

Plan	Road / Street	Object	Support	Support In part	Neither	Comments
Plan 6	Prior Park Road	Object				If the 2 hour slots are opened to those with Residents Parking Permits we believe that those with permits will leave their cars in these spaces for long periods of time. These 2 hour slots are used on a regular basis by people wishing to visit the shops in the Widcombe High Street. The parking for the shops is already very limited, any further reduction is likely to further reduce the viability of the shops. The Council is at this time spending considerably amounts of money on improvements in the Widcombe High Street, if this investment is to succeed customers need to be attracted to the area. We believe, that these 2 hour slots form an essential part of the parking for the High Street and need to be kept as 2 hour only spaces.
Plan 6	Prior Park Road	Object				These 2 hour slots we know are used on a regular basis by people wishing to visit the shops in the Widcombe High Street. The parking for the shops is already very limited, any further reduction is likely to further reduce the viability of the shops.
Plan 6	Prior Park Road	Object				We strongly object to the varying of parking restrictions in Prior Park Road from 2 hour limited parking to include permit parking. This small length of 2 hour parking is extremely valuable to those (like us) wishing to use the local shops in Widcombe High Street, such as the hairdressers and dentists. If this variation takes place, permit parking will inevitably use a large proportion of the few spaces available.
Plan 6	Prior Park Road	Object				The Widcombe Association objects to this proposal as it will have the effect of limiting the supply of general waiting spaces which are important for supporting the traders in Widcombe Parade. This would be contrary to the Council's own policy to support the traders at a time of change in the Parade. Due to the plans to re-organise traffic through Widcombe, currently in hand, there is going to be a net loss of limited waiting bays within and immediately adjacent to the Parade.

Plan 6	Prior Park Road	Object				This is the only length of 2 hour limited parking in Prior Park Road and it has recently been reduced by 4 spaces to install a bus stop. The local businesses depend on the availability of a reasonable amount of limited time parking for their customers and the recent reduction has already hurt their business. There are also well founded requests from residents in nearby St Marks Rd for dual limited/residents spaces to be made into residents only parking.
Plan 6	Prior Park Road	Object				We strongly object to the varying of parking restrictions in Prior Park Road from 2 hour limited parking to include permit parking. This small length of 2 hour parking is extremely valuable to those (like us) wishing to use the local shops in Widcombe High Street, such as the hairdressers and dentists. If this variation takes place, permit parking will inevitably use a large proportion of the few spaces available.
Plan 7	Lyncombe Hill		Support			Provide better accessibility and reduce obstruction.
Plan 7	Lyncombe Hill		Support			Provide better accessibility and reduce obstruction. This is a matter of highway safety, so please do remove those bays before I have an accident or someone is hurt because of the parked cars in the awkwardly placed location.
Plan 7	Lyncombe Hill	Object				We live just outside this Residents Parking Zone, our lane has no proper parking and as you will already know Lyncombe Vale has become a commuter car park during the day. We have often used these 2 hour slots to enable us to call in at home during the day. The loss of these slots will be a major inconvenience to us and I suspect many that visit the houses in Lyncombe Hill.
Plan 7	Lyncombe Hill		Support			Provide better accessibility and reduce obstruction.

Plan 7	Lyncombe Hill	Object				First, permitted parking on alternate sides of the road performs an effective role in slowing down vehicles which already travel at excessive speed especially down but also up the hill. The removal of the space on the west side of the hill would result in the loss of this very effective contribution to road safety. We should add that, with an adult daughter who is vision-impaired, we feel very strongly as a family about road safety which we would hope would be the primary concern of the Transportation Team and the Council. Secondly, residents' parking is already extremely limited in Lyncombe Hill with the result that households like ours with one car frequently struggle to find a parking place in the area.
Plan 7	Lyncombe Hill		Support			Access into 79 Lyncombe Hill with an estate car is very difficult when cars are parked in the parking bays opposite and if a lorry or a van is parked there it is sometimes impossible to turn in. Often when making the manoeuvre (3 point turn) cars will often try to pass behind my car which means with their car behind me and a wall in front all i can do is sit there, also often whilst pulling over to the left and signalling right to get into position to turn in, cyclists on several occasions will come flying past totally ignoring my indication with no chance of stopping. I feel it was a ridiculous decision to put a parking bay here in the first place, and removal or relocation can only help what is at best an awkward situation which under rush hour conditions can be downright dangerous.
Plan 7	Lyncombe Hill			In Part		Lyncombe Hill - Converting 2 hour limited parking to include permit parking in a length of Lyncombe Hill I am supportive as it adds greater flexibility for parking by residents. Lyncombe Hill – Replacing permit parking with no parking in a length of Lyncombe Hill I am NOT supportive as this area of parking serves to significantly slow the speed of traffic coming DOWN Lyncombe Hill.
Plan 7	Lyncombe Hill	Object				In six years of living in Lyncombe Hill I can honestly say that I have seen many vehicles entering and leaving this driveway and not one has had any problems in doing so.

Plan 7	Lyncombe Hill			In Part		<p>To change the current parking between 85 and 87 Lyncombe Hill from a Limited Waiting Bay into Dual Use Resident Parking and Limited Waiting. This is fine and only shifts the way this is already used from "unauthorised" to "authorised". The removal of the two resident parking bays outside Number 52, again on Lyncombe Hill. This is daft. Four years ago the local residents were at least treated to an individual letter on which to comment. This time it required a nudge from a neighbour towards a scrappy little sign posted on a local lamppost to warn of the move. I attach my response to the 2010 suggestion, and little has changed. The 20 mph imposition up the Hill is a mockery, as it seems to be around most of the city where, occasionally, it is possible to exceed this. Most of the residents of Lyncombe Hill have two cars (for which the Council happily sell two residents permits despite most of the houses being little more than one car wide) so we can ill afford to lose any more parking spaces.</p>
Plan 7	Lyncombe Hill	Object				<p>Whilst I think understand the reasons for the proposed changes, I am writing to point out that these alterations will also create problems for residents in our neighbourhood. At the moment, we are pushing for a Residents' Parking Zone because of a current lack of parking for residents in the area. You proposals will make the situation here even worse because commuters/shoppers will be pushed to park in other roads nearby.</p>
Plan 7	Lyncombe Hill	Object				<p>This section of Lyncombe Hill provides parking not only for residents in Lyncombe Hill but also for Forefield Terrace. As such on road parking is at a premium. Two spaces were removed relatively recently when the revised traffic signage etc was introduced at the junction of Greenway Lane, Lyncombe Hill and Rosemount Lane. This proposal means that 4 residents spaces will have been removed in the recent past. The "chicane" created by the two spaces it is proposed to remove is an effective deterrent to speeding motorists ignoring the 20 mph speed limit. To remove parking will increase traffic speeds.</p>

Plan 7	Lyncombe Hill	Object				I would like to object strongly to the proposed changes to the arrangements on Lyncombe Hill. The removal of the 2 resident parking bays outside 52 Lyncombe Hill would create a significant road safety hazard. It would make egress from the front entrances of four houses (48-52 Lyncombe Hill) as well as the rear access lane to the entire upper stretch of Lyncombe Hill extremely hazardous as traffic coming down the hill would have an unimpeded run down the hill. It would lead to increased traffic speeds - especially down Lyncombe Hill - by removing the west side parking "chicane" which is the only physical speed reduction measure in all of Lyncombe Hill. It would remove two resident parking bays from an area that already has significant peak parking.
Plan 7	Lyncombe Hill	Object				The proposed change to the dedicated 2 hour parking bay will have a direct impact on visitors, delivery vehicles and essential service providers, to my house and the other older properties in Rosemount Lane. The main fear of my household, is that if the 2 hour bay becomes available to residents for permanent parking it could end up being used to park cars which will be rarely, if ever, moved during the week as many Lyncombe Hill residents either walk to work or use the train to commute to London, Bristol or beyond. In addition, many of the retired residents tend to walk into Bath thus also alleviating the need to move their cars. This would obviously render the 2 hour slots unavailable for anyone else - and would leave the hill without any short term parking at all.
Plan 7	Lyncombe Hill	Object				The proposed change to the dedicated 2 hour parking bay will have a direct impact on visitors, delivery vehicles and essential service providers, to my house and the other older properties in Rosemount Lane.

Plan 7	Lyncombe Hill	Object				The proposed parking changes effectively mean that there will be 4 less parking spaces and this will make resident parking in Lyncombe Hill extremely difficult. In addition, the removal of the two spaces outside Number 52 may be sensible from a traffic point of view BUT the majority of car users in Lyncombe Hill speed well in excess of the 20 mph limit and this will mean that they can speed even more. By converting the 2 spaces at the higher end of Lyncombe Hill to "Limited Waiting" will mean that residents will have even less choice of being able to park as these spaces will be constantly filled by non residents during the day. So I object to both changes proposed in Lyncombe Hill in Zone 3.
Plan 7	Lyncombe Hill	Object				The proposed parking changes effectively mean that there will be 4 less parking spaces and this will make resident parking in Lyncombe Hill extremely difficult.
Plan 7	Lyncombe Hill	Object				This proposal will again reduce the amount of available parking to non residents affecting the commercial viability of the area.
Plan 22	Belgrave Crescent	Object				If you have ever been on our road in the morning when traffic banks up on Camden Road and our road becomes rat run, you will notice drivers exceeding substantially that limit. If the council would care to do its job properly and monitor speeds as part of consultation, it would know this. If there is a cost issue in doing so, then the proposal should be halted immediately.
Plan 22	Belgrave Crescent	Object				We are writing to register our strong objection to the proposals to alter the parking lay-out in Belgrave Crescent (Zone 15). The two chicanes you must know that these were installed several years ago following much local consultation. Their purpose is to restrict the number of vehicles using Belgrave Crescent as a rat-run (due to the traffic calming measures introduced on Camden Road), and the speed of any such traffic. They have been highly successful. To remove them now, as well as being a significant waste of council resources, will simply lead to a return of rat-runners who will use excessive speed.

Plan 22	Belgrave Crescent			In Part		<p>The plans that I saw at the one stop shop in Manvers St. indicate that the proposal is that the two build outs are to be removed to allow for an increase in the number of parking bays. This is good news as parking has become increasingly difficult. The build outs were put there in the first place, however, to slow dangerously speeding traffic using the street as a rat run. They have not stopped the rat running, but have made a significant difference to the speed of vehicles and the street is much safer. There was considerable consultation at the time they were put in and I am sure that you will have a record of these. The most popular solution by far was the installation of speed humps. We were told at the time that speed humps were not an option for the council (no reason given). Since then , however , speed bumps have been installed along Camden Road. The obvious solution would therefore seem to be the replacement of the build outs with speed humps and kill two birds with one stone.</p>
Plan 22	Belgrave Crescent	Object				<p>The removal of the chicanes will allow traffic to speed up. People will take no notice of the 20mph speed restriction signs.</p>
Plan 4	Tynning End	Object				<p>When the parking bays were first created, the Council advised that a car parked on the corner would cause traffic to slow down as they approached it, and therefore be a factor for safety. So a bay was put opposite number 14 Tynning End. This is what has happened over the succeeding years as traffic and speeds have increased in Tynning End. I would like to appeal against the proposed removal of this parking space, on the grounds that more traffic is likely to use Tynning End following Claverton St changes etc , and that there will be even more need to slow traffic down. Also, to my knowledge, there has never been an accident on this corner.</p>
Plan 4	Tynning End	Object				<p>I am a resident of Tynning End and object to the removal of the Parking Bay in Tynning End, opposite 14 Tynning End.as notified. The council created this Bay specifically for traffic to slow down as they approached the corner and be a factor for Safety. It is inferred that the position is dangerous though to my knowledge no accidents have ever occurred here....please advise if I am wrong</p>

Plan 4	Tyning End	Object				As a resident of Tyning End, I cannot understand why it is necessary to take away a parking space, which was put there to slow speeding traffic. This is even more necessary as Tyning End has become a shortcut to Widcombe Hill in one direction and in the other direction speeding traffic uses Tyning End to avoid roadworks in Widcombe.
Plan 4	Tyning End	Object				This bay was deliberately allocated by the council when parking permits were issued to provide safety for the residents. The same measures were introduced in the Tyning. If it is removed how do you intend to keep residents safe? How will the council cover their own liability if there is an accident to residents when this is removed? This road is increasingly being used as a rat run since the changes have been coming into place at the bottom of Widcombe Hill. Have you monitored who is complaining to see if they are taking a short cut? The number of cars and the speed they are travelling at as they round the corner and approach Widcombe Hill when there is no car in the bay should also be looked at. Please be aware that some are also now driving on the grass to get around vehicles parked in the streets. You can view evidence of this outside 10/12 Tyning End.
Plan 4	Tyning End	Object				I would like to appeal against the proposed removal of this parking space, on the grounds that more traffic is likely to use Tyning End following Claverton St changes etc , and that there will be even more need to slow traffic down. Also, to my knowledge, there has never been an accident on this corner.
Plan 21	Pera Road		Support			Parked cars cause obstruction.
Plan 21	Pera Road	Object				We have recently found out that more parking spaces on Pera Road are being taken away as a garage owner needs better access! We find it extremely difficult as it is already (especially as many residents now seem to own more than one car per household) and strongly wish to oppose this. It does not seem right at all that we pay for a resident's parking permit, and yet struggle every day to park anywhere near our house.

Plan 21	Pera Road	Object				<p>I was going to write in anyway to complain that there has been a significant increase in traffic and speed of traffic and speed of traffic in pera road (mainly coming down from lower hedgemed road) and going down pera road into London road (since the previous removal of spaces), to ask if you can either make it access only or put in traffic calming. It is a built up residential area with poor visibility and yet it seems to be being treated only to improve the flow of traffic!!! So, on this basis I would also like to object to the proposals to remove parking opposite the garages on pera road as this will make a bad and dangerous situation much worse.</p>
Plan 21	Pera Road	Object				<p>I strongly object to this proposal given the insufficient number of parking spaces in this zone already (which have also decreased substantially over recent years). I believe this is to improve access to an individual's garage, which seems to suggest that this one individual (who presumably can already access their garage) has the right to easier parking over the many people (who would have used the spaces to be lost) have any right to park at all.</p>
Plan 21	Pera Road	Object				<p>Zone 16 is very small and steep. It has become even harder to find a space now. We often have to resort to zone 15 at night and then moving the vehicle in the morning. This is difficult for those with young families, those less able to walk and indeed anyone on their own with shopping/work bags in their car. Although Bath is relatively safe, for a young woman parking further away from home at night alone and walking in the dark is also less safe than being able to park in zone near your home. It is not, therefore, appropriate to grant the application further reducing available parking spaces by 3 in order that just 1 car may park. This especially when one normal sized family car can get into that garage as it is.</p>

Plan 21	Pera Road	Object				I understand that there is a proposal to replace permit parking with no parking in a length of Pera Road. I would very much like this to be reconsidered. There has been parking available on Pera Road for many years even before the permit system can into force a few years ago and if people park sensibly and conciderately I think it is perfectly acceptable for this to continue.
Plan 21	Pera Road	Object				I am writing to express my concern regarding plans to reduce street parking on Pera Road. I am the landlord of a property on Walcot Parade and parking is very important to prospective tenants and is already very limited in the area with very few options for those who work outside of Bath and have no option but to travel by car. I appreciate that the parking at present sometimes makes the passage difficult but surely there are other alternatives to maintain street parking.
Plan 21	Pera Road	Object				Having no road at the front, the 20 houses in the Parade have to rely on parking in Pera Rd which runs behind the Parade. Most of those houses have been converted to multiple occupation. Some of the houses have been able to provide 2 or 3 off-street parking places of their own on their ground adjacent to Pera Rd. There are about 20 of these which add to the 9 spaces currently provided by the Residents Scheme. Those 9 spaces are heavily used. Looking at the position on Walcot Parade as a whole, your proposal is abolishing three heavily used places to add some seemingly un-needed extra ease-of-use for one of the garage owners. I do not see a case for doing that. I oppose the proposal.
Plan 21	Pera Road	Object				We have already lost at least 7 parking spaces over the last few years. As a result if I arrive home after 7.30 I am unable to find a space in zone 16. As a result of losing the parking spaces at the top of Pera road cars are traveling faster down Pera road using it as a high speed rat run (especially Dominos delivery drivers). The loss of the three spaces opposite the garages will cause higher speeds and possible accidents. The building of new one bed apartments on London Road will put more pressure on parking in zone 16, even without removing the spaces.

Plan 21	Pera Road	Object				I object for several reasons, but the first and most important reason is that removing those spaces will widen the road, thereby allowing vehicles to pass more quickly down the road, which will in turn make the road even more dangerous for pedestrians than it already is. As you will also be aware, the removal of three spaces will also reduce the already small number of spaces that are local to Clarence Street. This will affect my ability to park near to my house, which is essential to me with two young children, and will similarly affect my neighbours.
Plan 18	St Ann's Way		Support			In this capacity I have informed all residents of the street of the above proposal and have received no objections. Accordingly, unless you have heard otherwise, I am able to inform you there are no objections from St. Ann's Way to the plan for a further single yellow line on the east side of the street as outlined in the above Order.
Plan 20	Upper Lansdown Mews	Object				I understand that the Council intend to put double yellow lines / parking restrictions along parts of Upper Lansdown Mews. If this goes ahead, it will undoubtedly impact negatively on parking in the Crescent and East and West Lansdown Place. I am not sure what has driven this proposal, but those I have spoken with are not in favour and are concerned about the impact that it will have on the area. Therefore, I want to strongly object to the proposed parking restrictions
Plan 20	Upper Lansdown Mews	Object				The proposal conflicts with existing, agreed, arrangements and that, in my opinion, the consultation process has not been properly carried out.
Plan 20	Upper Lansdown Mews			In Part		We support the proposal to convert the 3 areas of the central section of Lansdown Mews into No Waiting At Any Time markings but not the proposed restrictions at the Western end as on street parking is very limited.
Plan 16	Great Bedford Street	Object				I would like to register my objection to the proposed double yellow line parking restriction in Great Bedford Street. Please don't go ahead with this proposal. There is little alternative parking at night and weekends for residents in the immediate area, an issue for a single woman having to walk back at night from some streets away, or for an elderly person just getting the shopping home, for instance.