

Number	Plan	Road / Street	Object	Support	Support In part	Neither	Comments
1	E13	Second Avenue	1				<p>1. Enforcement. Most of these measures appear to be the replacement of white line "avoid parking" to yellow line "parking prohibited" markings. However, as has been demonstrated for the past several years, road regulations in these areas are not enforced. One only has to stand outside St. John's School on Oldfield Lane to see the flagrant abuse good manners and behaviour by parents who drive their children to-and-from school. However, there is no police resource to move cars obstructing the lanes, driveways and garages, and those parked on "zig-zag" markings. Money was spent erecting 20mph speed limit signs around Oldfield Park. I have not heard of a single speeding conviction because there is no resource to enforce this speed limit.</p> <p>2. Emergency vehicle access. The order suggests some of these changes are to give access to emergency vehicles on call. This is disingenuous. Emergency vehicles will "dozer" obstructing cars out of the way when they are on call to an emergency.</p>
2	F13 / F14	Bloomfield Avenue	1				<p>1. The cars that currently park along this stretch of road (mainly commuters who leave their cars there for the day) would simply park along the other side of the road (in front of houses numbering 38-42). If the commuters park there instead, we will be unable to drive off our own driveways and access the road due to insufficient available road width. Cars parked outside number 38 leave us effectively housebound. Furthermore, if we were able to get off our driveways with our cars, getting back onto them would be virtually impossible. 2. The pavement outside houses 38-42 is used predominantly by primary school aged children at the exact same time that the commuters park their cars. This side of the road is favoured as it offers excellent visibility down the road for kids and adults. A row of parked cars would block that view and the parking cars would present a hazard for the children, some of whom are as young as 3. 3. Parking cars outside houses 38-42 would also present a hazard to motorists using that stretch of road. The traffic both up and downhill would be forced to drive (single lane) along the stretch of the road at the point of least visibility as the curvature of the road creates a blind spot. The proposed painting of the yellow lines on the road along our stretch of pavement presents several problems for us as residents but also significant hazards for pedestrians and road users, therefore we strongly request the scheme be reconsidered and other solutions to the parking issues found.</p>
3	F13 / F14	Bloomfield Avenue				1	<p>The segment of road where you are suggesting a Single Yellow Line is frequently a source of hold-ups as traffic attempts to negotiate parked cars both day and night. The current proposal would improve access during weekdays, but still cause issues at weekend and evenings. I strongly suggest that this proposal be changed to not allow parking at any time on this stretch of road. I would also suggest double yellow lines running down the right hand side of Bloomfield Avenue from Bear Flat as people frequently park on this side of the road (the same side as my property) by mounting the pavement. This makes child buggy and wheelchair access difficult without leaving the pavement and passing the parked cars in the middle of the road. It also causes issues for the care home at Fir Lodge 91 Bloomfield Avenue who use a small bus to pick-up and drop of residents daily and often struggle to pass down from Bear Flat through Bloomfield Avenue to Oldfield Road with cars parked on the right hand side of the road as it takes this path.</p>

4	F13 / F14	Bloomfield Avenue			1	I wish to add to your proposed no parking at the entrance to Bloomfield Avenue that such an action would make the drivers of the cars parking there at the moment just move to the other side of the road and park outside no 43A and no 42A restricting our access and blocking the ability to view oncoming traffic when exiting our driveways and severely restricting safety when trying to access our driveways, therefore would it not be prudent to extend the no parking restrictions to all sides of the road including the opposite bend outside no 43? The existing advisory white lines seem to encourage parking as parking on the advisory white lines cannot be enforced.
5	F13 / F14	Bloomfield Avenue			1	The plan to introduce a no parking period from 8 A.M. to 6 P.M. as shown on map F14 on the corner of Bloomfield Avenue and Maple Gardens should be welcomed however I fear it will only make the problem worse, as those people who currently park during the day on that side of the road will simply now park on the opposite side of the road. Currently this is not possible, as to do so would block the road completely, as the area you wish to restrict opposite is always occupied and to park on both sides would not allow the passage of lorries or refuse collection vehicles. However by restricting the one side of the road would move the parking to the other side. This would cause safety issues with poor visibility for people turning out of Maple Gardens. Could I respectfully request this is taken into account when auctioning this proposal. Currently there is a keep clear area on the corner of Maple Gardens and Bloomfield Avenue on the opposite side to your proposed area for restriction but I fear this is not sufficient in relation to the proposal and where this current restriction finishes to where the proposed new area outside of No.40 starts would create a number of parking locations causing the safety concerns I have mentioned above. However if this area of restriction was also extended to join up with the proposal for restriction commencing from No. 40 this could alleviate this issue and my safety concerns.
6	E13	Third Avenue	1			Where are residents meant to park if one side of the road is double yellow lines? And this is the case in all neighbouring roads too? We already are in competition with other people who park in our road - students, people visiting the Moorfields pub, people going to St John's school, people going to St Alphege's church, people using the gyms or outdoor pitches, commuters, people shopping on Moorland Road,..... How far away from my house will I need to go to find a parking space? How much time will it take driving round and round looking for a parking space? If (and I really hope this is NOT going to go ahead!) the Wansdyke Business Centre at the end of the road is converted, and we have nearly 200 more students in the area - who are told they are not allowed to bring cars, but obviously are going to - what then? Please can someone have some sense and not allow either these parking restrictions nor the additional students in the Wansdyke Business Centre!
7	E11	Denmark Road	1			It would seriously impact on our clients and on all volunteers to not be able to park within the immediate vicinity of Hedley Hall.

	8 E15, D14, D15	Moorfields Road and The Oval	1			<p>At present there is an insufficient amount of parking spaces for residents living in this road, & both ward councillors, Mr Sandry & Mr McGall are fully aware of this, it has been a problem for years. I have talked to, & emailed Mr Sandry about the parking problems, & even proposed some ideas of my own, but no feedback was ever received.</p> <p>At present, there is parking on one side of the road only. Driving from The Oval junction, parking is on the left hand side. Just past Willow Green, parking is on the right hand side. Spaces were lost recently when traffic chicanes were needlessly built in the road, with the loss of parking spaces. These were introduced to help adults with children cross the road, where a speed limit of 20mph had already been introduced. Last year I was granted a disabled bay, but fear that with more parking restrictions, other motorists will be tempted to park there leaving me nowhere to park when I return from work in the evenings. When it comes to the local elections, candidates standing for election across Bath always tell the electorate that solving parking problems is high on their lists of priorities, yet here we have two councillors creating more problems, not eradicating them. It isn't clear in the Public Notice column what is actually being proposed, but an article in the Bath Chronicle says that safety is one of the measures being considered. Surely yellow lines aren't going to be painted on the road where vehicles currently park, which is what happened recently in Chantry Mead Road forcing residents to park in an already overcrowded Moorfields Road?</p>
9	E15	Moorfields Road	1			<p>I would like to raise my objection to the above proposal, mainly for the Moorfields Road part of the scheme. Parking is already a major issue on both Chantry Mead and Moorfields Road, and it is often impossible to actually find a parking space. Additionally, many of my neighbours are tradesmen, and the nature of their employment means they require a van which has to be parked on street overnight. If the parking allocation is reduced, this will simply move the parking issue to nearby roads, as they will need to park somewhere. Having lived in this property for over 6 years, I can honestly say that I see no advantage to this proposal whatsoever. Traffic moves freely, and us, the residents who live there, feel this will only cause more issues than gains.</p>

10	D14 / D15	The Oval	1			<p>We are writing concerning an issue which has been troubling us for many years now and has recently become ridiculous. We live in a cul-de-sac off of the Oval (Cedar Grove), one of many similar. Parking down these cul-de-sacs as well as on the Oval itself has for many years been a problem. Drivers who have to negotiate the Oval at and near the entrance to our cul-de-sac must be sick and tired of the problems poor parking provision in the area creates. We witness daily - cars, buses, lorries and even emergency vehicles, having to reverse, mount the pavement and eventually inch past each other. We attended meetings held about this issue many years ago, with the then ward councillor Ruth Griffiths. The social housing landlords at the time were Bath City Council (may have been Somer), who did install many parking spaces in the front gardens of their tenants homes, around the Oval and in most of the cul-de-sacs. By doing quite a few at the same time, costs were kept down and added to the rents. None of the tenants in Cedar Grove (at that time) wanted a parking space and unfortunately, we did not live here at the time. This has left parking in and around Cedar Grove as the most troublesome in the area; compounded by it being the only one on the bus route. We would very much like to have a parking space provided in our front garden and would be willing to have a small increase in our rent to cover this cost, as would the other Curo tenants we have spoken to. I have written to Curo requesting that they offer this to their tenants in Cedar Grove, as was done before; other residents in the grove have added their own comments and signed this letter. Now we are faced with a proposal from the council, to install parking restrictions at many locations around this area, including Cedar Grove and the Oval; with a view to improving access for emergency/utility vehicles. Whilst we totally agree something needs to be done, painting double yellow lines down our cul-de-sac and restricting parking on the Oval is most definitely not the way to proceed. We object most strongly to this proposal.</p>
----	-----------	----------	---	--	--	---

11	F13 / F14	Bloomfield Avenue	1			<p>I would preface my remarks by saying that it is my view, and that of several of my neighbours, that these proposals, which are being made to reduce congestion, are trying to solve a non-existent problem. Congestion is not now, nor has it ever been, an issue in this part of Bloomfield Avenue. Furthermore, I am surprised that these proposals are being made in isolation from any residents parking scheme - on their own, these proposals will reduce the amount of parking available and will further exacerbate the parking (not congestion!) problems that affect the area as a result of non-residents parking here during the working day. I would wish to comment in addition with particular regard to the proposals for the west end of the avenue and the link road to Oldfield Road. Restricting parking on one side of the link road does make sense, and the effect of the proposals will mean the loss of only one parking space during the day. The proposed new "no parking at anytime" on the corner of the link road also makes sense, although I have never known anyone park here anyway! Likewise for the proposed restriction further down on the right hand side, but why not join this up with the restriction on the corner? And why not extend it down to the corner of Maple Gardens? I have a significant issue with the proposed no parking restriction on the inside of the bend outside numbers 81 and 82. This has been a parking area for residents and visitors for at least 20 years, and to the best of my knowledge, there has never been an issue with either safety or congestion. It provides an area for parking some 6 cars, and if these spaces are removed, the daytime parkers especially will merely attempt to park in other, probably more inconvenient, parts of the avenue, Maple Grove and Maple Gardens. I am particularly concerned that cars will start to be parked on the other side of the road instead, both on the bend and up the hill from the Maple Gardens turn - this would have a major impact on the access to the driveway of number 82 and my own driveway 81 if cars start parking opposite, rather than where they currently park, which inconveniences no-one.</p>
12	F13 / F14	Bloomfield Avenue	1			<p>Apart from the corner where Bloomfield Avenue joins Oldfield Road (proposed no parking at any time) the other proposed stretches of "no parking" or "restricted parking" are not necessary and would be a considerable inconvenience to local residents. Both Maple Grove and Maple Gardens are dead-end streets. There is no through traffic and therefore they are solely used by residents, their visitors and deliveries. This area is already a 20-mph zone. There is no history of collisions or accidents and there is no other evidenced or discernable safety risk by leaving them as they are. Reducing the amount of on-street parking in this area would, by contrast, oblige local residents to park elsewhere, greatly inconveniencing them and increasing pressure on the other already-crowded streets in the area. Delivery vehicles would have no choice but to ignore the restrictions in any case.</p>

13	F13 / F14	Bloomfield Avenue	1			<p>Our property does not benefit from any off street parking and therefore your proposed changes have a direct impact on where we are able to park our car. Our property is directly at the site of the junction of Englishcomb Lane and Bloomfield road. The entrance to our property is on Englishcomb Lane. I have been to review the detailed proposals being submitted and I can understand the sense of what is being proposed. The change that is being propose, which affects us, is to put in place a no parking zone around the junction of Englishcomb Lane and Bloomfield Road. As this is at times a busy junction, it does make sense to clarify the parking around the junction. In keeping with the Highway Code in any case no one is supposed to park within 10m of a junction. On the proviso that you do not intend to extend the no parking zone beyond a distance of 10m from the junction then I have no objection to raise. HOWEVER if your intention is to extend the parking zone for a distance of more than 10m from the junction then I would like to raise a strong objection.</p>
14	D14 / D15	The Oval	1			<p>I totally disagree with the proposed parking measures. According to Street Check.co.uk there are 134 properties in The Oval. If each one has a vehicle, and most have two where do these park. This is not including the multi occupancies, students or visitors. Many are retired, or with young families. How do people who have health conditions not severe enough to qualify for the coveted Blue Badge disablement but cannot walk any distance manage. Equally a family with two children, pushchair, shopping bags etc?</p> <p>What proportion of the electorate considered this a good idea? Have you considered the impact of people parking outside another persons house where they have been parking for years. This could cause social/civil unrest and anti social behaviour. NO I do not want this Soviet style imposition</p>
15	D14 / D15	The Oval	1			<p>I have read a posted notice about the proposed parking restrictions affecting Ash Grove Bath and The Oval Bath. I own a property in Ash Grove and wonder what plans you have for the communal parking area at the Oval end of Ash Grove. Are you intending this to remain as an uncontrolled parking area for residents of Ash Grove as it provides useful parking spaces in what is a narrow, single track access road to the properties in Ash Grove. I am concerned that this parking area will be taken over by residents of The Oval if The Oval is turned into a NO PARKING ZONE as proposed.</p>
16	F13 / F14	Bloomfield Avenue			1	<p>On Sundays there is virtually no parking in Bloomfield Avenue. On the other days my stretch of the road (backing onto the allotments) is usually double parked, making it difficult for traffic to pass. It would be extremely difficult for a fire-engine or ambulance to pass. Please may I suggest that this stretch of the road has parking restricted to just one side. That would make it easier for both traffic and pedestrians.</p>

17	E11	Denmark Road			1	<p>Whilst I welcome this plan with open arms I am concerned that this will simply push the existing cars on the road in to the already full car park leaving no parking for local residents. Despite this small car park having signs stating that it is a private car park no one adheres to this. We have one neighbour who runs a mechanic business from the car park and so at least 4 spaces are regularly taken as well as more cars on ramps on the sides of the road, another who runs a business that requires him to store his vans (usually 2) in the car park and then we have the students, commuters and local workers that use the car park because it is free. This is an ongoing bug bear and whilst it is tolerable at present I fear these restrictions will make that intolerable with residents being unable to park near their houses so I'd like to address this now before the plans progress. Permission has also now been granted for the redevelopment of the Bath Press site for new housing. The plans propose nowhere near enough parking spaces for the newly built houses and flats and so this will again increase the issues with parking around these areas and in the car park, especially as there will be a walk way and cycle way from the car park to the site. I am unhappy about the thought of having to potentially park some distance from my house when I return from work at 1am and would like you to consider some alternative solutions to this problem. There is enough parking around the locality for all residents if managed correctly. My partner and I would like to request permit parking for residents to use the car park and designated parking spaces to include some areas of the road side. Ideally two permits per household and option to purchase a friend pass (im not sure what schemes you have elsewhere in BANES). I have suggested this previously but have never followed it up as there has been no pressure to do so. However now you are planning these restrictions I would like to push for permit parking and would be grateful if you could respond.</p>
18	F16	Bloomfield Road / Englishcombe Lane			1	<p>As this is at times a busy junction, it does make sense to clarify the parking around the junction. We are supporting of your proposals in that regard. In keeping with the Highway Code in any case no one is supposed to park within 10m of a junction. We are in support of these proposals as long as you do not intend to extend the restrictions further than a distance of 10 metres from the junction.</p>
19	E15	Moorfields Road	1			<p>Moorfields Road has a huge parking problem, mainly because a lot of the elderly residents, who never had cars have passed away and younger families have moved into the area. This has caused an overspill on the estate. I strongly object to these proposals to remove more on-street parking.</p>
Totals:			13	1	5	



