and other businesses. Thankfully where the road narrows here it in turn forces them to 'slow' as they approach into the heart of the village. Again these 4/5 spaces create a great Traffic Calming Measure.</p>
24	31	Station Road			1	<p>double yellow lines, though welcome all down through Station Road from the A37 to Greensbrook, and something we have thought for years would be a good idea, in most respects, it will exacerbate other already existing problems. Then we have the question of when and how the yellow lines will be enforced. We rarely if ever see a police car, and there will have to be some sort of mobile traffic warden constantly going around all the villages listed . The biggest traffic and parking problems in Clutton happens at weekends, school times and late evenings when those employed and empowered to act on drivers flouting the lines, would be outside of their working hours - unless you are hoping to provide a 24-hour policing service.</p>

25	9	Wellow Lane		1		With regard to the proposed parking restrictions to the access road to 27 and 29 Wellow Lane. I am in favour of this proposal. I feel double yellow lines would make it clear that it is a no parking area. At the moment there are white lines which everyone ignores
26	14	Longfellow Road			1	Doesn't feel the new proposals will affect him.
27	4	Gullock Tynning	1			Feels that by removing parking provision on Gullock Tynning we are going to be making it very difficult for the residents of Hope Terrace and the surrounding roads to own a vehicle. The parking situation continues to get worse around Midsomer Norton and with all the new housing developments and the South Road car park becoming a supermarket car park soon with limited time parking, where are local residents supposed to park.
28	4	Gullock Tynning	1			Feels that by removing parking provision on Gullock Tynning we are going to be making it very difficult for the residents of Hope Terrace and the surrounding roads to own a vehicle.
29	53	Northend	1			I wish to object to the proposed 'no waiting at any time' restrictions on the section shown between the Methodist Church Hall (entrance to "Mike's Meadow") running north to the existing restrictions to the south of 28 Northend. This restriction will remove five or six parking spaces from an area where there is already considerable parking pressure. This will have a significant impact in putting further pressure on the already busy area at the top of School Lane and the terrace adjacent to the Methodist Church. Batheaston School and the multiple local halls and churches add significantly to parking pressures at certain times. There is sufficient width, equal or greater than many other local streets, for the parking of cars in this section without making the remainder of the road impassible or dangerous to other road users or pedestrians. Any resident of Northend will attest to occasions where LARGE lorries have become stuck and created temporary traffic chaos in the area. However, I have never witnessed this to happen due to parking in this part of the road. Invariably vehicles become stuck further to the south opposite the residential terrace where there is no pavement opposite the parked cars. Stricter restrictions on vehicle sizes entering Northend should be considered before imposing further draconian parking restrictions in my view.
30	53	Northend	1			I wish to object to the proposal to stop cars from parking at this location. There is a lack of on street parking in our village especially for residents in this area and to prevent parking here would simply exacerbate the problem. Traffic flow has to alternate here already so the proposal would make no difference except make life difficult for local residents.

31	6	Redfield Grove				1	I cant see why this would be an issue.
32	43	Wellow Lane	1				Having looked at the Council proposal for yellow lines in the area of Wellow Tyning we consider that they do not go far enough and would much rather have the alternative proposal which covers both sides of the road and extends from opposite the Wansdyke workshops and up to our boundary 6 Wellow Tyning. Also both sides of the road at the bottom on Braysdown Lane. We feel that the vehicles which at present are parking on the road are greatly restricting the flow of traffic making it single lane. This can only get worse as more house are sold. The homes all have parking spaces so there is no need to park on the roadway.
33	4	Gullock Tyning	1				I would like to object to the added parking restrictions on Gullock Tyning. when the skate park was built there was very few objections to it,as we were told the parking would not be affected! but as the years have gone on parking is getting seriously worse and worse as yourselfs continue to put yellow lines everywhere!,and now you are proposing to now limit it even more! i do not agree with these proposals as parking is limited as it is!

34	4	Gullock Tying	1			<p>The council has continuously created parking issues for the residents of Hope Terrace, Gullock Tying, Rackvernal Road etc etc and has on each occasion fobbed the residents off by telling us that our available parking is not going to be affected. On each occasion it has been.</p> <p>3 years ago the council attempted to make a similar move by double yellow lining Gullock Tying and Ham Gardens in their entirety. After raising the issues then, the council partially backed down and painted double yellow lines that cut our parking by 10-12 spaces. The council's argument then was that they had given us 5 new parking space bays. These are the same bays you are now attempting to turn into maximum of 30 minute waiting time bays Monday through to Saturday and so therefore removing from any practical use to residents. The council double yellow lined the junctions on Gullock Tying quoting health and safety as the reason for this. May I now quote you the same legislation that you yourselves used and ask how a vehicle belonging to a disabled member of the public is any more transparent than a vehicle belonging to a more able bodied member of the public? Why, you may ask? Because you wish to make disabled parking bays within the 10 metre (32 foot) exemptions on junctions that you said that we, the residents, couldn't park in because it was dangerous. I believe this is a very good example of the pot calling the kettle black. In fact, I think you will find that it was very rarely residents who were parking on junctions like this, but incomers using the High Street or skate park (who incidentally still flout the rules and park on the double yellow lines or on the paths). Even the idea of parking in South Road car park is soon to be "no go", due to the proposed supermarket and underground car park which will have its own parking restrictions and will inevitably force workers and users of the High Street and more importantly visitors to the skateboard park and children's park onto Gullock Tying where they will take up any remaining chance of locals residents ever being able to park.</p>
----	---	---------------	---	--	--	---

35	53	Northend	1			<p>I appreciate that there are regular obstructions to traffic caused by large vehicles trying to negotiate narrow sections of Northend where cars are parked. However the new road markings proposed are not one of the narrowest sections. I have never seen vehicles become stuck at this point.</p> <p>There is already very limited on street parking available to people visiting the Church Hall and six spaces were removed in a TRO made without proper consultation about a year ago, ostensibly to improve safety at the village school. The loss of a further 6 spaces will have considerable impact on people using the Church Hall, Youth Club, Methodist Church and Hall, the School and residents of nearby houses. At the very least a more imaginative approach needs to be taken to on-street parking in Northend . Blanket imposition of double yellow lines is not always appropriate and, particularly outside school hours there are many places where parking could be regulated by single yellow lines permitting parking at evenings and weekends.</p>
36	2	High Street, High Littleton	1			<p>1. The current level of parking IS THE ONLY thing that is currently actually slowing the traffic down. As I type (with most of the vehicles away from their current parking areas) vehicles of all shapes and sizes are hurtling pass my window. 2. With two small children (one of whom is autistic with NO sense of danger) I feel this increase in speed as a serious risk to pedestrian road safety. 3. The ONLY issue is the bus stop. Please ask yourselves, this one question ' Do we REALLY need THREE bus stops in the space of 300 meters?' 4. You would be correct in stating that these houses have parking at the rear, but for how many vehicles? Currently 61% of households are multiple vehicle households. The houses in question being NO exception. I would hate for these proposals to be put hastily in place only for a serious road traffic accident to happen as a result. In closing the simple and obvious solution IS to close/move the bus stop.</p>
37	53	Northend	1			<p>I am a resident of The Batch in Northend. I have recently discovered that you are planning to introduce more parking restrictions in the area by taking away the 4-5 parking spaces between the entrance to Mike's Meadow and the existing double lines further up the road. As a resident of the area I would ask you to please reconsider this decision. Most of us in the area live in tiny houses with no off street parking and sometime struggle to find anywhere to park. We have already lost a place further up The Batch near the church where double yellow lines were painted, as well as losing 6 places at the top of school lane in September 2011.</p>

38	53	Northend	1				<p>Our village is full of families and children as it is home to a thriving primary school and nursery. This means a lot of traffic passing by on a daily basis, including many large and heavy vehicles delivering to Hawkers Yard and other building businesses / projects in the village.</p> <p>Removing the obstacle of parked cars at the side of the road would definitely create an additional risk. On the rare occasions when there are no parked cars these vehicles travel far too quickly, often speeding up at the entrance to the nursery alongside the narrow pavement. Although we have speed bumps these are ineffective and cars take them as fast as they can. Removing the parked cars would also mean that cars would try to overtake each other where the pavement is very narrow. At the moment traffic is forced to travel slowly and carefully but with traffic moving both ways an accident is bound to occur.</p> <p>This area of Northend is by no means the narrowest and there are few problems with large vehicles passing. We have all seen emergency services vehicles pass through easily, as do large delivery trucks.</p>
39	53	Northend	1				I object to both of the proposals in Batheaston
40	4	Gullock Tynning	1				<p>I am a resident of Hope Terrace and I am objecting to the proposed parking restrictions in the area of Gullock Tynning on several counts. 1. Myself and my partner did not oppose the skate park when it was being planned as we were led to believe that there would still be adequate parking spaces for the residents of Hope Terrace. However several spaces were taken away and now we face even more parking restrictions. 2. We are very concerned that the value of our house within Hope Terrace will be seriously affected due to the lack of parking spaces and also lack of access from the illegal erection of the barrier by Rackvernal Court residents. 3. The few spaces that are available are frequently used by residents further afield which will only increase as more spaces are taken away. This is very worrying for myself as I am a nurse who works at the RUH working various shifts. At the moment I frequently have to park by the skate park when I arrive home at ten o'clock at night.</p>

41	23	Welton Road		1	<p>As residents of Welton Road, Radstock who use the road as pedestrians and drivers, we would like to record our wholehearted support for the proposal for double yellow lines. As pedestrians we have to take great care crossing over from the right hand side to the left just before the bend (going up towards Wells Road and vice versa of course on the way down) and although the Council have identified pedestrian walkways and the pseudo path, I'm afraid car/van/lorry drivers do not very often pass us with care. Speed seems to be their main priority. The day that the cones were placed around the corner recently, proved beyond doubt that having the whole width of the road available for vehicle users on that bend was MUCH safer.</p> <p>We are lucky and have a drive and garage for our car and we realise that most residents of the cottages do not. There is a fairly long wide grass verge outside the group of bungalows where we live, which we assume belongs to the Council. Could this area perhaps be turned into slanted car spaces for use by the residents who will have difficulty finding a parking space should this Order be approved?</p> <p>We also support the plan for double yellow lines along Wells Road at the Welton Road junction. Vehicles parking opposite the junction cause so many problems and dangers - I'm sure Chris Cray did not expect people to park so stupidly when he campaigned for the pavement.</p>
----	----	-------------	--	---	---

42	53	Northend	1			<p>I have concerns regarding the removal of essentially 4 parking spaces in Northend. While I appreciate that this is not the widest road in the village I feel that the removal of these spaces is going to create more problems than it solves. Firstly that the cars parked there actually provide a speeding deterrent, at present even with speed bumps drivers will speed up to well over 30 mph on stretches of the road with no parked cars or speed bumps. The cars offer natural traffic calming as the speed bumps are flown over with little thought by many a speeding car and truck however they slow down around the parked vehicles. Secondly – emergency vehicle access. The size and weight of a fire engine the largest emergency vehicle to require access is 13t and yet we frequently have up to 32 t (wider and longer than a fire engine) vehicles passing through this road – without any problems. So I don't feel that this should be a problem, I am sure we could back this up with photographs due to the regularity of their arrival. Thirdly there is limited parking in Northend. However we have the primary school, Jack and Jill's Nursery, Hopefully a new Village Hall, Mike's meadow which can accommodate parties and three churches within 400m of the area you are proposing to eliminate parking from. Surely the village needs to keep the parking or else the logic of allowing yet more facilities with the hall which also runs plays/parties and meetings, will be farcical as no one will be able to park.</p>
43	3	Berkeley Avenue	1			<p>The proposal says that the restrictions at the Clevedon Road end of Berkeley Avenue are to be put in place to increase safety at the junction.</p> <p>It is not clear to me, or other residents to whom I have spoken, how this will happen. At present cars are not allowed to park at the junction, either on Clevedon Road or on Berkeley Avenue. Pedestrian traffic, which is mostly up and down Clevedon Road, has a clear view of cars coming from all directions. As Berkeley Avenue has very limited traffic I can not see that there is an issue of safety. In addition, during the school day, when children are using the pavement, there are very few parked cars on either road.</p> <p>The proposed changes will push parking further down Berkeley Avenue and further down Clevedon Road into Vivien Avenue, which will make these two roads more congested. Parking is an issue with residents, as most houses have at least one car. Where do you suggest that they park?</p>

44		High Street, 2 High Littleton	1			<p>I have great concerns regarding the prohibition and restriction of parking you intend to impose on High Littleton, High Street.</p> <p>I live on the High Street and can therefore recall the horrendous time when parking on the high St was prohibited due to road works in Temple cloud, our small village road became a race track, vehicles particularly lorries were driving at very dangerous speeds - with no cars parked on the road there was nothing to calm the traffic, in fact over that period of time I needed to cross my son over the road to get school transport for fear of his safety, due to the speed and consistent volume of traffic, there is not a problem when cars are parked on the High Street - vehicles flow at a reasonable speed with breaks in the traffic, and as for the pedestrian crossing, that is ignored at the best of times. What hope will we have with vehicles racing through the village.</p>
----	--	----------------------------------	---	--	--	--

45	53	Northend	1			<p>Parking is a premium along this stretch of road. It is not simply the people residing in numbers 18 through 28 which use this stretch of road to park in. The residents in The Batch frequently park outside our own properties and in the area set aside for your proposal. You will exasperate an already difficult parking situation by imposing further restrictions. There are various functions serving the community held in the buildings along this section of road. The Batch and our group of houses were built in excess of 300 years ago, well before vehicles were a twinkle in Mr Ford's eye! Due to this, our only option is to park on the street outside our houses, or in the close vicinity.</p> <p>The speed of vehicles travelling along this vulnerable stretch of road continues to be a problem, particularly with children and elderly visiting the nursery, church and village hall.</p> <p>We will shortly have the amateur dramatic society giving a performance in the community. We have scouts, school performances, church days, fitness training, open garden day, sports days, girl guides, fetes, charity jumble sales, birthday parties and many, many more activities that take place in our lovely community. I fear that your proposal will deter people from coming to these events and our community will suffer as a result.</p> <p>If your proposal is due to access issues for the Fire/Ambulance/Police service, we have had several emergency vehicles travel your proposed restricted area without issue. In fact, the pinch point of this road is already covered by double-yellow lines. The area you have proposed is not a difficulty for larger vehicles, it is outside of our properties that is the pinch point if anything. We are well aware of this problem, and park accordingly to ensure safe passage of emergency vehicles.</p> <p>If your proposal is to enable the hedgerow to be trimmed from Spring through to Autumn, we are all more than reasonable and would not park in the vicinity on previously agreed dates.</p>
----	----	----------	---	--	--	--

46	53	Northend	1				It has recently come to my attention that the council intend to impose additional parking restrictions in the village and I wanted to write to say that I am strongly in disagreement with this proposal. I have lived in the village for nearly 7 years and parking is difficult at the best of times. My house only has one vehicle and quite often I cannot park near the house – parking is very limited and only a handful of houses have their own drives. All of the houses in the stretch of road I live have to park on the road as do the residents at the Batch who also have no parking.. If your proposed area of parking were to be taken away many of us would regularly have no where to park Not only do the residents need parking but there is also the Methodist Church, Jack and Jill's Pre-school Nursery, Forest School field from Batheaston Primary School and Village Hall all of which require parking on a regular basis. I understand that the road is narrow and there are concerns over access from Fire Engines but far larger vehicles drive through this village on a daily basis on their way to Hawkers Yard and other destinations and the area of road in question is wider than other places as you go through the village.
47	3	Berkeley Avenue				1	Feels the No Waiting At Any Time markings should be further up Berkeley Avenue in front of the public footpath which crosses through Berkeley Avenue.
48	47	St Peters Road				1	Is in favour of the proposed markings but doesn't feel they extend far enough. Wants the length of the No Waiting At Any Time markings to be increased.
49	14	Longfellow Road	1				Does not feel the proposed markings will have any effect on the parking situation in Longfellow Road and would like them to be extended further.
50	7	Bath Road, Peasedown St John	1				Feels the proposed yellow lines would make it awkward for her to park near her property.
51	4	Gullock Tynning	1				If the new proposed restrictions go down on Gullock Tynning it will make it impossible to park to visit relatives who live in Hope Terrace. By reducing parking spaces you are effectively reducing the lifestyle of my son and his family by making them consider how they get about and get to and from work.
52	4	Gullock Tynning	1				Feels that by removing parking provision on Gullock tynning we are going to be making it very difficult for the residents of Hope Terrace to own and operate a work van.
53	47	St Peters Road				1	Supports the proposals in part but would like to see them extended slightly further.

54	23	Welton Road	1				The parked cars outside properties 54 and 55 act as a traffic calming and speed reducing measure. They also provide protection and cover for the residents of properties 54 and 55 when stepping out from their front gardens onto the road. If the cars were removed this would encourage traffic to speed up and would also create a pull in area where vehicles would pull in last minute at speed, threatening to cause damage to properties 54 and 55. If the parking is removed in this location where are the residents of properties 54 and 55 supposed to park?
55	12	Bath Old Road	1				I object to the proposed intension by BANS to put double yellow lines on this residential road directly in front of the former infant school. As a resident of Bath Old Road, I fear this will increase the speed of the traffic that use the road during busy times as an alternate to the busy main road into Radstock (Bath New Road). Placing double yellow lines on Bath Old Road would take away already stretched residential parking.
56	19	Waterloo Road				1	We would welcome and support this change, for the new proposal of double yellow lines. Waterloo Road has continued to grow with increased traffic, and it is very noticeable when driver's park on this area in that it restricts visibility for local residents as it's not necessarily a normal size car parked there, but it also effects members of the Gym going in and out, and in turn has an impact on the traffic coming in both directions along the road, as there is nowhere for vehicles to pull in, especially if a vehicle is waiting to turn right, into the public car park. With having two accesses to properties on one side of Waterloo Road, in close proximity, and an access on the opposite side for the approach into the public car park, this gets very congested in this location and any parked vehicle can cause an obstruction. Radstock was fortunate to maintain the "free of charge" public car park, therefore we find it difficult to understand why some driver's feel the need to park on the "Keep Clear" marking and cause an obstruction.

57	12	Bath Old Road	1			<p>I would like to state my opposition to the restriction of parking in Bath Old Road, Radstock, on the grounds that this is a residential road with little or no off road parking and parking is difficult enough without further restriction.</p> <p>Surely it would be better and safer for the local environment to restrict its use as a "rat run" for those attempting to save time avoiding queues on Bath New Road. Perhaps traffic calming with the priority on traffic going up between the junction with the A367 and the football field should be looked at. I feel that creating 'passing places' will only encourage increased traffic.</p>
58	7, 8, 9, 43	Peasedown Parish		1		In favour of these proposals
59	38	Peasedown Parish, Belle Vue Close	1			The Parish Council does not feel the parking on this junction is a problem and so do not feel the proposed No Waiting At Any Time markings are necessary or required.
60	23	Radstock Town Council, Welton Road			1	<p>i. We are concerned that the areas between the restrictions on the north side where the pedestrian paths exit will be used as defect parking bays and cause a potential danger to pedestrians wishing to cross the road</p> <p>ii. We are concerned that parking on that north side will cause a problem due to there being a wall beside the road on the passenger side and driver door opening into the road</p> <p>iii. We are aware of the need to allow for visibility from the residential road in the middle of the proposed restricted section, but do not consider that this requires that whole side of the road to be a restricted zone</p> <p>iv. We approve of restriction by the junction with Somervale Rd and near the pinch-point at the eastern end of the proposed restricted zone</p> <p>v. We note that there is much more room for drivers getting out of their cars on the south side, to the west in particular, and that there appears to be some scope for creating bays if necessary</p> <p>vi. Apart from the areas mentioned above as necessary on the south side, we would prefer that parts of the restricted zone are moved onto the north side of the road, so that the restricted areas to the south are only at each end and one area in the middle to allow for visibility from the residential road mentioned above</p>

61	19	Radstock Town Council, Waterloo Road		1		<p>i. Radstock Town Council would like to see further restriction to the parking in Waterloo Rd west of the exit of National cycle route 24 onto Waterloo Rd for at least 5 metres; this exit/entrance is near a dangerous corner with bad visibility and we are concerned over potentially fatal pedestrian or cyclist conflict with cars; we note that there is also some parking within the entrance to NCN 24 off road</p> <p>ii. Council would like to see parking restrictions up the hill to past Daneacre Road due to the nature of the road and the danger posed by parked cars upon it.</p>
62	12	Bath Old Road		1		<p>I am writing in response to the proposed yellow lines in Bath Old Road, Radstock. The proposed lines on the corner of Bath Old Road and the junction of Woodborough Road would be most welcome as inconsiderate parking does pose a road safety hazard to other road users. I had a car written off two years at that junction due to cars being parked almost to the corner, so yellow lines are long overdue.</p> <p>I cannot see that yellow lines outside the old primary school would increase the safety of this road at all as they were not even considered when the school was in use. To put yellow lines outside the old primary school would take away four car parking spaces, encouraging people to park in less safe places.</p>
63	53	Northend		1		<p>Our village already struggles with the lack of available parking and reducing this further will cause more continued problems for residents, business owners, school-run parents and visitors when going about their daily routine.</p> <p>I am sure you are aware that the village Playgroup, School and hall are located near by (at either end of the proposed restricted parking area); we have already 'lost' some parking at the top of School Lane, which I respect was imposed for the safety of the children/parents of the School, so to 'remove' this section of parking ie. to 'open it up' will simply have a counter-effect and allow vehicles to increase their speed toward School Lane which would put pedestrians more at risk, especially at busy school and playgroup 'pick up' times and during local evening events.</p> <p>The road to Northend and St Catherines is very narrow in places and is unsuitable for very large vehicles although emergency vehicles have not been obstructed by vehicles parked in the stretch of road in front of our properties and Mike's Meadows, however a steady stream of HGVs often use it despite the 7.5 weight limit which is also a concern. In essence we do not want to lose any more parking when it is not necessary and I cannot see the need to impose further restrictions.</p>

64	2	High Street, High Littleton	1			<p>The High Street provides essential parking for the residents of High Littleton. As a result of the remote location of the village, it is necessary for most residents to own a car. If the proposed parking restrictions are enforced there will be no where for residents to park their cars. The proposed parking restrictions will cause disharmony between the neighbours in High Littleton as parking will become competitive.</p> <p>The elderly residents who live on the high street will be unable to park within easy access of their homes, restricting their mobility in the area.</p> <p>Currently the High street is wide enough for one parked vehicle and two passing vehicles to occupy the road. Therefore there is no valid reason to remove the parking spaces along the High Street on the grounds of restriction of free flowing traffic.</p>
65	53	Northend	1			<p>Concerned about the proposed removal of parking near the Methodist church on Northend and the effect this will have on the users of this church.</p>
66	38	Belle Vue Close	1			<p>Does not believe the council has the right to place these restrictions around this junction due to issues over rights of ownership.</p>
67	10	Church Street	1			<p>This is, in effect, a reduction of residents parking bays by 8 in around 4 years, mostly without any meaningful consultation, and the removal of more spaces behind the miners Welfare Institute effectively reduces the parking for Church Street residents by a further 5. The reduction of 13 parking spaces that residents have used for years doesn't seem to be constructive planning. From what I can see, 5 bays are earmarked for 1 hour limited waiting parking. That means that the residents now have 6 parking bays available instead of 11. The proposals may seem reasonable if the residents were working 9 to 5 or were not self-employed or retired. If I, for instance, were parked in the 1 hour bay overnight but did not have to leave the next morning until 09:30 I would either have to move my car or face the possibility of a ticket. Then the is the question of were do I move it to? The reality is that 6 bays on the north side of Church Street will be taken by non-residents and when we come to park, during the day, all that is left for us will be the 1 hour restricted bays and it is us that will be likely to incur penalty charges however well or poorly the 1 hour bays are "policed". Where is it proposed that we park when this happens?</p>