

| Number | Plan | Road / Street | Object | Support | Support In part | Neither | Comments |
|--------|------|----------------------------|--------|---------|--------------------|---------|---|
| 1 | H5 | Ragland Lane/Raglan Villas | 1 | | | | I am writing to voice my concern and opposition to the proposal to install double yellow lines at the junction of Raglan Lane and Raglan Villas in Fairfield Park, Bath. The reason cited by BANES Council is to improve safety, however I feel this is a false assessment. Firstly, I have lived in the area for over 12 years and do not know of any accidents at this junction. Secondly, no one ever parks on the current white lines in place, on the left hand side, as you drive up the road. Thirdly, if yellow lines are added it will not lead to cars being diverted away from the junction when driving up or down the street into the vacated space, so will not increase the reaction time for drivers turning out of Raglan Villas. Lastly, and most importantly, it will not improve, in any way, the sight lines for the people driving out of Raglan Villas. The solution here, which would have an impact on safety, would be to place a mirror on the street light across the road. A further reason to overturn this proposed change in designation is the reduction in available parking (3-4 car spaces) in a heavily terraced street where parking is already limited. A situation which will not affect residents of Raglan Villas who have car spaces. In addition, access to Raglan Villas by larger vehicles is possible and if concerns are raised in this regard it is an issue of driving ability rather than turning space. |
| 2 | H5 | Ragland Lane/Raglan Villas | 1 | | | | The reason cited by BANES Council is to 'avoid danger to persons or other traffic using the road or to prevent the likelihood of any such danger arising and to facilitate the passage on the road or any other road of any class or traffic' I believe that this measure may actually increase the danger to persons locally, will certainly further restrict available parking for local car owners. My observation over the twenty four years I have lived here is that delivery vehicles, contractors vans and lorries, will park wherever they can, regardless of restriction, in Ragland Lane, and unless the road is policed regularly and often, that the proposed 'No waiting at any time zone' will simply lead to a substitution of normally sized, locally owned, family cars parking, for a number of different sized contractors vehicles. I think this could be more dangerous for pedestrians, and potentially very inconvenient for my family, and others driving out of Raglan Villas. I also think that other road users, particularly wider vehicles, will have to mount the kerb to get safely through the area. In conclusion I think that this proposal is well meant, but falls short of achieving its aims. It will potentially cause a reduction in safety, and probably increase in inconvenience for my family and local residents,(to include Marshfield Way, who will presumably take up the parking overspill) . |
| 3 | H5 | Ragland Lane/Raglan Villas | 1 | | | | I am writing to relay my concerns regarding the above scheme. Having lived in Ragland lane for some 22 years I have seen and experienced parking become more of an issue. I would like to say that I do not see the need for restrictions at the junction of Solsbury way and Ragland lane. Sometimes there are no spaces to park when returning home late in the evening and there really should be no issue with people parking on Solsbury way overlapping the white markings. I do not consider this situation to be dangerous or obstructive in any way as in all the time that I have lived here I have not witnessed or heard of a single accident/incident occurring. To this end I ask you to reconsider this scheme and do not make our lives harder. |

| | | | | | | |
|---|----|--|---|---|--|--|
| 4 | H5 | Ragland Lane/Raglan Villas | 1 | | | <p>I am writing to object to the council's proposal to install 'no stopping' markings on the road opposite the entrance to Raglan Villas in Ragland Lane. I understand that the reason for the proposal is on the grounds of safety, although it is not made clear how these markings will improve safety. We have lived at this address for 13 years, and have never seen or experienced any difficulties with either lack of space for vehicle maneuvering or lack of visibility at this junction. Large vehicles, including removal and delivery vehicles, have experienced no problems turning in and out of Raglan Villas, and indeed your proposal is likely to speed the exit of vehicles from Raglan Villas into Ragland Lane. I am concerned that by installing 'no stopping' markings outside our property, this part of the carriageway will inevitably become a stopping place for delivery vehicles servicing the whole street. This is turn will increase traffic movement, fumes and noise directly in front of our property. We have three children and enjoy living on Ragland Lane because it is a quiet street where drivers obey the 20mph speed limit. I object to your proposals because I feel they will actually increase the danger on this section of the road rather than improve safety. I also object to the proposal because of the resulting loss of parking spaces for residents. This is a high density residential area, built in Victorian times and needing to adapt to high car ownership of the 21st century. The council's insistence in painting more and more white and yellow lines on the local roads is only causing residents to park further from their properties often causing dangerous situations in neighbouring roads. For example, we have seen increased parking on either side of the busier Marshfield Way since more white lines have been painted locally; this has made it increasingly dangerous to cross this road due to lack of visibility between parked cars and drivers' increased speeds due to their impatience with parked cars up and down the road, including on pavements.</p> |
| 5 | H5 | Ragland Lane/Raglan Villas | 1 | | | <p>We are writing to express our opposition to the installation of double yellow lines opposite the entrance to Raglan Villas in Ragland Lane. The Council's desire to improve safety seems, in our opinion, to be in no way enhanced by this measure and will result in the loss of four parking spaces where parking for residents is at a premium. The net result will be to speed the exit into Ragland Lane for people who have off road, dedicated parking already at their properties. This seems grossly unfair. The double yellow lines will undoubtedly lead to the constant use by delivery vehicles servicing the whole area, thus defeating the Council's intentions for a large part of the time. Having lived here for the last 10 years we have neither seen nor experienced any difficulties at this junction and so consider the Council's proposal to be both unnecessary and unfair.</p> |
| 6 | H5 | Ragland Lane/Solsbury Way | | 1 | | <p>As long as the double yellow lines do not extend further than the existing white lines I have no issue. However if the double yellow lines do extend further than the existing white lines I do have an issue. We have so little parking as it is I believe it would be detrimental to have any more taken away. There have never been any accidents at the top of Ragland lane due to poor visibility I have lived there for eight years.</p> |
| 7 | H7 | Arundel Road/Bennett Lane/Highbury Place/Snow Hill | 1 | | | <p>I wish to make the point that the proposed parking restrictions in Arundel Rd., Snow Hill and Bennetts Lane as they stand would lead to an increase in the number of cars(many from the nursery at the old Walcot infants school) parking in already congested Highbury Cottages and Highbury Place. To prevent this Highbury Place should be included in the residents parking zone.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|----|----|--|---|---|---|
| 8 | H7 | Arundel Road/Bennett Lane/Highbury Place/Snow Hill | 1 | | the application for restriction in Arundel Road and Snow Hill in particular will serve greatly to avoid daily access problems and allow service, delivery and emergency vehicles less restricted access and exits in these areas. |
| 9 | H7 | Arundel Road/Bennett Lane/Highbury Place/Snow Hill | 1 | | I am writing to express my objection to the above plans, unless and until they include provision for residents' permits for Snow Hill. If lengths are removed for no parking, then the already difficult situation will become impossible. The road is currently used as a free car park for those commuting in along the A4, meaning residents find it difficult to get home, and elderly relatives have to be carried up a hill, which is absurd. |
| 10 | H7 | Arundel Road/Bennett Lane/Highbury Place/Snow Hill | 1 | | Concerning the Proposed Restrictions to parking in and around Snow Hill I would like to raise the following objection. First I would like to make it clear that I am in support of any restrictions that help to make the local streets safer for all, pedestrians and road users including emergency vehicles. As a local resident I witness on many occasions dangerous and unsafe parking. However with the restrictions you have outlined I estimate that between 15- 20 parking spaces will be lost. Those car owners will continue to look for local parking making the streets without Residents Parking even more difficult for local residents to park in. I feel particularly aggrieved as last year we were informed by your department (this after lengthy correspondence beginning in 2011) that Highbury Place would be included in an informal consultation for a TRO that might lead to our small street becoming subject to a RPZ. This decision appears to have been reneged on with no consultation with residents. I have the emails to back up my assertions. In short without adequate consideration being given to local residents in Highbury Place I do not support your proposal. |
| 11 | H7 | Arundel Road/Bennett Lane/Highbury Place/Snow Hill | | 1 | I agree with parking restrictions in the main but parking on Highbury where I live is getting increasingly difficult, restricting parking will further put pressure on our road making it difficult for residents to park. Is it possible to keep some spaces on Arundel road and on Bennetts lane? Ultimately residents parking will probably be necessary on Highbury and Arundel road as it is becoming very difficult for residents to park on the same street. |
| 12 | H7 | Arundel Road/Bennett Lane/Highbury Place/Snow Hill | 1 | | I am writing to place on record my concern regarding the proposed No Parking areas in the Snow Hill area, as they are currently formulated. I appreciate the need for some form of parking regulation, as I have seen some very thoughtless and dangerous parking in this area, which could have had the effect of denying access to emergency vehicles. So, my opposition is not to the principle of more controlled parking in the area. However, as a resident of Highbury Place, I have been involved in the long process of consultation regarding the creation of a Residents' Only Parking Zone. Apparently this process of consultation has now been shelved. My concern is that, without a Residents' Parking Zone in place beforehand, the effect of the proposed restrictions will be to further funnel traffic into the remaining parking spots, thus aggravating the already significant parking problem in Highbury Place, Highbury Cottages and Arundel Road. This effect was predicted by local residents prior to the introduction of RPZs in surrounding streets, and our predictions have been proved correct. There is no reason to believe that a further set of parking restrictions will not lead to the same consequences. For this reason I feel I have no alternative but to oppose the proposed plan. |

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|--|---|--|--|---|
| 13 | H7 | Arundel Road/Bennett Lane/Highbury Place/Snow Hill | 1 | | | I agree that safety is paramount and is currently at risk. However as you seek to resolve one problem it is likely to cause another. Highbury Place is already used as a parking area for non residents. I would strongly suggest Resident Parking be considered for Highbury Place. |
| 14 | H7 | Arundel Road/Bennett Lane/Highbury Place/Snow Hill | 1 | | | Congratulations on attempting to get rid of some of the anti-social behaviour of some car-owners. I'm fed up with trying to walk up Snow Hill and finding the pavement blocked by parked cars; I don't know how disabled people, or those with push-chairs, are supposed to cope. I expect there will be a knock-on effect on adjoining roads. Here there's already overspill parking from Raglan Lane. Some people seem to think that the turning space at the end of this road is their private car park. It's surprising, considering this is a short dead-end road, the amount of traffic it takes. We often see large vehicles having to reverse down the road because the turning space is occupied. A visit from a traffic warden would be appreciated. Another annoyance is the housing at the bottom of Morford Street, with garages on the ground floor. The owners seem to feel entitled to park outside their garages and block the pavement. I often have to walk out in the road when using this route. I certainly would have objected, had I seen a notice, about removal of the traffic island on London Road, by the turning into Morrison's supermarket. There's often breaks in the traffic in one direction or the other, but rarely both, which made crossing via this refuge relatively easy, but now we have to stand in the rain breathing in noxious fumes while waiting for the new lights to change and let us cross the whole width. |
| 15 | J3 | Bailbrook Lane | 1 | | | I object to the introduction of the proposed parking restrictions under TRO PEV11676/AR as the proposal will not materially "improve traffic flow" the reason stated for its planned introduction. Bailbrook Lane is already an access only road and is also subject to a no waiting restriction between the hours of 08:00 to 18:00 Monday to Friday. Road layouts were considered as part of the planning applications of recent developments and concluded that no road layout changes or restrictions were required. The proposal will not improve traffic flow but merely move the perceived problem above and below the planned parking restriction as parked cars in the areas without a restriction will create a bottleneck allowing traffic to pass in 1 direction only. I have monitored the traffic flow over three different 1 hour periods, the peak number of cars travelling along the road in either direction was 55 in one hour, this does not appear to me warrant the need to improve the flow of traffic, however I would add that when the A4 is congested traffic volumes do increase on Bailbrook Lane. Enforcement of the current access only restriction would reduce the number of vehicles, particularly commercial vehicles and Taxis, using Bailbrook Lane as a short cut or when the A4 is congested, would greatly improve the flow of traffic. I would question whether this is a priority, I am aware of at least 2 collisions between vehicles exiting Bailbrook Lane on to the Gloucester Road due to reduced visibility because of parked cars on the Gloucester Road. As a pedestrian it has becoming extremely hazardous to cross the Gloucester Road. In summary the proposed introduction of the yellow lines should not be approved as it will not materially improve the flow of traffic, there does not appear to be a justified reason for the proposed improvement and it would not appear to be a high priority compared to improving the safety of pedestrians including school children crossing the Gloucester road. With pressures on budgets to maintain essential services I am surprised that this proposal is considered to be the best use of the money collected from Bath residents. |

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|------------------|---|--|--|--|
| 16 | J3 | Bailbrook Lane | 1 | | | <p>I wish to object to the above proposal to create parking restrictions to a section of Bailbrook Lane. I understand that the reason for this proposal is 'to help ease the flow of traffic along the road and avoid parking causing obstruction.' Bailbrook Lane is an access only road, and traffic should be restricted to residents and their visitors, plus any delivery or service vehicles. Despite this, it continues to be used as a short cut to avoid the London Road which is often congested. This contributes to traffic flow problems which would be reduced if the access only status of the road was complied with. The road above this proposed restriction is very narrow, and it is my experience that it is this section of the road that impedes traffic flow due to it being narrow and with limited passing points. This parking restriction will do nothing to assist in the flow of traffic through the entire road. Indeed, it concerns me that it may well encourage motorist to drive too fast through this stretch of road and create more congestion in the area around the tin church. As regards parking causing obstruction, the only difficulties I have ever witnessed in the 10 years that I have lived in Bailbrook Lane has been construction vehicles which only require access during working hours, and only for the duration of the building works .On a previous occasion there was a limited restriction applied to the road for the duration of the works and more recently I have received a polite request from the firm to avoid parking during the day which has been easy to comply with. Imposing a 24 hour 7 day a week restriction is disproportionate to the situation, when a weekday 8-6pm limit would seem to resolve any obstruction issues and cause least inconvenience for local residents. If I return home late at night ,I feel more secure leaving my car outside my front gate overnight, and entering the premises through the front door from a well lit street, particularly as a person who lives alone. I once experienced a burglary from some-one who gained access to my home from the rear of the property.</p> |
| 17 | J3 | Bailbrook Lane | 1 | | | <p>I understand that the reason for this proposal is 'to help ease the flow of traffic along the road and avoid parking causing obstruction.' Bailbrook Lane is an access only road Mon-Fri, 8am-6pm, and traffic should be restricted to residents and their visitors, plus any delivery or service vehicles. The proposals will not improve the traffic flow but merely move the perceived problem to areas without restrictions.</p> |
| 18 | J6 | Grosvenor Bridge | 1 | | | <p>I have to say I found it rather worrying as we have no garage or front patio/garden that could be used as a parking space. I do agree that quite a few people who come to walk in the Meadows nearby or on the towpath/footpath take too much of an advantage of the lack of parking restrictions, to the extent that sometimes the residents have to park further away from home, however for this very reason I would find an all-out parking prohibition rather draconian (as it would defeat the object of making parking easier for residents!) so may I suggest that if you do decide to restrict parking, you do so by making it a residents only area with a free parking permit for residents (as it already happens in other parts of Bath).</p> |
| 19 | J6 | Grosvenor Bridge | 1 | | | <p>As a resident of Hampton House with no garage and a car I strongly oppose this. I bought the property last year and was unable to acquire a garage with it so rely on the on street parking to park a car. I have no designated parking space. I have previously lived in 2 other properties in Bath where double yellow lines were drawn up outside my home after purchase and rental and no access to parking. This devalues the price of the property and makes it virtually impossible to sell. It also creates problems with</p> |

| | | | | | | |
|---------|-------|------------------|----|---|---|---|
| | 20 J6 | Grosvenor Bridge | | | 1 | <p>I have no objection to the above Orders but I have concerns about other road safety matters which will result from impimentation in Grosvenor Bridge Road. Namely, the parking restrictions which will be imposed on the short length of road outside no. 9 Grosvenor Bridge Road. Currently, two cars park here and provide a measure of 'traffic-calming' on the speed of traffic entering this section of the street. This road and neighbouring Ringswell Gardens was included in the 20 mph speed limit last year and we looked forward to safer road conditions. However, with the parking restrictions imposed no such impediment to speed will exist. Typically taxi-drivers ignore the low speed restriction as do a number of residents and tradespeople. Reminder road surface markings or even physical humps/cushions/table at the entrance to the road would help the situation. It is hoped this statement will be considered even though it is not a formal objection.</p> |
| Totals: | | | 16 | 2 | 2 | |



