

OBJECTIONS TO WAITING RESTRICTIONS			
CORRESPONDENT	CONTACT	DATE RECEIVED	COMMENTS
Andrew Boyd	andrewboyd497@btinternet.com	2011-02-08	Support/Object
<p>Support</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The vehicle access to my house (27 Bloomfield Road) is within the area of the proposed double yellow lines and, as parking - particularly of large vehicles - to the south of this access causes me great visibility problems when exiting, I am in favour of this proposal, providing there is some reasonable enforcement of the parking restriction when the currently vacant 50-52 Wellsway is occupied. <p>Objection</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The scheme was also to include a marked space for lorry deliveries. I understand from a neighbour who has viewed the available documentation that this marked space is not shown. I am particularly concerned with this part of any scheme as it transpired at the planning appeal hearing that B&NES officials had agreed with the appellant company an indicative scheme placing the delivery bay partly across and to the south of my vehicle access. (See para.29 of the Inspector's reasons.) 			
<p>Response</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Usual enforcement measures will be in place. Vehicles can currently park across the correspondent's access. Length of delivery vehicle not part of Inspector's conditions. 			
Mrs Jane Allan	mrs_jane_allan@hotmail.co.uk	2011-02-18	Object
<p>Objections</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The crossing will be c. 4 meters on the North side of my garden door (not shown on map) which makes it very close to my residence. The Beep of a crossing is similar to the sound of an alarm clock going off. This sound is intrusive and I believe that it will bring distress to myself and family and to my neighbours on both sides of the crossing. 24hr SILENT. Loss of parking for the residents living between c. 119 and 125 Wellsway. Is the crossing in the correct place? Health risks imposed on neighbour who uses his garage entrance and exit onto Wellsway on a daily basis, by lorry bay being positioned on the South side of this exit. Suggest gated crossing similar to the one erected at the junction of Wellsway and the Bloomfield Road instead of a puffin crossing. 			
<p>Response</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Crossing at optimum location, considering physical constraints. Audible sound can be on a timed operation. No alternative locations can be considered, in accordance with paragraph 38 of the Appeal Decision. No alternative locations can be considered, in accordance with paragraph 38 of the Appeal Decision. Vehicles can currently park across the correspondent's access. 			

OBJECTIONS TO WAITING RESTRICTIONS			
CORRESPONDENT	CONTACT	DATE RECEIVED	COMMENTS
6. Inspector has dictated Puffin.			
Mr K Ahmed & Mrs N Sabirali	nadiauk@btinternet.com	2011-02-16	Object
<p>Objections</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There will be loss of parking along that wide stretch of road (between Longfellow Avenue and Devonshire Buildings) which consists solely of residential houses, because of the crossing. 2. would make more sense to put the puffin Crossing AFTER Devonshire Buildings (road) as on one side there is just a brick wall (no house entrances) and on the other side there is the beginning of the said retail building. If the excuse in not having the crossing there is of too many roads (junctions) nearby, we would like to bring to your attention that of the crossing on Claverton Street just after Prior park Road/ Widcombe Hill/Pulteney Road, and also the crossing on Pulteney Road just after the roundabout on the bottom of Bathwick Hill. Both crossings are on busy roads and very near junctions. 3. The noise of the crossing is not favourable 4. Having a Puffin Crossing just outside your house and losing parking will severely devalue the property. 			
<p>Response</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No alternative locations can be considered, in accordance with paragraph 38 of the Appeal Decision. 2. Not viable due to location of proposed store's vehicular access. 3. Audible sound can be on a timed operation. 4. Subjective claim regarding market value of properties unsubstantiated. 			
Peter McSweeney	petermcsweeney@hotmail.com	2011-02-16	Object
<p>Objections</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The presence of a crossing will mean a reduction in parking in this area which is already short of spaces. The high density of housing, each often with at least two cars per household as is evidenced [by] us and most of our neighbours, leads to an already high demand for parking spaces. It is reasonable assumption that this will exacerbate the problem and encourage inappropriate and dangerous parking or even an inability to park anywhere near our homes. 2. will lead to a significant decrease in local air quality and an increase in noise. Lorries and buses regularly use this route (e.g the Park & Ride) and these vehicles are likely to add considerably to such a problem. 3. suspect that there will be even more cars overtaking downhill queues on the wrong side of the road and then racing to turn into Devonshire Buildings before oncoming traffic cuts them off. This cannot possibly improve pedestrian and road users safety in this area. 4. noise arising from a beeping crossing will be extremely disruptive and I would strongly urge you to consider a silent crossing with a refuge island or at least restricting the "beeping" to the hours from 08:00 to 20:00. 			

OBJECTIONS TO WAITING RESTRICTIONS			
CORRESPONDENT	CONTACT	DATE RECEIVED	COMMENTS
<p>Response</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No alternative locations can be considered, in accordance with paragraph 38 of the Appeal Decision. 2. It is considered that the addition of this crossing will not reduce air quality. 3. Build-outs on both sides will physically narrow road, centre lines to be realigned. 4. Audible sound can be on a timed operation. 			
Jill Spurrell	jillspurrell@talktalk.net	2011-02-15	Object
<p>Objections</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If I could fight against the crossing I would but as it appears to be a done deal may I request that a 24 hour silent crossing is installed. We get enough traffic noise and pollution now without bleeping crossings. 			
<p>Response</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Audible sound can be on a timed operation. 			
Pete Sellwood	pete@pop-ups-planet.com	2011-02-16	Object
<p>Objections</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This crossing will cause traffic congestion, it will be little used 2. If built it will cause distress due to noise - it is said that the proposed crossing will emit noise! This is a disgrace. I represent 50 households along this stretch of road, not one is in favour of the crossing and every one of them is against it! 			
<p>Response</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is considered that the addition of this crossing will not increase traffic congestion. 2. Audible sound can be on a timed operation. 			
Sally Manning	Sallymanning403@btinternet.com	2011-02-16	Object
<p>Objections</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the intrusive 'beep' sound from the crossing will be irritating and a noise nuisance. 			
<p>Response</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Audible sound can be on a timed operation. 			
Mrs Groenhuisen	123 Wellsway, Bath, BA2 4RX	2011-02-16	Object
<p>Objections</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The crossing is unnecessary. There are already two other crossings within a few hundred yards. 2. An additional crossing will cause congestion. 3. There is no purpose for the crossing. 4. The only on street parking, for at least six residences, will be lost in an area where this is already at a premium. This will certainly 			

OBJECTIONS TO WAITING RESTRICTIONS			
CORRESPONDENT	CONTACT	DATE RECEIVED	COMMENTS
			<p>significantly impact on the appeal & market value of these properties.</p> <p>5. This is a residential area. Any sound from a crossing will be highly intrusive. The planned location is only 30m from my bedroom.</p>
			<p>Response</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The crossing will provide a safe means for customers to access the retail development. 2. It is considered that the addition of this crossing will not increase traffic congestion. 3. The crossing will provide “a safe crossing point for general use as well as for use in connection with the proposed development [...]” (paragraph 25 of the Appeal Decision). 4. No alternative locations can be considered, in accordance with paragraph 38 of the Appeal Decision. 5. Audible sound can be on a timed operation.
Aileen Bain	ailenn.bain@o2.co.uk	2011-02-18	Object
			<p>Objections</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Loss of parking 2. Noise impact of crossing 3. Noise and vibration caused by standing traffic 4. Crossing is in the wrong place, pavement on opposite side is too narrow. I would not want my children walking on the pavement on the other side as one trip and they could easily be on the road!
			<p>Response</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No alternative locations can be considered, in accordance with paragraph 38 of the Appeal Decision. 2. Audible sound can be on a timed operation. 3. Anticipated negligible impact on local air quality and noise. 4. The crossing will provide “a safe crossing point for general use as well as for use in connection with the proposed development [...]” (paragraph 25 of the Appeal Decision).