

## SUPPORTS

	Address	Support/ Object/ Support with Modifications	Comments	Officer response
1	Wordsworth Close Bishop's Waltham	I support the proposals		
2	Bishop's Waltham Parish Council		I am all in favour of the proposals.	
3	Not supplied		I am a resident of Bishop's Waltham and I support the proposed order. Free Street is a major concern at present, particularly the blind bend. And the problems are exacerbated by HGVs (to be precise, large articulated vehicles) based at the yard in Paradise Lane that use this route on a regular basis. This use, coupled with traffic generated at school start and finish times, makes the current situation an accident waiting to happen.	
4	Hazel Grove Bishop's Waltham	I support the proposals		
5	The Hangers Bishop's Waltham	I support the proposals		
6	Free Street Bishop's Waltham	I support the proposals		
7	c/o Stagecoach South, Bus Station, Southgate, Chichester, PO19 8DG	I support the proposals	Currently Stagecoach do not have any plans to revert to serving these roads with the 69 bus service. However, without these works we certainly won't return to Free Street whereas this scheme will make it a possible future option.	
8	Butts Farm Lane Bishop's Waltham	I support the proposals		
9	Shore Lane Bishop's Waltham	I support the proposals		
10	Colville Drive Bishop's Waltham	I support the proposals		
11	Woodlane Close Bramdean, Alresford	I support the proposals		
12	Free Street Bishop's Waltham	I support the proposals		
13	Hampshire County Council	I support the proposals	I write on behalf of the passenger transport team at Hampshire County Council in support of the proposed measures which will enable/improve bus services in the Bishop's Waltham area.	
14	Cherry Gardens Bishop's Waltham	I support the proposals subject to modifications <i>I think this is a support really, unless there is some text missing.</i>	We welcome these proposals because the current parking is becoming dangerous to both pedestrians and motorists.	

Address	Support/ Object/ Support with Modifications	Comments	Officer response
15 Deer Walk Bishop's Waltham	I support the proposals subject to modifications/ <i>think this also a support, it's more of an enquiry requesting measures for Winchester Rd.</i>	I recently saw your sign regarding prohibiting the traffic in Bishop's Waltham which certainly makes sense and makes me feel better when walking the little ones to school. It also prompted me to see whether there can also be some traffic management at the end of Shore Lane the B2177 end joining Coppice Hill. I live in the new development off Charles Hemming Drive (Deer Walk) which is opposite the entrance to Shore Lane. Everyday I either drive out of my road onto Coppice Hill or more often walk my 2yrs and 4yrs old across that busy junction which has quite a blind spot to the right (looking Waltham Chase direction). A traffic Island was added for somewhere to wait but only metres away is the start/end of the 50mph limit therefore cars whizz by extremely fast and waiting in the middle feels a little exposed! Many dog walkers cross this road to walk through the new estate into the fields and obviously all of the residents too of Deer Walk. I was wondering if 1. More signage could be put up to reiterate the 30 mph limit along that stretch of road (in both directions) up to the roundabout by Bishop's Waltham high street or an electric speed monitor with the smiley face (they seem quite affective on the Botley Road) 2. Pedestrian lights could be put up where the Island is instead. This would also make that busy junction easier to cross when driving too as slows the flow down I appreciate you must get many requests but since I have moved in that road has given me so much worry that a poor little one is going to get hit by a car. Thanks for taking the time to read this and I look forward to hearing from you.	I will look into their request and reply separately.
16 HCC Travel planner		Thanks for forwarding the proposals, the restrictions for Free Street look great to me, they cover the areas that they need too. Looks like the parking along Shore Lane will be reduced a fair bit forcing people into the Jubilee Hall Car Park which has recently been extended! Overall they look good to me	
17 Headteacher Bishop's Waltham Infant School		I think something needs to happen to make both of these areas safer. I travel both on my journey to and from school and have seen lots of unsafe situations regarding parents and traffic. Shore Lane Current building work has caused traffic jams. Vehicles are constantly parked blocking pavements and parents are having to go out into the middle of the road with buggies and children, which is very dangerous. The traffic build up from the construction vehicles careless parking has made it a one-way pass road only. Buses struggle to get enough space to turn on this road and many cars end up reversing. At busy times this has been very fraught. Free Street I avoid this street as much as possible. Due to parked cars and no marked pull in areas, multiple cars often have to reverse lengths of street as there is no room to pull in to give way. When children are walking on this busy road, this is surely an accident waiting to happen?	
18 Not supplied		I would like to write in support of the suggested parking restrictions in Bishop's Waltham. Both of these roads can be very dangerous due to parking and not having good visibility to cross the road. Double yellows would make it safer for children walking to school.	
19 Headteacher Bishop's Waltham Junior School		As Headteacher of Bishop's Waltham Junior School, I fully support these proposed changes to the traffic regulation order.	

## OBJECTIONS

	Address	Support/ Object/ Support with Modifications	Comments	Officer response
1	Free Street Bishop's Waltham	I object to the proposals	<p>1) If parking is no longer to be allowed, the speed on Free Street will increase enormously. Cars already take the road at ridiculous speeds and opening up a clear racetrack for them will only make this worse, unless some sort of clever speeding restrictions are put in place.2) Although Free Street has road signs that state that it is unsuitable for HGV vehicles, this is already ignored and, with no car parking to disrupt the HGV vehicles, may well give rise to even more HGV movements along the road. A particular concern considering the school entrance in Free Street. Are physical restrictions to stop HGV's using the road a possibility? HGV's just thunder through the existing restriction by the school entrance, inches away from the children trying to cross, blatantly ignoring the danger. More restrictions aimed at stopping HGV's may dissuade them.3) Current parking does restrict some vehicle movements using the road, although it still very busy and dangerous. If parking is no longer allowed, this will likely increase the number of vehicles using the road. 4) The likelihood of additional speeding, increased numbers of vehicles and increased HGV movements along Free Street could increase the danger to children and pedestrians particularly at the School Entrance crossing point.</p>	<p>Unrestricted parking will remain in sections along the western side of Free Street, and with the built out crossing point and bend in the road, vehicle speeds will still be reduced, the proposed restrictions just making passing easier, and reduce the risk of an overtaking vehicle being on the 'wrong' side of the road at the bend. I will pass the information on speeds to Police for potential monitoring and enforcement.Unfortunately, it is very hard to control lorry movements, restrictions on use by certain vehicle types is enforced by the Police, and is very difficult as larger vehicles would be permitted for reasons such as deliveries, removals, emergencies etc. I disagree that this will increase the number of large vehicles using the road.</p>
2	Free Street Bishop's Waltham	I object to the proposals	<p>As a homeowner on free street, the only parking that we have is outside our house on free street. We do not have any off road parking or garage for our cars.</p> <p>Whilst I agree that something does need to be done to calm traffic and stop non residents parking on free street, taking away our only parking spots is going to be detrimental to us. I have young children and the logistics of not being able to park outside our house is going to have a huge impact on our day to day living. My husband is a trauma doctor and often works into the early hours, again not being able to park outside our house would impact him hugely.</p> <p>By making free street a non parking street, traffic would increase and the speed of cars would increase. At the moment the cars parked act as a natural "slow down" even with cars parked we have witnessed cars travelling ridiculously fast along Free Street, in my opinion, giving the cars a clear road would increase speed and also traffic using Free Street as a shortcut.</p> <p>I would support residents only parking, but to double yellow line would negatively impact our lives and the value of our property.</p> <p>Many thanks</p>	<p>Unrestricted parking will remain in sections along the western side of Free Street, and with the built out crossing point and bend in the road, vehicle speeds will still be reduced. The proposed restrictions will provide passing spaces, improve visibility at the crossing point and reduce the risk of an overtaking vehicle being on the 'wrong' side of the road at the bend. I will pass the information on speeds to Police for potential monitoring and enforcement.</p>
3	Free Street Bishop's Waltham	I object to the proposals	<p>Below are my concerns about the proposals:</p> <p>1) Traffic calming measures are needed on Free Street. At the moment parked cars along it provide a certain degree of traffic calming. By introducing the parking restrictions, I am concerned that traffic will travel faster and the street will become less safe, particularly for children and parents using the school crossing. Installing traffic calming measures may be more appropriate.</p> <p>2) We have no off road parking. To no longer be able to park outside our home would have a detrimental effect on our quality of life and have a financial impact, as it would affect the value of our home. Perhaps reducing the no parking restrictions to the bend of Free Street may be acceptable in achieving the aim to make the road safer, along with traffic calming measures.</p> <p>3) Many people visiting Bishop's Waltham park on Free Street to avoid paying for parking in Bishop's Waltham. Installing residents parking bays, thereby restricting the number of cars parked on Free Street may be an alternative option.</p>	<p>Unrestricted parking will remain in sections along the western side of Free Street, and with the built out crossing point and bend in the road, vehicle speeds will still be reduced. The proposed restrictions will provide passing spaces, improve visibility at the crossing point and reduce the risk of an overtaking vehicle being on the 'wrong' side of the road at the bend. I will pass the information on speeds to Police for potential monitoring and enforcement.</p> <p>A permit scheme is unfortunately not an option as it would not meet the Highway Authority (HCC) criteria for its implementation. New schemes are required to be cost neutral, with the implementation, administration and the ongoing enforcement costs being balanced by the cost of the permits. This means small schemes are generally not viable, and would be unlikely to be supported by the majority of residents.</p>

	Address		Support/ Object/ Support with Modifications	Comments	Officer response
4	Free Street Bishop's Waltham	I object to the proposals	<p>These comments relate to the proposals for Free Street.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The stated objective is "to improve visibility, reduce obstruction, and make the road safer for pedestrians including children". We have lived in Ash Green, Free Street, for nearly 5 years, and are in prime position to understand the effects of parking on the west side of Free Street, from Maypole Green, downhill to the new school entrance. What is very clear is that it is the current parking which acts as a "traffic calming" measure and significantly reduces traffic speeds for vehicles in both directions. When there is little or no parking on this section, traffic speeds increase significantly, often beyond 30mph. The parked cars protect children on the footpath from moving traffic by providing a solid shield.</li> <li>The one aspect that we would support is the double yellow lines proposed for the west side, against the short island at Maypole Green.</li> <li>As to the claim that these measures would reduce obstruction, since the cessation of the bus service since the installation of the school pinch point, any delays are limited to generally 2 or 3 vehicles, and for less than a 30 seconds. The result is that traffic speeds are further attenuated.</li> <li>One of the continuing problems for traffic movements in Free Street, is its use by HGVs, despite the "Not suitable for HGVs" signing. This is used regularly by through traffic and a local transport company, as a short cut. We have complained to the CC. that there is no enforcement of this regulation, to which the answer appears to be that the signs are "advisory only". Given the opening of the new school entrance on Free Street, we believe that the severe reduction of parking will only encourage more through traffic, particularly by HGVs. It is difficult to understand how the CC. which is both the Highways and Education Authority, can contemplate a measure which can only put school children at greater risk.</li> <li>It is current Government policy to reduce vehicle pollution in and around schools. Last Wednesday's Inquest verdict on the death of a young child, highlighted pollution as a contributory factor. Surely Councils must now give priority consideration to this problem. There is a strong possibility that traffic speeds and volume will increase air pollution close to the school, as a result of this proposal. It would be helpful to know if the Council has carried out any air pollution assessment? Has it specifically consulted the schools?</li> <li>When the new school entrance opened last year, we asked that "20 mph" school signs be attached to the new school entrance warning signs. Lack of available money was apparently the reason why this simple measure could not be introduced. It is therefore astonishing that, at a time when local authorities are desperately short of funding, this measure is raised yet again, particularly given the latest surge in Covid infections, and when pressure on central and local funding is extreme. A long-term resident of Free Street tells us that parking restriction schemes like this, have been tabled on and off for the last 18 years. Has your Council costed this project? If so, what is the estimated cost? If there is funding available, there must be other schemes in the Bishop's Waltham area which would bring about a much more positive benefit to highway safety. As a more general point, it is surprising and disappointing that your Council has chosen to carry out this consultation over the Christmas period, at a time when, despite Covid, residents may be away, but particularly when Council offices will be closed, or officers away on leave, and unable to answer questions. That it should happen when schools are closed, and head teachers have more than enough on their plates, seems to be very short-sighted. For all of these reasons, I object to this proposal as strongly as I can. I am copying this objection to the local MP, the County and District Councillors, and the Parish Council, as this proposal raises important health and road safety questions, which I believe, have not been properly assessed. Further to my earlier email, objecting to this proposal, it has been very clear that, over the last 10 days when there has been little or no parking on the west side of Free Street downhill from Maypole Green, traffic speeds in both directions, have noticeably increased. Today, with return to work, traffic is again slower. Probably, no council officers would have been available to visit Free Street over this period, but this is exactly the problem which residents are very concerned will result from this proposal. I cannot understand how the stated objectives "to free up improve visibility, reduce obstruction and make the road safer for pedestrians including children" are compatible. Increasing speeds in Free Street can only increase the risks to pedestrians, particularly children using the new Free Street school entrance. The car parking in this area provides free traffic calming, whereas it is difficult to understand, when councils' funding is apparently so stretched, how this scheme can be tabled again.</li> </ol>	<p>Unrestricted parking will remain in sections along the western side of Free Street, and with the built out crossing point and bend in the road, vehicle speeds will still be reduced. The proposed restrictions will provide passing spaces, improve visibility at the crossing point and reduce the risk of an overtaking vehicle being on the 'wrong' side of the road at the bend. I will pass the information on speeds to Police for potential monitoring and enforcement. Unfortunately, as HCC have indicated, it is very hard to control lorry movements, restrictions on use by certain vehicle types is enforced by the Police, and is very difficult as larger vehicles would be permitted for reasons such as deliveries, removals, emergencies etc. I disagree that this proposal will increase the number of large vehicles using the road. In terms of air quality monitoring I will enquire where this responsibility, and whether any data exists for Free Street, although I suspect this kind of monitoring is targeted at roads with consistently high vehicle movements such as city centres. In order to make any changes to the restrictions on roads it is required that a Traffic Regulation Order, is proposed, comments considered (as has been done here) and if approved made. Orders to change speed limits are a matter which HCC as the Highway Authority deal with, that said 20mph limits are only suitable in a locations where the speeds are self-enforcing, due to the disproportionate amount of Police enforcement that is required otherwise. I omitted to consult the schools as I believe that parking restrictions at the crossing point were part of the initial proposal, however, I have now consulted them and both support it. I do not know the exact time that these proposals have been under consideration. The local councillors and Parish Council have been consulted on these proposals prior to the public consultation which ran from the 09/12/20 - 06/01/21, thereby covering the school terms, and extending the statutory 3 week public consultation to 4 weeks. I believe that the current pandemic has meant that more people are taking walks and therefore likely to see the A3 notices with plans that I purposefully erected at visible locations, thereby encouraging responses. In terms of the costing and prioritisation of this scheme, the majority of costs are associated in Officer time designing the scheme, and arranging the internal and public consultation, and considering their responses. To my knowledge this scheme was the highest priority scheme to the parish and local councillors.</p>	

Further to my earlier email, objecting to this proposal, it has been very clear that, over the last 10 days when there has been little or no parking on the west side of Free Street downhill from Maypole Green, traffic speeds in both directions, have noticeably increased.  
 Today, with return to work, traffic is again slower. Probably, no council officers would have been available to visit Free Street over this period, but this is exactly the problem which residents are very concerned will result from this proposal.  
 I cannot understand how the stated objectives "to free up improve visibility, reduce obstruction and make the road safer for pedestrians including children" are compatible. Increasing speeds in Free Street can only increase the risks to pedestrians, particularly children using the new Free Street school entrance.  
 The car parking in this area provides free traffic calming, whereas it is difficult to understand, when councils' funding is apparently so stretched, how this scheme can be tabled again.

5	Free Street Bishop's Waltham	Not Answered	<p>My husband and I live in Ash Green, Free Street and have been looking at the Traffic Order proposals.          We would like to point out that Free Street is no longer a bus route and has not been one since shortly after the pinch point and pedestrian access to the school was installed by HCC. We understand that the bus company has no intention of returning the buses to the Free Street route. However, they have not completely removed the bus stop signs, though the timetable displays have gone. This causes some confusion for non-residents.</p> <hr/> <p>I object to the proposals</p> <p>My comments on the proposed TRO in Bishop's Waltham refer only to those for Free Street as I do not know enough about the situation in Shore Lane to comment. My husband and I have lived in Free Street for nearly 5 years. We have been told by long-term residents that there have been discussions on putting double yellow lines in Free Street for 18 years. I wonder why this seems to have come to a head now at a time when we understand that all local authorities have very little money and will need time to recover from Covid-19. The proposed work in Free Street would appear to be a very bad way to spend what little resources that you have. Reducing the parking in the way you suggest is bound to increase traffic speed as drivers will see no reason to slow and take care. There is a bend in the road on the upper side leading down to the school pinch point such that cars come upon the pinch point very quickly and without warning. This will be made worse if the road appears clear and unobstructed. Residents including ourselves asked HCC for 20 is plenty signs when they constructed the school pinch point but we were told that there was no money for this. You say that you propose to make the road safer for pedestrians. Controlling traffic speed with a speed sign would be much more welcome than planning to free traffic up with less parking. We have seen increasing speed in Free Street during the Covid lockdowns when there has been far less parking with people working from home and shopping differently, so I feel we have recent experience to back up this argument. Cars have speeded up as they see no reason to take more care. You cannot improve visibility as you cannot straighten the road out, drivers will always need to be aware of what might be around the bend and this is more obvious when you can also see that there is parking on one side. I mentioned in a previous brief email that there is no longer a bus route using Free Street. It has been nearly a year since the last bus came down the street. Finally, how is this scheme to be enforced? Bishop's Waltham has double yellow lines in its High Street which are universally ignored by everyone such that it is often very difficult for the Co-op to receive deliveries. If it is not possible to enforce the traffic regulations in the main street of the Town, how do you propose to do it in streets like Free Street and Shore Lane? I believe this scheme will make Free Street more dangerous and hope that it will not go ahead.</p>	<p>This scheme has been at the internal consultation (councillors and Parish Council) stage for a long time, for various reasons, primarily staffing levels. I started with WCC in February and took it on, Covid has slowed its progress again unfortunately. The TRO process is a lengthy legal one, and the programme for each financial year is approved in previous financial years, for as you know it has been on the list for investigation for a long time.</p> <p>Unrestricted parking will remain in sections along the western side of Free Street, and with the built out crossing point and bend in the road, vehicle speeds will still be reduced. The proposed restrictions will provide passing spaces, improve visibility at the crossing point and reduce the risk of an overtaking vehicle being on the 'wrong' side of the road at the bend. I will pass the information on speeds to Police for potential monitoring and enforcement.</p> <p>In order to make any changes to the restrictions on roads it is required that a Traffic Regulation Order, as is proposed here, is proposed and made. Orders to change speed limits remain a matter which HCC as the Highway Authority deal with, that said it would be unlikely to be progressed as the Police would be unlikely to support a 20mph speed limit here, given the nature of the road it would likely require a disproportionate amount of enforcement.</p> <p>I will pass on your comments regarding enforcement on the High Street to my colleagues in the Parking team.</p> <p>The bus company have supported this scheme as without it there would be no possibility of the route returning. I will check with them regarding the removal of the bus stop signs.</p>
---	---------------------------------	--------------	---	--

	Address	Support/ Object/ Support with Modifications	Comments	Officer response
6	Beeches Hill Bishop's Waltham	I object to the proposals	<p>I support the proposal's apparent aims which are to improve visibility and pedestrian safety on Free Street and Shore Lane. As a resident and a past user of the village's schools, I am well aware of the local traffic problems, however I feel there will be several unintended consequences of the plans which far outweigh the plan's proposed benefits.</p> <p>1) The lack of parked vehicles on Free Street will definitely improve traffic flow along the road, however that will increase speeds, so reducing road user and pedestrian safety (the exact opposite of the desired effect). Having an enforced 20MPH speed limit at the southern end of Free Street (near the school entrance) would improve safety of pedestrians.</p> <p>2) The displaced parked cars will exacerbate the village's parking problem, pushing it onto the smaller residential streets such as Coleville Drive. We do have the recently completed expanded car park at the Jubilee Hall, but I believe that was built to cope with our pre-existing lack of parking. I do not believe that it will be adequate cope with the parking needs of the displaced residents of Free Street and Shore Lane that park on the roads, never mind shoppers that at present park in Free Street and walk through St Peters St when the main car parks are full, nor the parents on the school run who drive in from the hinterland of Bishop's Waltham.</p> <p>3) The improved traffic flow along both roads will encourage increased traffic from 'rat runners' cutting a corner from the B3055/Lower Lane to Swanmore, and the Meon Valley.</p> <p>4) The improved traffic flow/speed will increase the urbanisation of the village, to the general detriment of all non car users.</p>	<p>Unrestricted parking will remain in sections along the western side of Free Street, and with the built out crossing point and bend in the road, vehicle speeds will still be reduced. The proposed restrictions will provide passing spaces, improve visibility at the crossing point and reduce the risk of an overtaking vehicle being on the 'wrong' side of the road at the bend. I estimate that 3 car spaces would be removed by the double yellow lines by the build out, or 5 if they were parked right up to the build out. I haven't estimated the number of spaces removed from Maypole Green bend as none were suitable under the Highway Code. I will pass the information on speeds to Police for potential monitoring and enforcement.</p> <p>In order to make any changes to the restrictions on roads it is required that a Traffic Regulation Order, is proposed, comments considered (as has been done here) and if approved made. Orders to change speed limits are a matter which HCC as the Highway Authority deal with, that said 20mph limits are only suitable in a locations where the speeds are self-enforcing, due to the disproportionate amount of Police enforcement that is required otherwise.</p> <p>The extent of the restrictions cannot be extended at this stage, the parking on Colville Drive will be monitored.</p>
7	Hall Close Bishop's Waltham	I object to the proposals	<p>Putting double yellow lines along Free St will not stop residents and visitors coming into the town centre and needing to park. Even more so in the coming years when the 500 new homes target for Bishop's Waltham will have been reached. The restriction will inevitably mean people will start parking in the residential estate of Colville Drive and Hall Close as it's only a short extra walk from where they can currently park along Free St. I live in Hall Close, just off Colville Drive and our estate roads are narrow so parked cars will cause obstructions to residents trying to enter/exit the area. I feel that WCC have not given enough public consideration to an alternative solution to the problem, and that is implementing a one-way system along Free St from the junction with Hoe Rd up to Colville Drive. Thereafter, there could be double yellow lines from Colville Drive down to the B3035, as currently proposed. This scheme would allow residents and visitors to safely park along Free St where they currently do, and would also provide safe progress for vehicles travelling along Free St as no vehicles would be coming the other way where the sight line is poor. A temporary one-way system has been put in place in the past for carriageway repairs so my suggestion should not be discarded as a permanent solution. Clearly some residents, including myself, would have to travel a bit further to get to certain destinations but their return journey would be as it is today, so any inconvenience would be minimal. This seems a pragmatic solution that has overall benefits and does not create an unintended obstruction problem for other local residents. Pushing the problem into another area is not a long term solution. The TRO says that the scheme has the support of residents however as someone who can be classed as a resident affected by the problem/solution, I was not consulted on WCC's plans. Can I please ask WCC to consider including my alternative solution as part of a revised consultation containing both options. If not I'd appreciate seeing the rationale as to why the proposed solution is the only one being offered to residents and also plans for how WCC will mitigate the future problem of parking in my estate. Thank you.</p>	<p>Proposed restrictions cannot be extended at this stage. Parking in Colville Drive and the adjacent streets will be monitored. A one way scheme such as you suggest for Free Street would be the remit of HCC, I will raise your suggestions with them for future consideration. They will also be aware of any impacts the temporary one way system had.</p>

Address	Support/ Object/ Support with Modifications	Comments	Officer response
8 Colville Drive Bishop's Waltham	I object to the proposals	<p>The proposals will merely push the parking problems into the adjacent Colville Drive estate which has a narrow access road hardly wide enough for two vehicles to pass. We already have visitors parking on the pavement making it difficult for pedestrians to pass, especially those in wheelchairs or pushing buggies. Furthermore, when there are weddings, funerals, etc at St Peter's church the same issues arise and the proposals will inevitably push the parking issues another 100 yards into a residential area.</p> <p>With c500 new houses coming to Bishop's Waltham who will need vehicular access the additional parking in the Jubilee Hall will definitely not solve the problem.</p> <p>I've seen this type of issue elsewhere and the results are all too obvious and familiar.</p> <p>The proposals should be scrapped or, at the very least, provide a guarantee that they will be extended to protect Colville Drive and enable residents to safely exit their driveways. My own house, number 7, is off a tiny spur and we already experience problems when non residents park their vehicles too close to our driveway exit.</p> <p>I strongly urge WCC to scrap and rethink this proposal and look at the issue of parking in and around Bishop's Waltham as a whole, or at least to simultaneously propose a scenario which includes parking restrictions in Colville Drive. This proposal is in theory a good idea but the ramifications have not been thought through sufficiently.</p>	<p>Proposed restrictions cannot be extended at this stage. Parking in Colville Drive and the adjacent streets will be monitored. The access to your properties is protected by no waiting at any time under the current proposal. I will contact the Church to highlight the issues their events can cause and ask that they request attendees make use of Jubilee Hall car park if possible.</p>
9 Upper Basingwell Street Bishop's Waltham	I object to the proposals	<p>Being a local resident frequenting the streets in question, in particular shore lane, the majority of on road parking in this area is done by people living locally. I personally live in a street/property with no options available for off road parking and parking in my own road is extremely difficult to obtain. We therefore need to make use of the likes of Shore Lane to have somewhere to park during the working day, particularly during the COVID pandemic where many people are working from home and therefore require to park near to their property. Limiting parking opportunities in the more residential areas of Bishop's Waltham is only going to have an increasingly negative impact on parking elsewhere particularly with those with no option to park on the roads.</p> <p>The only acceptable solution would be to provide free (considering the council tax already charged) local resident parking permits that will allow for parking in those areas for those that require it.</p>	<p>A permit parking scheme is unfortunately not an option as it would not meet the Highway Authority (HCC's) criteria for its implementation. New schemes are required to be cost neutral, with the implementation, administration and the ongoing enforcement costs being balanced by the cost of the permits and any tickets issues. This means small schemes are generally not viable, and would be unlikely to be supported by the majority of residents.</p> <p>Spaces, not at junctions will remain on Shore Lane, as will the existing stretch of no waiting 8am-6pm. Short term and permit parking is available in Jubilee Hall car park. Please contact the Parish Council for details of permit application process.</p>
10 Bank Street Bishop's Waltham	I object to the proposals	<p>There was NO parking when I bought the property , but we were able to park in the roads nearby. I bought 2 The Old School House to move into when I am able to retire, so I have currently got a tenant in place... My tenant has a baby of under a year old, so if she is unable to park nearby,, it will make life much more difficult for her.If double yellow lines are put in place, it will impact on how suitable my property will be ultimately for my retirement, and I may have to re consider and even possibly sell, which would be , for me a disaster.There are 6 apartments in The Old School House, and each owner/ tenant has a car. Would parking permits not be an option for the 6 apartments ?</p>	<p>In terms of the decision process, local councillors and the parish council are consulted on the proposal prior to the 3 week public consultation. The responses to the public consultation considered and amendments proposed if suitable. The decision on whether to/ extent to implement is either made by Councillors or the head of the section. Equalities Impact Statement - the impact on the community is considered as an intrinsic part of the proposal development, not as a separate stage.Unrestricted parking will remain on Shore Lane, as will the existing stretch of no waiting 8am-6pm that is at the northern end closer to your property. At the northern end of Shore Lane the only locations where restrictions are proposed are unsuitable ones at junctions. Short term and permit parking is available in Jubilee Hall car park. Please contact the Parish Council for details of permit application process.A permit parking scheme is unfortunately not an option as it would not meet the Highway Authority (HCC) criteria for its implementation. New schemes are required to be cost neutral, with the implementation, administration and the ongoing enforcement costs being balanced by the cost of the permits. This means small schemes are generally not viable, and would be unlikely to be supported by the majority of residents.</p>
	Not Answered	<p>To whom it may concern</p> <p>I have already sent an email today in regards to this, but would like to add the following.</p> <p>I own one of the converted apartments in The Old School House.</p> <p>I have concerns about how these proposed parking restrictions will impact on access to the properties, and the use that has been established historically.</p> <p>There are a total of 6 apartments within The Old School House. The building is typically lived in by young families and retirees who need access and there is a lack of other nearby parking.</p> <p>I would like to ask whether this was subject to a political decision, or was this decided by officers? Please could I have a copy of the Equalities Impact Assessment undertaken to inform the decision? I look forward to hearing from you.</p>	

	Address	Support/ Object/ Support with Modifications	Comments	Officer response
11	Bank Street Bishop's Waltham	I object to the proposals	I would like to see a residents permit system operated. As a homeowner on Bank Street with no parking, double yellows on the surrounding roads would leave no where to park for residents. I understand wanting to stop those avoiding carparking charges and parking on the surrounding roads as a result (visitors to the village shops), however operating a permit system would stop this and still allow residents to park.	Unrestricted parking will remain on Shore Lane, as will the existing stretch of no waiting 8am-6pm that is at the northern end closer to your property. At the northern end of Shore Lane the only locations where restrictions are proposed are unsuitable ones at junctions. Short term and permit parking is available in Jubilee Hall car park. Please contact the Parish Council for details of permit application process. A permit parking scheme is unfortunately not an option as it would not meet the Highway Authority (HCC) criteria for its implementation. New schemes are required to be cost neutral, with the implementation, administration and the ongoing enforcement costs being balanced by the cost of the permits. This means small schemes are generally not viable, and would be unlikely to be supported by the majority of residents.
12	Cherry Gardens Bishop's Waltham	I object to the proposals	I object as I am a leaseholder of a flat in The Old School House (crossroads of Bank Street and Shore Lane), which if these regulations come into play then there will be no local parking available for the residents of this building. Open to suggestions such as permits.	Unrestricted parking will remain on Shore Lane, as will the existing stretch of no waiting 8am-6pm that is at the northern end closer to your property. At the northern end of Shore Lane the only locations where restrictions are proposed are unsuitable ones at junctions. Short term and permit parking is available in Jubilee Hall car park. Please contact the Parish Council for details of permit application process. A permit parking scheme is unfortunately not an option as it would not meet the Highway Authority (HCC) criteria for its implementation. New schemes are required to be cost neutral, with the implementation, administration and the ongoing enforcement costs being balanced by the cost of the permits. This means small schemes are generally not viable, and would be unlikely to be supported by the majority of residents.
13	Bank Street Bishop's Waltham	I object to the proposals	We am writing to you to express our concerns at the proposed scheme above. We live in one of the flats in the Old School House Bank Street in Bishop's Waltham and have always parked in either Free Street or Shore Lane. The Old School House does not have off road parking. How is this going to effect us and what options are available to not only just us but several other residents living in this vicinity It seems little consideration has been given to our situation. My wife has ongoing health problems (but does not qualify for a blue badge) and it would not be appropriate that she should have to park further away from the residence We are therefore objecting to this scheme unless there is evidence that appropriate support is offered.	Unrestricted parking will remain on Shore Lane and Free Street, as will the existing stretch of no waiting 8am-6pm that is at the northern end closer to your property. At the northern end of Shore Lane the only locations where restrictions are proposed are unsuitable ones at junctions. Short term and permit parking is available in Jubilee Hall car park. Please contact the Parish Council for details of permit application process.
14	Bank Street Bishop's Waltham	I object to the proposals	I live on the corner of Shore Lane and Bank Street. My house is a Grade 2 listed building. It has cellars underneath and it has suffered massively from the damage done by very large container lorries coming down Shore lane and turning into Bank street. When we moved in here, we had to have the whole wall on the shore lane side, of my kitchen, rebuilt, from cellar to roof level due to the damage from passing lorries. While living here, we have experienced a gas leak from a damaged pipe in the middle of the road in between White Culvers and the old School House. We do not have gas in the house, and yet the pipe leaked gas through the soil into our cellar and into the spaces under the Old School House. The pipe was damaged by the weight of passing lorries. In recent years I had my front door canopy and railing badly damaged by a passing container lorry and had to get my insurance to pay for its repair. The report is on the website. I still get container lorries passing close to my house despite the bollard placed on the corner of Shore Lane and Bank street. If you restrict the parking down Shore Lane this will further increase the lorry traffic, making it easier for them to use Shore Lane. We need some kind of reduction to the entry of Shore Lane from the 2177 to prevent Container lorries entering from that end. Either that or make the bottom end of Shore lane one way only, going upwards. Many cars also use Shore Lane as a race track as I often hear them roaring up Shore lane, from my window. If you want children to be safe on this road, you must consider ways to properly BAN large Lorries from using the road as a cut through, and also putting in measures such as road width restrictions to prevent speeding. Thank you for listening.	The proposed restrictions on Shore Lane will improve visibility for vehicles turning out of the residential side roads, I do not agree that it will increase the number of large vehicles using Shore Lane. I will discuss with HCC the potential installation of 'unsuitable for HGVs' signage at the junction of Shore Lane/ Winchester Road. Unfortunately, restrictions on use by certain vehicle types is enforced by the Police, and is very difficult as larger vehicles would have to be permitted for reasons such as deliveries, removals, emergencies etc.



## SUPPORT WITH MODIFICATIONS

	Address	Support/ Object/ Support with Modifications	Comments	Officer response
1	Free Street Bishop's Waltham		<p>The speed of traffic along Free Street must be controlled. Cars already exceed 30pmh even with current parking situation where visibility and parked cars reduce road to single file.</p> <p>I think clearing this road of parked cars will increase the speed. This is dangerous with the new school access on Free Street.</p> <p>Are any traffic calming measures proposed?</p> <p>I am also concerned that the private road Maypole Green will become blocked with parked cars.</p>	<p>Unrestricted parking will remain in sections along the western side of Free Street, and with the built out crossing point and bend in the road, vehicle speeds will still be reduced. The proposed restrictions will provide passing spaces, improve visibility at the crossing point and reduce the risk of an overtaking vehicle being on the 'wrong' side of the road at the bend. I will pass the information on speeds to Police for potential monitoring and enforcement.</p> <p>HCC have confirmed that Maypole Green is adopted highway, and drivers are required by the highway code not to park in a manner which causes obstruction.</p>
2	Free Street Bishop's Waltham	I support the proposals subject to modifications	<p>My household does not have any permitted access to off-road parking.</p> <p>We have two cars one is needed for my wife to travel to various treatments for long term recovery from cancer treatment and major reconstructive surgery.</p> <p>I have a need for a car for my work, which covers the whole of the UK mainland</p> <p>I note that there is provision for parking permits, provided I can access these I would have no objection to the scheme</p>	<p>Unrestricted parking will remain in sections along the western side of Free Street, including opposite your property.</p> <p>A permit scheme is unfortunately not an option as it would not meet the Highway Authority (HCC) criteria for its implementation. New schemes are required to be cost neutral, with the implementation, administration and the ongoing enforcement costs being balanced by the cost of the permits. This means small schemes are generally not viable, and would be unlikely to be supported by the majority of residents.</p>
3	Free Street Bishop's Waltham	I support the proposals subject to modifications	<p>I understand the need to put in parking restrictions on Free Street but I don't think that the consequences have been fully addressed. Although Free Street is a 30mph zone the speed at which the majority of the vehicles travel along it is shocking. During the school run period in particular it is common for cars to travel at 40 mph + and the cars which currently park along Free Street are useful in that they slow the speeding drivers down. This, in addition to regular run of articulated lorries (mostly from the Rawlinson depot) make Free Street a dangerous road for both residents and pedestrians. The parking restrictions will allow users to travel even faster along this road - surely it must be time to introduce a 20mph limit and put up some decent signage? Currently there is no warning of a school crossing/pinch point and only 1 30mph sign at the Corehampton Road end of Free Street. A flashing speed restriction sign would also be helpful.</p>	<p>Unrestricted parking will remain in sections along the western side of Free Street, and with the built out crossing point and bend in the road, vehicle speeds will still be reduced. The proposed restrictions will provide passing spaces, improve visibility at the crossing point and reduce the risk of an overtaking vehicle being on the 'wrong' side of the road at the bend. I will pass the information on speeds to Police for potential monitoring and enforcement. The Highway Code and signing regulations (TSRGD) specify that roads with street lighting are 30mph unless signed otherwise, so we are not able to put 'repeater' signs in 30mphs. In order to make any changes to the restrictions on roads it is required that a Traffic Regulation Order, is proposed, comments considered (as has been done here) and if approved made. Orders to change speed limits are a matter which HCC as the Highway Authority deal with, that said 20mph limits are only suitable in a locations where the speeds are self-enforcing, due to the disproportionate amount of Police enforcement that is required otherwise. I will enquire internally regarding a flashing speed limit reminder sign, in order to be installed there would have to be a suitably located lamp column, and to remain effective these are recommended to only be used for short periods (2 weeks).</p>
4	Butts Farm Lane Bishop's Waltham	I support the proposals subject to modifications	<p>I fully support these proposals, which are long overdue. Free Street has long been an accident waiting to happen. I was a Parish Councillor when the plans for for the new entrance to the primary school were considered a number of years ago and one of our concerns - and if memory serves me correctly one of our conditions for approval - was that double yellow lines be painted on Free Street. It is disappointing that it has taken so long for action to be taken.</p> <p>Not only that, the elderly residents in this area, of whom there are many, have lost their bus service because of the difficulties posed by the current on street parking. I doubt they will get it back even if these proposals are approved.</p> <p>I suggest the order prohibiting parking is extended further up Colville Drive.</p> <p>Cars that would normally park along Free Street will be seeking alternative places. Colville Drive is one of the few options and since that road is quite narrow, parking along there will cause a problem for the residents of Colville Drive itself, Hall Close, Butts Farm Lane, and Rareridge Lane. It will also cause problems for large service vehicles such as refuse collection vehicles</p>	<p>Proposed restrictions cannot be extended at this stage. Parking in Colville Drive will be monitored.</p>

	Address	Support/ Object/ Support with Modifications	Comments	Officer response
5	Hall Close Bishop's Waltham	I support the proposals subject to modifications	This will push town parking up Colville Drive, Hall Close, Butts Farm Land and Rareridge. These roads are narrow and extra parking will not allow access for emergency vehicles as well as causing this residential area to turn into a carpark for the town. Therefore it would better to make Free Street one way and allow parking on one side. This reduces the congestion problem and still allows parking for residents of that street and the town. Children crossing will only need to focus on traffic from one direction whilst crossing on the built-in section. Additionally, a pelican or zebra crossing could also be put in to help the children cross safely.	Proposed restrictions cannot be extended at this stage, parking in Colville Drive will be monitored. A one way scheme such as you suggest for Free Street would be in the remit of HCC, I will raise your suggestions with them for future consideration. They will also be aware of any impacts the temporary one way system had.
6	Rareridge Lane Bishop's Waltham	I support the proposals subject to modifications	1)Not allow parking to overflow to Colville Drive - bendy road difficult to drive when cars are parked. Perhaps have resident parking only. 2) Reinstate bus route on Free Street - many elderly people have walking difficulties owing to Free St hill if they take bus from town centre. The bus company seems to think the land is flat near Colville Drive and that we can all walk well. If there were no parked cars in Free Street it would be easier for buses.	Proposed restrictions cannot be extended at this stage, parking in Colville Drive will be monitored. A permit parking scheme is unfortunately not an option as it would not meet the Highway Authority (HCC) criteria for its implementation. New schemes are required to be cost neutral, with the implementation, administration and the ongoing enforcement costs being balanced by the cost of the permits. This means small schemes are generally not viable, and would be unlikely to be supported by the majority of residents.
7	Little Shore Lane Bishop's Waltham	I support the proposals subject to modifications  I support the proposals subject to modifications	The proposed restricted areas exiting from both sides of Little Shore Lane into Shore Lane should be continued to close the gap in front of Kestor and towards Shore Crescent as vehicles are always parked there. These vehicles, which are frequently commercial vehicles/vans, obstruct visibility to the left and right for drivers exiting Little Shore Lane into Shore Lane. This dangerous junction has become a more dangerous accident hazard since the Jubilee Hall car park has been substantially increased in capacity creating additional vehicles entering and exiting Little Shore Lane into Shore Lane. These parking restrictions are much needed in this area and would hopefully move all day on street parkers into the extended Jubilee Hall car park. The Jubilee Hall car park is yet to realise some value to local ratepayers. The parking restrictions from Little Shore Lane into Shore Lane in both directions should be continued to close the gaps in front of Kestor and Shore Crescent. Vehicles, some of which are commercial vehicles/vans, are always parked here obstructing the view to left and right of drivers exiting Little Shore Lane into Shore Lane. This has been a dangerous junction for a long time and is now made worse by the additional traffic to the extended Jubilee Hall car park. These restrictions are much needed for the safety of drivers and pedestrians in Shore Lane and Little Shore Lane.	We endeavour to leave as many suitable on street parking spaces as possible. Proposals restrictions cannot be extended at this stage, parking on Shore Lane will be monitored.
8	Bank Street Bishop's Waltham	I support the proposals subject to modifications	I live in the flats at the end of Shore Lane, on the junction of Bank Street. We have no parking spaces for the flats so we have to use the road along Shore Lane to park our cars. Otherwise we would have to park very far away from our residence. I would propose that a permit system is used so that those of us within the flats could still park anywhere along Shore Lane. Obviously anyone else on Shore lane that doesn't already have a driveway should be given a permit as well so that they don't lose out on parking. If this is not acceptable then I strongly object to the proposals.	A permit scheme is unfortunately not an option as it would not meet the Highway Authority (HCC) criteria for its implementation. New schemes are required to be cost neutral, with the implementation, administration and the ongoing enforcement costs being balanced by the cost of the permits. This means small schemes are generally not viable, and would be unlikely to be supported by the majority of residents. Unrestricted parking will remain on Shore Lane, as will the existing stretch of no waiting 8am-6pm that is at the northern end closer to your property. At the northern end of Shore Lane the only locations where restrictions are proposed are unsuitable ones at junctions. Short term and permit parking is available in Jubilee Hall car park. Please contact the Parish Council for details of permit application process.

	Address	Support/ Object/ Support with Modifications	Comments	Officer response
9	Bank Street Bishop's Waltham	I support the proposals subject to modifications	<p>I am a resident of a set of flats in the area, and as such I do not have my own parking space or driveway, and as such some availability for local road parking is essential, as otherwise the only place for parking is quite a distance from the flat. However, having had to travel along the road even in the lower traffic conditions of lockdown, the mass of cars makes it difficult to navigate, manoeuvre and make accommodation for pedestrians. I would propose a permit only parking rule, to allow the residents somewhere to park when they are without any area to store their vehicles otherwise.</p> <p>Without such modifications, I strongly object to the proposal, as it would make working and living in any accommodation without parking extremely difficult, and the proposal as it stands makes no attempt to accommodate those issues.</p>	<p>A permit scheme is unfortunately not an option as it would not meet the Highway Authority (HCC) criteria for its implementation. New schemes are required to be cost neutral, with the implementation, administration and the ongoing enforcement costs being balanced by the cost of the permits. This means small schemes are generally not viable, and would be unlikely to be supported by the majority of residents.</p> <p>Unrestricted parking will remain on Shore Lane, as will the existing stretch of no waiting 8am-6pm that is at the northern end closer to your property. At the northern end of Shore Lane the only locations where restrictions are proposed are unsuitable ones at junctions. Short term and permit parking is available in Jubilee Hall car park. Please contact the Parish Council for details of permit application process.</p>
10	Bank Street Bishop's Waltham	Not Answered <i>but reads similar to other Bank Street ones</i>	<p>I've just been talking to a neighbour who has advised me about the proposed plans to put double yellow lines in these areas.</p> <p>As one of the people who live in a flat (The Old School House) with no parking at all I'm really concerned as to what this will mean for me - and longer term the value of my property. Please could you advise that provision will be made for residents like me who need to be able to park somewhere, or whether permits and visitor permits will be available for purchase. I can't think how it will be possible to prohibit parking in those roads without making other provisions and has really worried me.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you</p>	<p>A permit scheme is unfortunately not an option as it would not meet the Highway Authority (HCC) criteria for its implementation. New schemes are required to be cost neutral, with the implementation, administration and the ongoing enforcement costs being balanced by the cost of the permits. This means small schemes are generally not viable, and would be unlikely to be supported by the majority of residents.</p> <p>Unrestricted parking will remain on Shore Lane, as will the existing stretch of no waiting 8am-6pm that is at the northern end closer to your property. At the northern end of Shore Lane the only locations where restrictions are proposed are unsuitable ones at junctions. Short term and permit parking is available in Jubilee Hall car park. Please contact the Parish Council for details of permit application process.</p>