

Section 38 - Rockery Tea Gardens
FORMAL CONSULTATION

RTG/FC

Name	Date	Comments	Opinion		Councils Response	Valid Objection?
			For	Against		
Cllr Symonds	26/07/13	There is no off-road parking, so locals will have nowhere to park. It's a drop-off for Rainbow Wood and NT Skyline Walk. The lack of parked cars will encourage speeding as the road is straight, and this is a walking route for hundreds of school children going to Ralph Allen School.		✓	The points made about parking are justified. Whether this will increase the speed of cars can be investigated at a later date. Appropriate signage should help this perceived problem.	Yes
Cllr Beath	26/07/13	Endorses everything Cllr Symonds said.		✓	See above.	Yes
Martin Laker	22/08/13	No comments, just wishes to be informed if the works go ahead, so they can update the mapping system.			Not an objection.	N/A
Jane Goodwin (e-mail)	24/08/13	Thought the restrictions were only for a short length, and has asked where friends are now supposed to park.		✓	Response outlined what is actually proposed, and highlighted that no-one has a right to park outside their home.	No
POLICE	27/08/13	Reiterated their concerns over moving the parking to the other side of the road, and asked to mirror the restriction on the other side.		✓	The restrictions are suggested to aid visibility out the new development. If the parking moves to the other side of the road, this will be equally as dangerous, and a bad idea.	Yes
Paul Isaac (telephone)	27/08/13	Asked for confirmation of the length of the restrictions, and asked why it is needed.		✓	Might come back with a valid objection now he knows what is proposed.	No
Jane Goodwin (telephone)	28/08/13	A large number of children use the road, and the cars provide protection against the traffic. If cars are forced to park on the other side, she will be unable to get her caravan out the gate.		✓	The protection of pedestrians can be seen as a positive, but there is always the issue of visibility of them to the traffic. I'm not sure if the caravan issue is relevant to the consultation.	Yes

**Section 38 - Rockery Tea Gardens
FORMAL CONSULTATION**

Name	Date	Comments	Opinion		Councils Response	Valid Objection?
			For	Against		
Roy Shears	28/08/13	Thinks that the restriction should be single yellow lines, as this would reduce the amount to extended parking, while still allowing some.		✓	Could be considered as an alternative to the current solution.	Yes
Dr C A Fuge	07/09/13	He made a number of points about how the road is narrow, and how the new restrictions would create more problems further out. Highlighted that cyclists and children walk to school, and it would make this more dangerous.		✓	They are valid points, as it will move the problem elsewhere, and the surrounding roads are narrow.	Yes
Paul Isaac (e-mail)	08/09/13	The proposal will increase vehicle speed, reduce available parking in an already congested area and make exiting driveways dangerous. Child safety also affected due to the loss of parked car 'shield' and increase in vehicle speeds. He also questioned the validity of the consultation process.		✓	These are all valid, apart from the question over the consultation, which has been carried out as it should have been, to the correct time-frame.	Yes
Hugh Woodward	08/09/13	Lives on Claverton Down Road, and is concerned that the parking will just move to that road, increasing an already bad situation.		✓	A valid objection.	Yes
Chris Rogers	09/09/13	Reiterated points made about removing the protection to pedestrians, the amount of disruption for a small number of cars using the development, and also questioned where the displaced cars will now go.		✓	All valid points raised.	Yes

Section 38 - Rockery Tea Gardens
FORMAL CONSULTATION

Name	Date	Comments	Opinion		Councils Response	Valid Objection?
			For	Against		
Esme Ellis	09/09/13	Objects to the affect on the existing residents, who have no option but to park on the road, the increased traffic speed, the removal of the 'safety barrier' of the parked cars and the reduction in parking for people using the local area for recreational activities.		✓	All valid points raised.	Yes
Owen Davies	09/09/13	Does not see how a minor development can have such a drastic effect on the other residents, while other, busier junctions have no such aids to visibility.		✓	A valid objection.	Yes
Diane Shearn	10/09/13	Displaced cars will block drives further up the road, affecting many more residents than those with lines outside.		✓	They are valid points, as it will move the problem elsewhere, and the surrounding roads are narrow.	Yes
Sarah Cooper Fuge Stephen Cooper	10/09/13	Area is used by cars visiting Rainbow Wood, and this will move the cars down to their area, meaning they will be unable to use their driveways. The road is narrow, so they will also park on the pavement, which is dangerous.		✓	A valid objection.	Yes
Jemma Crawley	10/09/13	The existing cars help to slow traffic, while also providing a barrier to protect pedestrians. 'Why should many be inconvenienced for the rights of so few?'		✓	A valid objection.	Yes

**Section 38 - Rockery Tea Gardens
FORMAL CONSULTATION**

Name	Date	Comments	Opinion		Councils Response	Valid Objection?
			For	Against		
Simon Whittaker	10/09/13	Objects to the affect on the existing residents, who have no option but to park on the road, the increased traffic speed, the removal of the 'safety barrier' of the parked cars and the reduction in parking for people using the local area for recreational activities.		✓	All valid points raised.	Yes
Michael Fathers	11/09/13	The increasing amount of pedestrians and having to park further down the road where it is narrower would make for a very dangerous situation. Suggests making a parking area in Rainbow Wood to accommodate the extra cars.		✓	A valid argument, and the parking solution could be looked into.	Yes
C M B Newton	11/09/13	Shaft Road has no such considerations, and the line of cars help to slow down the traffic for what is a much busier junction than the development will be.		✓	Slowing down and moving out the traffic would make it easier to pull out of Shaft Road.	Yes
Andrew Bennett (telephone and e-mail)	11/09/13	The length of parking lost is excessive, and there is no possibility for residents to create off-road parking themselves. Suggests that the development comes up with a better plan that doesn't cause so much disruption to existing residents.		✓	A valid point that there is no option for some residents to park on the road, and other places to park locally, and safely, are very limited.	Yes
Andrew Russell	11/09/13	Parked cars outside his house makes pulling out harder, but a lot safer, as the cars have slowed to go around the obstacle.		✓	Traffic slowing down and moving out would make it easier to pull out of his driveway, although visibility would still be an issue.	Yes

Section 38 - Rockery Tea Gardens
FORMAL CONSULTATION

Name	Date	Comments	Opinion		Councils Response	Valid Objection?
			For	Against		
Mr Steiner	12/09/13	The proposal will lose the parked car 'shield' along the road and increase vehicle speeds. He mentioned that some cars park on the footway, which forces people to walk in the road.	✓	✓	Valid points for both sides.	Yes
Jan & Mike Bryant	13/09/13	Thinks the restrictions are not necessary as the trouble only happens at specific times of day. The length of the restriction is also excessive, and there are better areas the restrictions could have been applied.		✓	A valid point.	Yes
Ian Oxford	16/09/13	Objects to the granting of planning permission without thought being considered to how it will affect existing residents. Surely we should be encouraging recreation and exercise (Rainbow Woods and Skyline Walk), and not stopping it at the first hurdle.		✓	All valid points raised.	Yes
Peter & Jenifer Ridley	16/09/13	Objects to the loss of parking space for regular dog walkers using Rainbow Woods and Skyline Walk in the area.		✓	A valid point.	Yes
Jan & Roger Chapman	16/09/13	Objects to the removal of the parking for people visiting the area, and thinks that some other option could be considered.		✓	A valid point.	Yes

**Section 38 - Rockery Tea Gardens
FORMAL CONSULTATION**

Name	Date	Comments	Opinion		Councils Response	Valid Objection?
			For	Against		
John Crawley	12/09/13	He thinks the problem should have been picked up during the planning stage, and got rid of. Also, the parked cars do create a safe zone for pedestrians walking along the road.		✓	A valid point, but I am assuming that the design was advertised at the planning stage, so would have been available for inspection.	Yes
Matt Davies	12/09/13	Needs to park his works van near to his property for security, and this will seriously hamper him. He also pointed out the safety aspect of having cars parked down the side, separating the pedestrians.		✓	There is no guaranty that he would be able to park near anyway, but the proposal isn't helping.	Yes
Robert Coles	12/09/13	Made several comments, backed up with photos, about how the parked cars increase safety to pedestrians and help to slow down the traffic.		✓	All valid points raised.	Yes
Phil Chant	12/09/13	Doesn't see why the new development should have extra safety, when Shaft Road serves a vast amount of people, and has no visibility splay at all.		✓	A valid point.	Yes
John Summers	12/09/13	Prohibiting parking would hit the immediate residents and those using the local amenities. It would also move the problems onto Shaft Road, which is even narrower than North Road.		✓	A valid point.	Yes
Phone Call	12/09/13	Local resident in support, as they have real trouble getting out of their driveway with the cars parked along the road. It would greatly increase their visibility and reduce the chance of an accident.	✓		Valid point, as pulling out onto a fast moving road, with very little visibility, is very dangerous and scary.	N/A