

Number	Plan	Road / Street	Object	Support	Support In part	Neither	Comments
1	E19 / F19	Kempthorne Lane	1				<p>I am responding to the above TRO for Kempthorne Lane. My concern is that the proposals in the TRO scheme will, in the main retain the current problems that result from the parking of so many cars by the local workforce from 7.30 hrs. – 17.30 hrs. (Monday – Friday) with all the daily hazards for residents that such congestive parking entails. If double yellow lines are restricted to one side of the road only the parking will shift to the opposite side as we know only too well from past experience. Parking around the green is preferred by those who come to park as this allows them to squeeze in far more cars than would be possible if they were restricted to parking outside the homes of residents. As the green is oval in shape the cars are parked around a continuous 'bend' which severely restricts the vision of drivers of vehicles either entering or leaving Kempthorne Lane. The windows of my own property front onto the green but my front door is located just into the junction of Kempthorne Lane. Several cars arrive early in the morning and park outside my home. Invariably 2 of these cars in order to obtain a space park without regard to the borders of the dropped kerb which gives me access onto my driveway. Such parking across the dropped kerb severely restricts the ability to exit the driveway as I cannot see beyond the sides of the vehicles and have to pull out into the road 'blind' to traffic coming from both directions. The parked cars also have a detrimental impact on anyone pulling into the junction coming from the side of the green. The parked cars are situated to the oncoming driver's left which means he/she/I have to take the bend into the junction on the right-hand side of the road i.e. the wrong side of the road for the direction of travel and it is impossible to ascertain in advance whether a vehicle is approaching to exit the junction. Meeting another car head on is a frequent encounter. There are also daily problems with the difficulties encountered by delivery vans, service vehicles, council collection trucks, etc. Often vehicles are forced to park on the pavements in order to complete their work, drop off goods, etc.</p>

2	E19 / F19	Kempthorne Lane	1		<p>I object to the parking restrictions proposed for Kempthorne Lane in TRO reference PEV11751 on the grounds that they are insufficient and do nothing to change the status quo. 1. The proposed restriction shown on attached Map Tile "F19/Proposed" ("Entrance to Kempthorne Lane") is insufficient and dangerous. The current road configuration provides enough space for only a single vehicle to enter Kempthorne Lane from Midford Road (B3110). Clear passage into Kempthorne Lane is routinely obstructed by vehicles parked on the left hand side. It is particularly dangerous during rush hour when the volume of vehicles attempting to simultaneously enter and exit Kempthorne Lane at the Midford Road intersection is at its peak. The proposal does not appear to alter the length of the current no parking area and instead serves to formalise and perpetuate this dangerous road configuration. I appreciate that it is not within the purview of this consultation process to consider alternative solutions, however, the safest and most cost-effective solution is to extend the double yellow lines to both sides of the Kempthorne Lane's entrance so that 2-3 vehicles (or one recycling truck) can safely enter Kempthorne Lane from Midford Road. I request that the proposal outlined in Tile F19 of Traffic Order Notice PEV11751 be set aside and that this alternate highway configuration be the subject of an accelerated round of public consultation. 2. The parking restrictions proposed on attached Map Tile "E19/Proposed" ("Parking within Kempthorne Lane") are insufficient and dangerous. Kempthorne Lane extends into the Concordia Development. At present, when the entrance to Kempthorne Lane is full of parked vehicles, drivers continue into the development where they are currently allowed to park in an unrestricted manner all day long. Around the green there appears to be an understanding between drivers that vehicles will park on the grass side only and this is formalised by the proposed TRO PEV11751 however parking along the length of the green reduces the access road to a one-way system. Kempthorne Lane is not wide enough take three lanes of traffic. The current proposal endorses unrestricted parking and the congested and unsafe parking practices</p>
3	E19 / F19	Kempthorne Lane	1		<p>We who live in the part of the estate nearest to the Wellsway are concerned that if parking restrictions are put in place in the other parts of the estate, non residents will park their cars to an even greater extent in our part. We already have non resident parked cars most of the way along one side, leaving only one lane for traffic in both directions, and very often three or four cars in the turning areas. Parking for our visitors is very limited and any large delivery lorry has to reverse out instead of using the turning areas. Kempthorne Lane is a publicly owned road and obviously we have to share it, but some sort of parking restriction would be desirable. Perhaps there could be a period in the middle of the day when only residents' cars are allowed to park.</p>

	4 E19 / F19	Kempthorne Lane	1			<p>My concern is that the proposals in the TRO scheme do not go far enough to improve the situation in Kempthorne Lane where the parking of so many cars Monday to Friday 08.00 to 17.30 is hazardous as well as an impingement on the ease of access to and from the homes of the residents. I have specific comments on four main issues. Entry to Kempthorne Lane from Midford Road. The entry into Kempthorne Lane from Midford Road is currently hazardous as the double yellow lines around those corners do not extend far enough into Kempthorne Lane. Parking on the Roadside Round The Green. The current proposal to introduce double yellow lines around the "House side" of the road round the Green leaving space for parking on the Green side of the road formalises what seems to be the informally accepted status quo. But this situation restricts the remaining through way for traffic in both directions to a "one-way system." Cars Parking on Corners of Junctions. There are frequent occurrences of cars parking right on the corners of the T junction of Kempthorne Lane adjacent to Numbers 19 and 55. Such parking is irresponsible as it limits visibility and creates a hazard for vehicles approaching the junction either from the Green side of the Lane or from "within" the Lane attempting to exit. Cars Parking in Turning Areas. At one end of the Kempthorne Lane cul de sac, nearest the Play Park, there is an essential turning area. However, the turning area is rendered useless throughout the working day because of cars parking there from 08.00 to 17.30. This creates a hazard for frequent large delivery vehicles needing to turn to return to the exit of the Lane and an impediment to smaller vehicles attempting the same manoeuvre.</p>
	5 E19 / F19	Kempthorne Lane	1			<p>In reference to the above TRO you would have received comments from a large number of residents of Kempthorne Lane. It is clear the current TRO proposal won't address the issues highlighted by the community so I would like to see the traffic team revisit the Kempthorne Lane proposal and consider the concerns and suggestions from the residents.</p>

6	E19 / F19	Kempthorne Lane	1			<p>Whilst we agree wholeheartedly that there is a need for parking restrictions for BA2 5DX, the proposed restrictions will not alleviate the issues we experience on a daily basis (between Monday & Friday, 8am to 6pm) within our estate. At the entrance of Kempthorne Lane (entering from Midford Rd) . It is very difficult to see what the situation is with cars parked and cars waiting to pull out onto Midford Rd until you have committed to turning into the Lane. Cars parked around the large Green Cars park around the Green allowing single file traffic around the green. This type of parking causes issues with access as you can't see what is coming around the green from the other end. Emergency vehicles have had to stop and block the road to attend to their patients and delivery drivers are forced to just stop on the road as there is nowhere for them to stop/park. Double yellow lines on one side will do nothing to resolve any of these issues. Inconsiderate parking Once you've moved past the Green and into the deeper areas of the estate there are yet more problems. Every single week day cars park over pedestrian drop kerbs. Cars park (on opposite sides of the road) too close to each other so there is not enough of a gap for vehicles to pass through. Culdesac issues Both ends of Kempthorne Lane are Cul de sac's (there is no sign to indicate this). At the playground end of the road the cul de sac has become a free parking area, you could say there is a daily challenge to see how many cars can squeeze in there. Unsafe Footpaths Due to the parking situation cars are regularly forced to drive on the footpaths this is unsafe for the many pedestrians. Speeding issues There was a time, when the estate was residential parking only, that it was safe for children to ride bikes around the estate or play on the green. Destruction of grass areas another note worth mentioning is that drivers regularly drive on the grass if they can't easily get out this damages the grass that we, the residents, pay to maintain in our estate maintenance fees. We urge you to reconsider the proposed TRO. In our opinion it will not do anything to resolve the dangerous situations we see every weekday. We believe further restrictions are needed, either a residents parking scheme or restrictions between the hours 8-6.</p>
7	E19 / F19	Kempthorne Lane	1			<p>1. I agree that each corner should have double yellow lines around them as this has been a huge issue even for my self when trying to drive around the estate people have been parking on the blind sides of corners making crossing for pedestrians extremely difficult. i have also been made aware of situations where emergency services have had to get the police involved so they can get access to the roads making it extremely dangerous for the residents in case of emergency. 2. The yellow lines around the communal green in the middle of the estate are fine but there needs to be the ability to park during the evenings for residents would it be better if the parking was limited between the hours of 7am and 5pm meaning that the Bin trucks and emergency services can still get access, However my concerns are how this will be managed. 3. there should be a sensible speed limit enforced as i have almost hit several cars that are speeding to leave work or coming to work, the entrance to Kempthorne lane people are cutting the corner because they yellow lines don't extend far enough for a car to get round and let others past and even where it dose cars that have been parked</p>

8	E19 / F19	Kempthorne Lane	1			We who live in the part of the estate nearest to the Wellsway are concerned that if parking restrictions are put in place in the other parts of the estate, non residents will park their cars to an even greater extent in our part. We already have non resident parked cars most of the way along one side, leaving only one lane for traffic in both directions, and very often three or four cars in the turning areas. Parking for our visitors is very limited and any large delivery lorry has to reverse out instead of using the turning areas. Kempthorne Lane is a publicly owned road and obviously we have to share it, but some sort of parking restriction would be desirable. Perhaps there could be a period in the middle of the day when only residents' cars are allowed to park.
9	I19	Combe Road Close	1			Currently my property has no off-road parking and immediately outside my house there are double yellow lines. To the rear of the property is an access lane that exits into Combe Road Close. All the houses that are in Combe Road Close which is a cul-de-sac either have their own driveway or garage. with the increased development that has taken place in the area over the last couple of years this has increased the amount of cars needing to park. With parking space already at a shortage limiting this would just add to what is already a lottery for places. As the proposed restrictions isn't on a through road or main road I can't see what purpose this would serve for the council. Doing this would cause major upset and problems for residents who would have to make sure they're able to move their car in the morning to a legal parking space and wouldn't even be able to leave their car when they go on holiday. In my opinion this would be a pointless enforcement of power and I would object to the proposal.
10	E19 / F19	Kempthorne Lane	1			My concern is that the proposals in the TRO scheme do not go far enough to improve the situation in Kempthorne Lane where the parking of so many cars Monday to Friday 08.00 to 17.30 is hazardous as well as an impingement on the ease of access to and from the homes of the residents. I have specific comments on four main issues. 1. Entry to Kempthorne Lane from Midford Road. The entry into Kempthorne Lane from Midford Road is currently hazardous as the double yellow lines around those corners do not extend far enough into Kempthorne Lane. 2. Parking on the Roadside Round The Green. The current proposal to introduce double yellow lines around the "House side" of the road round the Green leaving space for parking on the Green side of the road formalises what seems to be the informally accepted status quo. 3. Cars Parking on Corners of Junctions. There are frequent occurrences of cars parking right on the corners of the T junction of Kempthorne Lane adjacent to Numbers 19 and 55. Such parking is irresponsible as it limits visibility and creates a hazard for vehicles approaching the junction either from the Green side of the Lane or from "within" the Lane attempting to exit. 4. Cars Parking in Turning Areas. At one end of the Kempthorne Lane cul de sac, nearest the Play Park, there is an essential turning area. However, the turning area is rendered useless throughout the working day because of cars parking there from 08.00 to 17.30. This creates a hazard for frequent large delivery vehicles needing to turn to return to the exit of the Lane and an impediment to smaller vehicles attempting the same manoeuvre.
11	H17	Meare Road / Queen's Lane	1			this is a bus route so I understand it but a blanket ban down one side is unnecessary. The problem is not so dense that this is required.
12	I19	Combe Road Close		1		although I am not convinced I agree that it is worth a try.

13	J11	Bathwick Hill	1			an example of whole stopping parking is counter-intuitive. People come here as a starting point for a walk, particularly at weekends. This is not a bus route so allow some parking but with 'no parking' intervals so there is space to pull in and allow a flow of traffic. The presence of parking slows traffic down in what otherwise is used as a 40mph road. No limitations on parking causes people to speed up and dash through spaces increasing risk. So limit parking rather than stop it.
14	J17	North Road	1			I support the limitation around the top of Shaft Road, although surely this is obvious. I am less convinced by the limitations near the residential part in the bottom left hand corner of the map.
15	E19 / F19	Kempthorne Lane	1			In reference to the above TRO you would have received comments from a large number of residents of Kempthorne Lane. It is clear the current TRO proposal won't address the issues highlighted by the community so I would like to see the traffic team revisit the Kempthorne Lane proposal and consider the concerns and suggestions from the residents.
16	E19 / F19	Kempthorne Lane	1			1. Entry to Kempthorne Lane from Midford Road. The entry into Kempthorne Lane from Midford Road is currently hazardous as the double yellow lines around those corners do not extend far enough into Kempthorne Lane. 2. Parking on the Roadside Round The Green. The current proposal to introduce double yellow lines around the "House side" of the road round the Green leaving space for parking on the Green side of the road formalises what seems to be the informally accepted status quo. 3. Cars Parking on Corners of Junctions. There are frequent occurrences of cars parking right on the corners of the T junction of Kempthorne Lane adjacent to Numbers 19 and 55. Such parking is irresponsible as it limits visibility and creates a hazard for vehicles approaching the junction either from the Green side of the Lane or from "within" the Lane attempting to exit. 4. Cars Parking in Turning Areas. At one end of the Kempthorne Lane cul de sac, nearest the Play Park, there is an essential turning area. However, the turning area is rendered useless throughout the working day because of cars parking there from 08.00 to 17.30. This creates a hazard for frequent large delivery vehicles needing to turn to return to the exit of the Lane and an impediment to smaller vehicles attempting the same manoeuvre.
17	H14	Lyncombe Hill	1			I see it is proposed to 'remove resident parking bays in lengths of Lyncombe Hill'. I am not clear from the notice which parking bays are to be removed but wish to make the following comment if it relates to the bays outside number 52 Lyncombe Hill/opposite number 83 Lyncombe Hill. The addition of this parking bay a number of years ago has been of enormous benefit to Lyncombe Hill. It has slowed down the traffic which previously had a clear run down to the junction with Rossiter Road. This has made Lyncombe Hill safer for pedestrians and drivers and has also made it possible to drive back up Lyncombe Hill against the flow of the downward coming traffic. In addition to slowing down the traffic I also believe it has reduced the volume of traffic as Lyncombe Hill is now a less attractive rat run. I appreciate that the parking bays are inconveniently placed for the houses which share a drive that comes onto the hill opposite the parking bays. However for the safety and amenity of the residents as whole I strongly believe that the parking bays should be retained as they provide a traffic calming function.

18	I19	Combe Road Close	1			I would like you to record my objection to the above parking restrictions especially the ones proposed for Combe Road Close, Combe Down, Bath. Combe Road Close has space for about six to seven cars which is naturally limited to one side of the road because of access to resident's garages. To restrict parking here would inevitably lead to further demand on Combe Road parking where there are a number of businesses which has no private parking. EG: - Estate Agent, Dental Surgery, Picture Framers, Museum, Crock Hire also bed and breakfast facilities and multiple occupy homes that has increased the demand for local car parking places. Therefore I confirm my objection to any parking restriction in Combe Road Close, Combe Down, Bath.
19	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1			Petition sent in from 45 residents against the proposed restrictions.
20	E19 / F19	Kempthorne Lane			1	<p>1. I agree that each corner should have double yellow lines around them as this has been a huge issue even for my self when trying to drive around the estate people have been parking on the blind sides of corners making crossing for pedestrians extremely difficult. i have also been made aware of situations where emergency services have had to get the police involved so they can get access to the roads making it extremely dangerous for the residents in case of emergency. 2. The yellow lines around the communal green in the middle of the estate are fine but there needs to be the ability to park during the evenings for residents would it be better if the parking was limited between the hours of 7am and 5pm meaning that the Bin trucks and emergency services can still get access, However my concerns are how this will be managed. 3. there should be a sensible speed limit enforced as i have almost hit several cars that are speeding to leave work or coming to work, the entrance to Kempthorne lane people are cutting the corner because they yellow lines don't extend far enough for a car to get round and let others past and even where it dose cars that have been parked there for days have had no action taken against them.</p>

21	J11	Bathwick Hill			1	<p>We reply to your letter of 5th May, 2016 and confirm that we are in favour of the proposal to introduce Permit Parking 8am-6pm Monday-Saturday, BUT unless the same 'mixed' use of the space can be applied to the entire length of Bathwick Hill, we cannot agree to and strongly protest against the proposal that Limited Parking may still be available for 4 hours (no return for 1 hour) and just to our narrow and dangerous stretch of the Hill. we urge the Council either to have the whole Hill offer the 'mixed' status [Permit Holders and 2 hour Short Stay visitors - a max stay of 2 hours as 4 hours is too long for a Tesco shop or coffee visit to local friend etc and it would compromise residents] or otherwise the whole Hill should be reserved for Permit Holders only. If I had to say what we'd prefer, personally, selfishly, of course we'd say the former – the whole Hill for Permit Holders only. But, if we say in our hearts what would be best for Bath, for the whole Hill, for a return to the slower-moving residential area it should be, we must say the latter. And quieter. Roll on electric cars. In summary, we can see no reason why a different Parking Rule and pavement status should be applied exclusively outside our few houses on the Hill's narrow stretch. It must be the worst possible place to offer a 'mixed' parking status, as it is the chicane of the Hill. The speeds that cars, lorries, buses drive down the Hill has become crazy. We'd so like the whole Hill to be preserved as a Residential Area, with visitors able to visit, shoppers able to shop, residents able to park, people to be able to get out of their cars and cross the road without having to run etc etc. We thank you for the Council's kind deliberation of our request - for the entire Hill's Parking Rule to be Reconsidered, for the Rule to be made exactly the same from top to bottom, a uniform treatment and consistent policy for all the Hill's residents.</p>
----	-----	---------------	--	--	---	---

22	J11	Bathwick Hill			1	<p>We are in favour of the proposal to introduce Permit Parking 8am-6pm Monday-Saturday, BUT without Limited Parking available for 4 hours (no return for 1 hour). The addition of the 4 hour parking 'allowance' will not solve the very serious congestion problems we face on a daily basis. As the University has expanded, and commuter / shopping traffic has grown BH is now one of Bath's main artery roads, barely able to cope - without a single improvement in its infrastructure for at least 35 years. It is not a side road, like Cleveland Walk (limited parking only 2 hours). BH is also the main bus route to/from the University, with bus frequency measured in minutes. Full parking restrictions are in force throughout the top one third of BH; and the same, by and large, is the case for the lower third of BH. Moreover, both these stretches are much wider than the central third which amounts to a narrow 'pinch point', where there are no restrictions. It is not clear why there is such an anomaly. Given traffic pressures, at the very least there should be uniformity of parking restrictions along such a busy bus route, and artery road. The lack of uniformity on parking restrictions on BH has created quite unacceptable pressures on the remaining parking spaces outside BH dwellings 16-23 (in the 'pinch point'). Commuters park there all day, some from around 7am. Shoppers enjoy the 'free' use of what parking they can find. Both can take advantage of the very frequent bus service to return to their vehicles – there are two bus stops each way in this narrow stretch of the road. This small area is effectively Park and Ride. The Current Proposal: All this means that the current proposal to have Permit Parking, but with limited parking for 4 hours (no return for 1 hour) is very unlikely to solve the serious traffic situation in the 'pinch point' on BH: 1)to enforce the 4 hour limits will require additional continuous policing of a location not in the city centre 2)spaces will be taken within minutes as now, disadvantaging residents 3)early morning commuters may therefore continue to park as usual, risking a fine; while for shoppers 4 hours is no deterrent, given the available bus service 4) 4 hours will mean that in the morning when bus frequencies are at their highest, serious congestion can be expected to build.</p>
23	I19 / J18	Church Road / Combe Down Close		1	<p>I would like to strongly object to any parking restrictions in Church Road and Combe Down Close for the following reasons which already make parking in our area a nightmare and which would be immeasurably worsened if further restrictions apply</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2 schools in the immediate area of Combe Road one of which is relatively new. The pre-school at the top of the road has added considerably to the number of cars needing to park in the morning and evening 2. The new bus stop arrangement at the top of Combe Road has used up 2 of the existing parking places 3. The new mining history centre and wheel chair access arrangement has taken up 2 parking places 4. The owners of the new houses adjacent to the mining centre (and with doors on to Combe Road) all use the road for parking their cars rather than their dedicated parking within the new complex this has reduced the number of parking places by approx. 4 or 5 places to the original residents <p>The net effect of the points 1-4 above has been to make the parking situation almost impossible on occasions where before the situation was tolerable</p> <p>Any new restrictions in Combe Down Close and Church Road would cause an intolerable amount of unnecessary hardship</p>	

24	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1			I object to the plans to the change the parking in Calton Gardens by painting double yellow lines directly outside the houses. Painting double yellow lines will severely restrict the number of parking spaces for residents in the street and it will also be a struggle for visitors and tradesmen to park. The current parking arrangements do not need to be changed. I hope that you will reconsider this planning application.
25	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1			I am objecting to the removal of parking in the length of Calton Gardens. As a resident I sincerely object to these restrictions as a complete ban on parking outside our houses would result in much fewer parking spaces on our road. Relying solely on the parking bays and permit holder spaces along our road is not sufficient enough to accommodate all residents' cars. There are also no alternatives nearby.
26	J17	North Road	1			I have been dismayed to learn that you are planning further parking restrictions in Combe Down. It is already very difficult for residents to find a place to park. These proposals will make it even more so. I would strongly urge you to reconsider this matter,
27	E19 / F19	Kempthorne Lane	1			I write to urge a review of the proposed parking arrangements for Kempthorne Lane in the interest of safety. The entrance to the Lane from Midford Road has only a few metres of double yellow lines. Cars coming into the Lane cannot see round the corner and frequently meet vehicles coming towards them on the narrow lane. If there is only one car it can usually move sideways into the entrance to the smaller green, but if there is more than one car, or a van or larger delivery vehicle, there is no option but for the car coming into the Lane to back out into the road again. This has happened to me on several occasions and is very dangerous, and frightening. We do need double lines for at least the length of another two cars, and on both sides of the road. All the residents are worried that, with cars parked round the major green area, there is very little room for emergency vehicles. If an ambulance or fire engine is called and spends time in the road, as the estate is a cul-de-sac, no one can either come or go from the Lane. RESTRICTION TIME: The suggestion has been made that a two-hour parking restriction during the day would prevent all-day parking and mean that only visiting cars would use the facility for parking. Another alternative, which would give residents an opportunity to park a second car if they only have one parking space allotted, is to use a resident parking scheme. It is important to note that any restriction on parking is only required Monday-Friday 8 am to 5 pm. It is noticeable that in the evenings and weekends all cars disappear.

28	I19	Combe Road Close	1			<p>I wish to make an objection to the proposal of no parking in lengths within Combe Road Close, Combe Down, Bath. I have no designated parking on my property and outside my house are double yellow lines. The rear of my property is a lane, which residents use for access to the rear of their properties, and this lane exits to Combe Road Close. The residents in Combe Road Close, either have a garage on their property and drive way or have a garage opposite their house with a small area to park a car in front their garage. Very often, if Combe Road is busy with parked vehicles the only parking available is in Combe Road Close, and as my property exits to Combe Road Close, I sometimes park here. More cars park in Combe Road now, with the new Ralph Allen Corner Stone conference centre now open, the new Ralph Allen Yard houses, these residents park outside their houses, where there were no houses here before, and some properties are now holiday lets so parking is very tight. If this parking in Combe Road Close is taken away, and is made into no parking in lengths, I can not see how this would be an advantage to anyone. Combe Road Close is a cul-de-sac , and does not have any through traffic. When vehicles are parked here, there is always enough room to access all properties in the Road and even the recycling truck has enough room to access the area when cars are parked here. Please do not restrict the parking in this Road as parking is difficult enough without taking away a number of Parking spaces in Combe Road Close.</p>
29	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1			<p>I am writing to register my objections to the proposal to replace the keep clear white lines with a double yellow lines in Calton Gardens. These changes will force residents to use the zone 3 spaces of which there are nowhere near enough. This will have a knock on effect on the surrounding area including St Marks Road which is already at saturation point. This whole zone 3 area already has enough problems. As there is no dedicated parking in St Marks it is used 24/7 by shoppers and commuters, residents have to park in Calton Gardens as it is. Creating additional pressure on the limited zone 3 spaces in this way will only add to the parking misery already faced by the residents of Calton Gardens and also St Marks Rd. It is really not a good idea at all!</p>
30	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1			<p>We wish to object to the above proposal. This is a far-reaching change but, as far as I can see, no reason for it has been given. Is there a study on which this is based and which has indicated that this is a desirable outcome? What specific problem is this proposal addressing? Why is it proposed that owners should not be able to park cars directly outside their houses? While I can understand that it might be necessary to obtain a resident's parking permit to do so, an outright ban seems unnecessary and very inconvenient. The current monitored scheme of residents' parking permits seems to work well. The current 'off-road' parking available to residents is not monitored in any way. For example, attached is a photograph of the 8 parking spaces opposite our house this morning. It includes 3 residents of Calton Gardens, one van working on Calton Walk, one resident of Holloway, one unknown van and three unknown cars. Earlier this morning, having done some heavy shopping I returned to find all of these spaces full, and I stopped outside my house until one became available. What am I to do if no parking space is available? Park in central Bath? Is it the Council's intention also to introduce permits for these spaces, and to ensure that they are policed? In short, this proposal seems unnecessary and arbitrary and it should not proceed.</p>

31	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1			I do not believe any change in the residents Parking arrangements is either necessary or beneficial. The current system has worked effectively for 20 years. The provision of resident parking on the North side of Calton Gardens is an effective method of providing parking and withdrawal of this facility would leave insufficient parking on the road for residents and their visitors. There are no valid reasons why an alteration is merited in this cul-de-sac and appears another unnecessary interference by the council which is acting both officiously and without need !
32	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1			We'd like to register an objection to the proposed new parking restrictions for Calton Gardens. The proposed double yellow lines directly outside the houses would cause chaos for residents. We would need to seek parking in nearby streets, where parking space is already limited. The parked cars outside residents' houses do not block traffic or cause a nuisance as the road is a cul-de-sac with no passing traffic. Visitors and tradespeople can park as needed at the moment, whereas if the double-yellow lines are introduced they will also need to seek alternative space nearby, exacerbating parking problems in other areas.
33	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1			I wish to lodge my objection against your plans to put double yellow lines on the north side of Calton Gardens alongside the houses for the whole length of the street. Parking is already a huge issue for the houses of Calton Walk and Calton Gardens with many non residents leaving their cars on our road and in the parking bays whilst they travel elsewhere on the train for sometimes days at a time. By restricting the owners of the properties from parking directly outside of their houses will make life completely intolerable for the residents of this area. We have a high density of student properties which seem to have upwards of 4 cars attached to them, plus your plans to restrict parking further up Lyncombe Hill and a total lack of residents permit parking available, if you then restrict parking on the north side of Calton Gardens parking for all the residents in the area will become an absolute nightmare, it could also have knock on effect and reduce the values of our properties. Perhaps you should look at ways of reducing the numbers of vehicles per property instead ? or allocating parking to properties and making the property owners confirm that they are eligible to park in the road rather than people outside of the area just using our parking for their own gain. Please do not be so short sighted as to carry out this ludicrous plan to reduce parking even further making life even more difficult for the residents.
34	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1			I strongly oppose to your proposed major reduction in parking availability in Calton Gardens,as this obviously will cause considerable inconvenience and grief to all of us owners/residents of Calton Gardens. The existing regulations work well considering the number of residents vehicles that need to be accommodated,so why cause a major disruption to all concerned. Common sense prevails,if you prohibit the existing parking by painting yellow lines along the whole street,where can the residents park their cars,on a field somewhere outskirts of Bath?. There is an issue which you could consider is to stop unauthorised cars being parked in the two Parking Bays in Calton Gardens which is for the owners/residents of Calton Gardens only..unfortunately residents of Holloway, St.Marks Road and other commuters use it as a freebie parking bay when they travel to London on business or holidays overseas. Would be grateful if you could look into this matter. Thank you.
35	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1			I should like to object to this proposal on the grounds that the present situation is not ideal, but given the physical space available it is a reasonable solution. Double yellow lines would not solve any problems, but make things much worse.

36	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1			<p>I am writing to object to the proposed parking changes on Calton Gardens, referenced above, for the reasons set out below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We bought our house in Calton Gardens due in a large part to its related parking spaces, both immediately outside the house, and the availability of permit spaces along Calton Gardens, we paid a premium for the house due to the ease of parking on the road. • I suffer from Hypermobility Syndrome, which has resulted in prolonged periods of wheelchair or crutch use in the last 6 years, and ongoing problems with walking on some days due to the fact that my joints can spontaneously dislocate or subluxate. I have had 2 X 18 month periods in a wheelchair, longer periods using elbow crutches in the last 6 years, which have meant that I have not (quite) met the criteria for a Disabled Parking Badge because each episode lasted just under the minimum 2 year period. As a result of this problem, I require a parking space very close to the house. • There are very few alternative spaces nearby – on the other roads in the zone there is a shortage of parking spaces, meaning (1) we have no nearby alternative and (2) the scheme will cause even greater parking shortages on roads nearby, impacting on the desirability of the area for older people, the disabled, and young families, as well as impacted on house prices and traffic. In addition, due to the fact that parking shortages provoke some drivers to park less responsibly (for example the people who frequently park on the double yellow lines at the bottom of Lyncombe Hill), there may well be an impact on road safety in the area, a key route for children walking from Bear Flat to Widcombe Infant and Junior Schools, and pupils walking to and from Beechen Cliff School. • There would be insufficient spaces for visitors and tradesmen on the road. Currently there is a limited number of visitor and resident spaces at the Eastern end, but these are almost always full. • Whilst many of the houses do have garages, we have discovered they are unfortunately too small for the modern family car, particularly when getting in and out of the vehicle is difficult for people with mobility difficulties, so most residents do not have the option of using their garage space instead. • The demographic of Calton Gardens is currently changing:
37	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1			<p>This is an objection to the permanent order proposed for Calton Gardens. The reason for the proposal relates to safety. Whilst I accept that safety is a crucial consideration, Calton Gardens is a no-through-road with full-width vehicle access, a 20mph limit and no history of accidents. The proposed parking spaces will be inadequate. The present restrictions are satisfactory as they provide adequate parking for residents and visitors, and some overspill parking for residents of the adjacent pedestrian-only Calton Walk; they also deter non-residents from parking.</p>
38	E19 / F19	Kempthorne Lane	1			<p>In relation to the above, I object to the current proposed parking solution under BANES TRO PEV11751. The non residents that park on Kempthorne Lane drive in excess of the speed limit, causing danger to pedestrians, especially children. This is exacerbated by the fact the parked cars reduce visibility. They drive aggressively, and have often forced me to drive up on the kerb in their bid to get a space. The cars block access to residents parking spaces, causing huge difficulty when trying to exit. They often squeeze into spaces, parking too close to our cars, which means that residents cannot access their car boots, and have difficulties leaving in the morning. They queue at the entrance to Kempthorne Lane, making it difficult for cars to Exit Kempthorne Lane. They park on corners, and over entrances, blocking access for emergency vehicles. They destroy the grass when turning outside our House, as they drive off the road. The extra fumes and cars parked all day make our lovely enclave an unnecessarily urban environment. As there are plenty of spaces to park on the Wellsway, I suggest that Kempthorne Lane is restricted to residents parking only between 8am and 5pm.</p>

39	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1			<p>This is to register our very strong objections to the proposed addition of double yellow lines along Calton Gardens. Not only will this proposal cause considerable inconvenience for the vast majority of residents in Calton Gardens but it also risks significant knock-on implications for the surrounding area. In particular, it would inevitably mean that vehicles from Calton Gardens would have to decant to the surrounding area, including St Mark's Road. As the Traffic team is fully aware, there are already serious road safety issues in St Mark's as a result of the volume of traffic entering this cul-de-sac, and the fallout can only add to the already high risk of accidents. Furthermore, Calton Road provides the only viable alternative parking option open to residents in St Mark's Road on the many occasions that St Mark's is clogged with vehicles from elsewhere (commuters/shoppers/Community Centre users/school runs/rugby fans etc etc). If the residents in Calton Gardens were to have to decant their vehicles to Calton Road because of the installation of double yellow lines then Parking Services would need to provide an alternative solution for St Mark's Road residents. Two additional related points in conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is there a reason why the accepted change from single to double yellow lines at the very bottom of St Mark's doesn't form part of the current set of proposals in the notice? • there remains considerable concern amongst residents about safety in St Mark's Road following the abortive "consultation" exercise last October and we are still waiting to hear the proposed next steps from B&NES for developing acceptable solutions to <u>reduce the risks here</u>.
40	J11	Bathwick Hill	1			<p>I will keep this brief as I am sure you receive numerous emails. If it isn't broken, don't fix it ! There is NOTHING wrong with the current parking system on the section of Bathwick Hill currently under consideration. Most residents have garages or some type of courtyard in which to park their vehicles leaving on-street parking available for tradespeople, workers and visitors to Bath. Please don't take away one of the few unrestricted places to park in this city.</p>
41	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1			<p>I would like to add a personal comment. I have a Blue Badge. It is sometimes essential for my husband to drop me off at our front door and in fact being able to do this was a consideration when we bought the house. If he had to leave me on the doorstep, park the car somewhere else and come back, it would be to say the least, inconvenient. I hope you will take this into account along with all other objections from our neighbours when you make your decision.</p>
42	J11	Bathwick Hill	1			<p>I am writing with regards to the above proposal to introduce parking restrictions on a section of Bathwick Hill. I use this section of road to park every day in order to then walk into work in the centre of Bath. This prevents me from causing further traffic congestion and pollution in the city, and of course reduces the amount of time that my engine is running and damaging the environment. There are very limited parking areas on the outskirts of Bath now, and this seriously jeopardises those wishing to visit the city on a budget. I hope that these plans are reconsidered.</p>

43	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1		<p>There we all were living quietly in our street Calton Gardens to be precise and boom! We are notified that the Council plan to put double yellow lines outside our houses. Why on earth would there be a requirement to do this after 40 years plus of none. Is this because the Council are seeking extra revenue? For more permits? I for one have a parking permit and mostly park on the permit side of the street, however, my garage is too small for my car to fit in as most modern cars will not fit in the garages these days and leave room to get out of the car. Sometimes when i have heavy shopping i park outside my garage, i am in my 60's now and have bad knees so it is important for me not to have to carry heavy things too far. Besides i believe the double yellow lines will mean there are not enough parking spaces for the whole street and coming home late at night it is likely that there will not be a space to park in and then what does one do? I also think double yellow lines are very ugly don't you? I understand that they are required in busy business streets in town but not in residential ones like ours. I strongly object to this proposal and seek a response to my objection as soon as possible please.</p>
44	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1		<p>We wish to object to the proposals contained in PEV11751 regarding the replacement of 'KEEP CLEAR' white lines with double yellow parking restrictions on the northern side of Calton Gardens for the following reasons: 1. Parking has been taking place in the current format for many years without incident. The parking arrangement self-manages and allow all residents sufficient space to park their cars, which incidentally cannot be parked in the garages because they are too small to accommodate a modern car. 2. Due to the way cars are parked they automatically add a road 'calming' effect reducing the speed in which cars can drive down the road. As the pavement is so low if cars were not parked on the north side of the road there would be potential for a car to mount the pavement during periods of low visibility, such as at night. Therefore the existing arrangements mean we currently do not experience speed or safety related problems; and 3. Calton Gardens is a cul de sac with no through traffic. Residents are considerate in the way they park their cars and therefore we do not experience problems with access in the road. We urge Bath and North East Somerset Council to reject this proposal and take no action regarding further parking restrictions in Calton Gardens.</p>
45	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1		<p>I write to object to the proposals for Calton Gardens that form part of Order 201. I object on the following grounds: 1 - The proposals will put pressure on the current parking provision as many people who currently park in front of their garages on the north side of the road will be forced to park in the residents bays opposite. (We do have a permit and generally only park in front of the garage to unload the car.) 2 - Even with cars parked in front of garages there is room for people to walk on the footpath. In fact the road is so quiet that many people choose to walk in the road. In this respect the road works well as a shared surface for cars, bikes and pedestrians. Cars seldom get near to the 20mph speed limit. 3- I also object on aesthetic grounds. The double yellow lines will look ugly and the road surface is so poor it will be very difficult to make a decent job of painting them. Please can the above be considered when considering the scheme further.</p>

46	E19 / F19	Kempthorne Lane	1			<p>The proposal alone would not prevent any of the safety issues at Kempthorne Lane. The DYL proposed need additional restrictions to supplement them to make the road safer.</p> <p>Safety is a major concern due to the number of vehicles parking, with no regard for other road users / pedestrians. There have been occasions when the emergency services have been unable to drive along the road in an emergency & had to actually drive into a vehicle to move it out of the way. It's particularly bad on the corners & entrance to Kempthorne Lane from Midford Rd, where it's impossible to see oncoming traffic beyond parked cars & is only a matter of time before an accident occurs. The existing lines here really need to be extended. With a bus stop nearby on Midford Rd, Kempthorne Lane is used as an informal Park & Ride, as well as an informal car park for staff / visitors of the hospital & vet. Odd Down P&R is a short drive from Kempthorne Lane & with park and ride being a part of the Councils transport policy perhaps some focus could be put on trying to get more people to use this service (raise awareness, reduce fares, more signage to P&R etc). Vehicles also park over the speed bumps in the road & leave no space to allow vehicles to pass in the opposite direction, which can cause traffic to back up onto the main road. By managing the parking it would help deliver the Council transport policy of reducing congestion & pollution. There are no problems at weekends or evenings so perhaps single yellow lines Monday to Friday in addition to double yellow would help. Something along these lines would be more appropriate than the current proposal. An alternative would be to ask for residents parking & see if we could get an exemption from the department for transport (DfT) to not have bay markings such as zone 10, Bathwick or zone 9 Woodland Grove to name a few (I know they faced similar issues with students / University parking & this has been resolved by permit parking & an exemption from bay markings was granted by Dft). If this isn't possible, having bay markings would be preferable to help control the parking over the current free for all.</p>
47	J17	North Road		1		<p>Having reviewed the proposed extension to the 'Keep Clear' marking on North Rd, I am content that this will not unduly impact myself or other residents on this stretch of road. Also, it is reassuring that this TRO does not look to implement the previous TRO I mentioned in my enquiry as that had been very badly thought through and potentially introduced additional hazards. Of course, if the proposed TRO changes prior to implementation, may I ask that you keep me informed and allow me to comment accordingly.</p>
48	J11	Bathwick Hill	1			<p>The restricted parking zone reserved for residents during business hours in the middle section of Bathwick Hill is less than 20% occupied today, proving that resident demand is very limited and there is certainly no reason to warrant extending such restrictions further up the hill (especially given that almost all residents in the upper reaches have private parking facilities off the highway). The parking amenity is much more valuable to visitors and workers in the city. Permitting free parking in this area is a vital contribution to Bath remaining prosperous and businesses being able to pay the taxes to the Council. It also helps reduce congestion and pollution down town.</p>

49	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1			<p>I am writing to object about the above order (Reference PEV11751) concerning proposed No Parking on the entire length of the north side of Calton Gardens. Calton Gardens is a residential cul de sac with no through traffic. In the over 40 years that I have lived here there have never been any problems with large vehicles gaining access, including removal vans, refuse collecting vehicles, ambulances and fire engines so we do not need a change for that reason. The current arrangement for parking works well. If double yellow lines were installed it would put overwhelming pressure on the residents parking spaces on the south side of the road. At the moment there are sufficient spaces for residents here and also for residents of neighbouring roads (St Marks Road, Lyncombe Hill, Southcot Place and Alexandra Road) who often find their spaces are full and need to look nearby for parking. Parking in this part of Widcombe would not be improved by these proposals, but would cause chaos. Like many residents on Calton Gardens we are unable to park in our garage as the house is set very close to the road meaning that when cars are parked opposite there is insufficient room to turn in to the garage. Cars are larger now than they were in 1970 making the garages small even if access is possible. It is additionally very dangerous to exit the garage even if access were possible as they open directly onto the narrow pavement. Houses designed like this would not now be given planning permission. In short, we have no option but to park on the road and double yellow lines would cause tremendous problems for our road and the surrounding area.</p>
50	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1			<p>We strongly object to the above proposal to replace the Keep Clear and white lines in Calton Gardens with double yellow lines on the following grounds. 1. There is insufficient space to accommodate the demand for resident and visitor parking in the Zone 3 bays to the south of Calton Gardens. There are 37 houses in Calton Gardens and only enough space for approximately 30 vehicles, thus the proposal to remove the ability to park vehicles outside our garages would cause a parking problem in Carlton Gardens that does not currently exist. Also we are currently the 'overflow parking' for nearby zone 3 roads such as Lyncombe Hill, Alexander Road, Calton Road and St Marks Road. So further restrictions in Carlton Gardens would only exacerbate parking problems in the area. 2. If resident's parking in Calton Gardens is full there is no nearby alternative Zone 3 parking. Holloway and adjacent roads are Zone 4 and as previously explained in point 1 all alternative Zone 3 parking nearby is already oversubscribed. So where do we all park? Unfortunately the integral garages are far too small to accommodate a modern family car. 3. Safety Concerns - There is no doubt that the cars currently parked on the garage side act as a traffic calming measure. We feel that without them there is a real danger that speeds will increase. This is a concern for many of the houses as their front door is extremely close to the road and as there is no raised kerb anywhere the potential danger is obvious and worrying. Many of our neighbours park there specifically to protect their children when coming out of the front door. 4. These proposals will devalue our properties - As you are well aware Bath has terrible parking problems throughout the city. Local agents have advised us that the current arrangement is a selling benefit of our properties and removing this would undoubtedly devalue the whole road.</p>

51	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1			As residents of Calton Gardens, my wife and I wish to object to the proposal to prevent us from parking in front of our garage. It is difficult to understand the reason for the proposal. There is no problem with access – the largest vehicles can deliver to the houses and there is a turning area at the end of the road. The road is a cul de sac and there is a 20mph speed limit so safety is hardly an issue. Adoption of the proposal will drastically reduce the stock of parking places forcing residents to compete for an inadequate number of residents parking slots. In short, we have yet to find any of our neighbours who support the proposal.
52	E19 / F19	Kempthorne Lane	1			As a resident of Kempthorne Lane I wish to express my concern about this proposal. I don't think it would improve the situation at all, putting yellow lines round the circle on one side only just leaves things as they are at the moment with cars parked on one side. They impede the view of anything coming towards you. We have all had frequent experiences of being bumper to bumper and nowhere to go because of cars parked right up to and sometimes across corners. The entrance from Midford Road does have a short stretch of double yellow lines but it is much too short to be safe and some cars often park over the lines. When turning in to Kempthorne Lane I sometimes have to back out onto Midford Road to allow cars to exit. This is very dangerous, it is a very busy road. The proposed scheme makes no mention of the rest of Kempthorne Lane. We have the same problems of cars parked inappropriately for long periods ie. the working day. Large delivery vehicles, ambulances, fire engines and waste collectors have all had problems. There is a turn-round at the blind end of the road near the playground. Cars park here every weekday blocking the dropped kerbs making access impossible for anyone in a wheelchair or mobility scooter. This affected my husband before he died three years ago. He reported it to the council, someone came to see him about it and told him that it was illegal to park there and that double yellow lines would be placed there, where are they? The police are aware of our problems, they have been called on several occasions. The present situation is dangerous and I would ask that you think again. Yellow lines on bends and corners and the turn-round area, a limit on parking times, residents parking only would be better options.
53	H14	Lyncombe Hill	1			I wish to object to this order as far as it concerns the planned withdrawal of a residents parking space in Lyncombe Hill. The order refers to the interests of road safety. I fail to see that the reduction in the length of the chicane that currently exists can possibly increase road safety. The heavy commuting and school run traffic already induces games of chicken and if the chicane is to be reduced these will simply become even more aggressive and dangerous. If you have scientifically proven evidence that reducing the length of a chicane increases road safety please let me have details. You may also like to consider conducting vehicle speed checks in Lyncombe Hill as the 20 MPH limit is completely ignored. The second issue is the existing scarcity of resident parking bays in Lyncombe Hill. The proposal may be in the interest of an individual resident but is not in the wider public interest. Two such bays were removed not so long ago from the top of Lyncombe Hill. Currently spaces are at a premium and parking on double yellow lines is not so rare as it used to be. This in itself reduces road safety as parking is often near junctions or opposite garages. The proposal will increase such problems as well as public annoyance.

54	M16	Claverton Down Road			1	Further to the notice opposite our house (facing Claverton Down Road) dated 5th May 2016, I would like to request that you consider an additional proposal to the parking restrictions referred to on Claverton Down Road. I would request that there is ALSO included in the plans - No Stopping on Entrance Markings into Flatwoods Road (directly off Claverton Down Road). There has been a continued issue with cars parking in the entrance to Flatwoods Road over recent years, particularly with the expansion of the National Trust play area as well as Ralph Allen School pupil collections. This creates a real safety issue will congestion at the entrance directly off Claverton Down Road into Flatwoods Road. The amount of road parking (on Flatwoods Road) also creates a safety issue in the use of our driveway, when entering and leaving, due to restricted vision on either side of the drive entrance, as well as cars often parked directly opposite our drive, where manoeuvring becomes problematic/impossible (with the risk of cars entering the road at speed off Claverton Down Road). I would request therefore that single white line entrance lines are planned for, and which extend beyond the first two driveways (no. 8 and 51), are included. This will enable the displaced cars from the Claverton Down Road parking restrictions to be prevented from causing a dangerous blockage to Flatwoods Road.
55	J11	Bathwick Hill			1	Further to receiving the above notice I am in favour of Residents parking as parking on our section of Bathwick Hill is so congested and used frequently during the week by commuters.
56	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens			1	I am writing to object to the treatment you are proposing for the North side of Calton Gardens. As you are probably aware this was a feature of the plan when Residents' Parking was being implemented in 2001. Let me assure you that it took only a brief conversation with the Policy and Programmes Manager in charge of the implementation, Rab Smith, for him to convince himself that it would prove a fiasco to continue with the proposed double yellow lines in front of 15 - 52 Calton Gardens. Indeed it was he who came up with what we have had for the last 15 years. When I say "fiasco" I am not referring just to Calton Gardens but also to Alexandra Rd, St Mark's Rd, Southcot Place and Lyncombe Hill as the residents of these addresses investigate each other's streets in search of a (non-existent) parking place. In fact the Residents' Parking in Calton Gardens has always provided an overspill for residents of the other addresses mentioned; it is the permitted parking on the North side that provides the flexibility to make this feasible. The South side of Calton Gardens opposite 25 - 52 is divided into two sections. Opposite 25 -28 is a 25 metre stretch where parking is limited to 2 hours. This takes 4 or 5 cars depending on their sizes and how considerately they have been parked. The second stretch opposite 29 - 52 is Residents' Parking and extends for 159.4 metres (I take these figures - 25 and 159.4 - from the published plans). There is therefore the capacity for between 26 and 32 cars in the Residents' Parking section. I have seen a planning guideline that suggests that contiguous parking places should allow 6 metres per vehicle. If this is the case then the capacity would be consistent with my lower estimate i.e. 26. The number of houses in Calton Gardens is 38; it is possible that not every house will have a car but it is clear that some houses have two. Problems parking the cars of those who live in Calton Gardens are inevitable before considering demand from the other neighbouring streets as well as visitors, both domestic as well as business.

57	J11	Bathwick Hill	1		<p>I wish to strongly oppose the proposed imposition of parking restrictions in this area. Owners of properties in this area already have their own private parking in their driveways, front yards, and garages; rarely do they need to park their own vehicles at the side of the road. Although such facilities are useful when one has visitors or contractors working on the properties, at all other times this roadside parking amenity can be efficiently used by the public when wishing to access Bathwick Fields National Trust property, or indeed by the public who wish to do the environmentally friendly thing of parking outside the city centre and walking or taking the bus into town. It is vital to have such facilities if we are to minimise pollution and congestion in the city centre, plus allow the city's businesses (tax paying) to thrive. Please note that restricted parking areas further down the hill are very under-utilised (typically much less than 50%, during the working week). Higher up the hill, where unlike lower properties, most residents already have private parking provision, the utilisation rates would plummet to well under 25% were the restrictions to be imposed. Furthermore, this stealth tax would raise little money for the council given that owners do not require additional parking in the street (our car is kept in the garage when not in use). Your letter states the following pros for introducing restrictions on Bathwick Hill. As previously stated, restricting parking here would further deteriorate air quality in the city centre. I strongly recommend that existing free parking is retained in the area on grounds of safety, pollution reduction, congestion reduction and to maintain the amenity value of the area.</p>
58	H14	Lyncombe Hill	1		<p>I strongly object to the proposed removal of the resident parking bay in Lyncombe Hill on grounds of road safety and for the loss of much-needed residential parking in this area. Road safety: The major road alterations which have improved Widcombe Parade as a neighbourhood centre have resulted in changes in the pattern of local road usage and an increase in the number of drivers using Lyncombe Hill at certain times of the day, including the school run, and at speeds very obviously in excess of the speed limit. This speed limit in Lyncombe Hill, as in other surrounding residential roads, was recently reduced to a widely-welcomed 20 mph in the interests of road safety but enforcing this speed limit is a challenge. One of the most effective (and cost-effective) ways to do this is to reduce the width of the road at regular intervals by allowing on-street parking on both or, as in the case of Lyncombe Hill, on alternate sides of the road, depending on its width. The proposal to take away one of two residential parking bays on the east side of Lyncombe Hill would reduce the effectiveness of the existing chicane, contrary to the interests of road safety. The reasoning for the proposal to remove this bay, therefore, is not soundly based and cannot be in the public interest. Loss of residential parking bay: There is very limited on-street parking in this area and the residential parking bays are heavily used, The loss of even one of these bays would create unnecessary problems for residents. I very much hope you will withdraw this part of the proposed order.</p>

59	H14	Lyncombe Hill	1			<p>I can see no benefit to the public for the proposed removal of a residents parking space at the top of Lyncombe Hill. " The order is proposed so as 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."It is important to note that this is a residential street widely used by school children and the priority therefore must be the safety of pedestrians, not facilitating traffic. What is the point of instigating a 20 mph speed limit, widely ignored when possible, and then making changes which will allow cars and vans to go faster? How does this avoid danger to persons or other traffic? Cutting the parking space from two to one will undoubtedly do this as I have frequently observed it makes it easier to manoeuvre and check oncoming traffic particularly going downhill. Making it easier will encourage more and faster traffic when proposals should be doing the reverse in residential roads. Although our household only has one car, it is not unusual to have to park at the top of the hill and on occasion I have taken the only remaining space in the time limited bay. The loss of even one of these bays would therefore create unnecessary problems for residents.</p> <p>Please withdraw this part of the proposed order</p>
60	E19 / F19	Kempthorne Lane	1			<p>There is a considerable issue with outsider parking on this development, and I am happy for the frontage (as indicated) to have no parking. All of the residents on this section have two parking spaces I believe, so no undue hardship, and I suspect they are the instigators of the scheme. However, if there was a proposal to project the 'no parking' further (or all of Kempthorne) then there would be serious issues, as many of the properties only have one parking space, which is obviously inadequate, therefore some parking outside of the houses is essential, as there is nowhere else to park. I would therefore seriously object, if there was any further proposal / extension of 'no parking' to the 'rear' section of Kempthorne Lane.</p>

61	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1			<p>I'm writing to express my concerns and objection to the proposed introduction of Double Yellow lines directly outside our properties in Calton Gardens. The current parking situation works extremely well and I really do not understand why this amendment is being suggested? Safety Concerns, the current situation allowing people to park directly outside their own properties actually reduces the speed that vehicles; (especially delivery vans) travel down the road. At the points where cars are parked opposite each other, you see a noticeable reduction in their speed. There is adequate room for refuse vehicles and emergency vehicles to pass easily between parked cars. At most times the number of households that have cars parked outside is fairly low so there are no passing issues. By removing the parking totally on one side of the road, it will only encourage drivers to travel at greater speeds; requiring the introduction of speed management, such as 'Speed Bumps' deployed in others areas nearby. I would also suggest it will require a raised kerb to be introduced, outside the houses. Capacity Concern, removing the ability of residents and their visitors to park outside their properties will definitely create an issue that currently does not exist; there certainly not be enough capacity for residents of Calton Gardens; especially during the evenings and weekends. This proposed change will also penalise working people who arrive home after 6pm, who will be forced to seek a space some considerable distance away from their homes. For people like myself with mobility issues this will be a tangible problem due to the steepness of surrounding roads and shortage of viable alternatives. I only have one car myself and my first choice is to use my permit space at all times subject to one being available but a number of my neighbours have multiple cars, which again needs to be factored into the capacity issue in the road. Garages, Whilst I appreciate all the properties have Integral Garages, these garages have not been designed for a typical modern car, as they are too narrow and short.</p>
62	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1			<p>I wish to record my objection to the proposed painting of double-yellow lines along Calton Gardens BA2 4QG. I would further request that the Resident and Visitor Spaces opposite be properly designated through parallel white lines allocated by house number and patrolled accordingly to prevent others from abusing these thereby leaving residents no option but to park along the road.</p>

63	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1		<p>1. There is insufficient space to accommodate the demand for resident and visitor parking in the Zone 3 bays to the south of Calton Gardens. The bay is approximately 200meters long, current guidance would indicate this is sufficient space for 33 vehicles at 6meters per vehicle. Elimination of parking on the northern side of the road will cause problems in both Calton Gardens and nearby roads as the resident bays are used as overflow parking by nearby Zones 3 residents. 2. The proposed resident parking provision does not meet current guidelines in terms of number of spaces per household. Current guidance would indicate a minimum of 1.75 non-allocated vehicle spaces should be provided for each terrace house. This would indicate a minimum requirement of 67 spaces for the 38 terrace houses in Calton Gardens. 3. If the resident's parking in Calton Gardens is full there is no viable nearby alternative parking in resident parking Zone 3. Holloway and adjacent roads are in Zone 4 therefore unavailable for use. Residents of nearby Zone 3 roads e.g. Calton Road, Alexandra Road, Lyncombe Hill, Southcot Place use Calton Gardens as overflow parking as the resident's parking bays in those roads are often full. 4. The road is a cul-de-sac and does not suffer from traffic congestion or access problems for vehicles. We do not experience congestion or speed related problems therefore there is no need to restrict the existing parking. 5. The "KEEP CLEAR" white lines deal adequately with non-resident parking. We do not experience problems with non-resident parking on the northern side of Calton Gardens. 6. Lack of parking within our property boundary. There is no parking provision within the curtilage of our property other than the garage which is too small to use for a modern family vehicle. 7. Restricted access to garages if parking bays are full. If the residents parking bays are in use it will not be possible to utilise the integral garages in the properties with smaller vehicles due to the turning space available in front of the garage and the width of the garage door. This will add to the number of vehicles needing street parking. We would add that the removal of parking outside the houses will make the transportation of elderly difficult.</p>
64	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1		<p>I am writing to object in the strongest terms to the above proposal to restrict residents' parking in Calton Gardens, Bath and not allow them, or their friends and family, to park outside their own houses. I understand that B&NES are keen to improve the parking situation in Bath, but rather than easing the parking problem, imposing this restriction would make matters much worse. This is because: 1. There are many more residents with cars than there are designated resident parking areas in the immediate surrounding streets, including Calton Road (where there are no parking spaces at all), Calton Row and Alexandra Road. What spaces there are quickly fill up and those residents then rely on Calton Gardens as an overspill. 2. The number of residents with cars in Calton Gardens alone is far more than the number of resident permit parking spaces in Calton Gardens. This is partly why residents choose to park outside their own houses. If those spaces became unavailable, the competition for spaces, from Calton Gardens residents and from residents from nearby streets will cause chaos in the street. There is nowhere else to go! 3. The issue of cars blocking the pavement is not serious because most residents are very mindful of this and make sure that when parking there is enough room for pedestrians to walk on the pavement. Calton Gardens is a cul de sac and there is very little moving traffic and no through traffic in the street. This means that it is safe for people to walk in the road on the rare occasion they need to.</p>

65	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1		<p>1 We do not see any danger to the public due to the existing situation of cars parked within the double white lines alongside the houses. There is sufficient space between the cars parked alongside the houses and the cars parked opposite the houses for cars, delivery vans, dust bin lorries, recycle bin lorries, fire-engines, ambulance etc. The turning circle is always left free and therefore there is no problem for the traffic.</p> <p>2 It is cul-de-sac and therefore there is no through traffic other than resident's cars.</p> <p>3 It is a 20 mph zone. 4 Pedestrians are able to walk comfortably and most of the time prefer to walk on the road as it is clear of traffic. When and if they do meet traffic there is ample space for them to step aside. 5 Garages are too small for modern day family cars and therefore they have to be parked somewhere outside. The current practise of parking within the white lines works well. 6 Even if one manages to park a small car in the garage if a car is parked opposite a garage it is not easy to put the car in or to get it out of the garage and one hopes there will always be a gap to make the move comfortable. We are lucky to be able to park our car in the garage albeit with some difficulty. 7 If the resident's cars are not allowed to park outside the houses this will require considerably more number of parking bays opposite the houses for parking. There aren't enough parking spaces opposite the houses to accommodate resident's and their visitor's cars. Others who can park at Zone 3 also use these spaces as an over flow. 8 Currently Zone 3 parking restrictions are Mon – Sat; 8am – 6 pm. After 6 pm anybody can park. This means that when a resident returns home after 6 pm if they cannot park alongside their house they would find there is no parking space for him / her to park his /her car. 9 Existing situation of KEEP CLEAR white lines keeps the non-residents at bay and allows the residents to park their cars in that area and this works well.</p>
----	-----------	----------------	---	--	---

66	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1			<p>The houses have garages (designed for the smaller cars of the early 1970s) which no longer provide a viable or popular option for car storage in this century. Over these past eight years we have seen an increase in the number of cars parking along Calton Gardens by residents – I am sure this is in line with vehicle increases across the country. As a result, the Calton Garden residents' cars could not be accommodated on just one side of the road. If this proposal were to go ahead then these 'remaining cars' would need to be parked elsewhere – thereby causing a parking/congestion problem in other parts of Bath, something I know is a priority for the Council to reduce, not increase. Calton Gardens is a quiet street and clearly is a cul-de-sac; it is not a through street, the only traffic is that of residents arriving or leaving their homes (and of a minority of visitors). Car drivers are respectful and sensible, honouring and appreciative of the recent 20 mph speed restriction, I genuinely think this is, in part, due to parked vehicles on both sides of the street. Many pedestrians are comfortable and confident that they are safe either on the pavement or in the street, walking young children, exercising their dogs or indeed dragging their Bath-visiting luggage, possibly to Bear Flat or other nearby destinations – in the whole time we have lived here, I am sure the Council can confirm, there has never been an accident or injury to any party. I am confident that the parking on both sides of the road in Calton Gardens causes no concern to the significant majority of the Bath population nor to its many visitors. However, I am confident that a parking ban along one length of this road will have significant and negative consequences on a number of the residents with a negative knock-on effect to neighbouring streets if Calton Gardens' residents were to park elsewhere. I find myself wondering if this is the Council's attempt to gain a greater revenue from Permit Parking – currently those parking directly outside their house technically do not need to pay. If this is the case, then a more logical solution could be to consider Permit Parking on both sides of the street.</p>
----	-----------	----------------	---	--	--	---

67	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1			<p>Please register our objection to the proposal that the "Keep Clear " notices and Single white lines on the north side of Calton Gardens be replaced by Double yellow lines. We ask that the following points be considered before a final decision is made :-</p> <p>1) The available permit parking is used by all the houses in Calton Gardens and we believe some in Calton Walk. The parking areas to the eastern end are used by residents and their visitors and probably, since these spaces are not specifically designated, by drivers who live outside Zone 3. The integral garages are narrow and modern cars are wider than in 1975 so accessing and egressing is difficult and well nigh impossible when cars are parked directly opposite. 2) The resident parking bays in other sectors of Zone 3, principally St. Marks Road, Alexandra Road and Lyncombe Hill are usually fully parked up and drivers from these areas migrate to Calton Gardens for their parking. Further pressure then comes from households with more than one car, builders and other tradespeople, deliveries, visitors and any others requiring legitimate access. 3) We have not experienced any problems with non resident parking on the northern side of Calton Gardens. It is a cul de sac, there is no through traffic and drivers respect the conditions. It is probable that drivers are more cautious when vehicles are parked on both sides of the road. Furthermore, my wife has a Blue badge and removing the ability for us to park outside our house will make it very difficult for both of us. In summary, removing the facility for residents to continue using the northern side of Calton Gardens as they have done since the residents parking scheme was introduced will result in an even greater imbalance between the number of cars needing spaces and the very limited number of spaces available. We request you reject this proposal and agree to maintain the status quo.</p>
68	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1			<p>We are concerned about the proposed removal of a parking space, on the opposite side of the road just south of where this drive joins Lyncombe Hill, for two reasons, these being (1) safety and (2) the loss of a parking space. (1) Safety - We have observed that when the present 2 car parking bay is free cars both up and down the hill go noticeably faster past the drive entrance. This makes it more difficult and more dangerous when we are driving out and also more generally for pedestrians crossing the road and other drivers as well as the speedier ones. Our judgement is that the 20 mph limit is widely ignored. It is the chicane that improves the safety. There are often 2 cars in this bay so when one leaves the chicane effect still works because one is still there. If this bay is reduced to a single car space then when it leaves there will be no chicane effect slowing down the traffic until another car uses the space. Reducing the 2 spaces to 1 will leave no car in that position to create the chicane effect for longer periods thereby increasing the danger for everyone. If this parking bay has to be reduced in length then can a bollard mounted on a raised plinth be placed immediately south of the shortened bay? This would mean that the chicane would be there 24/7 and this would actually enhance safety compared with now. It would not need to protrude as much as a car's width. Its presence would make it much safer for children to leave the pedestrian gates of the 2 houses opposite the drive entrance which have no pavement on their side. (2) The loss of a parking space - At peak times all the present parking bay spaces are occupied. To remove even one space will make it more difficult for our neighbours to park because it will make the periods of full occupation arrive sooner and last longer.</p>

69	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1			<p>1. There is insufficient space to accommodate the demand for resident and visitor parking in the Zone 3 bays to the south of Calton Gardens. The bay is approximately 200meters long, current guidance would indicate this is sufficient space for 33 vehicles at 6meters per vehicle. Elimination of parking on the northern side of the road will cause problems in both Calton Gardens and nearby roads as the resident bays are used as overflow parking by nearby Zones 3 residents. 2. The proposed resident parking provision does not meet current guidelines in terms of number of spaces per household. Current guidance would indicate a minimum of 1.75 non-allocated vehicle spaces should be provided for each terrace house. This would indicate a minimum requirement of 67 spaces for the 38 terrace houses in Calton Gardens. 3. If the resident's parking in Calton Gardens is full there is no viable nearby alternative parking in resident parking Zone 3. Holloway and adjacent roads are in Zone 4 therefore unavailable for use. Residents of nearby Zone 3 roads e.g. Calton Road, Alexandra Road, Lyncombe Hill, Southcot Place use Calton Gardens as overflow parking as the resident's parking bays in those roads are often full. 4. The road is a cul-de-sac and does not suffer from traffic congestion or access problems for vehicles. We do not experience congestion or speed related problems therefore there is no need to restrict the existing parking. 5. The "KEEP CLEAR" white lines deal adequately with non-resident parking. We do not experience problems with non-resident parking on the northern side of Calton Gardens. 6. Lack of parking within our property boundary. There is no parking provision within the curtilage of our property other than the garage which is too small to use for a modern family vehicle. 7. Restricted access to garages if parking bays are full. If the residents parking bays are in use it will not be possible to utilise the integral garages in the properties with smaller vehicles due to the turning space available in front of the garage and the width of the garage door. This will add to the number of vehicles needing street parking. We currently park one small vehicle in our garage as do some other residents.</p>
70	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1			<p>The length of the road available for permit parking in Calton Gardens is about 160 meters and has to accommodate the parking for all the houses in Calton Gardens plus the seven in Calton Walk who can park in Zone 3, plus the residents of Alexandra Road, Lyncombe Hill and St Mark's Road who bring their cars to park in Calton Gardens. This means there is insufficient room for every household to park in the permit zone, let alone those who own and need 2 cars, their visitors, delivery lorries, builder working in the houses, care workers, utility engineers etc. We have a garage but it is extremely difficult to negotiate turning into the narrow entrance and exiting from it, especially for those houses where the road narrows from 37-45. Yellow lines will prevent maintenance and cleaning of cars outside the house, and if it was possible to park opposite would mean cables trailing across the road. and would be dangerous. When the permit scheme was introduced, the council then proposed a single yellow line, it was accepted that our road needed the extra space on both sides to accommodate all cars who are entitled to park. We in Calton Gardens have no drive and so the the council painted a white line, which prevents commuters from using the road but allowed residents to do so. It is a quiet cul-de-sac with slow moving 20 mph traffic and any cars parked on each side of the road do not pose a problem to pedestrians. I was using a mobility scooter for over 6 months and encountered no problems with the traffic in our road.</p>

71	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1			<p>The Order is being made : 1) so as to avoid danger to persons or other traffic using the road. We understand that the council first tried to implement double yellow lines in front of our houses in 2000. What evidence has come to light since then that there is a danger to persons or traffic using the road in order to support the implementation of double yellow lines? Have there been accidents, complaints, problems reported to the council? We ask for a copy of any such evidence. If there is none, how does the council justify its decision to implement double yellow lines? We believe that having parking down both sides slows the traffic down. Our road is a cul de sac so the traffic is usually slow and light anyway. These measures seem disproportionate to the location. Our road is a cul de sac where most people walk down the middle of the road anyway. 2) To facilitate the passage on the road of any class or (sic) traffic. We assume you mean "of" traffic. What evidence do you hold to support and justify double yellow lines on the basis that the current parking arrangements do not allow clear passage of traffic? If you do not hold any, then these measures seem unjustified and disproportionate to the location. Many of the houses on the road are being done up – we are not aware of any problems with access. Huge delivery and builders' lorries come up our small road, as well, we believe, as fire engines. As our road is a cul de sac it is only residents who use it, there is no through traffic to consider. Most of the traffic is on foot and bicycle. Traffic goes too fast sometimes anyway. We are concerned it will go faster if the road feels even more open due to double yellow lines. This could endanger our children who can play freely on the street as it is a cul de sac. We are a cul de sac – if the residents disagree with these measures they should hold precedence over the council as there is no through traffic to consider other than bicycles and people on foot. Parking on our road is shared with the traffic-free Calton Walk. The addition of double yellow lines all down one side of the road will put unreasonable pressure on residents for the two roads being able to park their cars.</p>
72	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1			<p>I would like to write to express my objection to the proposed instigation of double yellow lines. This would cause great inconvenience to residents and there are no problems with the width of the road without double yellow lines; it can easily fit cars and other vehicles, and the bay at the end of Calton Gardens allows for sufficient turning space.</p>
73	J11	Bathwick Hill		1		<p>I am writing to say that I am in favour of your proposal to extend the parking zone to Residents Parking with Limited Parking for 4 hours (no return for 1 hour).</p>

74	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1			<p>We object to the part of PEV11751 which will permanently prevent parking on the north side of Calton Gardens. The length of road available for permit parking in Calton Gardens is about 160 metres. This has to accommodate the parking for all the houses in Calton Gardens plus the seven in Calton Walk who are entitled to park in Zone 3. It also has to cope with the residents of Alexandra Road, Lyncombe Hill and St Mark's Road who bring their cars to park this road. The two parking areas at the east end of the road are used by the Calton Walk residents, their visitors and opportunistic commuters. This means there is insufficient room for every household to park in the permit zone, let alone those who own and need 2 cars, their visitors, delivery lorries, builders working in the houses, care workers, utility engineers etc. We pay £100 a year for one slot somewhere in zone 3. We each have a garage but when there is a car parked opposite the garage it is extremely difficult to negotiate turning into the narrow entrance and exiting from it, especially for those houses where the road narrows from 37 to 45. Yellow lines will prevent maintenance and cleaning outside the house. If we were able to park opposite, stretching hoses and electrical cables across the road would be dangerous. For those of us who were here when the permit scheme was introduced, when the council then proposed a single yellow line, it was accepted that our road needed the extra space on both sides to accommodate all cars who are entitled to park. The residents on Holloway and Calton Walk have a garage and a drive-way which means they can accommodate their own car plus a visitor/second car without having to park in the road. We, in Calton Gardens, have no drive and so the council painted a white line, which prevents commuters from using the road, but allowed residents to do so. It is a quiet cul-de-sac with slow moving traffic and any cars parked on each side of the road do not pose a problem to pedestrians.</p>
75	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1			<p>I wish to object to the proposed introduction of no parking in lengths of Calton Gardens. There will not be sufficient parking for residents of the street if we cannot park on both sides of the road. I would also like to be able to park outside my own house.</p>
76	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1			<p>I would like to protest in the plans regarding the no parking zone in Calton Gardens. There are 37 houses just in Calton Gardens along with many more residents on Calton Walk who park their vehicles in the available spaces on Calton Gardens. It has been calculated that there are only 30 parking spaces available if the 'keep clear' signs are removed from the front of our properties. Also, to make this plan seem even more ridiculous, many home owners own more than one car and residents of Alexandra Road park their cars in Calton Gardens due to the lack of spaces in their road. The houses were constructed in the 1970's when vehicles manufactured were a lot smaller than today's cars. So the garages we own will not accommodate our cars - my mondeo does not even fit through the door. Another reason is due to the lack of space for residents cars, where would visitors now be able to park and more importantly where would we be able to park if all the spaces are taken. There are never any spaces in Alexander Road, St Marks Road or Lyncombe Hill so there will not be anywhere to park</p>

77	J18	Church Road		1	<p>Peter Bailey, Area Traffic Engineer, called round yesterday. He was very helpful indeed and has already provided us with a drawing showing the proposed new lining outside our house, outside Glenburnie and in the cul de sac. He has marked out sufficient space to allocate two new parking spaces outside Glenburnie when the zig zags disappear and he worked it out very carefully so that our own exit from our driveway is hopefully not obstructed by future parking. He commented that the double yellow lines currently proposed for the cul de sac turning area would be better observed and also easier to police than simple white keep clear lines. He explained that there will be no need to erect additional “no parking” signs on metal posts. This being the case, we are happy to take his guidance and feel much more relaxed about having double yellow lines in place.</p>
78	L17/M17	Claverton Down Road		1	<p>Our view is that the current proposal of removing all parking would significantly reduce public access to the Claverton Down countryside, limiting the impact of our recent National Trust funded initiatives that have successfully delivered against the Council’s health and well-being agenda as well as delivering on our own strategy to encourage more people to get outdoors and closer to nature. At our recent public Residents Discussion Forum concerns were expressed from Flatwoods residents, many of whom had not commented on the proposals as they had not been aware of the consultation process. The feedback was that, by removing parking options on the main road, there would be a big impact on their local roads as people may instead seek parking in their residential area. We would ask that you consider reducing the restrictions so that the scheme reverts to the staggered parking plan originally proposed. This could result in maintaining access to Claverton Down whilst enabling safe passing spaces when cars are parked on the road I do think the restrictions will create an issue for residents at Flatwoods and we will certainly look at what we can do to help manage this by seeking alternative parking options for any events that we plan on Claverton Down – such as at the Sulis Club. It would be great to have your support to facilitate this and indeed we have already been looking at ways to take this forward. Do you have any contacts at the university that might help us? The Bath Clinic already kindly provides parking for Park Run every Saturday, but I understand that this is only possible because it is a low use period of the week and so they wouldn’t necessarily be able to offer the space at other times during the week. Just to clarify we wanted to explore the option for staggered passing places whilst acknowledging that we are not experts in road safety. If the conclusion is that double yellow lines are required for road safety then of course that has to take precedence. It is really helpful to hear the process you have gone through to reach your conclusion and in light of this, I would like to clarify our statement below to make clear that if the passing place proposal is not considered to be a safe option then we would not object to double yellow lines on both sides of the road.</p>

79	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1			1) Why upset the status quo which has been in place and has worked well for residents for over 10 years? What has changed to promote this proposal? 2) Should double lines be introduced, this would mean that Calton Gardens residents and thir guests will be forced to try and find parking in the already overcrowded nearby streets. 3) In Calton Gardens, we are at the far extremity of Zone 3 and residents along the street cannot use the nearby Zone 4 if our own Zone becomes overcrowded. 4) I'am in my 60's and suffer with the onset of arthritis and increasingly find it difficult to walk long distances. 5) Considering the numbers of vehicles now parking on Calton Gardens, including those from the already overstretched nearby streets, there is already insufficient parking. The proposed double yellow lines on the north side would make things much more difficult. 6) Households along Calton Gardens often have more than one car which increases parking requirements from those residents. 7) intermittent parking on both sides of the street that is currently the case helps to reduce vehicle speeds.
80	M16	Claverton Down Road		1		1) The road is not particularly wide. It does not have the capacity to accommodate parked cars. A single car effectively reduces the road to a single lane. 2) One parked car is capable of producing tailbacks of up to 3 quarters of a mile. 3) For many years Wessex Water and Ralph Allen School have requested that their staff, employees and students do not park on Claverton Down Road. 4) BANES appear to have accepted responsibility for public safety with these proposals and someone is either going to be seriously injured or possibly killed if it isnt implemented. 5) Between the Bath Clinic and Wessex Water is the fastest stretch of Claverton Down Road. 6) Cars frequently park on the pavement forcing pedestrians with wheel chairs or push chairs to enter the road. 7) Emergency vehicles are obstructed by tail backs caused by parked vehicles.
81	I19	Combe Road Close	1			I'am particularly worried about the proposed parking restrictions in Combe Road Close. As a resident of Combe Down I know how difficult it can be to park. There are not enough spaces and I urge the Council to do something about helping people to park. Restricted parking here would inconvenience neighbours and visitors and force drivers to park further away.
82	H14	Lyncombe Hill	1			Parking bays are already stretched to their capacity limit on may occasions. The hill lost 3 bays at the top on safety grounds some years ago, and to lose two more would indeed lead to serious shortage. When residents parking was introduced some time ago the staggered alternating layout between one side of the road and the other was created to reduce traffic speeds. The removal of this bay is being requested so that a resident can use their large campervan. They should widen their own driveway entrance.
83	G13 / H13	Calton Gardens	1			These proposals will leave us without enough parking spaces on the south side. It has provoked a lot of anger so please abandon it if you wish to maintain goodwill.
Totals:			71	6	5	



