

## Appendix 2

### Representations (redacted)

#### A334 High Street Botley/Broad Oak

1	The passenger transport group at HCC write in support of the plans for Botley which will aid the movement of buses in the area.
2	<p>We are writing in connection with the proposed extension of the existing parking and waiting restrictions in Botley High Street.</p> <p>We object strongly to the proposed changes on the grounds that they will serve only to increase the volume and speed of traffic passing through the village during the peak times indicated.</p> <p>Botley High Street already has an excessive amount of traffic and suffers from extreme volumes of traffic whenever there is disruption on the M27 Motorway. Prohibiting parking or waiting on the currently unrestricted sections of the street will also inconvenience trade and private deliveries to the properties affected. The solution to your perceived problem is to expedite the construction of the Botley by-pass.</p> <p>We trust that you will therefore reconsider this proposal.</p>
3	<p>I have just received your letter dated 26th March 2021 Ref. HEWEB/A13/TRO regarding the proposed implementation of waiting and parking restrictions along Botley High St. I have now lived on the High Street for the past 14 years or so during which time the traffic flow has steadily increased, and, along with many others have been looking forward to the Botley Bypass to reduce noise and flow of traffic along the High St.</p> <p>Within the past two weeks or so there have been traffic works outside the Texaco garage (Broad Oak) to install a Traffic Information sign, and now we are to get parking and waiting restrictions on the High St, given the imminent construction of the bypass due to likely start in 2021/2 as per the hants.gov website (<a href="https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/transportchemes/botleybypass">https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/transportchemes/botleybypass</a>) and the fact that traffic using the new bypass would not pass this latest traffic information sign, are the residents of Botley being misled over the proposed bypass?</p>

#### Barrowfield Close

1	<p>As a resident of Barrowfields Close I am pleased that these waiting restrictions are being put in place.</p> <p>However, the main cause of congestion along Moorgreen Road during school drop-off and pick-up times is the cars that park along the south-west junction up to the bus stop. The proposed no waiting restriction on the plan along this road will therefore not alleviate this problem. If it were to be extended up to the bus stop it would make a big difference in helping to alleviate the congestion &amp; I would like this to be considered.</p>
---	--

#### Chalk Hill

1	Thankyou for your letter about the proposed parking restrictions. Please would you tell me whether there will be double yellow lines on Chalk Hill, West End or whether it will be restrictions plates on the lamp posts?
---	---

2	<p>I am broadly in favour of the measures in the order, there has been too much parking on pavements recently. However I have to put forward my concern as one of the only two properties on Chalk Hill without any off road parking at all . Would it be possible perhaps to have a line drawn on the pavement so it allows my self and my neighbours car to park slightly off road while leaving enough pavement for pedestrians. I always tend to park on the side roads in order to leave the pavement free and keep my wing mirrors intact . But there are times i need to unload the car outside the house . Would it be possible for a half width parking bay to be created outside our two homes so the cars could be parked safer while allowing a permanent pavement at all times , I see this has been done further down the hill, As i say the only reason i have made this objection is because i have no off road parking , I fully appreciate the reasoning behind the order , i think that any one that has off road parking options should use them and not park on pavements</p>
3	<p>Totally agree with proposal to stop cars parking on pavements in Chalk Hill, the amount of times I have to walk in road is ridiculous.</p> <p>I live past Beechwood rise going up Chalk Hill (pavement side) and have a concern that should vehicles not be able to park on kerb one side they may park opposite which means they will park half on soft verge. This will not only damage the grass verge but also make it harder for people leaving their homes to view the road.</p> <p>Finally are there any plans to put traffic calming measures on chalk hill? The road is not only a major rat run most road users consider it a speed track.</p>
4	<p>As a resident on Chalk Hill (no.39) I am pleased to support your proposal for 'No Waiting at anytime on verge or footway'.</p> <p>Your plan however indicates that there is an existing no waiting at any time restriction between number 42 Chalk Hill and number 56. I can confirm that the existing restriction from the corner of Clifton Gardens only extends as far as the gateway of no.42 not as shown on your plan. Can you please confirm that this will be put in place as per your plan.</p> <p>Regarding the top of Chalk Hill, does the proposed green line join up with the existing restriction at the junction with West End Road? There is always a problem with cars parking half on the pavement opposite the flats just before the bend.</p>
5	<p>My submission is that we are quite all right as we are and I disapprove of the expense and unsightliness of yet more 'street furniture' and markings on this nice semi-rural road. I have observed occasional parking on the pavements along the length of the road but it seems quite infrequent and causes, as far as I'm aware, very little nuisance, up with which we should be prepared to put.</p> <p>In particular, the recent Traffic and HEWEB consultation seemed to accept that parking partially on the pavement opposite the flats of 86 Chalk Hill, Monterey Court, with the exception of the now yellow lined part immediately adjacent to the junction, was an acceptable compromise with their lack of parking for visitors on the site; it hardly disrupted traffic, and the pavement was still left with enough space to get a pram or wheelchair past. There are many places where parking on a verge or pavement is allowed and marked, such that enough space is left for pedestrians, and I think that might be preferable to forcing cars to park totally in the road. There is space up at the top end to widen the road on the East side leaving only the pavement of just sufficient width. My worry is that by forcing cars off the verges, they will park fully in the road and that will be then used as an excuse to put in the hideous yellow lines which will in turn present severe restrictions on visitors to all the houses in Chalk Hill. If there have been isolated, and, I am guessing, very few, cases of total</p>

	<p>pavement obstruction, surely these can be dealt with individually. Regular visitors quickly learn to leave a sufficient gap. It seems also excessive to make the restriction 'at all times' rather than just 'the working day'. I realise that the council has a duty to protect the interests of pedestrians as well as road users. If this is an apparent conflict between the two, I would be interested to know how the advantages and disadvantages to each group have been assessed and apparently judged in favour of pedestrians. It does seem to to the layman that the council tends to favour more and more restrictions, as the answer to any problems.</p> <p>The attitude of finding out what people want and helping them to achieve it doesn't seem to show through very often.</p>
6	<p>I support this idea, however, it needs to be completed in conjunction with traffic calming measures such as speed humps. Cars often race down and up the hill greatly exceeding speed limits and cars parked in the Road (although dangerous) actually slow the speeding traffic.</p>
7	<p>I am pleased that something is going to be done as it has been getting worse of late ,and would it be possible to include a few metres into Coopers Close on the South Side as walking down chalk hill one has to step onto the road to access Coopers Close due to vehicles parking right up to the Junction ,also it affects vehicles entering and leaving the Close causing head on meetings would you please consider this proposal .</p>
8	<p>The reasons stated could be best avoided by providing access only to Chalk Hill from the south and north end to restrict through vehicular traffic. You state that Chalk Hill is a busy C class road which is classed as a minor road in the UK yet it has all class and weight of vehicles using it and a number of them at speed, putting double yellow lines will not solve the problem. This traffic needs to be kept to the main road this would allow residents to access and leave their homes on foot or by car and be safe in doing so. Chalk Hill has been turned into C class through route for all vehicles on its west flank there is no footpath for more than half of its length. This has been brought about by Highways amendments in West End in the past altering the flow of traffic. By restricting the flow of traffic you will solve the problem and remove a dangerous hazard for the residents</p>

### Maunsell Way

1	<p>While we appreciate the need to reduce traffic and make Maunsell Way safer, unfortunately the only thing the new parking restrictions will do is move the inconsiderate parkers and drivers to the side roads. This is already a problem in Giles Close and particularly for children walking to school the proposed markings on the main road will make Giles Close considerable more dangerous as more cars will be driving in and out both looking for parking and turning. The only option I see is to put parking restrictions in the narrow side roads so that cars cannot park at school time (this is already the case in Cudworth Mead), while also encouraging parents to either walk or use a local car park, eg Drummond Road.</p>
2	<p>Police have reservations regarding EBC proposal to install restrictions at Maunsell Way between Drummond Road and Giles Court. We note the proposals will require vehicles to park on the opposite side of the road to the school as opposed to the current situation where vehicles park on the same side of the road to the school.</p> <p>We recognise the issues for traffic management which occur during school travel times and there is no perfect solution. However, the priority is to provide as safe an environment as possible for pupils travelling to and from school.</p> <p>Requiring vehicles to park on the opposite side of the road to the school means children</p>

	<p>exiting from those vehicles will have to cross the road. This places them in potential conflict with other vehicles. Our preferred option would be for the children to exit vehicles straight onto the footpath adjacent to the school avoiding the need and potential risk of crossing the road.</p> <p>Consequently, Hampshire Constabulary does not support the proposal for Maunsell Way restrictions between Drummond Road and Giles Court.</p>
3	<p>I would like to provide an observation regarding the proposed changes to Maunsell Way. You have proposed that there be an increase to the no-waiting at any time restriction on Maunsell Way. Whilst I applaud the desire to make the road safer - my concern is:</p> <p>Once clear of vehicles, cars will be able to drive at an increased speed down Maunsell Way. When cars are there the traffic naturally slows down, which makes it safer in the event of an incident. Cars always speed up – some significantly once the road clears.</p> <p>My concern is that cars will be parking elsewhere on Maunsell way or the side roads, ie. the issue being pushed elsewhere, whilst actually making the areas which should be slower unsafe, or rather at more of a risk.</p> <p>I also note that Cudworth Mead is proposed to become "No waiting between times". One one side of the road – the diagram doesn't show the limit of the new restriction. I certainly support making one side of the road off limits – I would also suggest a traffic control officer attending – people tend to park at the junction of Cudworth Mead.</p> <p>In summary, I am suggesting that moving waiting vehicles on Maunsell way will increase traffic speed, (&gt;30mph) which would have a massive effect on the survivability of an impact with a child. I urge you to allow this natural traffic calming to remain.</p>
4	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I would like to complain about not receiving a notification letter about the proposed traffic restriction orders (TRO) on Maunsell Way. These restrictions will have a direct impact to residents on surrounding streets. This is the second time this year that I have complained about not being notified by Eastleigh Council of changes occurring near to my home address. The TRO required a response by Friday 7<sup>th</sup> May, and I was not made aware of the planned restrictions until Monday 10<sup>th</sup> May.</li> <li>2. I would like to propose an amendment to TRO order, Maunsell Way Plan 1, and to extend the no waiting lines between 8 am and 9 am and 2:30 pm and 3:30 pm along the righthand side of Cudworth Mead past the lay-by area along to the first set of white H bars for the following reasons. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Currently people ignore double yellow lines on Cudworth Mead and park on the corner causing outbound traffic to drive on the opposite carriage way.</li> <li>b. Parents picking up children park two cars deep across the lay-by area blocking in cars parked in the lay-by. Please see photos below.</li> <li>c. Drivers do not respect the single white lines marking at driveway entrances making it dangerous to exit driveways due to blocked vision and this means that you must exit the driveway on to the wrong side of the carriageway. Please see photos below.</li> <li>d. Due to the changes in the pre-school and primary school start and finish times, the traffic issues are prolonged and there may be up to 6 different car parking changes during one morning or afternoon pickup time. This exacerbates the parking and access issues and also increases the risks of accidents to pedestrian and drivers.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>

	<p>I note that the current plans have incorrectly documented the no waiting times on Cudworth Mead as 2-pm to 3 pm when they are actually 2:30 pm to 3:30 pm.</p> <p>3. I would like to object to TRO Maunsell Way Plan 2. Although TRO Maunsell Way will improve access for traffic and pedestrians along Maunsell Way, it will cause further traffic issues on the surrounding side roads pushing traffic which cannot park on Maunsell Way on to narrower roads such as Cudworth Mead, Walker Gardens, Locke Road and Missenden Acres. TRO Maunsell Way Plan 2 does not include any solutions to alleviate the problems of additional volume of traffic which will try to park on these neighbouring side roads.</p>
--	---

### Monarch Way

1	<p>I've just spoken to your customer service advisor regarding the above named notice which has appeared outside of our house this afternoon. One of the proposals is to make 'from the boundary of numbers 22 and 23 Monarch Way Westwards to it's western closed end' a 'no waiting at ANY time' area. As residents of Monarch Way we have to deal with inconsiderate parking around school times on a daily basis which I am assuming is why this proposal has arisen? So whilst we welcome any help it does cause us a major issue. We live at number 22 and bought the house just over a year ago. Although the properties generally have a decent sized driveway, ours has an attractive large artificial grassed area (another reason we bought the house) meaning we can only fit one car on our driveway (we can squeeze two in but the tail end of the second car sticks out onto the pavement which we don't think is acceptable) so therefore we park the second car on the area your proposing to be a no waiting area!</p> <p>We are currently a two car household but our eldest son turns 17 in three months time, and will be learning to drive, and we will then become a three car household. This parking area outside our house was one of the attractions in buying the house as you can also fit two cars there. Knowing how controversial parking can be and the neighbourhood disputes that can arise we spoke to all of our neighbours after moving in who all gave their blessing to us parking our cars there.</p> <p>Under your proposal will there be a permit that allows us as owners of number 22 to be allowed to continue to park there? If not, we are then going to be looking to park our cars outside someone else's house which therefore makes the whole exercise rather pointless in our opinion as it will just shift the problem on to one of our neighbours.</p> <p>Please could you respond and let us know where we stand with this?</p>
2	<p>The proposed restrictions outside 120 monarch way will ensure that parking for myself resident at 120 severely restricted when there appears to be no significant problems evident (restricted parking already in place further north) during school traffic peaks. In order to improve perceived traffic issues for a period of 2 X 20 mins per day, the restriction directly outside 120 monarch way will apply 24/7 which feels excessive.</p>
3	<p>I do think putting in extra yellow lines is a good idea , especially on corner of house 120 , but I feel if doing the lines it should also be extended on bend of houses 117-118 to help traffic flow, as gets congested on that corner in school hours . However at same time, doing this I don't see it solving anything during school hours because parents park on the yellow lines on a daily bases (some days worse than</p>

	<p>others but as you can imagine winter/ wet days is a nightmare for this) and parking in front of driveways, as there is no one to enforce this. We had traffic wardens out the other day , one walked past a car parked In front of drive and didn't say anything, then they both stood in same spot for next 20 mins , not doing anything. ( have photo of this) We need better enforcement, like tickets on regular bases and regular police patrol . Otherwise the council is wasting their money putting in extra yellows, because they will be ignored . I have plenty of pictures to show you what I mean.</p>
4	<p>As a resident of Monarch Way I completely support your actions and would say they potentially don't go far enough. I think it would also be helpful if the double yellow carried on in front of numbers 120 to 177. Regardless of this they will still park over them on the school run as they currently do. They do not think of road regulations/ Highway Code (or common sense that parking my car/small tank will block the road) It would be helpful to regularly have parking wardens issuing tickets on the school runs.</p>

#### Upper Northam Rd/Yew Tree Close

1	<p>I object to this proposal. There are currently double yellow lines everywhere surrounding the proposed areas. We have two vehicles, one of which is used as a tradesman vehicle with tools and essential equipment. The other is for my partners business, working as a childminder. My trades vehicle would have to park a very long distance from my house, something I am not happy to do considering the contents inside. My partner runs a business from home as a childminder. It is not practical to walk all of the children to her vehicle along a busy road. She also has parent drop off and collections. If there was somewhere nearby to park it still would not be ideal but there is literally nowhere to park. The road is very quiet with few cars coming through. It has two separate entrances. I know this has no impact on my objection, but, when you consider road's like Portsmouth Road in burseldon for instance.. there's a long line of parked cars causing great difficulty to drive along the road as it's a very busy road. Nothing is done here. There are many more roads like it. I strongly object</p>
2	<p>I would like to register our objection to the proposed TRO: THE BOROUGH OF EASTLEIGH (HEDGE END, WEST END AND BOTLEY) (AMENDMENT NO 13) ORDER 2021 covering the placement of Double yellow lines outside of our property at 52 Upper Northam Rd Hedge End SO30 4EB for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We are regularly visited by my parents who are both in their 90's, if the Double yellow lines are installed they will no longer be able to visit as the nearest open parking facility would then be down the hill into the Village centre. Although to many of us the walk back up the hill from the Village wouldn't be restrictive, however to them it would simply be prohibitive and as such they would become less mobile and unnecessarily more housebound.</li> <li>2. Due to my redundancy I am currently looking into starting up a small consultancy business from our home. I intend to offer design services whereby on occasion individual clients may need to call in to review any projects. If the visitor parking restriction is imposed then you will unnecessarily and a directly have a prohibitive impact on my ability to work from home, whereby alternative premises wouldn't be viable for such a small business start up.</li> <li>3. As we are both very near to full retirement and out of work, If in the event that we need to move house as a result of not being able to generate sufficient income, then the value of our property will be significantly devalued by this proposed parking restriction. With my wife registered as 'Clinically Vulnerable' we are already located in a desired bungalow</li> </ol>

close to the village amenities and shouldn't have to move. If as a consequence we are then forced to move then this would also represent a unnecessary financial burden.

4.

We are the only support for our grandchildren whereby in the effort to allow our children to work we look after our grandchildren each week. They are dropped off and collected from our home and the unnecessary parking restriction would mean they would then need to park down the village and be walked up, although not the end of the world, this again would just be unnecessary.

5.

As we are located at the bottom end of our cul-de-sac which is set back off the main Highway, where anybody visiting parks right into the corner which then allows other vehicles to pass, including the dust cart, Ambulances, and many delivery or post office vans. As such parking in front of our property doesn't stop through traffic access. As we are tucked in the bottom corner of the Service road such effective parking in front of our property does not obstruct the passage of traffic, or prevent other residents from accessing and egressing their driveways.

6.

In discussions with a few of our neighbours in the Cul-de-sac and adjoining Yew Tree close, if the TRO is imposed as stated, there is an intention to park in the unrestricted Wheatsheaf Court being the nearest parking available rather than the Village car park! I realise that although this is within their rights this will simply move any perceived highway restriction down into Wheatsheaf Court also creating unnecessary grievances between neighbours who I'm sure will incorrectly believe they have more of a right to park in front of their houses!

The proposal to implement the Double Yellow line parking restriction through out the entire Service road is taking the simplest and probably the cheapest option to resolve a perceived issue, with little regard to the consequential problems that will arise from its enforcement!

We all realise there could be a need to restrict parking within the single road entrance to Yew Tree close, although that also has never represented a problem since it's construction! We have lived at No 52 Upper Northam rd. for over 34 years where we have always had one of our cars parked outside of our house which has become established custom and practice and has never been a problem for anybody, so what has changed which has never historically been deemed an issue for justification of this TRO but apparently now justifies this current requirement?

A suitable Resolve:

If regulations have changed which now present a genuine need to increase vehicular Access along our Service road, then a much more effective resolve would be to reduce the Island width separating our properties from the main Highway. The adjacent Kerb could easily be pushed back into the Island by at least 1mtr thereby widening the Service road and removing the need for any visitor parking restrictions.

Additionally the bottom end of the Service road , adjacent to No.52 would be better closed off, allowing access only from the much more suitable & wider Grange Nursing Home entrance, which could then remove the need to widened the thoroughfare that the current Service road presents. Closing the lower end Entrance would also remove the ongoing Flooding issues experienced by property No's 52 & 54 which is caused by the inefficient storm water drainage from the main Highway. The Highways Agency have recently serviced the drains by pumping out 12 tons of collected silt!

Works Ref 21514906 with further works planned to try and resolve the flooding issue!

These proposed options provided above represent a more suitable resolve to any recently perceived accessibility restrictions and would remove the inherent problems, for all local residents that will arise as a direct consequence if this TRO is enforced as stated!

3	<p><b>Proposed waiting and parking restrictions – Hedge End, West End &amp; Botley</b></p> <p>Thank you for your letter dated 26 March regarding proposed changes to restrictions in Upper Northam Road and Yew Tree Close.</p> <p>We are very pleased that this work is being carried out as vehicles are parked constantly outside 52, 56, 68 and 70 Upper Northam Road blocking the road making it impossible for delivery vehicles and emergency vehicles to access Yew Tree Close safely. Also cars parking in Yew Tree Close make it impossible for emergency vehicles to access it.</p> <p>The only concern we have is that there is currently one parking space outside 1 Yew Tree Close (see attached plan) which is convenient for residents' visitors, and we believe that this place should remain.</p> <p>We look forward to the work being carried out.</p>
4	<p>I feel the" no waiting at any time "only needs to be both sides of the entrance road,not the whole close in it's entirety,as this will create parking problems for residents visitors</p>
5	<p>I have just had ----- from -- Yew Tree Close, Hedge End, SO30 4ED.</p> <p>She is really happy at what is being proposed as she is getting fed up with people parking there as the road is narrow and people knock her door thinking the vehicle outside her bungalow are hers when they are blocking the road as it is very narrow.</p> <p>She says that she is not on email but if you do need to speak to her then her number is ----- otherwise please can you accept her agreement to this.</p>
6	<p>I would like to express my objections for the above proposal of traffic/ no waiting outside 52-58 Upper Northam Road.</p> <p>Yellow lines will severely impact my parents and long term neighbours houses. There will be no visitors parking available any closer than the village.</p> <p>Surely with the issues of vehicles that are clearly too large to enter the road and the constant flooding the elderly residents have had to endure for many years it would make sense to do one of two things or even both.</p> <p>Close their end, so that's there's no access from this end - this will avoid potential flooding. And/or widen the island so that two vehicles can pass with ease without having to mount the island or damage vehicles.</p>
7	<p>We're writing to appeal the proposed parking restrictions at our address.</p> <p>Our reasons for the appeal are as follows:</p> <p>We only have a single driveway and 2 vehicles. The parking restrictions that have been put in the area would mean that one of our vehicles would need to park around half a mile away from our home. This is not something that any home owner wants to do but given the crime rate in the area at the moment, it's a very big concern for us.</p>

I'm also a childminder so even though parents picking up and dropping off their children only takes a matter of minutes, they too would have to park far away, potentially affecting my business.

Any updates regarding the parking restrictions would be appreciated.

### Disabled Persons' Parking bays (various roads)

1	<p>Hi I have been given your contact details to contact regarding some spaces that are going to be painted where I live. I'm in Ambleside, botley, so30 2nt and there has been a sign out up saying up to 6 disabled spaces are going to be painted in our shared car park. I obviously completely understand the need for a disabled space, however I am concerned because I have a van and can only park in a few of the spaces there are as it is due to the way other people park, making it not possible for me to get out in the morning. I was hoping to find out how many and where the spaces would be put or if it wasn't decided whether it would be possible to have them on the area of the car park that cars can park easily but not other vehicles?</p>
2	<p>Hi there is a notice on the green in longclose road about you putting another disabled parking space in myself and my neighbours totally reject any more being put in as there is not enough parking anyway and where they are now there isn't even any disabled people that use them as the residents do NOT have cars and it's just the family members of those bungalows that use them and without a badge that's their own i.e. a white bmw that goes into no 28 or 26 that thinks it's their own personal space they don't live there!! Also last year you gave permission for 2 of the houses opposite the green to have drop curbs this took away 5 spaces just for 2 houses to have drop curbs and access to their drives something needs to be done to have more spaces as another of the houses has 4 cars alone there is an area of green to the left of the main green that could be turned into 4/5 new spaces which is on the end 46 which I believe is owned by the council/housing society which there is a number of houses belonging to them so would benefit all!!! You keep putting our council tax up but nothing ever happens with the parking myself and my neighbours have raised concerns about the parking numerous times and yet you do nothing!!!</p> <p>Now your saying you want to put more disabled parking in it's a joke and devaluing our house because of the parking please could someone get back to ASAP on this matter I am going to contact our local MP on this again they already know about it briefly</p>
3	<p>----- called to say that she has seen a notice on the pole outside on her street to say that a disabled bay will be erected between 19-53 on Lower Northam Road. She lives at no.-- and wants to know where exactly this will be? Please can you call her on -----</p>
4	<p>I understand from a notice that has appeared in Cobbett Way, Botley that there is potentially some new disabled parking bays to be placed in Cobbett Way.</p> <p>I have tried to see the plans and cannot find them on the website so after speaking to customer services they suggested that I contacted yourselves.</p> <p>I wondered if you could let me know whereabouts in Cobbett Way these bays may be located as I just have concerns about where I will be able to park as a resident legally.</p> <p>Any information you can give me would be much appreciated.</p>

5	<p>----- (Waldon Gardens, SO18 3QL) called regarding the TRO notice where he lives regarding Disabled Bays. Couldn't see this road on the emailed list of TROs - so wan't sure what this was for. He's quite anxious that we might move his disabled bay to make room for another and he wanted some reassurance if possible. Sorry he wasn't able to explain very well what the notice said for me to!</p>
6	<p>I am contacting you regarding the sign in Cobbett Way about disabled parking bays I live at number -- Cobbett Way where there are 6 Bungalows and 5 parking bays one of which is a disabled bay which currently serves the lady in number -- and no other resident needs a disabled bay . If more disabled bays are made it will leave the other residents with nowhere to park legally . I hope that you will take this into consideration when deciding the allocation of disabled bays in Cobbett Way. Thanking you for your time and assistance</p>
7	<p>Re: Schedule 10 Roads with up to six Disabled Persons' Parking Bays (Addition) I am enquiring about Disabled Parking Spaces in High Street, West End. There is currently a Disabled Parking Space outside No10 High Street. As neighbours, we were not consulted about this before it was painted on the road last year. Can you please comment on this, as we objected at time of painting. Ie. Was the correct procedure followed ? Under your current proposals, are you adding any more Disabled Parking Bays within 50m of existing, or is this just confirming the existing one outside No 10</p>
8	<p>DEAR SIRS</p> <p>PROPOSED DISABLED PARKING BAYS, BIRCH ROAD HEDGE END, SOUTHAMPTON.</p> <p>FOLLOWING THE NOTICE DISPLAYED REGARDING DISABLED PARKING BAYS IN BIRCH ROAD, WE WISH TO <u>OBJECT</u>, TO ANY FURTHER BAYS</p> <p>THERE ARE ALREADY 3 DISABLED BAYS FOR THOSE RESIDENTS WHO QUALIFY.</p> <p>THERE IS A STRETCH OF THE WITH YELLOW LINES WHICH REDUCES PARKING AND ALSO A DROPPED KERB WHICH HAS TO BE KEPT CLEAR.</p>

	<p>WE ALREADY EXPERIENCE DIFFICULTIES BEING ABLE TO PARK AS RESIDENTS FROM LONGCLOSE ROAD AND BEECH ROAD USE BIRCH ROAD.</p>
9	<p>Whilst I appreciate the availability of disability parking bays is crucial for those who require them, the addition of these in the crescent is likely to cause further on street parking issues. The on street parking in this area is already far over capacity, difficult to navigate and frankly dangerous on what was a narrow road and has now become a single car width road due to the inconsiderate parking, with very few spaces to manoeuvre should you encounter a car coming in the opposite direction. The addition of further disabled parking bays would lead to a shifting of this inconsiderate parking around the bays and make the situation worse. In conclusion, the principle of disabled bays is obviously important, however there are serious vehicular and access issues in Hindmarch crescent which I feel the proposal will exacerbate. I believe some form of waiting restrictions by way of yellow lines are required on the crescent to prevent the dangerous parking on both sides of the road, on blind, narrow corners, and cars parked which encroach on the road, as well as cars parking over/across/opposite dropped kerbs and driveways making driveway access difficult/dangerous/impossible. Without the consideration of further waiting restrictions, the addition of disabled bays is only going to make the above worse.</p>