

20 OBJECTIONS				
	Address	support / object	Summary	Response
1	Bank Street bishops Waltham	I object	Respondent felt that restriction would move problem elsewhere including Free Street. Concern about lack of enforcement in High Street leading to indiscriminate parking.	I am hopeful that with enforceable restrictions in the inappropriate parking locations, parents will choose to use one of the nearby car parks instead. Moving the parking will improve safety for the school children. I have passed your comments regarding enforcement onto out parking services department. The recent survey was carried out by the Parish Council independent of Winchester City Council. Traffic Regulation Orders for 'moving traffic' (versus 'static' parking) matters are the remit of HCC as the Highway Authority. Pedestrianising shopping areas is a large, potentially controversial, project we do not have the resources to progress at this time. It is further complicated in historic locations, such as Bishops Waltham, with narrow streets for alternative routes.
2	pine road	I object	Would like to restriction extended in Pine Road to improve safety for pedestrians	This location wasn't brought to my attention during the initial consultation with the schools and the local police, and it didn't stand out to me as requiring a restriction here. Unfortunately the extents of restrictions cannot be increased/ added at this stage. The impact of any restrictions that are implemented will be monitored for future amendment. HCC has terminated all districts traffic and parking agency agreements as of April 2023, therefore future projects will be considered by them.
3	Oak Road Bishop's Waltham	I object	Respondent is concerned about introduction of parking restrictions outside their property. Concerned that the restrictions will make it difficult to park for local residents. Respondent suggested residents parking	Unfortunately your house is by the junction with Pine Road and very close to the Junior School vehicle access, and the current parking in this area can be obstructive. There is unrestricted parking around the corner from your house on Pine Road.
4	Langton Road Bishop's Waltham So32 1gf	I object	Respondent feels that current restriction are not enforced in the high street and any new restrictions will be ignored . They are concerned about allowing parking at the top of the High Street and suggest the use of lockable bollards and a single disabled bay.	I don't understand why you object to vehicles parking at the top of the High Street, it is 2 lanes wide and as its one way parking on one side it isn't obstructive. The proposed no loading at any time restriction at the junctions will keep the junctions clear. I have passed your comments regarding enforcement onto out parking services department.
5	pine road bishops Waltham	I object	Respondent is concerned about the number of disabled bays in Pine Road. They would like residents permits if restrictions are to be enforced	I will check whether the disabled bays on Pine and Oak Road are still required, and remove any that are not. The enforcement of the any restrictions that are implemented will be included in parking enforcement programme. To introduce permit parking would require a new Traffic Regulation Order to be made. WCC currently act on behalf of HCC for local on street parking matters. HCC policy is that new permit schemes are self financing, and they are only considered in areas where the majority of residents don't have off street parking (including garages and parking courts). Therefore I suspect this area would not qualify, also they do not guarantee a space to those who have purchased permits.
6	The Avenue, Bishops Waltham	I object	Respondent is concerned that the additional restrictions will cause access problems in Avenue Road for local disabled residents. Request changes to communal parking area.	Drivers can stop on double yellow lines to load/ unload and to allow passengers to get in and out, therefore drivers can stop outside your house to pick you up or drop you off. Visitors can park on the unrestricted stretches of nearby roads. Highway rights allow for people and vehicles to pass and repass, parking on public highway is not a right. The council is unable to make changes to your public off street parking area, and unfortunately I do not think there is a suitable location for a disabled bay to be marked close to your property.

7	Andrewes close bishops	I object	Respondent objects to the proposed disabled bays in the High Street, would prefer very short stay parking or no parking. Would prefer any bays to be dual use for mothers and children and disabled bays. Feels that the major of shops in Bishops Waltham are not accessible. Feels that the majority of disabled people could park in adjacent car parks	It is difficult to understand why you object to vehicles parking on the western side at the top of the High Street, it's two lanes and as its one way, parking there isn't obstructive. The proposed no loading at any time restriction at the junctions will keep the junctions clear. The proposals are increasing options for parking, not reducing them. The increase in distance from the same street to a few streets away can make a significant difference to someone with limited mobility.
8	Hermitage Close, Bishops Waltham	I object	Respondent is concerned that the proposals do not address the issues in the area. They would like a permanent one way system around the school. With safe drop off areas. They feel that sometimes taking the car to school is the only solution and this will move the problem elsewhere. Would like the High Street pedestrianised. They broadly support proposals in Avenue Road but consider the bus stop should be included within the proposals	1) An official one way system would require another Traffic Regulation Order, and as a 'moving' traffic order it is not within the remit of the Agency Agreement we have with the Highway Authority Hampshire County Council under which we manage local on-street parking matters. There is still unrestricted parking near the school for those who cannot walk from one of the nearby car parks. I am hopeful that with enforceable restrictions in the inappropriate locations, the use of one of the nearby car parks will become more routine, freeing up the unrestricted parking areas for those who need it (sick, injured or disabled children/ parents). Moving the parking away from the school entrances will improve safety for the school children walking in, which may make it more desirable to walk, in turn reducing the parking problem. 2) Pedestrianising any of the High Street would also require a 'moving traffic' order, so is the remit of HCC. To make such changes is a large, potentially controversial, project. It is further complicated in historic locations, such as Bishops Waltham, with narrow streets for alternative routes. 3) Your comments regarding the bus stop are noted. I am intending to add the signing to make the bus stop an enforceable restriction.
9	High street, Bishops Waltham	I object	Respondent feels that the situation in the High Street, should remain as is. Would prefer a single disabled bay if one is necessary.	The top of the High Street is currently all no waiting at any time, therefore these proposals increase the legitimate on street parking. These proposals were initiated due to concerns raised by the Parish Council regarding highway obstruction issues during deliveries, and access for large vehicles. Having carefully considered your comments it is felt that the increase in legitimate parking is of overall benefit to the town centre, however the operational hours of the goods loading bay will be reduced to 7am - 7pm (instead of 6am start). The disabled bay was requested by the Parish Council, and will improve access for those with reduced mobility.
10	Oak Road, Bishops Waltham	I object	Respondent is concerned about access to property under the proposals and believes this will be reduced. Concern raised about completing with school time parking. Believes school needs to take more responsibility for issues and work with residents on a better solution.	The proposed no waiting at any time restriction proposed on the southern side of Oak Road Spur (by the off street parking behind your property) will not affect your access or use of your off street parking and should stop other drivers parking on the road obstructing your access to the parking area. The proposals should reduce obstructive parking, at school times. Drivers can stop on double yellow lines to load and unload, providing it isn't obstructing the road. From our records it appears the off street parking area is WCC owned, so I will liaise internally regarding the possibility of installing 'PRIVATE' marking or provision of signing to discourage non-resident parking. The school are continuing to work with the HCC Travel Planning Team to encourage the use of the nearby car parks for school drop off and pick up. I am hopeful that with enforceable restrictions, more parents will decide to make use of alternative options.

11	Oak Road Bishops Waltham	I object	Respondent is concerned that will be no where to park on street in Oak Road or the surrounding roads. Concern that this proposal will increase tensions between neighbours. Feels that there have been no accidents in the neighbourhood so proposals unjustified. Believes that the informal one way system should be formalised and additional parking bays should be created in verges.	<p>The statement you quote refers to a summary of all the proposed restrictions, the damage to property reference is for parking near the Bank Street/ High Street junction and proposed no loading restrictions.</p> <p>Unfortunately your property is located between to 2 junctions (Pine Road and Oak Road Spur) and very close to the Junior School vehicle access. Vehicles parking on both sides of the road between the junctions can be obstructive to vehicles and sightlines, and the school means it's busier than other residential roads for both vehicles and pedestrians, increasing the issue.</p> <p>The proposed restrictions leave unrestricted sections for parking, and drivers will still have to give way to pass parked vehicles. The only sections with restrictions on both side are at junctions/ the school accesses.</p> <p>The schools have had to put cones out on the junctions near them for years, and have been asking for parking restrictions for years, also the local police regularly visit to discourage inappropriate parking, so I respectfully dispute that there isn't a issue.</p> <p>An official one way system would require another Traffic Regulation Order, and as a 'moving' traffic order is not within the remit of the Agency Agreement we have with the Highway Authority Hampshire County Council under which we manage local on street parking matters.</p> <p>WCC currently act on behalf of the Highway Authority (HCC) for local on street parking matters, we do not have the remit or funding for the works required to convert verges to parking areas.</p> <p>In light of your comments and to reduce the impact of the proposal on the properties close to the school, the double yellow lines on the eastern side of Oak Road spur have been reduced by a cars length. Also, following consultation with the Infants School, the operational times of the no stopping (zig zags) restriction are reduced to 8am - 5pm Monday to Friday.</p>
12	LINCS	I object	Respondent is concerned that restriction in Oak Road will impede access to property. Believes the Council has a duty of care to provide access to property. Feels that proposals were not well advertised and a leaflet drop should have been completed.	<p>In light of your comments and to reduce the impact of the proposal on no.6, following consultation with the Infants School, the operational times of the no stopping (zig zags) restriction are reduced to 8am - 5pm Monday to Friday, and their length reduced to partway across the frontage. The double yellow lines will be extended to meet the zig zags. The double yellow lines on the eastern side of Oak Road spur have been reduced by approximately a cars length.</p> <p>Drivers can stop on double yellow lines to load or unload and to allow passengers to get in and out, therefore cars could stop outside to pick up or drop off. Visitors can park on the unrestricted stretches of nearby roads.</p> <p>The proposals were advertised in the Mid Hampshire Observer, in the TRO and public notices section of our website, and as A3 notices with colour plans on most of the street lights in the area. I also increased the consultation period from the statutory 3 weeks to 4 .</p> <p>In terms of provision of a vehicle crossing point to the property, I agree this would be the ideal solution, however my team has no access to funding for this type of work. It may be that other WCC/ government departments are able to assist but that subject is outside of my area of expertise, however with your permission I can forward your requests within WCC for consideration. I would also hope that Occupational Health would be able to provide guidance/ tools to help make it easier to continue going out (e.g. ramps for kerbs , portable wheelchair).</p>

13	Elm Crescent Upham	I object	Respondent is objection to the no stopping at any time on School zig zags in Oak Road. Feels that the proposal will restrict access to properties. Would like to have a dropped kerb constructed as part of the proposals. Considers that the proposals were not well advertised as not everyone has access to internet.	<p>In light of your comments and to reduce the impact of the proposal on no.6, following consultation with the Infants School, the operational times of the no stopping (zig zags) restriction are reduced to 8am - 5pm Monday to Friday, and their length reduced to partway across the frontage. The double yellow lines will be extended to meet the zig zags. The double yellow lines on the eastern side of Oak Road spur have been reduced by approximately a cars length.</p> <p>Drivers can stop on double yellow lines to load or unload and to allow passengers to get in and out, therefore cars could stop outside to pick up or drop off. Visitors can park on the unrestricted stretches of nearby roads.</p> <p>The proposals were advertised in the Mid Hampshire Observer, in the TRO and public notices section of our website, and as A3 notices with colour plans on most of the street lights in the area. I also increased the consultation period from the statutory 3 weeks to 4 . I don't understand how you found out about it on Facebook before the notices went up, they went up on the day the consultation started. The Parish Council were consulted and notified on the start of the consultation so maybe it was on their page or social media.</p> <p>In terms of provision of a vehicle crossing point to the property, I agree this would be the ideal solution, however my team has no access to funding for this type of work. It may be that other WCC/ government departments are able to assist but that subject is outside of my area of expertise, however with your permission I can forward your requests within WCC for consideration. I would also hope that Occupational Health would be able to provide guidance/ tools to help make it easier to continue going out (e.g. ramps for kerbs , portable wheelchair).</p>
14	Oak Road Bishops Waltham	I object	Respondent objects to the no stopping on the school zig zags in Oak Road and feels that it will restrict access to properties. Considers that the proposals were not well advertised.	<p>In light of your comments and to reduce the impact of the proposal, following consultation with the Infants School, the operational times of the no stopping (zig zags) restriction are reduced to 8am - 5pm Monday to Friday, and their length reduced to partway across the frontage. The double yellow lines will be extended to meet the zig zags. The double yellow lines on the eastern side of Oak Road spur have been reduced by approximately a cars length.</p> <p>Parking restrictions do not apply to emergency services vehicles on duty.</p> <p>Drivers can stop on double yellow lines to load or unload and to allow passengers to get in and out, therefore cars could stop outside to pick up or drop off. Visitors can park on the unrestricted stretches of nearby roads.</p> <p>The proposals were advertised in the Mid Hampshire Observer, in the TRO and public notices section of our website, and as A3 notices with colour plans on most of the street lights in the area. I also increased the consultation period from the statutory 3 weeks to 4 .</p> <p>In terms of provision of a vehicle crossing point to the property, I agree this would be the ideal solution, however my team has no access to funding for this type of work. It may be that other WCC/ government departments are able to assist but that subject is outside of my area of expertise, however with your permission I can forward your requests within WCC for consideration. I would also hope that Occupational Health would be able to provide guidance/ tools to help make it easier to continue going out (e.g. ramps for kerbs , portable wheelchair).</p>
15	Oak Road, Bishops Waltham	I object	Respondent feels that parking on Ridgemedes is difficult and additional restrictions in the area will make it worse. Considers that as they have not witnessed any accidents there is no justification for the proposals. Considers that the Council should provide alternative parking. Feels that a letter drop should have been completed.	<p>In light of comments received the length of double yellow lines has been reduced to between the eastern property boundary of no.92 and the southern property boundary of no.94, maximising on street parking whilst improving visibility.</p> <p>I am hopeful that with enforceable restrictions in the inappropriate parking locations, parents will choose to use one of the nearby car parks instead. The school are continuing to work with the HCC Travel Planning Team to encourage the use of the nearby car parks.</p> <p>The proposals were advertised in the Mid Hampshire Observer, in the TRO and public notices section of our website, and as A3 notices with plans on most of the street lights in the area. I also increased the consultation period from the statutory 3 weeks to 4 weeks.</p>

16	Hertfordshire	I object	Respondent objects to the proposals in Oak Road spur and considers that access to the properties will be restricted unnecessarily. Would like to have a dropped kerb constructed as part of the proposals	<p>In light of your comments and to reduce the impact of the proposal, following consultation with the Infants School, the operational times of the no stopping (zig zags) restriction are reduced to 8am - 5pm Monday to Friday, and their length reduced to partway across the frontage. The double yellow lines will be extended to meet the zig zags. The double yellow lines on the eastern side of Oak Road spur have been reduced by approximately a cars length.</p> <p>Parking restrictions do not apply to emergency services vehicles on duty.</p> <p>Drivers can stop on double yellow lines to load or unload and to allow passengers to get in and out, therefore cars could stop outside to pick up or drop off. Visitors can park on the unrestricted stretches of nearby roads.</p> <p>The proposals were advertised in the Mid Hampshire Observer, in the TRO and public notices section of our website, and as A3 notices with colour plans on most of the street lights in the area. I also increased the consultation period from the statutory 3 weeks to 4 .</p> <p>In terms of provision of a vehicle crossing point to the property, I agree this would be the ideal solution, however my team has no access to funding for this type of work. It may be that other WCC/ government departments are able to assist but that subject is outside of my area of expertise, however with your permission I can forward your requests on within WCC for consideration. I would also hope that Occupational Health would be able to provide guidance/ tools to help make it easier to continue going out (e.g. ramps for kerbs , portable wheelchair).</p>
17	Oak Road Bishops Waltham	I object	Respondent feels that the parking on Ridgemedede estate is difficult and these proposals will not improve the situation. Respondent requests that additional road marking are installed in Oak Road spur to identify public and residents parking.	<p>The no waiting at any time restriction proposed on the southern side of Oak Road Spur (by the off street parking behind your property) will not affect your access or use of your off street parking and should stop other drivers parking on the road obstructing your access. The proposals should reduce obstructive parking.</p> <p>From our records it appears the off street parking area is WCC owned, so I will liaise internally regarding the possibility of installing 'PRIVATE' marking or provision of signing to discourage non-resident parking.</p> <p>The school are continuing to work with the HCC Travel Planning Team to encourage the use of the nearby car parks for school drop off and pick up. I am hopeful that with enforceable restrictions, more parents will decide to make use of alternative parking options.</p>
18	Rareridge Lane Bishops Waltham	I object	Respondent feels that the proposals are too extensive. Concern raised about the additional enforcement required together with the cost. Believes that the problem is only for a short period of time and this would spread the parking further afield. Believes that an 8am-4pm restriction will impact visitors. Would like a reduced speed limit considered and enforcement of the highway code rules trialled	<p>Blanket parking restrictions have not been proposed, parking has been removed from inappropriate areas, mainly junctions and the school entrances.</p> <p>I am hopeful that with enforceable restrictions in the inappropriate parking locations, parents will choose to use one of the nearby car parks instead. The school are continuing to work with the HCC Travel Planning Team to encourage the use of the nearby car parks.</p> <p>An official one way system or speed limit reduction would require a new Traffic Regulation Order, and as a 'moving' traffic order is not within the remit of the Agency Agreement we have with the Highway Authority Hampshire County Council, under which we manage local on street parking matters.</p> <p>We have not received any comments regarding Maypole Green following the restrictions in Free Street.</p> <p>In light of comments received the length of double yellow lines has been reduced to start at the eastern property boundary of no.92, to reduce the loss of on street parking whilst improving visibility.</p> <p>The 8-4 no waiting restriction prevents vehicles parking on both sides of the road, creating chicanes or obstructions and reducing the number of spaces overall. Vehicles can load and unload, just not park. The road isn't wide enough for a vehicle to get through with vehicles parked on both sides, so to be able to park without causing obstruction, the other side of the road must have been clear, therefore they can park on that side instead, i.e. the overall parking isn't reduced by this restriction, just obstructive parking.</p> <p>In terms of enforcing rules 242 and 243 of the Highway Code. Rule 243, lists locations that logically would be obstructive or dangerous places to park, surprisingly it is not supported by any traffic law and is therefore unenforceable. Civil Enforcement Officers are only able to enforce parking restrictions marked on the road, so matters such as obstruction and dangerous parking can only be enforced by the Police. Please note should there be an incident caused or exacerbated by drivers not following the guidance of the Highway Code this would be taken into account in any court proceedings. In terms of Rule 242, police officers have powers to prosecute if you leave your vehicle or trailer in a dangerous position or where it causes any unnecessary obstruction of the road, as this rule is supported in law.</p>

19	Pine Road Bishops Waltham	I object	Respondent feels that residents would lose flexibility in parking because of the new proposals. Feels that the parking issues associated with a school were raised when planning permission was granted. The school is open for extended hours throughout the week which means residents can't park in the evenings either. Feels that a nearby development has caused additional parking pressures which are not being addressed and feels the proposals will be implemented anyway leaving residents with no alternative parking.	<p>The main locations where parking restrictions were proposed were inappropriate ones, such as at junctions and at the school entrances, or to prevent obstructive parking.</p> <p>In light of comments received and to reduce the impact of the proposal on the properties close to the school, the proposed restrictions have been reduced in 3 locations - the double yellow lines on the eastern side of Oak Road spur by a car's length, the operational times of the no stopping (zig zags) restriction are reduced to 8am - 5pm Monday to Friday, and the double yellow lines on the bend in Oak Road have been reduced to between the eastern property boundary of no.92 and the southern property boundary of no.94.</p> <p>The school are continuing to work with the HCC Travel Planning Team to encourage the use of the nearby car parks for school drop off and pick up. I am hopeful that with enforceable restrictions, more parents will decide to make use of alternative options.</p>
20	Bucks	I object	<p>Respondent objects to the proposals in particular the proposals around the infant and junior schools and in Oak Road spur. Considers that access to properties will be restricted by visitors. Feels that the existing restrictions and the highway code should be enforced and then additional restrictions would not be needed.</p> <p>Feels that zig zag yellow lines should have some provision for residents access. Feels that parking will reduce available spaces for residents. Request that a dropped kerb is provided as part of these proposals. Feels that the proposals were not well advertised and some residents may not be aware of the proposals.</p>	<p>In light of your comments and to reduce the impact of the proposal, following consultation with the Infants School, the operational times of the no stopping (zig zags) restriction are reduced to 8am - 5pm Monday to Friday, and their length reduced to partway across the frontage. The double yellow lines will be extended to meet the zig zags. The double yellow lines on the eastern side of Oak Road spur have been reduced by approximately a car's length.</p> <p>Parking restrictions do not apply to emergency services vehicles on duty.</p> <p>Drivers can stop on double yellow lines to load or unload and to allow passengers to get in and out, therefore cars could stop outside to pick up or drop off. Visitors can park on the unrestricted stretches of nearby roads.</p> <p>The proposals were advertised in the Mid Hampshire Observer, in the TRO and public notices section of our website, and as A3 notices with colour plans on most of the street lights in the area. I also increased the consultation period from the statutory 3 weeks to 4.</p> <p>In terms of provision of a vehicle crossing point to your parents property, I agree this would be the ideal solution, however my team has no access to funding for this type of work. It may be that other WCC/ government departments are able to assist but that subject is outside of my area of expertise, however with your permission I can forward your requests onto our Housing team to consider. I would also hope that Occupational Health would be able to provide guidance/ tools to help make it easier to continue going out (e.g. ramps for kerbs, portable wheelchair).</p> <p>The 8-4 no waiting restriction prevents vehicles parking on both sides of the road, creating chicanes or obstructions and reducing the number of spaces overall. Vehicles can load and unload, just not park. The road isn't wide enough for a vehicle to get through with vehicles parked both sides so to be able to park without causing obstruction the other must have been clear so they can park on that side instead, i.e. the overall parking isn't reduced by this restriction, just obstructive parking.</p> <p>In terms of enforcing rules 242 and 243 of the Highway Code. Rule 243, lists locations that logically would be obstructive or dangerous places to park, surprisingly it is not supported by any traffic law and is therefore unenforceable. Civil Enforcement Officers are only able to enforce parking restrictions marked on the road, so matters such as obstruction and dangerous parking can only be enforced by the Police. Please note should there be an incident caused or exacerbated by drivers not following the guidance of the Highway Code this would be taken into account in any court proceedings. In terms of Rule 242, police officers have powers to prosecute if you leave your vehicle or trailer in a dangerous position or where it causes any unnecessary obstruction of the road, as this rule is supported in law.</p>