

TRO	Plan No.	Street Name	Committer	For	Against	Undecided	Comment
10961	3	Northend	Batheaston PC	1			No objection
10961	5	Wellow	Resident		1		Unbelievable, the one and only thing which reduces speed and creates traffic calming is the parked vehicles. Now your planning to in force parking restrictions. Having already avoided been narrowly knocked down twice this past week and witness on pretty much daily basis near misses due to excessive speed. It will only be a matter of time before someone is either seriously injured or killed if the ludicrous idea of removing parked vehicles is implemented. I know the issue of speeding through the village has been raised before, only to fall on deaf ears with the attitude of the horse hasn't bolted yet. Furthermore as a resident with no driveway where am I expected to park!?!?
10961	9	High Street	Davide Le Lohe@Bathford PC			1	North Kerbline - 1) the proposed upgrade to the west (downhill) side of the buildout to be kept to a minimum commensurate with traffic safety, not necessarily replacing the same length as existing; 2) the proposed new lines to the east (uphill) side of the buildout to be kept to a minimum commensurate with traffic safety as the 48m proposed is considered too long; South Kerbline - 3) the proposed upgrade to the existing lines opposite the north buildout to be minimised commensurate with traffic safety in relation to 2) above; 4) the proposed upgrade to the east (uphill) side of the buildout to be kept to a minimum commensurate with traffic safety, not necessarily replacing the same length as existing.
10961	9	High Street	Resident			1	I write with concern to the above Proposal. I live at 106 High Street and note that you propose new "no waiting at any time" markings in front of my house, to which I have no objection. However, I also see that opposite my house you have proposed a Buildout. Does this mean that the current Buildout opposite No 110 is being moved down? If a Buildout is sited opposite my house, I have concerns that this will greatly restrict the turn as I go up or down my drive, which is at the East end of my property. How deep would this Buildout be?
10961	9	High Street	Resident		1		Bathford Hill is a very dangerous road, however at present the parked cars act as supplementary chicanes and to some extent deter drivers from racing up and down the hill. If double yellow lines were to be imposed it is likely that the extra width would encourage drivers in the practice of illegal speeding and overtaking up and down Bathford Hill
10961	9	High Street	Resident			1	Concerned that the proposed yellow lines may be longer than the existing white lines. Resident of no. 96 and currently parks opposite the house although the plan proposals looks as if the current white lines might be extended, as yellow, to prevent this.
10961	11	Bannerdown Road	Resident			1	We are writing to object to the proposal to extend the double yellow lines on Bannerdown Road, outside our property. We find this proposal unnecessary. Elizabeth Aspinall from Stobswood believes part of the proposal is due to her recently built garage. She has informed me that she doesn't require any extra clearance space going up Bannerdown Road and she doesn't agree with increasing the double yellow lines. Can you please reconsider this proposal as several of my neighbours don't want to see the extension of the yellow lines.
10961	11	Bannerdown Road	Batheaston PC	1			No objection
10961	14	North Way	Resident		1		I have 4 daughters who like to visit me frequently. Are they going to be able to park in North Way? If not, they would have no alternative than to use the vets car park or the dentists car park which I expect they wouldn't take kindly to, causing more problems. Also I have a gate at the side of my garden which is the access point to the garden and rear of my house - in North Way - which I use to take my bins of grass etc out of. I am a widow trying to stay as independent as possible but if you put double yellow lines ALL the way down North Way, this is going to restrict my activities and life to become very distressing - for me and my family. Why does Clevedon Road, Midsomer Norton get away with Parking on BOTH sides of their road making passing virtually impossible sometimes? People have to push their prams and take their wheelchairs into the centre of the road due to 24/7 obstructions on BOTH sides and the pavement completely obstructed at times. If the lines I see on your proposed map for North Way are INSTEAD of the existing ones then my family and friends would be able to park and visit me still, so that would be acceptable but if they are ADDITIONAL then it would affect my life enormously.
10961	15	Catherine Way	Batheaston PC	1			No objection
10961	29	Clevedon Road	Resident		1		I agree with a No Waiting At Any Time markings across the access areas to any of the properties. But if I have understood your plan - (plan_29_clevedon_road_msn_nwaat) then the no waiting area would extend beyond the property access at the top of the road to meet the existing double yellow lines. This would in effect remove two existing parking bays on a road that is already crowded. And it is the loss of parking I am opposed too. I can not see any reason to remove the parking. There is ample distance from the junction of North Road to the start of the parking. In fact, I would like to see the double yellow lines removed from outside of No.1 Clevedon Road on both sides of the road to allow two more vehicles to park.

10961	29	Clevedon Road	Resident	1	Many properties on Clevedon Road do not have off-street parking for more than one vehicle. Residents therefore have to park second vehicles "on-street". The number of unrestricted spaces is already very limited - demand outweighs supply every day. This situation will become even worse by the loss of two parking places if these proposals receive Council approval. The reasoning behind the proposals is vague. We've lived on Clevedon Road for almost 20 years and are unsure why Clevedon Road is one of the roads selected for further restrictions. In our opinion there are other roads in Midsomer Norton where people park without restrictions (and inconsiderately) which cause greater danger to pedestrians and other road users.
10961	31	Ashley Road	Resident	1	With so many of us with no option but to park on the road, we cannot afford to lose any more spaces. 18 properties including a busy bed and breakfast have to park on a stretch where there is a max. of 20 spaces. The applicant wants to extend the existing yellow line so that she can get in and out of her drive more easily, however she is a young woman with no particular need to park right outside her house and the previous owner parked on the road to avoid this difficulty. With the loss of the spaces the rest of us will be seriously inconvenienced, most of us being in our 80s and struggle with heavy shopping bags.
10961	31	Ashley Road	Resident	1	It is already extremely difficult to find a parking space on Ashley Road and this will only make the situation worse. We are a neighbourly community and take pains to avoid parking across each other's drives or outside another resident's house but this will become more difficult if spaces are restricted. This stretch of road is used frequently by those who lease allotments who need to park in order to offload/load their gardening equipment and it's unfair to restrict this activity. Finally where will the visitors to the house opposite the planned restrictions park? there are frequent and regular visitors to this property all of whom travel by car and it will be unreasonable to expect residents to make allowances for them on an ongoing basis.
10961	31	Ashley Road	Petition: 19 Signatures	1	The lines serve no useful purpose and are detrimental to normal access to the properties abutting for both domestic and business purposes. The previous tenants had no problem accessing their drive and had been doing so for over 50 years. If the lines are approved it will only cause more problems as a lot of the houses are without drives. It would mean the visitors to No 29 would have to take spaces that are needed for the existing houses. There are a lot of elderly and disabled people in the road who need nurses visits and they themselves need picking up and dropping off with shopping etc. so the yellow lines would make it very difficult. If No 29 has difficulty accessing her driveway we suggest she should get in touch with CURO to have her gateway enlarged. We invite the Proper Officer of the Highways Authority to a public meeting with the residents of Ashley Road together with CURO housing association, the Police and Parish Council and any other interested parties as soon as convenient to discuss the source of the original proposal for the double yellow lines and the facts material to the decision to pursue it or reject it.
10961	31	Ashley Road	Davide Le Lohe@Bathford PC	1	The length of the proposed No Waiting at any Time marking is too long eastwards (13.5m) and should be shortened in order to allow parking space between the new and existing lines.
10961	40	Barton Well	Cllr Liz Hardman	1	Residents in Barton Well very pleased with proposed yellow lines.
10961	41	Church Street	Resident	1	Live at Nelson House opposite 'The Rising Sun' pub. Parking on left hand side of Church Street forces passing vehicles mount the pavement outside our house meaning we can't use our front door. We are asking for double yellows to be painted across the whole of the front of rising sun pub and also along side of Nelson House.
10961	41	Church Street	Resident	1	No Waiting markings should be extended past Rising Sun pub onto Culverly Lane. Parking on left hand side of Church Street forces vehicles to mount pavement past our front door stopping us safely using our front door or side gate. Parking on left hand side of Church Street creates blind spot for exit of pub and garages
10961	41	Church Street	Cllr Paul May	1	Need for lines at the entrance to Church Street and on the tight corner by the rising sun pub up to the narrow road turning. Apart from that no other yellow lines needed, except a different road surface together with 20mph could identify the area more as a pedestrian/vehicle mix. The parking spaces near the shop obviously work well but it would be appropriate to set a 30 minute time limit to help the three businesses there
10961	41	Church Street	Resident	1	It is proposed to implement parking restrictions in Church Street Pensford. We have lived in the village for 28 years and have used the road regularly. There has been no accident in the road and we have never had a problem driving through. The people living in the street park with consideration for road users and the other inhabitants. It has been said the residents could park in the village hall car park - to then have to cross the very busy A37 with small children, putting their lives, and their children's lives, at risk. How can the council consider these petty parking restrictions when the considerable danger to life of the uncalmed A37 traffic remains unaddressed?

10961	41	Church Street	Resident	1	<p>We wish to object to the removal of the badly needed parking spaces. According to a request under the Freedom of Information Act there have been no accidents in Church Street in the last 10 years. There are a number of elderly and disabled persons residing in Church Street who need to be able to park near their homes and not to have to walk 440 metres to & from the alternative parking at the Memorial Hall. (This also applies to families with young children) and to cross the A37. The trustees of the Church Room and the Churches Conservation Trust are against the ban of parking at the entrance to the churchyard and the church rooms. Whilst it may be advisable to have double yellow lines on both corners of the entrance into Church Street, it is totally unnecessary for them to be extended as indicated on your map. If the residents of the area had been consulted well in advance by the Parish Council of the decision to put in these yellow lines, a much better solution could have been found, perhaps by providing residents parking bays.</p>
10961	41	Publow Lane and High Street	Resident	1	<p>I would welcome the installation of yellow lines to improve highway safety, as parking of vehicles at these locations create very hazardous road conditions. Particularly on Publow Lane around the Lock Up cottages, and also along High Street as it adjoins the A37. Children from Pensford Primary School often have to make the journey on foot to Pensford Memorial Hall and Publow Church for school activities such as sport and religious assembly. This is already a difficult journey as there are some areas with no footpath at all; the children have no alternative but to be walking directly on the road. When vehicles are parked at these locations they force other vehicles onto the wrong side of the road coming around a blind bend; this is obviously extremely dangerous for the school children as well as any other pedestrians and road users.</p>
10961	41	Centre of Pensford	Resident	1	<p>My household have no problem as we have sufficient parking, however most of the properties in the centre of the village are terraced miners cottages where owners rely on roadside parking. My family have lived here for over 40 years and can never recall a serious parking issue. Owners have invariably parked sensibly. If the proposed restrictions are applied it will inevitably move the problem to other part of the of the village where the roadways are narrower or busier, for example the main A37.</p>
10961	41	Church Street	Resident	1	<p>Pensford is a lovely unspoilt village, spraying double yellow lines down the street would be an absolute eyesore and will cause more parking issues than we already have. As properties in Pensford have been developed and children have grown up, the amount of parking has obviously increased, at present just enough parking for residents. Where are the residents that park where the double yellows are proposed meant to park? I believe a solution would be permits for residents and visitor parking in Memorial Hall. This surely would be more cost effective. The cars parking as they currently do ensure cars using Church street do so at a respectable speed. Removing the parking will increase drivers speed.</p>
10961	41	Pensford	Resident	1	<p>Would be a great shame to have our pretty village defaced with yellow lines and the proposals will result in faster driving along our road. Memorial Hall should be turned into a car park and maybe pay and display could be enforced with residents permits.</p>
10961	41	Pensford	Resident	1	<p>To remove parking in Church Street would have an adverse effect on the PO and shop's trade as well as the George & Dragon pub. Would also severely inconvenience residents and significantly reduce the value of those properties without off-street parking. Restrictions on the High Street would also cause problems for residents of Hillcrest and Old Road as their parking spaces would be taken by High Street Residents. No public car parks anywhere in the village. Removing parking from the High Street will turn it into a race track. Any concerns about access for emergency vehicles are unfounded, there is ample room.</p>
10961	41	Church Street	Resident	1	<p>I feel that although some of the restrictions (on Publow Lane) are necessary, there are some restrictions that are not. I am referring to those proposed for Church Street, I do not see how these markings are necessary? The residence on Church street have limited parking as it is, and to ask them to park elsewhere (the Memorial Hall for instance) is then asking them to take greater risk getting to their homes by having to cross the A37, even with the pelican crossing there is still a greater risk of them being hit by a vehicle than if they are able to park by their homes. If the restriction is to make the road safer, I completely disagree. By clearing the parked cars from this road it will make it seem more like the A37 and will not encourage drivers to go slowly but the opposite, drivers will see a clear path and will not take care with their speed, this is just inviting an accident to happen.</p>
10961	41	Church Street	Resident	1	<p>On behalf of myself, my wife and my son, as residents of Pensford we would like to oppose such restrictions most strongly. Church Street is predominantly used by its own residents. They park respectfully and there are no obvious safety issues, (in fact your own representative, Stefan Chiffers made it plain on a visit that the council have no desire to take away spaces where no safety issues exist). The residents of Church Street on the whole do not have the luxury of off road parking. To restrict the current parking arrangements would merely force them to park elsewhere causing a potential problem where there is currently none. We are a community who respect each other and see no reason to support the enforcement of unnecessary restrictions which will only serve to cause hardship to our neighbours.</p>

10961	41	Church Street	Alison Patey @ Pensford Primary School	1	<p>At present there are very few places to park a vehicle in the village and by making it illegal to park along Church Street the local businesses will suffer. Small businesses have a hard job competing with bigger stores that have facilities for shoppers and if you make it impossible for shoppers to park for a few minutes during the day, they will drive on to the superstore. Small businesses keep a village alive and it will be a sad day if the PO and stores, the Coffee Shop, the Barber Shop have to close for lack of customers. From the point of view of the school – parents need to leave their car for a few minutes near to the school and walk their little children in to the playground. They can't park right next to the school entrance so have to choose the closest places. If there are yellow lines on the nearby road and they can't park, what are they going to do? There have been no accidents in Church Road, it's a narrow road and drivers are cautious because of that so drive slowly anyway. I would like to know if the residents who live in Church Road have been consulted? I know of no-one living there who has asked for parking restrictions to be applied.</p>
10961	41	Church Street	Anon	1	<p>I would like to support the above proposal for parking restrictions in Pensford as I believe it will improve public safety. Parking of vehicles at these locations on High Street, Publow Lane and Church Street creates very precarious conditions for pedestrians and other road users. I also support the installation of yellow lines outside the Church Rooms on Church Street. This area has been marked as a no parking area for many years, but since converting St Thomas a Becket church (Application No: 08/03447/FUL), the applicants/residents (Mr and Mrs Baxter) have parked two vehicles here on a daily basis, severely restricting access to the graveyard and Church Rooms, especially for those with limited mobility and/or wheelchair users. On the planning documents with reference to converting the Church to residential use, it was requested on several occasions by Pensford Parish Council and Banes that the applicants "respect pedestrian access to the graveyard and Church Rooms". Mr and Mrs Baxter were fully aware there was no parking here and agreed (as stated in their planning application) that they would "source two spaces elsewhere". Considering their subsequent actions, it would seem they never had any intention of doing so. Double yellow lines would allow the pre-existing no parking area to be enforced. Mr Baxter also claims that yellow lines are an eyesore within the conservation area. I would argue that they are much less intrusive than seeing his red van and his other vehicle parked outside the Church every single day, and that ultimately public safety takes priority.</p>
10961	41	Pensford	Resident	1	<p>i have been resident in pensford (wick lane) for 3 years and do not have a driveway or space outside my house to park. as a result i park at the nearest safe point i can, currently on church street about 100m away, and so the introduction of yellow lines would mean i would have to park further away, as would the other people who currently park there. this would certainly mean we would then have to park on the other side of the A37 which is well known as a dangerous road due to the many accidents that have occurred. church street in comparison has had no accidents on it on record and none in memory of any of the residents. it was mentioned at a parish council meeting by some residents that the cars on there act as traffic calming of their own by reducing the effective road width, an empty street invites higher speeds. parking in the memorial hall car park which would then certainly attract car theft as it is on the outskirts of the village and leave those people to walk down the stretch of road from the memorial hall which has no pavement and which vehicles travel down quite fast from the direction of publow, again creating a reduction in safety rather than an improvement. so rather than improving safety it would seem obvious that yellow lines on church street would actually reduce safety of the residents, including a number of children. reducing the parking in pensford would also negatively impact the businesses here, post office/cafe/pub and the ability of parents bringing their children to the school to park which may affect the schools ability to attract pupils and ultimately its future.</p>
10961	41	Church Street	Resident	1	<p>Notwithstanding the reduction in parking spaces over the last 10 years, the Post Office has increased in vans from 2 to 4 which means 2 vans are now parked on the street. The Miners Welfare Institute car park has now been allocated to the 2 businesses that occupy the building and every time that I return to Church Street, at any time, it is almost impossible to park anywhere near my house. As a pensioner, I find it extremely difficult to carry shopping when I can't find a suitable parking space and I know that others feel the same. People are still double-parking and many times I have been hemmed in by another vehicle and cannot move mine. People are still parking in Church Street and using the bus and if there are more parking restrictions it will be nigh on chaos.</p>

10961	41	Pensford	Pensford PC	1	<p>1) Lock Up Cottages – The Parish Council Support the proposal here, but if possible the line could be shortened one car length to give a parking space. But Yellow Lines should still continue in front of the Lock Up.</p> <p>1a) High Street – Shorten the line on the corner to allow the parking outside of 150 High Street. Keep the Lines opposite. And all the way down to the A37.</p> <p>2) War Memorial – The Parish Council support the need for yellow lines by the War Memorial, but maybe again shorten slightly just to allow another parking space to stay.</p> <p>3) Coombe House Church Street – Parish Council cannot really see the need for the lines directly outside of Coombe House. The Parish Council agree with the lines on the corner of the A37, but in Church Street there is no real need for them there.</p> <p>Item 4) Church Cottage – Parish Council suggest removal of Yellow Line proposal outside of Church Cottage and would also re-iterate as below No Line should be placed across the front of the garage belonging to Church Cottage. The Parish Council support the Yellow Line on the opposite side of the road to Church Cottage.</p> <p>5) Church Rooms – Parish Council suggest enhancing the existing Keep Clear Lines instead of placing Yellow Lines here.</p> <p>The Parish Council also support the lines on the A37 by the Primary School and opposite.</p>
10961	41	Pensford	Resident	1	<p>There is very limited parking on Church Street and additional stresses on parking is only going to only make matters worse. There is very limited parking in Pensford altogether. Many of the houses are old and do not have their own parking or garages. It is surrounded by narrow country lanes. The resident who owns Church cottage parks in front of his own garage every day. The road here is wide enough for him to do so without blocking any traffic at all.</p> <p>By removing parking spaces on the street you will force some residents to park a very long way from their houses, having to cross a very dangerous road to do so. There is no safety issue on Church Street as evidenced by my request under the Freedom of Information Act. The road outside of the old forge by Coombe house is not owned by the council but by the family that live at Coombe House. Just to make it clear that people have parked in front of the church gates, Church cottage garage, the war memorial and Coombe house every day ever since I have known Pensford i.e. the past 8 years, with no issue. Our local Parish Council have not sought opinions from anyone living on Church Street. They did not advise anyone on the street about the proposals, let alone publish a map and ask our opinions. Nearly all residents on our street attended a Parish Council meeting and voiced our objections in any other business. The Council promised to hold a discussion with the residents but this has never happened. The residents were so impassioned that several of us made very strong speeches voicing our concerns.</p>
10961	41	Pensford	Resident	1	<p>Removing parking spaces from church street will not make the residents or their cars disappear. There are no employers of note in the village or big shops, nurseries ect. By removing parking in close proximity to peoples residences you will cause them to walk to their homes from afar. This will lead to more pedestrian traffic on church street, but also on surrounding roads and the main road. If this endangerment and annoyance where in the service of a clear and proven safety improvement on the street that outweighed the hazard and fuss it will cause it might be justifiable. This is not the case however, the road is perfectly safe, the residents of the road are happy to continue as they are and none of the outside bodies that run and support church streets amenities has shown the least desire to change this. There is no demand for parking restrictions from the village as a whole and strong opposition to it from those who live on the street. The unavoidable presence of pedestrians in the road will not be alleviated in any appreciable way by removing parked cars and their absence will encourage road users to speed up not slow down when using the street.</p>
10961	42	Railway View Place	Resident	1	<p>I understand from the telephone call I made to yourselves the reason for the suggested changes are complaints from residents. The lady I spoke to did not fully explain the reasoning other than to say she had completed a site visit which had found a problem to exist. As with all the roads locally that mainly consist of miners cottages the parking situation is always a problem but is mainly brought about by inconsiderate parking by the minority. I fail to see how REDUCING the number of available parking spaces is going to resolve this problem and if anything will actually make the problem worse. As a resident of Railway View Place since 1986 I live in a semi detached home without a drive therefore we have to park in the road. It is only in the last 12 months the parking has been a massive problem caused mainly by families parking on the road rather than in their drives.</p>
10961	44	Cobbler's way	Resident	1	<p>I welcome the current no parking section on Cobblers way - would it also be possible to have a no parking section on Cobblers Way corners by the exit from Upper Court? There are always cars parked directly to the left of the junction when exiting Upper Court blocking the view and causing you to exit the estate on the wrong side of the road into oncoming traffic. I've nearly gone head on into cars on many occasions and I feel it would make the exit from Upper Court much safer - especially with the proposed extra housing being built at the end of Cobblers way and the extra traffic that will be driving down there.</p>

10961	45	North Road	Resident	1	<p>Congregational Church should be asked to alter their wall to provide a better view to the east when exiting Lippiatt Lane. Both Congregation and Tabor Churches have funerals- where will the cars park for the services? A large number of houses in North Road dont have garages or off-road parking, where will they park if parking spaces are reduced? Travelling west at the point of Chapel Walk/Tabor Church, car drivers have a good view to the west so what is the reason to reduce parking at this point? I hope the proposed 'Good Vehicles Loading Only' will have clear marking. Is it necessary to reduce parking either side of these restrictions? Businesses need customers. Cars travelling from the east have places to pull in along North Road to allow traffic from the other direction to pass.</p>
10961	45	North Road	Resident	1	<p>Proposed Yellow Lines Opposite Derwent: Parking here provides a natural speed restriction which causes drivers to navigate with caution through the village. Proposed Loading Bay: The parking restriction for 4 hours a day seems excessive for the amount of time the vehicles are actually in the village. Can you not incorporate a flashing light system, similar to the school system, so that when a lorry is due lights flash and there is no parking but when the vehicle has left the lights are turned off and the road can be used again for shoppers.</p>
10961	45	North Road	Resident	1	<p>As a resident of North Road ,Timsbury, I am pleased that after many years of increasing traffic congestion and larger vehicles causing problems on North Road that there are plans to improve safety and traffic flow in the village by t,he introduction of yellow lines. I am concerned that the proposed yellow lines by the Tabor chapel appear to extend beyond the present white lines which means that at least one parking place will be lost.consequently the cars will move to park on non-mandatory white lines such as those outside my house.This area of North Road has problems with short term parking due to the hair dressers and frequent use of the chapel. Any obstructions on the white lines negates their use to create a much needed passing place, and contributes to the traffic congestion in this area.</p>
10961	45	North Road	Resident	1	<p>Welcome the idea of parking control along North Road as parking adds to the problems of traffic flow and pedestrian safety. Feel however that the current proposal does not go far enough. All white keep clear markings should be made enforceable yellow lines as removing one or two spaces will mean people are more likely to park here, affecting traffic flow. The road opposite the loading bay outside McColls should be double yellow to avoid lorries not being able to pull into the bay without blocking the road. I am also concerned that we are being asked to comment before we have an opportunity to view the 20mph proposal for the village as both schemes could have implications for each other.</p>
10961	46	Chapel Lawns	Resident	1	<p>I just want to add my support to this, 110%. I live on Chapel Lawns (BA3 3BQ) and the road is becoming a nightmare to navigate both in a car and with a pushchair due to inconsiderate parking. My only question is, will enforcement follow when the double yellows go in?</p>
10961	47	Temple Inn Lane	Resident	1	<p>Would like restricted parking (2hr time limit) at the end of Cameley Road with its junction with A37 outside the Doctors Surgery. At present there is one disabled space and all other parking is taken by commuters. We have often needed the car to get to the Doctors but there has been no parking and on entering the surgery only one person waiting.</p>
10961	47	Temple Inn Lane	Resident	1	<p>I understand that the proposals for Temple Inn Lane and Meadway relate purely to the painting of yellow lines at the junction only around Number 1 and 2 Meadway onto Temple Inn Lane and not the whole of Meadway and Temple Inn Lane. If this is correct, I have no objection to the proposal as this will improve the junction – provided it is policed in some way.</p>
10961	47	Temple Inn Lane	Resident	1	<p>We live at no 7 Meadway, Temple Cloud, Bristol and understand that there is a proposal to put yellow lines around the end of the junction at the end of the street. I have lived here for 11 years now and all residents park very considerably so this has come as a surprise. We never had a prob with visibility or obstruction at this junction and have never heard of any incidents occurring?! Therefore, I object to this proposal and feel it is very unnecessary.</p>
10961	47	Temple Inn Lane	Resident	1	<p>I live at 27 Goldney Way, Temple Cloud and have been a resident for 8 years. My son goes to Camely school. I strongly appose the proosal of putting yellow lines at this junction. There has never been an issue at this junction before so why do we need yellow lines.</p>
10961	47	Temple Inn Lane	Resident	1	<p>I strongly APPOSE the new parking restrictions for the junction of Meadway/Temple Inn Lane. I consider this to be a safe junction and am not aware of any current or previous issues with regard to inconsiderate parking affecting visibility. Double yellows are totally unnecessary. Do you have any statistics of incidents to support your proposal?</p>
10961	47	Temple Inn Lane	Resident	1	<p>Having lived at 1 Meadway for the past 8/9 years, I have not been aware of any problems with parking and/or visibility on this junction. The houses in Meadway have been here for some 30 years and to the best of my knowledge there have been no incidents at this junction?! In the recent article that was published in the Chew Valley Gazette regarding new housing, it has been reported that Temple Inn Lane is a safe road, and there have been no recent traffic incidents there either. The neighbours here always park considerately. I am aware however that Mr Ball, a resident of this village, has been harassing my neighbours on Temple Inn Lane taking photographs of them, their cars and their property etc. I think this proposal has arisen as a part of Mr Ball's personal vendetta, rather than an actual issue with parking and visibility.</p>
10961	47	Temple Inn Lane	Resident	1	<p>Regarding the proposal due to a request from a local resident to improve visibility and obstruction from parked vehicles, we feel is unjustified as ourselves and neighbours always park responsibly and we strongly oppose this</p>

10961	47	Temple Inn Lane	Resident	1	<p>We have lived in Meadway since the houses were built and we have never had a problem with the parking arrangements and I feel that there is no need to make any changes to how it has always been, in the time we have lived here there have been no accidents on the junction or on the estate so I do not think that adding double yellow lines will achieve anything but make it worse on the estate as people park along the lane when they come to visit as there are enough vehicles parking on the estate already. All the residents that live in the first 10 houses park sensibly so everyone can get in and out without any problem so if we have people visit they will park on the lane not to cause any obstructions as we have had the school at the top for the last 15 plus years. The complaints that have been made are not by anyone that lives on the estate so I find it hard to understand how they would know what it is like to live here and how everyone manages to be courteous to each other making it as safe as possible as we have lots of traffic go up and down everyday regarding the school and the village hall.</p>
10961	49	Winterfield Road	CLlr Liz Hardman	1	<p>Some for, some against. All agreed that yellow lines on the corner of Paulton Rovers Football Club are a good idea. However residents that live opposite the Club on Winterfield Road area opposed to yellow lines outside their homes; will have nowhere to park and see their parking slows traffic down and is a form of traffic calming. These residents will have to park further up the same street. One resident in particular relies on family member to take them shopping who has to park close to the house due to disability.</p>
10961	49	Winterfield Road	Resident	1	<p>Winterfield Park (at the rear of my property) has limited parking and so me and my family often park to the front on Winterfield Road. We have not received complaints from Paulton Rovers club to say that our parking creates issues for people entering or leaving the club, nor any complaints from other residents. One resident on Winterfield Road has often complained about people parking opposite his drive however the proposals would give us and our neighbours no choice but to park here. The parking on Winterfield Road outside our properties is on the widest part of the whole road and still allows for 2 cars to pass, albeit making them slow down to do so. We will end up parking along narrower stretches, putting us at higher risk of being damaged by passing vehicles. A recent accident saw a drunk driver right off my sons car, the policeman who investigated saw no problem with where we parked on this stretch of the road. We purchased our property two years ago and the parking was an influencing factor. Had we not been able to park outside our property we would probably not have purchased it.</p>
10961	49	Winterfield Road	Resident	1	<p>There are currently no parking restrictions on the western side of Winterfield Road, around the area of our house and the entrance to Paulton Rovers Football Ground. This allows for vehicles to be parked in this vicinity often for extended periods of time. We have been very concerned and frightened on many occasions when it has been necessary for drivers travelling south to mount the pavement outside of our house in order to avoid a collision with vehicles coming from the opposite direction. This part of Winterfield Road is possibly the narrowest point and has the worst level of visibility, and there is certainly insufficient room for parked vehicles whilst allowing for two lanes of free moving traffic. Another point we would like to raise is the problem of overspill parking on event days at Paulton Rovers. Often the line of parked cars can extend from the junction of Elm Road to the bus stop at Winterfield Close and beyond, which is dangerous and chaotic. Vehicles even park on the pavement opposite our house, and have even parked on the pavement alongside our drive. In our opinion, it really is imperative that parking restrictions are implemented and extend beyond your original design. The volume of traffic has increased exponentially over the last forty years and we have campaigned vigorously for safety in this area, even giving part of our front garden over to the Council for the construction of the pavement. This is an ideal opportunity for the Council to make this part of Paulton even safer.</p>
10961	49	Winterfield Road	Resident	1	<p>Agree with initial proposal but strongly suggest that the restrictions are extended to at least Winterfield Close bus stop on both sides of Winterfield Road. The proposed restrictions will benefit Paulton Rovers & Bloomfield Rise entrances but without extending will have adverse effects for residences to the south. The road is the narrowest with worst visibility between Paulton Rovers Club and Winterfield Close. Parked cars opposite PRC and the drives of Brabant House and Domus make it extremely dangerous to exit our drives in our cars or on foot. Have had to request owners of vehicles in Hill View to move their cars opposite drives due to safety issues. Cars travelling into Paulton have to pass the parked vehicles on the wrong side of the road which is dangerous and frightening. The limited proposals will increase parking opposite drives of Brabant House and Domus unless lines extended. Dangerous for pedestrians to cross between parked vehicles to PRC. Restrictions should be extended to bus stop (Winterfield Close). Vehicles overtaking stationary buses cant see parked vehicles in front of the bus and will have no refuge against oncoming vehicles rounding the bend.</p>
10961	49	Winterfield Road	Paulton Parish Council	1	<p>Extending restricted parking to the bus stop on both the eastern and western side of Winterfield Road should be considered. There are significant difficulties accessing and egressing from properties at these points due to residents parking, the problem increasing on match/event days at Paulton Rovers Football Club.</p>

10961	49	Winterfield Road	Resident	1	Lived in property for 36 years and have parked outside with no complaints. I rely on my sister to help with the weekly shop which has to be dropped at the front of my property as my rear garden is long with steep steps making it difficult for myself and my sister (who also has mobility issues) to navigate. Where are residents supposed to park? I have a 4 bed property so it would be expected we require parking. Parked cars at this point slow cars down and removing them would have negative impact on safety.	
10961	49	Bloomfield Rise	Resident	1	<p>1) Bloomfield Rise is a private unadopted road. 2) A management company (controlled by the residents of Bloomfield Rise) is responsible for this private road, not the local authorities. 3) The planning application documents for Bloomfield Rise show a clear boundary for the adopted highway, which is circa 1 metre from the junction of Winterfield Road. 4) Residents of Bloomfield Rise have parked along the north side of Bloomfield Rise for several years, without obstructing the main road or the general public's access. A 5 metre restriction would reduce the available parking for residents by 1-2 cars. These cars would then be forced to park on the already congested main highway. 5) Parking restrictions on a private unadopted road can only be enforced by those who are responsible for the road.</p> <p>Additional Proposed Changes Bloomfield Rise, Paulton - South side - from its junction with Winterfield Road for a distance of 17 metres in a easterly direction.</p> <p>Notwithstanding all of the points mentioned above, the planned restriction on the south side does not accurately reflect the true configuration of the existing road layout. We already have adequate parking restrictions on the south side of Bloomfield Rise, which is in fact the south side of the access to Paulton Rovers Football Club. I would have no objection to there being a parking restriction on the north side of Bloomfield Rise, providing it was only up to the boundary of the adopted highway, which would be circa 1 metre from the junction to Winterfield Road.</p>	
				15	34	9

Total: 58
Overall Total 79